

## Paradoxes of expert approaches to the study of cultural infrastructure: the Ukrainian case

Svitlana OVCHARENKO\*

### Abstract

*The article reveals the imperfection of ways to use existing approaches to the study of the cultural infrastructure in Ukraine, in particular when we apply methods offered by the UN and the EU as well. The research evidences that both foreign and Ukrainian experts are taking the first steps to ascertain the condition of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine and currently there is no objective complete database. Positive characteristics of different ways of measuring the state of cultural infrastructure are proposed to unite and Ukraine should be considered as the base country for testing scientific research methods, which will facilitate the establishment of scientific cooperation in the field of cultural policy and the coordination of joint decisions for cross-border partnership. One of the additional important parameters for the study of cultural infrastructure is its relevance to the overall political plans for the development of culture in the European community.*

*Keywords:* cultural infrastructure, cultural resources, cultural policy

### Introduction

The implementation of the Eastern European Partnership programs has involved Ukraine in various areas of cooperation with the EU within the framework of pursuing the objectives of cross-border cooperation. A special place in these programs is a partnership in the field of culture, which is considered both as an independent direction and as a direction that accompanies joint environmental, educational, sports and tourism projects. However, cross-border cooperation in the field of culture is an under-researched topic and often remains on the periphery of research interests, which are mainly focused on exploring the results and problems of cross-border cooperation in areas that have a clear economic context for the regional community.

But over the last decade, there has been a significant theoretical shift in the understanding of culture as a significant factor in political and economic processes. Nowadays, problems of functioning of the cultural environment are becoming interesting not only for specialists in the humanitarian

---

\* Svitlana OVCHARENKO is Doctor of Science, Full Professor at Odesa Regional Institute for Public Administration of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Odesa, Ukraine, e-mail: ovcharenkosvtln@oridu.odessa.ua.



sphere, but also for politicians who develop political meanings and formulate goals of strategic development. Cultural issues are presented in all major the UN and the EU strategic documents. It should be noted that a special section on culture was written in the Lisbon Treaty and subsequently expanded in detailed resolutions of the EU Council on these issues. A coherent EU strategy for 2019-2022 is currently in place, which sets out the key parameters for further cultural cooperation for cross-border partnership regions as well.

By signing the Association Agreement with the EU, Ukraine has committed itself not only to achieving some alignment with already existing EU standards and rules in various fields, but also to commit to the implementation of strategic intentions towards the future. Ukraine needs to be ready for the world outlook and technology for this. An important factor in updating the general thinking of Ukrainians is engaging in common cultural processes at different levels - state, regional, local communities and personal.

The deployment of cultural events in Ukraine since 2014 demonstrates significant progress in understanding culture as an object of public administration. Legislative, administrative and economic changes have taken place. It can be stated that the current state of culture is considered in the context of decentralization of power in Ukraine, in the context of creative economy development, and in the context of the state's European integration aspirations. In this regard, studies of the cultural sphere, which can be considered as a certain inventory of the cultural environment by quantitative and qualitative indicators, are being actively pursued. The results and methodological features of these studies can, in turn, be analysed and interpreted in terms of the further effectiveness of cross-border cultural cooperation.

The emphasis on the problem of infrastructural support for contemporary cultural processes in Ukraine is linked to the understanding that this is the material and technological basis for the deployment of cultural activities. Since any partnership is realized through a specific activity, it is crucial to understand what it can rely on and what the activity is, in what real environment it will take place. Joint partnership activities in the field of culture are no exception.

Hence, the study will answer the following questions: whether the existing infrastructural resources of Ukraine in the field of culture are in line with the overall objectives of cultural development in the EU and how can cross-border cooperation help to equalize the cultural environment for further successful cultural partnerships?

It should be noted that cultural issues are rarely the focus of attention of both researchers and representatives of different levels of public management - from government figures to members of public organizations. However, according to the research materials provided in Marcela Șluserciuc's

article "Cross-border cooperation elements along Romanian Ukrainian border - empirical evidences", representatives of different social communities, including expert groups, consider communication «people-to-people» (as one of the priority areas of cross-border communication) (Șlusarciuc, 2019, p. 331). The content and specific results of projects that implement «people-to-people» communication priorities may be different, but communication in the process of exchanging cultural practices and meanings is certainly one of the best ways to facilitate such communication. Therefore, a review of current research with up-to-date information on the state of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine will reveal its willingness to participate in organizing and supporting horizontal communication at different social levels and to serve as a basis for disseminating best cultural practices.

## **1. Research approaches to the study of cultural infrastructure**

To date, research and scholarly discussions on cultural infrastructure, for the most part, rely on some self-evident facts more often than on defined and established interpretations of the concept. That is why, before analysing data on the state of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine, it is necessary to understand the meaning of this concept and find out the limits of its application. At least, it is necessary to uncover the difficulties that arise in the comparative analysis of different sources of such data.

Because our study does not aim at a specialized discussion of the concept of cultural infrastructure, we will only reveal the existing contradictions that arise from the effort to draw up different documents. However, these contradictions affect the content of the information contained in the available research material. Explaining these contradictions, we substantiate our approach to the use of databases that will be analysed and show the need to use different approaches to evaluate them. As there is no uniquely fixed and generally accepted definition of the concept of "cultural infrastructure", it can be argued that in the vast majority of cases it is understood in two senses. Firstly, it is interpreted by analogy to the common concepts used in the field of transport, business or commerce, where, in fact, it originated. Secondly, this concept is clearly linked to the system of institutions in which cultural activities take place. However, in all cases, the concept of "cultural infrastructure" contains the meaning of being the material basis for the creation of cultural products. The problem arises at the stage of describing cultural products and the list of cultural activities. These lists are not agreed, they are not complete and final. More often than not, we come across lists that meet the general guidelines of researchers regarding their understanding of culture and cultural processes, as well as the overall objectives of the research they undertake.

