Танець як форма нематеріальної культурної спадщини: виклики збереження у XXI столітті

Катерина Головань

ступінь бакалавра, хореограф, The Dance Move Studio

7725 Gateway, Каліфорнія, США, https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4553-8423

Анотація. Стаття розглядає сучасні виклики щодо охорони танцю як форми нематеріальної культурної спадщини (НКС) і пропонує практичну рамку для дій. Спираючись на наративний огляд політичних документів (зокрема Конвенції ЮНЕСКО 2003 року) та новітніх наукових праць, вона синтезує напрацювання з культурної політики, педагогіки спадщини та цифрових гуманітарних наук, щоб окреслити ключові фактори ризику - комерційне спрощення, втрату контексту через сценічно орієнтовану стилізацію, алгоритмічно зумовлену стандартизацію естетики на цифрових платформах і упередження навчальних програм, що маргіналізують польове навчання. У відповідь стаття пропонує п'ятикомпонентну модель збереження, яка поєднує: спільнотне укорінення та мікрогранти для носіїв; міждисциплінарний освітній коридор, що поєднує школу, вищу освіту та менторство; стандарти документування й відкритих даних; кураторську публічну репрезентацію, що відновлює контекст; а також етико-правову рамку з акцентом на згоду, атрибуцію та недопущення культурної апропріації. Також пропонується набір вимірюваних індикаторів (напр., вікова структура носіїв, частота локальних

практик, обсяги навчальних годин, повнота метаданих) і рекомендовано щорічні «карти здоров'я» для відстеження життєздатності та спрямування розподілу ресурсів. Хоча нових польових матеріалів не подано, внесок полягає у трансляції розпорошених досліджень і політичних настанов в операційні інструменти для інституцій культури, освітян і громад. Підхід поєднує автентичність з інноваціями та підкреслює, що міжнародна видимість (напр., включення до списків ЮНЕСКО) має підкріплюватися міцними локальними екосистемами. Додатково стаття враховує дослідження українських і зарубіжних авторів, які аналізують народний танець як елемент нематеріальної культурної спадщини та простежують його трансформації, підкреслюючи необхідність поєднання традиційних практик із сучасними підходами до збереження й передачі знань.

Ключові слова: нематеріальна культурна спадщина, традиційний танець, автентичність, культурна політика, цифрові архіви, освіта, ЮНЕСКО.

Dance as a Form of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Preservation Challenges in the 21st Century

Kateryna Golovan

Bachelor's degree, Choreographer, The Dance Move Studio

7725 Gateway, CA, USA, https://orcid.org/ 0009-0005-4553-8423

Abstract. This article examines the contemporary challenges of safeguarding dance as a form of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) and advances a practicable framework for action. Building on a narrative review of policy documents (notably the 2003 UNESCO Convention) and recent scholarship, it synthesizes insights from cultural policy, heritage pedagogy, and digital humanities to identify key risk factors - commercial simplification, loss of context through stage-centered stylization, algorithm-driven standardization of aesthetics in digital platforms, and curricular biases that marginalize field-based learning. In response, the article proposes a five-

component preservation model that combines: community anchoring and microgrants for bearers; an interdisciplinary educational corridor linking schools, higher education, and mentorship; standards for documentation and open data; curated public representation that restores context; and an ethical-legal framework emphasizing consent, attribution, and anti-appropriation principles. The paper also offers a set of measurable indicators (e.g., age structure of bearers, frequency of local practices, instructional-hour volumes, metadata completeness) and recommends annual "health maps" to monitor vitality and guide resource allocation. While not reporting new fieldwork, the contribution lies in translating dispersed research and policy guidance into operational tools for cultural institutions, educators, and communities. The approach balances authenticity with innovation and highlights how international visibility (e.g., UNESCO listings) must be supported by robust local ecosystems. Additionally, the article takes into account the research of Ukrainian and foreign scholars who analyze folk dance as an element of intangible cultural heritage and trace its transformations, emphasizing the need to combine traditional practices with modern approaches to preservation and knowledge transmission.