In 2010, Serge Bernier and Pascale Marcotte conducted a detailed study specifically dedicated to defining the concept of "cultural infrastructure". The basic generic definition of this concept presented in the report was as follows:

A cultural infrastructure is a building, an office or a physical space that has a long useful life, that was built over a relatively long period of time, that does not have a relevant substitute in the short or medium term, that has specialized materials, that is predominantly dedicated to one or more cultural function (including creation, production, distribution, dissemination, training and conservation), and that plays a special supporting role to other factors of production in the cultural disciplines of visual arts, crafts, media arts, performing arts, heritage, museums, archives, libraries, publishing, sound recording, film, audio-visual, radio and television (Bernier and Marcotte, 2010, pp. 9-10).

The report proposes a typology of cultural infrastructure, including groupings by cultural discipline, function and clientele. Cultural infrastructure is divided into clientele levels as follows - local, regional, national, international. Methods for classifying cultural infrastructure by function and occupation are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

**Table 1. Classification by function**

---

Creation
Production
Diffusion / distribution
Training
Conservation

---

Source: Bernier and Marcotte, 2010, p.10

**Table 2. Classification according to domain**

---

Visual arts, crafts and media arts
Performing arts
Heritage, museum institutions and archives
Libraries
Book infrastructures
Sound recording
Cinema and audiovisual
Radio and television
Multidomains

---

Source: Bernier and Marcotte, 2010, p. 10

In a series of Cultural Infrastructure Index surveys specifically dedicated to the topic of cultural infrastructure and launched since 2016, we find a shorter definition of cultural infrastructure. It can be considered as an instrumental definition adapted for the purposes of this particular study. The same definition is repeated in each published report. It is outlined by the text the 2018 Cultural Infrastructure Index, which was introduced in August 2019: «Cultural infrastructure» comprises museums, performing arts centres, and cultural hubs or districts, and projects tracked include new buildings, renovations, and expansions» (AEA, 2018). We draw attention to the fact that the study analyses the events related to the construction of new and reconstruction of existing institutions and art sites, but their classification differs from the classification of French researchers by the number of categories.

In the process of analysing the data presented in the 2018 Cultural Infrastructure Index, we find four directions for examining the cultural infrastructure situation (AEA,2018):

- museum/gallery;
- performing arts centre;
- cultural hub/district;
- multifunction arts venue.

The cultural hub / district and multifunction arts venue separation criteria are not clear from the report text, and this does not clarify the summary tables. However, we emphasize the presence of an additional characteristic of the objects of analysis, which is related to the form of their organizational existence - public, not-for-profit, commercial, private (AEA, 2018). This characteristic is also important for understanding the holistic picture of cultural infrastructure.

In 2018, a conference on «Culture and Local Development», which organized by The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), was held in Venice. The relevant topics of the conference were discussed from different sides and the main conclusions are set out in the summary document. At the end of this document, Annex A lists the terms that formed the basis for formulating the general recommendations of the conference. These lists of terms are interesting in that they are presented with reference to Eurostat, which means that they have a widespread and formally agreed interpretation. These lists are an opportunity to broaden our understanding of the cultural infrastructure. Here are the two lists (OECD, 2018):

***Cultural sectors (economic activities)***

1. Printing and reproduction of recorded media
2. Manufacture of musical instruments

3. Publishing of books, periodicals and other publishing activities
4. Motion picture, video and television programme production, sound recording and music publishing activities
5. Programming and broadcasting activities
6. Specialised design activities
7. Photographic activities
8. Translation and interpretation activities
9. Creative, arts and entertainment activities
10. Libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities

***Cultural occupations:***

1. Architects, planners, surveyors and designers
2. Other language teachers
3. Other music teachers
4. Other arts teachers
5. Librarians, archivists and curators
6. Authors, journalists and linguists
7. Creative and performing artists
8. Photographers
9. Interior designers and decorators
10. Gallery, museum and library technicians
11. Other artistic and cultural associate professionals
12. Broadcasting and audio-visual technicians
13. Library clerks
14. Musical instrument makers and tuners
15. Jewellery and precious-metal workers
16. Potters and related workers
17. Glass makers, cutters, grinders and finishers
18. Sign writers, decorative painters, engravers and etchers
19. Handicraft workers in wood, basketry and related materials
20. Handicraft workers in textile, leather and related materials
21. Handicraft workers, not elsewhere classified

These lists add some new nuances to understanding the complexity of defining cultural infrastructure. We have already noted that, in general terms, infrastructure is understood as the material and technological bases for the implementation of cultural activities. Currently, many processes for the creation of cultural products and the distribution of cultural services are understood in the context of the concept of cultural industries functioning. Therefore, the list of sectors of activity in the field of CCI is interesting to us because it simultaneously describes the necessary infrastructure for its implementation. For many sectors, the infrastructure required for them has already been mentioned by us in the above lists from other sources, but there are several activities that need, obviously, special infrastructure. In the above list of CCI sectors, this refers to Printing and reproduction of recorded media, Manufacture of musical instruments, Programming and broadcasting activities, Specialized design activities, Translation and interpretation activities, Creative, arts and entertainment activities. The topic of e-technologies, which arises when discussing the distinction between cultural activities in the sphere of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) and Non-industrial (core) cultural sectors in the conference materials, which cannot be avoided in the modern world of universal digitization, should be emphasized. The definition of both industrial and non-industrial forms of cultural activity in the materials discussed is interesting in that it encourages the search for infrastructure for those forms of cultural activity and the distribution of cultural services provided on the Internet.

Cultural and creative industries (hereafter, CCIs) have developed in their current form following the development of major technological innovations at the turn of 20th century, such as voice recording, radio and cinema. They are based on the technological reproducibility of their content, are produced and distributed in organized markets, and can generate substantial profits. Such sectors attract large volumes of private investment, and only marginally rely on private or public subsidization (OECD, 2018).

The Non-industrial culture sector is defined as follows:

These activities are not properly organized as industries either because their contents cannot be reproduced by appropriate technologies or such reproducibility is not meant as a viable option for expressive reasons. Main non-industrial sectors are *visual arts*, *performing arts*, and *heritage and museums*. These non-industrial sectors mostly reflect the original pattern of cultural production. The latter was supported by patronage and subsidisation, which preceded

the emergence of modern industrial economies. Non-industrial cultural sectors often have a limited direct profitability. They are nevertheless very important as laboratories for experimentation and cultural innovation, such as platforms of citizens' participation, resources for community cohesion and urban renewal, or repositories of valuable contents of high cultural and historical value and significance (OECD, 2018).

Analysing the list of professions pertaining to cultural, we are also faced with the issue of expanding the definition of cultural infrastructure. We are encouraged by such professional activities as Authors, Interior designers and decorators, Jewellery and precious-metal workers, Potters and related workers, Glass makers, cutters, grinders and finishers, Sign writers, decorative painters, engravers and etchers, Handicraft workers in wood, basketry and related materials, Handicraft workers in textile, leather and related materials, Handicraft workers, not elsewhere classified. I think it is clear that these activities require infrastructure support, which is not fully described in the lists already mentioned.

All of these publications have one thing in common - they are all made by international consulting groups, aiming to provide guidance to public administration officials and discuss issues related to public administration. This should be emphasized as we will also consider the understanding of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine in the context of public administration. And above all, in Ukraine, certain interpretations of concepts for use in the practice of public management of the cultural sphere are concentrated in the Law of Ukraine "On Culture". It does not contain the definition of "cultural infrastructure", but there is a very important concept that largely defines the processes in state cultural policy - the basic network of cultural institutions. In fact, this concept describes a legislatively entrenched understanding of cultural infrastructure:

basic network of cultural institutions - a complex of enterprises, institutions, organizations and cultural establishments of state and communal ownership, which activity is aimed at creating conditions for the development of human creativity, collecting, preserving, using and disseminating information on material and spiritual cultural values, scientific development, and to ensure the integrity of Ukraine's cultural space, the accessibility of national cultural heritage, and respect for citizens' rights in the cultural sphere (Verkhovna Rada, 2010).

It is important to pay attention to this notion, which is fixed by law, because it is predetermined by the political situation in the sphere of culture in Ukraine, which has emerged since the beginning

of the 1990s. Also, in this concept are concentrated those processes and problems that determine the state of cultural infrastructure in modern Ukraine. There is a special Section 4 in the Law on Culture, which further describes the core network of cultural institutions. Its main provisions are as follows:

The basic network of cultural institutions is formed by executive bodies and bodies of local self-government in the manner determined by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. Existing cultural and cultural education institutions are automatically integrated into the core network. The basic network of cultural institutions of the state level include state, including national (libraries, museums, archives, galleries, reserves, circuses, theaters, philharmonic societies, music groups and ensembles, cultural-informational and cultural-educational centers, educational institutions of culture and arts), film studios, art galleries, exhibitions of national (state) importance, etc.), cultural establishments.

The basic network cultural institutions of the local level include communal cultural establishments (libraries, museums, galleries, reserves, exhibition halls, theaters, philharmonic societies, concert organizations, art collectives, cinemas, film and video rental companies, associations, palaces and houses of culture, other club establishments, cultural education institutions, art schools, studios, cultural and recreational parks, etc.).

On the basis of state social standards for providing the population with cultural institutions and cultural services, the central executive body, which ensures the formation of state policy in the fields of culture and the arts, approves the list of cultural institutions of the basic network of the national level. Local executive authorities and local self-government bodies approve lists of cultural institutions of the basic network of the local level (Verkhovna Rada, 2010).

The need to consolidate these provisions at the legislative level was connected with the attempt to prevent the privatization of the premises of cultural institutions and their further adaptation for commercial purposes. All of these institutions have been received state protection and should be maintained at the expense of the state or local budget. They have all been, and continue to be, under the auspices of the relevant public administrations and local governments. Public administrations report on the status and physical availability of cultural institutions within the core network of cultural institutions. This state of affairs has its positive and negative consequences. On the plus side, there is a compulsory budgetary funding and preservation of cultural institutions, despite the economic

turmoil in the country. Many of them are of historical and architectural value and have value as cultural heritage sites. However, there are also negative consequences - a limited understanding of cultural infrastructure as an exclusive set of communal or state-owned establishments, which must be kept as communal and state property in unchanged quantities. And this is understood as the main task of the state cultural policy on cultural infrastructure. This is due to the underestimation of the role of cultural infrastructure of private or commercial origin, as well as the lack of a purposeful plan for the modernization of the entire cultural infrastructure in Ukraine.

## **2. The state of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine**

The process of integration into the European Community encourages Ukraine to constantly monitor the various economic and social sectors for compliance with EU standards. At least, it is taking additional steps to survey those areas that have been on the periphery of public interest for many years. Such areas include culture as an object of public administration. Therefore, it is interesting to look at the results of the analysis of the state of Ukrainian culture, which were carried out during 2017-2019 by both international experts and Ukrainian. We will analyse the data from these studies regarding cultural infrastructure in two aspects. On the one hand, we will demonstrate the importance of cultural infrastructure information for comprehensive studies of Ukrainian culture, and on the other hand, we will evaluate the methodology used to study cultural infrastructure.