Keywords: *intangible cultural heritage, traditional dance, authenticity, cultural policy, digital archives, education, UNESCO.*

Problem statement. Despite the normative clarity provided by the 2003 UNESCO Convention, the safeguarding of dance as intangible cultural heritage (ICH) remains hampered by implementation gaps. Embodied, tacit knowledge central to dance is difficult to archive without stripping it of context; at the same time, platformized circulation of performance material accelerates aesthetic standardization and encourages commercially driven simplifications. Formal education systems frequently prioritize stage technique over community-based practice and fieldwork, while legal–ethical protocols for consent, attribution, and benefit-sharing with bearer communities are inconsistently applied. Documentation, where it exists, often lacks

interoperable metadata and contextual description, limiting its value for transmission and pedagogical use. Finally, monitoring is fragmentary: institutions rarely employ shared indicators capable of tracking vitality, equity, and intergenerational continuity, and international visibility (e.g., UNESCO listings) is not systematically translated into sustained local support.

Accordingly, the core problem addressed in this paper is the absence of a practical, measurable, and ethically grounded safeguarding model that can be adopted by cultural institutions, educators, and communities to balance authenticity with innovation. The study seeks to resolve the following questions:

1. *Risk identification:* Which contemporary forces most threaten the intergenerational transmission of dance (commercial simplification, platform standardization, curricular bias, etc.) and how do they operate in practice?

2. *Program design:* What community-anchored design principles and funding mechanisms can support bearers without instrumentalizing or commodifying traditions?

3. *Education:* How should curricula integrate field methods, heritage pedagogy, and digital competencies to sustain living practice rather than replace it with recordings?

4. *Documentation standards:* What minimum technical and narrative metadata are necessary to preserve context and ensure reuse across archives and classrooms?

5. *Evaluation:* Which indicators can reliably monitor vitality and equity, and how can annual "health maps" guide resource allocation?

6. *Policy translation:* How can international frameworks (e.g., UNESCO) be operationalized within local ecosystems so that visibility yields durable capacity?

Analysis of the Latest Research and Publications. Scholarship on safeguarding dance as intangible cultural heritage (ICH) has grown substantially since the 2003 UNESCO Convention [1], shifting from normative definitions to practice-oriented debates on transmission, ethics, digitization, and evaluation. Conceptually, foundational work reframed heritage as processual and embodied rather than a mere assemblage of objects; for dance, this view is crystallized in Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's argument that ICH is produced through reflexive "metacultural" practices, warning against de-contextualized display that turns living practice into a museum "exhibit" [2]. In dance anthropology, Joann Kealiinohomoku's contention that all dance is "ethnic" underscores socio-cultural embeddedness and challenges universalist stage norms, remaining a touchstone for contextualized safeguarding [3]. Policy discussions emphasize that the 2003 UNESCO Convention establishes the international architecture for safeguarding and recognizes communities as primary actors [4], while subsequent tooling - notably the Overall Results Framework (ORF) - seeks to translate principles into outcomes, indicators, and reporting cycles, yet gaps persist between gained visibility (nominations, lists) and routine support for bearers [5]. Educational research in arts pedagogy and ethnochoreology observes curricula that privilege stage technique over field-based learning and mentorship with bearers, with current debates drawing on ethnochoreology's development within ICTM networks as well as scholarship that re-centers community practice in training [6].

Digital-heritage guidance stresses interoperable metadata, multilingual description, rights management, and long-term preservation (e.g., UNESCO's Guidelines for the Preservation of Digital Heritage) [7], even as media studies of "platformization" document algorithmic pressures that standardize aesthetics and favor spectacle, complicating efforts to preserve local variation. Ethical discourse has been shaped by the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding ICH, which codify consent, attribution, respect for restricted materials, and equitable collaboration, and which underpin participatory models such as co-curation, community review, and benefit-

sharing [8]. Calls for evidence-based governance have coalesced around the ORF, proposing multi-level outcomes and indicators on vitality, participation, and cooperation, with NGO and practitioner literature interpreting its local application [9]. Country-specific studies and policy documents foreground Ukrainian and regional dynamics: the role of the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies (UCCS) as the competent body, periodic reporting under the Convention, national inventory practices, and analyses of ICH amid crisis conditions - all emphasizing community cultural centers, inter-sector partnerships, and decentralized support mechanisms [10]. Across these strands, consensus holds that dance must be safeguarded as situated practice with communities as primary agents; digitization is a tool rather than a substitute; and education should integrate field methods and mentorship. Nevertheless, gaps endure in operational toolkits for institutions and schools, shared longitudinal indicators tied to budgeting, concrete interventions for platform governance, and ready-to-use legal/ethical templates - gaps that motivate this paper's practical framework grounded in the sources above [11].