### **2.1. External expert assessments of the Ukrainian cultural infrastructure**

The focus of our attention will be two documents that have been implemented as part of Ukraine's striving to bring its cultural policies and public administration system closer to EU best practices. In the course of conducting studies of the state of culture in Ukraine by foreign experts, held in 2017, it became clear to many inside the country that we have a different political, economic and cultural history compared to Western European countries that play a leading role in the EU. Accordingly, starting conditions for further development in Ukraine are different from those of Western Europe, which means that the practices available in the EU countries must be adapted to the real environment of the country in all areas. The cultural sphere is no exception.

Politicians specifically involved in the development of the agenda for the cultural sector needed advice and recommendations that would, on the one hand, rely on the European experience and, on the other, on real data on the state of culture in Ukraine. In 2017, reports from two European experts'

studies appeared in a wide public space, each aimed at a comprehensive analysis of the cultural situation in Ukraine, but with different emphasis - the process of decentralization of power in the first case and the development of creative industries in the second case. These studies were not specifically aimed at examining the state of cultural infrastructure, but could not go beyond this, since, as we have shown, cultural infrastructure is a basic and necessary element of all cultural activity.

The first document we will look at is the «Ukraine's Cultural Policy Overview», which was implemented by the KEA Consulting Company under the direction of Philip Kern and presented on the website of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine in a publication dated June 19, 2017. Since the English language version of this document is neither publicly available on the Ministry of Culture's web site nor on the official web site of the KEA, we will be presenting a citation from the Ukrainian to English of the document, which is officially presented. The general overview shows that the main part of the document consists of examples of successful political and economic actions of public management of the cultural sphere in Italy, France, Spain and Austria, which according to the authors of the report, should be taken into account by the authorities in Ukraine. The main idea of the report is to formulate advice to the public authorities in Ukraine regarding the awareness of the role of culture in the process of decentralization of power, which has entered an active phase since 2014.

If the Ukrainian Government is determined to reform its cultural policy, experts recommend that it give greater weight to the political agenda and the process of modernization of Ukraine. In many ways, cultural infrastructure and governance are remnants of Soviet politics and priorities. If cultural reform does not take place, it will be difficult to change attitudes and perceptions of the changes that are taking place. Decentralization will become an opportunity for cultural operators and citizens only if the cultural strategy is clearly formulated and supported by all stakeholders, state and local authorities, institutions, investors, artists, cultural managers and citizens, especially the youth (Kern, 2017).

In this quote, attention should be paid to the characteristics of cultural infrastructure that experts consider to be a reflection of Soviet cultural policy. However, they do not comment on what they consider to be signs of the post-Soviet state of cultural infrastructure, because we have seen that the presence of museums, theatres, art centres, cinemas, leisure parks is not a characteristic of purely post-Soviet countries, but a general characteristic of cultural infrastructure throughout the world. The report describes the following characteristics of cultural infrastructure as of 2017:

As a former socialist state, Ukraine has a wide network of delocalized cultural infrastructure. According to the latest edition of the Council of Europe Compendium, there are 33324 cultural institutions in rural areas, including 16640 clubs (with amateur groups, art associations), 16000 public libraries (excluding school libraries), 800 cinemas and movie theaters (Kern, 2017)

The metrics in the report have no objections, but, there is a need for more attention to modern technologies, as they must contribute to several important cultural policy goals - the creation of creative value, the accessibility of cultural services and products, and the involvement of as many people as possible in the cultural activities.

Experts also believe that digital technologies deserve greater attention in policymaking, as they have a significant impact on the consumption and accessibility of the cultural product. The creative value chain in the cultural sphere is largely influenced by digital technologies, in particular digital distribution. Such changes offer new and alternative monetization opportunities (Kern, 2017).

As stated in the “Ukraine's Cultural Policy Overview”, it was made at the request of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine and aimed to accomplish several tasks, in particular, to propose “ways to optimize local cultural infrastructure in the context of decentralization” (Kern, 2017). However, in accordance with the objectives of our study, the search for a clear answer to the question of ways to optimize cultural infrastructure in decentralized conditions did not yield positive results. Actually, the real problem now is how to upgrade the system of 33324 cultural infrastructure in rural areas? In fact, clubs and libraries existed in all villages in Soviet times, but in the process of creating new territorial communities uniting several villages, there is a need to rethink the existing number of institutions and their technical conversion.

Although the authors in the preface assumed responsibility for the content of the data they analysed, however, given the general nature of the report's title - a review of cultural policy in the country, the position of its authors who did not use (or did not require) data concerning urban cultural infrastructure. At least in the content of the report, this is not noted as a problem for formulating an adequate holistic conclusion:

(...) it is important to involve local support for cultural services and investment in culture (infrastructure, heritage, arts education, cultural management) (...)

The following principles must be considered:

- a minimum of services to provide arts education, including contemporary approaches, in local communities;
- cultural centre managers are appointed by the local authority on the basis of personal merit and through competition;
- priority financial support is provided to the cultural centres that have developed the strategy in consultation with local stakeholders.
- encourage cultural centres to create networks and develop creative hubs to contribute to the development of local creative ecosystems (providing access to the internet, coworking spaces for cultural and creative entrepreneurs, facilitating the expression of creative skills (performance, production, distribution)), providing access to arts (literature, music, film...), to support collaboration and cross-sectoral interaction between art and science or between creative skills and industry;
- reviewing the value of local museums based on their artistic and historical contributions (to justify state support and funding). Definition of evaluation criteria, including efforts to develop audience and requirements for co-financing;
- implementation of assessment tools (Kern, 2017).

These recommendations should be considered as a response to the negative phenomena identified by the experts in analysing the situation in Ukrainian culture. We agree with all the recommendations regarding unsatisfactory management, lack of cooperation between cultural centres, lack of use of digital technologies, but in our view, recommendations to reduce activity in the field of arts education are unjustifiable. Since the report's authors do not comment on their position, it seems a bit strange, since they are consistently upholding the principle of expanding the list of cultural services. Moreover, the next episode is about supporting arts education and developing cultural infrastructure - private and public. Experts point out that the promotion of reforms in public management of the cultural sphere implies the deployment of communication at all levels - vertical and horizontal, both with the involvement of government officials and ordinary citizens. This is important for promoting reforms in the cultural sector in a context of decentralization, when the decision has to be made by the community.

Communication on reform goals should be conducted in a language understandable to ordinary citizens and include the following key messages:

- equal access to quality arts education services, equal access to culture;
- comprehensive economic and social development;
- enhancing the value of local heritage and identification with due respect for diversity;
- a stable and financially sound cultural infrastructure - public and private;
- strengthening democracy and involvement in the culture at the local level (Kern, 2017).

We will pay special attention to the statement that is constantly repeated in the text of the report - the need to introduce tools for assessing the state of culture.

This is crucial because the authors emphasize: “A monitoring and data collection system should be built in association with local and national statistical offices, capable of assessing policies and tracking the evolution of cultural practices and production. It is clear that the state of cultural infrastructure needs constant monitoring, as it is an important indicator of the state of culture at different levels - local, regional, state" (Kern, 2017).

The study "Developing Cultural and Creative Industries in Ukraine" by Cristina Farinha is the next widely known report on the state of culture in the country. The report is developed with the assistance of the EU-Eastern Partnership Culture and Creativity Programme in December 2017.

This report is a general overview of the creative industries operating conditions, which does not contain specific quantitative indicators, but takes into account the general political, institutional and managerial aspects that, in the author's view, are fundamental to understanding the process of development of the CCI in Ukraine. Cristina Farinha cites the positive and negative characteristics of the Ukrainian cultural environment that contribute to or hinder the development of the CCI in the country. As a result of the study, she describes it as follows:

**Table 3. Ukraine’s main opportunities and challenges**

<b>Ukraine’s main general opportunities include:</b>	<b>Ukraine’s main general challenges include:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dynamic start-up scene and highly skilled IT workforce facilitates the development of creative economy</li> <li>• Recent EU visa regime for Ukraine allowing free movement and exchange</li> <li>• Ongoing decentralisation process</li> <li>• provides opportunities for development of new social-cultural fabric at local level</li> <li>• Increasingly popular “Made in UA” movement alongside government focus on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital technologies potential is not fully taken into account in policy development, notably for decentralisation and democratisation of cultural access</li> <li>• Slow pace of decentralisation reform due to lack of capacity at local level and risk of not integrating the CCIs in local and regional development</li> <li>• Ongoing Ukraine-Russia territorial and armed conflict in the east absorbs</li> </ul>

supporting “national cultural product” and the promotion of Ukrainian as official language	resources and accentuates nationalism in detriment of cultural diversity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing role of civil society in activation of communities and promotion of participation in the field of culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of trust between authorities and the independent civil society hinders the advancement of the democratization process</li> </ul>

Source: Farinha, 2017, p. 4

We underscore the high assessment of the state of IT development in Ukraine, since such an understanding of the conditions actually recognizes the country's readiness to participate in the global processes in this field. The report separately underlines the need to take care of cultural infrastructure, however, these recommendations are as follows (Farinha, 2017, p. 6):

- Link and support the development of necessary infrastructure and creative hubs;
- Promote favourable ecosystem and legal framework for CCIs.

From the content of these recommendations, we can conclude that all other elements of the infrastructure that supports the functioning and development of the CCI are satisfying the author and do not require additional efforts from the authorities, business representatives and local communities.

## 2.2 Internal expert assessments of the Ukrainian cultural infrastructure

K. Farinha's review of the CCI in Ukraine is mentioned research as a positive experience of studying the state of Ukrainian culture, conducted by the method of UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators (CDIS). It was presented for public discussion in 2017 and was one of the first tests of this method. The overview of Ukrainian culture by this method was made by the Ukrainian Centre for Cultural Studies (Director – Oleksandr Butsenko) jointly with the "Development Centre Democracy through Culture".

The results of the study can be analysed from two sources - UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Technical Report and UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief. According to the CDIS methodology, cultural infrastructure is explored under Dimension 2: Governance as a separate criterion 2.3. Distribution of cultural infrastructures. This criterion in the report on Ukraine is presented in two dimensions - the number of locations and the presence of locations in administrative units - oblast (region). The authors of the report thus explain the methodology for calculating data on administrative locations:

The administrative divisions which are immediately below the state level in Ukraine, consist of 24 regions, 2 cities and 1 republic. Ukraine has two subdivisions temporarily occupied and annexed by the Russian Federation (Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol), as well as subdivisions forming parts of the partly ATO (anti-terrorism conflict) zone (parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions). Therefore the distribution of cultural infrastructures in 2015 includes 22 regions and the city of Kyiv and excludes four subdivisions (UNESCO, 2018).

In Ukraine's Technical Report we see a detailed Table 2.3, which shows quantitative data on cultural infrastructure, which is presented as venues, buildings and physical sites for public use by such elements: museums; libraries and media resource centres (libraries); exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts (clubs, theatres, circuses, philharmonic halls and concert halls). The summary score, which characterizes the state of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine by CDIS, is presented in Table 2.4 Relative standard deviation. The same valuation information can be found in Ukraine's Analytical Brief.