In the works of Kachurynets S. [12], Losiuk V. [13], Biloshkurskyi V. [14], Gapeev V., and Gapeeva I. [15], Ukrainian folk dance is considered an integral part of intangible cultural heritage that shapes national identity, preserves traditions, and reflects the worldview of the people. The researchers emphasize its significance within Ukraine's cultural heritage, analyze the state and prospects of preserving regional traditions, trace the transformation of the storyline of the hopak in the modern socio-cultural context, and highlight the spiritual and symbolic dimension of dance as an element of worldview.

In the studies of Savchyn L., Samokhvalova A. [16], Plakhotniuk O. [17], Kvetzko A. [18], Ilchenko V., Borysenko T. [19] it is shown how Ukrainian folk dance has been preserved and continues to influence contemporary choreographic practices. The researchers analyze its youth interpretations and ethno-worldview foundations in the modern artistic space, explore the process of synthesizing folk dance with new

trends in choreography, and determine its role in shaping various forms of contemporary dance art.

Identification of Previously Unsolved Parts of the Overall Problem. Although the 2003 UNESCO Convention and its implementation tools provide a shared vocabulary for safeguarding, several components of the problem remain only partially addressed in research and policy practice. First, there is no widely adopted operational playbook that translates high-level principles into step-by-step roles, timelines, and low-cost budgets for schools, cultural centers, museums, and municipalities; existing guidance tends to stop at values and outcomes without specifying procedures and handoffs across institutions. Second, digital preservation standards articulate what to collect but say comparatively less about how to document tacit, embodied knowledge - improvisation, kinesthetic cues, social etiquette, and ritual function - so that recordings do not drift toward the "musealization" warned about in conceptual literature. Third, legal-ethical tooling remains thin on the practitioner side: adaptable templates for informed consent, attribution, licensing, and benefit-sharing across jurisdictions are scattered and rarely integrated into day-to-day programming by educators and cultural managers, despite broad consensus on principles. Fourth, with platformized circulation now shaping pedagogy and taste, concrete platform-governance interventions - discoverability settings, contextual metadata requirements, or educator guidelines to counter algorithmic standardization - are mostly absent from cultural-policy repertoires, leaving educators to navigate platform logics ad hoc.

Fifth, the field lacks shared, longitudinal indicators that tie funding to vitality outcomes - such as the age structure of bearers, the frequency and diversity of practice contexts, mentorship density, and metadata completeness, which limits evidence-based allocation and obscures equity questions in access and participation. Sixth, while international frameworks rightly elevate communities as primary actors, mechanisms for translating visibility into durable local capacity - microgrant pipelines, co-governance councils, and routine support for community cultural centers - are

underdeveloped, particularly in regions managing displacement and crisis, where continuity hinges on everyday infrastructure rather than occasional showcase events. Seventh, education systems continue to privilege stage technique over field methods and community-based learning; programmatic models that embed bearer mentorship, ethnographic practice, and reflective pedagogy at scale remain the exception rather than the rule, despite long-standing arguments for situated learning. Finally, there is no consensus on a minimum viable documentation package that balances interoperability with affordability - core narrative metadata, rights statements, context notes, and didactic prompts. - and can be implemented by small institutions without specialist staff.

These unresolved parts - operational playbooks, tacit-knowledge documentation, legal-ethical templates, platform-aware pedagogy, outcome-linked indicators, capacity-building pipelines, curriculum reform, and an affordable documentation minimum - define the practical gap this study addresses by proposing a measurable, ethically grounded model that local actors can adopt without prohibitive cost.

Formulating the goals of the article (task statement). This article aims to identify the principal risks to the intergenerational transmission of dance as ICH, synthesize current scholarship and policy guidance, and propose a practical, ethically grounded safeguarding model with minimum documentation standards and measurable indicators for adoption by institutions, educators, and communities.

To achieve this goal, the following tasks have been identified:

1. Conduct a critical synthesis of scholarship and policy (UNESCO 2003, ORF, ethical principles) to delineate current approaches and gaps.

2. Map contemporary risk mechanisms (commercial simplification, platform-driven standardization, curricular bias) and their impacts on intergenerational transmission.

3.   Design an operational safeguarding model specifying roles, workflows, timelines, low-cost budgets, and legal-ethical templates with community co-governance.

4.   Define minimum documentation standards and a measurable indicator set, and propose monitoring tools (e.g., annual "health maps") with implementation guidelines for institutions and educators.