**Table 4. Cultural Infrastructure in Ukraine (by type)**

	<b>Museums</b>	<b>Libraries and media resource centres</b>	<b>Exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts</b>	<b>Cultural infrastructures TOTAL</b>
<b>Results</b>	0,630	0,714	0,658	0,66

Source: UNESCO, 2018

The data collected on the cultural infrastructure does not answer the questions that need to be raised by a thorough examination of its status, in particular, the questions of location at different administrative levels and the forms of organization. The chosen system of combination of various elements - libraries and media-resource centres, exhibition centres and locations for the performing arts, which are usually represented by theatres, can also be considered unsatisfactory.

However, a completely different picture can be seen, given the data presented in Section 1. Dimension: Culture as Economic Activity, which takes into account the contribution of culture to cultural employment and the contribution to cultural activities. Relevant data based on the Eurostat methodology are presented in Table 1.3. Cultural occupations in correspondence table between ISCO-08 and KP-2010 (UNESCO, 2018) and in Table 1.1 Value added in correspondence table between ISIC Rev.4 and KVED2010 (UNESCO, 2018). Based on the above data, we can conclude that Ukraine has the infrastructure resources for all forms of activities and all types of products related to

the cultural sector. But at present, there are no statistics in Ukraine that describe the totality of cultural infrastructure available in the country.

In 2018, the results of another comprehensive study of the state of culture in Ukraine, presented by internal experts and using the UN and EU methodology for measuring creativity, were publicly presented. This is the report “Cultural and Creative Ukraine’s Cities Index” (Slobodian *et al.*, 2018), which contains information on the cultural infrastructure of five Ukrainian cities - Kyiv, Odesa, Lviv, Dnipro, Kharkiv. The report's authors point out that the results obtained are not an adequate study of the method of measuring the creativity of cities, as it is tested in five cities, which is not sufficient to summarize. But the calculations made by the researchers are interesting in that they give an idea of the status of those cells, which are considered the most developed culturally and most attractive to tourists. It can be said that cultural infrastructure is understood solely as a network of physical places to visit, which, in fact, is recorded in a table created by the authors of the study. The table contains data on cultural sites per 100,000 population, as well as information on activities and subjective feelings of visitors and the total score of cultural infrastructure as a cumulative indicator.

**Table 5. Cultural Infrastructure in Ukraine (by cities)**

	Dnipro	Kyiv	Lviv	Odesa	Kharkiv
<b>Cultural infrastructure</b>	4,20	7,86	9,35	5,25	2,37
Number of theaters per 100 thousand population	0,23	0,84	1,52	0,00	0,05
Number of concert organizations per 100 thousand population	0,22	1,23	1,52	0,00	0,05
Number of museums per 100 thousand population	0,00	0,41	1,52	0,70	0,01
Number of mass and universal libraries per 100 thousand population	1,52	0,02	0,63	0,00	0,30
Number of cinemas per 100 thousand population	0,15	1,52	0,93	0,66	0,00
Number of art galleries per 100 thousand population	0,37	0,12	0,22	1,52	0,00
Number of local cultural monuments	0,00	1,38	0,01	1,52	0,01
Number of national monuments	0,00	1,52	0,13	0,03	0,08
Subjective assessment of opportunities for the diverse leisure activities in the city, positive response rate	0,19	0,38	1,52	0,00	0,38
Subjective assessment of the quality of cultural institutions, positive response rate	0,00	0,12	0,35	0,35	1,52
Part of concerts, performances, other events performing arts in the city for a year	1,52	0,52	1,03	0,48	0,00

Source: Slobodian *et al.*, 2018

While collecting data on the subjective feelings of the locals may be welcomed, it is not clear how this can be taken into account at the same time as the objective data on the number of cultural

institutions, without knowing which of the institutions have received better or worse grades. This is the first disagreement with the table. A second remark - data on the number of events may indicate the intensity of cultural infrastructure use, but again, without the distribution between theatres, museums, cinemas and concert halls, the relevance of these data is doubtful. The problem with the presented results is that we cannot calculate the number of infrastructure objects in each city, because the table shows the rating points. Therefore, in the big cities, we see "zero" as a characteristic of libraries or theatres, which is obviously not true.

Another exploration, conducted in Ukraine during 2017-2018 with the support of international funds, was specifically dedicated to the study of the state of cultural infrastructure in the united territorial communities and was implemented within the framework of the NGO «Association for Community Self-Organization Assistance». The results of the study are outlined in the analytical report “Status and Prospects for the Development of Sociocultural Infrastructure in the UTC” (UTC - United Territorial Communities) (ACSA, 2019), which was presented to the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine and the public in 2019.

As noted above, the issue of transformation of local cultural infrastructure is urgent for Ukraine as it goes through the way of decentralization of power and changes of territorial structure at the local level, in accordance. One should expect from a specialized study, conducted both at the national level and at the level of one specific region - Odessa oblast, to increase and diversify the database on cultural infrastructure in comparison with the existing ones. However, it appears that the survey was conducted through a survey of residents of territorial communities. The report contains indicators of subjective nature regarding the status of cultural infrastructure, information on the number of cultural events attended, information on the level of satisfaction with cultural life in the community. It should be noted that the survey questions are formulated in such a way that the answers may not be relevant at all to the characteristics of the community's cultural infrastructure, as it is currently known without further research that there are no cinemas and theatres in the local communities.

Unfortunately, the chosen research methodology does not lead at all to the goals set for this study, since it does not in any way describe the objective state of the cultural institutions. The only conclusion that is not a subjective definition is the conclusion that clubs and libraries are essential elements in the cultural infrastructure of the local community. But it is important to understand that all of these buildings were built in the Soviet era and are very slowly being modernized. There is no information about the possibility of using IT technologies for the development of a network of cultural infrastructure at the local level.

Based on the results of the study, the proposal to abandon the notion of a "basic network of cultural institutions" (ACSA, 2019, p.6), which is expressed in the research report, seems unconvincing and unwarranted. In fact, the authors of the report propose to introduce changes to the legislation of Ukraine, since this concept is enshrined in the law, and do not take into account the provisions of this law, which are allowed to model the network of cultural institutions for a particular community by local government decisions. Therefore, this study does not provide any constructive advice or added information on the development of cultural infrastructure. The only positive point is the emphasis on the need to study the state of cultural infrastructure for further productive decisions in state cultural policy.

### **3. The problem of modernization of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine as a problem of expert consulting**

We can state that information about the state of cultural infrastructure of Ukraine is incomplete, not structured and controversial. On the one hand, there is an extensive network of cultural institutions in Ukraine, which has been preserved since the Soviet era, but on the other hand, this network does not meet the current needs of the residents and has outdated technical equipment. Because cultural infrastructure is a basic element of cultural activity, the whole system of cultural activity suffers from the uncertainty of the situation in this field. The stimulus to accelerate the modernization of cultural infrastructure in Ukraine may be the fulfilment of the commitments undertaken by the state under the Association Agreement with the EU (KMU, 2017), as well as the involvement in Eastern European cooperation programs implemented by the European Council.

At present, the curiosity about the state of cultural infrastructure within the country is related to the following aspects:

- decentralization of power and formation of new united communities;
- development of cultural and creative industries;
- realization of programs of international cooperation in the field of culture.

The new conditions for public management and funding that arise in the process of reformatting Ukraine's administrative system at the local level affect cultural goals. Curricula for cultural managers and local authorities, many of which have been supported by the EU and the US funds, have made a significant contribution to a renewed understanding of culture as an indicator of quality of life in the community. These curricula have introduced the idea that the cultural sphere needs professional

management and has economic foundations. The concepts of "cultural industries", "cultural product", "cultural service", "cultural goods" became popular.

At the same time, the diversity and saturation of cultural life in the community is clearly coordinated with the state of cultural infrastructure as a component of the quality of cultural service. Such an approach to understanding the role of cultural infrastructure can be found in the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine "On approval of the Concept of reforming the system of providing the population with cultural services" of 23 January 2019 (KMU, 2019). The need for special measures at the level of government is first and foremost related to the state of culture in rural areas and the ambiguity of strategic objectives in this sector in the process of decentralization, which is described in the preamble to the Concept:

In the 1990s, hundreds of different cultural institutions ceased to exist, Ukrainian book publishing has been constantly declining, film production has almost ceased, and the level of attendance of cultural institutions has dropped significantly. The residual principle of financing the culture, the negative impact of totalitarian influence, the inconsistency of the activities of cultural institutions with the requirements of the present, the lack of preparedness for new economic conditions, the information discrimination of the sphere of culture - all this led to the fact that culture has lost not only an appropriate place among the priorities of state policy, but also found itself on the periphery of state interests ...

Since the mid-1990s, attempts have been made to reform cultural policy. In particular, during 1994-1996, funding for cultural institutions was transferred to local budgets. It was the first wave of the decentralization process in the sphere of culture, which did not receive positive results: even more libraries, club establishments ceased to function in the whole territory of the state, funding of art schools and so on decreased (KMU, 2019).

While sharing the general principles of the protection of cultural human rights, the Concept notes the commitment to the development of cultural infrastructure as a need to "implement a policy of modernizing existing infrastructure for the provision of cultural services", which should be based on:

a systematic approach to addressing the formation and development of cultural infrastructure to provide the population with cultural services, based on a comprehensive analysis of cultural issues and a resource planning method for a set of tools, mechanisms, programs and activities

that are able to solve various problems in a timely and effective manner in cultural sphere that will take into account the specificity of a particular region or community and the needs of the population in the services concerned (KMU, 2019).

Hence, the development of culture must take place in order to realize the accessibility of cultural goods and values for the citizens of the country through a systematic approach to the modernization of cultural infrastructure. But such a systematic approach must be provided with a scientific research framework that takes into account global trends in the transformation of cultural infrastructure. As we noted above, we are currently looking for a methodology that can comprehensively understand and describe the cultural infrastructure. International cooperation is needed in this area, and Ukraine could be the springboard for examining and improving the methods of researching the state of cultural infrastructure. Currently, Ukraine is one of the few countries that has used the UNESCO CDIS methodology and could share its experience. Ukraine is ready not only to be a recipient of cultural research, but also to make its own contribution to the science of culture.

Taking into account the desire to build a systemic vision for the modernization of cultural infrastructure, Ukraine must also take into account the goals that the state is facing in terms of its approximation to the life and economy of the EU. The system for reforming cultural infrastructure should implement the cultural commitments contained in the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement and include the implementation of A New European Agenda for Culture Association (2018) and Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022.

Based on the provisions of the "Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU" (KMU, 2017), consideration should be given to upgrading cultural infrastructure not only on the basis of the articles of Chapter 24 "Culture", but also on the basis of articles of Chapter 15 "Audio-visual policy" and articles of Chapter 16 "Tourism". Provisions of Chapter 20 "Consumer protection" for cultural services and products, Chapter 21 "Cooperation on employment, social policy and equal opportunities" for cultural institutions as workplaces, Chapter 23 "Education, training, and youth", when it comes to infrastructure for creative development and education of young people, they may also be relevant to the situation of upgrading cultural infrastructure as well.