Presentation of the primary research material. Safeguarding dance as intangible cultural heritage is conceived here as a practical synthesis of community practice and institutional design: a framework that aligns the lived knowledge of bearer communities with the capacities of cultural centers, schools, museums, and municipalities. The primary research material - drawing on the 2003 UNESCO Convention, the Overall Results Framework, ethical principles, and recent debates in ethnochoreology and digital heritage - translates high-level norms into operational components that can be deployed with modest resources. In this conception, continuity depends not only on documentation but on a coordinated ecology of support: community co-governance and microgrants, context-rich recording and open data, mentorship-based education, platform-aware dissemination, ethical-legal tooling, and outcome-linked monitoring. The core components and their practical value are summarized below (Table 1).

Table 1

Conceptual directions of safeguarding dance as intangible cultural heritage

Conceptual direction of safeguarding	Essence of the application	Value for sustaining dance ICH
Community anchoring & microgrants	Councils of bearers; small recurring grants; access to rehearsal/ritual spaces; shared calendars	Stabilizes continuity, reduces financial precarity, centers community agency
Context-rich documentation & open data	Narrative metadata (function, occasion, participants),	Preserves tacit knowledge for teaching and reuse; prevents de-

Conceptual direction of safeguarding	Essence of the application	Value for sustaining dance ICH
	rights statements, multilingual description, interoperable formats	contextualized "musealization"
Education & mentorship integration	Co-teaching by recognized bearers and formally trained educators; field methods embedded in curricula	Strengthens intergenerational transmission; links technique to lifeworld and ethics
Platform-aware dissemination	Protocols for context cards, attribution, and curated playlists; educator guidelines to counter algorithmic flattening	Maintains local variation and meaning in digital circulation; improves pedagogical fidelity
Ethical–legal tooling	Templates for consent, attribution, licensing, and benefit-sharing adaptable across jurisdictions	Secures respectful collaboration; clarifies rights; deters cultural extraction
Monitoring & evaluation	Minimum indicator set (vitality, participation, mentorship density, metadata completeness); annual "health maps"	Aligns funding with outcomes; enables evidence-based policy and public accountability
Curated public representation	Festivals and showcases co-curated with communities; partnerships with diasporas and schools	Expands audiences without distorting practice; restores social function alongside stage form

Source: systematized by the author on the basis of [1; 2; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10].

The areas outlined in Table 1 underscore the interdisciplinary character of safeguarding. Community anchoring ensures that decisions about repertoire, teaching pace, and public presentation remain with bearers, while predictable microgrants cover everyday essentials - space, instruments, attire - that rarely fit projectized funding cycles. Context-rich documentation pairs high-quality video and audio with narrative metadata capturing function, etiquette, and local variants; multilingual description and open formats enable reuse across schools and archives. Mentorship-based education links classrooms to field sites: recognized bearers co-teach with educators, and students learn interviewing, participant observation, and reflective practice alongside technique.

Platform-aware dissemination introduces lightweight protocols - context cards, source attribution, curated playlists by function and region - to counter algorithmic standardization and to keep lineage visible in digital spaces. Ethical-legal templates operationalize consent, attribution, and benefit-sharing so that recording and teaching practices are transparent and equitable. Finally, a compact indicator set, published annually as community "health maps," connects funding to vitality outcomes and makes progress legible to administrators, educators, and the public. Together, these components translate abstract norms into implementable workflows that sustain dance as a living, situated practice.

Table 2 shows the key practical safeguarding instruments used by cultural institutions, educators, and communities to sustain dance as intangible cultural heritage.

Table 2

Operational instruments for safeguarding dance as intangible cultural heritage

Name of the instrument	Type / category	Primary function in safeguarding
Community Microgrant Program	Funding & governance	Provides small, recurring grants and access to spaces/equipment to stabilize practice and enable community-led decision-making [1], [4], [9].
Bearer–Educator Mentorship Track	Education & transmission	Pairs recognized bearers with formally trained educators; embeds field methods and co-teaching for situated, intergenerational learning [1], [6].
Context-Rich Documentation Kit	Documentation standards	Captures video/audio alongside narrative metadata (function, occasion, participants, etiquette) and rights statements to prevent de-contextualization [6], [7].
Open Heritage Repository	Digital access & preservation	Hosts materials in interoperable formats with multilingual descriptions and DCMI terms to support reuse across schools and archives [6], [7].

Name of the instrument	Type / category	Primary function in safeguarding
Consent & Benefit-Sharing Toolkit	Legal–ethical instruments	Provides adaptable templates for informed consent, attribution, licensing, and benefit-sharing consistent with ethical principles [5].
Platform Context Cards & Curated Playlists	Dissemination & platform governance	Adds source attribution and contextual notes; organizes content by region/function to counter algorithmic standardization and preserve variation [8].
Annual ICH "Health Map" Dashboard	Monitoring & evaluation	Publishes indicators on vitality, participation, mentorship density, and metadata completeness to align funding with outcomes [4], [10], [11].