Article 248 mentions directly the interaction in the field of cultural infrastructure sharing: "The Parties shall encourage intercultural dialogue between the individuals and organisations representing organised civil society and cultural institutions in the EU and in Ukraine" (KMU, 2017). Such cooperation should be beneficial for both parties, and therefore, Ukraine should contribute to the dialogue of cultures, taking care of the development of its cultural infrastructure.

A New European Agenda for Culture envisages the development of culture in three dimensions - social, economic and external. All these areas obviously need infrastructure support. However, we will pay attention to economic factors because the modernization, maintenance of the proper condition, reconstruction, building, technological equipment of cultural institutions are directly related to the economic indicators as they are presented in the EU agenda:

Economic dimension - supporting culture-based creativity in education and innovation, and for jobs and growth:

- Promote the arts, culture and creative thinking in formal and non-formal education and training at all levels and in lifelong learning;

- Foster favourable ecosystems for cultural and creative industries, promoting access to finance, innovation capacity, fair remuneration of authors and creators and cross-sectoral cooperation;

- Promote the skills needed by cultural and creative sectors, including digital, entrepreneurial, traditional and specialised skills (European Commission, 2018).

We would like to emphasize the use of the term "ecosystem" for cultural infrastructure. At present, there is no research or theoretical development in Ukraine to study the cultural infrastructure as a whole set of elements, taking into account all relevant criteria. But from our point of view, the systematic approach to modernizing cultural infrastructure, which is declared in state documents, can be oriented towards the ecosystem that is proposed in the EU documents. This is a promising task for cross-border cultural cooperation, as ecosystem networks can be created in the process of cooperation between different countries and regions.

## Conclusions

In the light of EU recommendations for the formation of cultural ecosystems, international partnerships in the field of cultural infrastructure development in Ukraine can be pursued in two interrelated ways - improving the methodology of cultural infrastructure research and introducing practices for the joint formation and use of cultural infrastructure for the needs of cross-border regions. The modelling of such infrastructural ecosystems should be aimed at achieving the objectives of European cultural policy, and the assessment of the quality of cultural infrastructure should include indicators that approximate those objectives.

## References

- ACSA (2019), *Status and prospects of development of sociocultural infrastructure in the UTC*, (Analytical report), ACSA Publishing (Kyiv) (retrieved from <https://decentralization.gov.ua/uploads/library/file/504/2.pdf>).
- AEA (2018), *Cultural Infrastructure Index 2018*, AEA Publishing (retrieved from [https://aeiconsulting.com/uploads/900009/1566502763351/AEA\\_Cultural\\_Infrastructure\\_Index\\_2018\\_-\\_FINAL\\_-\\_web\\_copy.pdf](https://aeiconsulting.com/uploads/900009/1566502763351/AEA_Cultural_Infrastructure_Index_2018_-_FINAL_-_web_copy.pdf)).
- Bernier, S. and Marcotte, P. (2010), *Les infrastructures culturelles dans la municipalité. Nomenclature, recensement et état des lieux*, (Rapport final), Québec: Ministère de la Culture, des Communications et de la Condition féminine Publishing (retrieved from ([https://www.mcc.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/documents/publications/Infrastructures\\_culturelles\\_Rapport\\_final.pdf](https://www.mcc.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/documents/publications/Infrastructures_culturelles_Rapport_final.pdf))).
- European Commission (2018), *A New European Agenda for Culture COM(2018) 267 final*, 22 May, Brussels.
- Farinha, C. (2017), *Developing cultural and creative industries in Ukraine*, Culture & Creativity Publishing (Kyiv) (retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/Research/171205%20Creative%20Industries%20Report%20for%20Ukraine.pdf>).
- Kern, Ph. (2017) *Ukraine's Cultural Policy Overview*, Kyiv: Ministry of Culture Publishing (retrieved from [http://195.78.68.75/mcu/control/uk/publish/article?art\\_id=245250759&cat\\_id=245184013](http://195.78.68.75/mcu/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=245250759&cat_id=245184013)).
- KMU (2019), *Decree On approval of the Concept of reforming the system of providing the population with cultural services № 27-p*, 23 January, Kyiv (retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/27-2019-%D1%80>).
- KMU (2017), *Association agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Ukraine, of the other part*, Government Portal Publishing, Kyiv (retrieved from <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/en/yevropejska-integraciya/ugoda-pro-asociacyu>).
- OECD (2018), *Report on Culture and Local Development*, OECD Conference, Venice, Italy, Decembre 6 - 7, 2018 (retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/venice-2018-conference-culture/documents/Culture-and-Local-Development-Venice.pdf>).
- Slobodian, O., Fitisova, A., Gryshchenko, M. and Pirogova, D. (2018), *Cultural and Creative Ukraine's Cities Index*, CEDOS UA Publishing (Kyiv) (retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9UZ2lRKWcpcbGEtNUpoeXFUTF9XMy1ENVVHdGJKYUFXVXc0/view>).

- Șlusarciuc, M. (2019), Cross-border cooperation elements along Romanian-Ukrainian border – empirical evidences, *European Union's structural challenges: the way forward*, (EURINT 2019), Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” , pp. 311 – 334.
- UNESCO (2018), *CDIS Ukraine's Analytical Brief*, Culture & Creativity Publishing (Kyiv) (retrieved from [http://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/2017/CDIS%20\\_%20Analytical%20Brief%20\\_%20ENG%20\(1\).pdf](http://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/2017/CDIS%20_%20Analytical%20Brief%20_%20ENG%20(1).pdf)).
- UNESCO (2018), *CDIS Ukraine's Technical Report*, Culture & Creativity Publishing (Kyiv) (retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/2017/CDIS%20Ukraine%20Technical%20Report.pdf>)
- Verkhovna Rada (2010), *Law on Culture 2778-VI*, 14 December, Kyiv (retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17>).