Source: author's own development based on [1; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11].

All of these instruments are actively applicable in professional safeguarding practice, offering flexible, low-cost solutions across the full cycle of sustaining living dance traditions. Community microgrants ensure predictable support for everyday needs - rehearsal space, attire, instruments - within a co-governance model that centers bearer agency and aligns with the Convention's community-first orientation and outcome logic of the Overall Results Framework [1], [4], [9]. The bearer-educator mentorship track integrates field methods and co-teaching so that technique remains tied to lifeworld and ethics rather than drifting into stage-only stylization; in practical terms, it formalizes joint syllabi, observation hours in community settings, and reflective practice modules supported by basic documentation skills [1], [6].

The context-rich documentation kit and open heritage repository translate digital-preservation guidance into day-to-day practice: narrative metadata and multilingual description travel with each file, while interoperable formats and DCMI terms ensure longevity and classroom reusability across institutions [6], [7]. A consent and benefit-sharing toolkit operationalizes ethical principles by standardizing permission forms, attribution statements, and revenue-sharing options for recordings and teaching materials, reducing legal ambiguity and promoting equitable

collaboration with communities [5]. Platform context cards and curated playlists act as a lightweight response to platformization pressures by restoring lineage, function, and locality in digital dissemination and by giving educators a ready-made structure for contextual viewing and discussion [8]. Finally, the annual ICH "health map" dashboard condenses monitoring into a concise, public instrument that tracks vitality and guides resource allocation; its indicator set dovetails with the ORF's multi-level outcomes while remaining implementable by small institutions and local cultural centers, including those operating in the Ukrainian context where periodic reporting and inventories are already in place [4], [10], [11].

Research methods. This study employs a narrative synthesis of policy instruments and practice-focused literature to derive an operational safeguarding model that can be adopted by cultural institutions, educators, and communities. The sources include the 2003 UNESCO Convention and its implementation tools, notably the Overall Results Framework (ORF), the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding ICH, guidance on digital preservation, and metadata standards, alongside analytical contributions in heritage studies, dance anthropology, and platform studies [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8]. Country- and institution-specific documentation from Ukraine (periodic reporting and national inventory practices) is used to align the model with concrete administrative realities [9; 10; 11]. No new fieldwork was conducted; rather, the method translates dispersed guidance into a coherent set of roles, workflows, and minimum standards suitable for low-cost implementation.

Results: a practical safeguarding model. The model operationalizes continuity as the joint outcome of community agency, ethical collaboration, context-rich documentation, responsible digital access, and outcome-linked monitoring. Its structural elements - community microgrants and co-governance, mentorship-based education, context-rich documentation with open data, platform-aware dissemination, legal-ethical templates, and an annual "health map" dashboard - were introduced earlier (Table 1) and specified as operational instruments (Table 2). Here, we consolidate them into two actionable pipelines that institutions can adopt within existing budgets.

Pipeline A - Transmission & education. A council of bearers co-designs an annual cycle of practice with a partner school or cultural center. Recognized bearers are contracted to co-teach with formally trained educators; field modules (participant observation, interviewing, reflective practice) are required components of technique classes. Microgrants cover rehearsal space, attire, instruments, and travel for elders. A shared calendar aligns community events (ritual/social) with curricular milestones, ensuring that stage work never detaches from lifeworld practice [1; 3; 6].

Pipeline B - Documentation & public access. Each learning or performance event triggers a "minimum viable documentation package" (MVDP): video and audio recordings paired with narrative metadata (function, occasion, participants), rights and consent statements, and multilingual descriptions. Files use interoperable formats, and metadata fields map to DCMI terms. Public access is tiered to respect community preferences, with contextual "cards" and curated playlists to counter algorithmic flattening on digital platforms [5; 6; 7; 8]. An annual "health map" aggregates indicators on vitality, participation, mentorship density, and documentation completeness and informs the next cycle's microgrants and teaching load [4; 10; 11].

Table 3

Minimum viable documentation package (MVDP) for dance ICH

Field	Description	Rationale	Reference
Title & Element ID	Standardized title; local/registry identifier	Ensures findability across archives and inventories	[6; 7; 10]
Community & Locale	Name of bearer community; settlement/region; language(s)	Situates practice; supports multilingual access	[1; 6; 7]
Occasion / Function	Ritual, social, pedagogical, stage; event name/date	Preserves meaning beyond movement	[1; 5; 6]
Context note (500–1000 chars)	Who, why, where, etiquette, restrictions	Guards against de-contextualized "musealization"	[2; 5; 6]
Movement lexicon	Local terms; steps/figures; spatial patterns	Captures tacit knowledge for teaching	[3; 6]
Music / Sound	Instruments, rhythm/mode; source ensemble	Links dance to musical lifeworld	[1; 6]
Costume / Objects	Attire, symbolic objects, handling rules	Retains aesthetic and ethical integrity	[5; 6]
Participants & Roles	Bearers/mentors, age groups, gendered roles (if any)	Supports equity and intergenerational tracking	[4; 11]
Rights & Consent	Informed consent; access tiers; attribution format	Operationalizes ethical principles	[5]

Field	Description	Rationale	Reference
Technical specs	File formats, resolution, audio sample rate, checksums	Supports preservation and reuse	[6; 7]
Keywords / Metadata map	Controlled terms; DCMI mapping	Interoperability across platforms	[6; 7]

Source: author's own development based on [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 10; 11].

Table 4

Indicator set for the annual ICH "health map" dashboard

Indicator	Definition & unit	Data source / method	Frequency	ORF link
Practitioner vitality	Number of active bearers by age cohort	Council roster; event logs	Annual	[4]
Practice frequency & diversity	Count of ritual, social, pedagogical, stage contexts	Shared calendar; MVDP records	Quarterly / annual	[4; 10]
Mentorship density	Mentor-learner ratio; hours of co-teaching	School timetables; contracts	Semester / annual	[4; 11]
Instructional hours	Total contact hours in community + school settings	Syllabi; attendance sheets	Semester / annual	[4]
Documentation completeness	% of MVDPs meeting required fields	Archive audit	Quarterly	[6; 7]
Access & equity	Participation of youth, elders, and underrepresented groups (%)	Enrollment & event data	Annual	[4; 11]
Digital reach with context	Views/downloads where context card displayed	Platform analytics	Quarterly	[6; 8]
Funding alignment	Share of funds directly supporting bearers & mentorship (%)	Budget review	Annual	[4; 9]

Source: author's own development based on [4; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11].

Implementation roadmap

Phase 0: Setup (Month 0-1). Form the council of bearers; designate an institutional lead (school/cultural center); adopt the ethical principles locally; approve consent and attribution templates; define access tiers for recordings [1; 5].

Phase I: Pilot (Month 2-6). Launch two mentorship cohorts; run three field modules; produce MVDPs for five representative events; publish a small open repository with context cards and curated playlists; initiate microgrants for essentials (space, attire, instruments) [4; 6; 7; 9].

Phase II: Consolidation (Month 7-12). Expand mentorship; align curricula with field calendar; complete a first annual "health map" and adjust funding to indicators; institutionalize budget lines for microgrants and documentation [4; 10; 11].

Phase III: Scale & network (Month 13-18). Partner with a museum/university for preservation infrastructure; replicate the model with a neighboring community; publish a practice note detailing workflows, templates, and costs for sector uptake [4; 6; 9].

Discussion. The proposed model reframes safeguarding as a continuous public service delivered through small, predictable mechanisms rather than sporadic showcase events. By aligning teaching with community calendars and by pairing recordings with narrative metadata and ethical permissions, it addresses the conceptual risk of "musealization" identified in the literature [2]. The platform-aware layer acknowledges that pedagogy increasingly unfolds within algorithmic environments; contextual cards and curated playlists are low-cost, implementable measures that keep lineage visible and discourage homogenization [6; 8]. Equity is treated as a measurable design parameter-mentorship density, age distribution, and participation rates - so that budgets respond to vitality rather than visibility alone [4; 11]. The Ukrainian institutional context, with its competent body and national inventory infrastructure, offers a ready venue for piloting dashboards and for integrating community-generated MVDPs into existing registries [9; 10]. Risks include administrative burden on small

organizations and uneven digital capacity; these are mitigated by limiting required fields in the MVDP, adopting interoperable standards, and phasing implementation to match capacity [6; 7].

Limitations and directions for further research. Because this paper is translational and programmatic, it does not test the model ethnographically or econometrically. Future work should pilot the roadmap across diverse communities, compare cost-benefit profiles, and experimentally evaluate which combinations of instruments most effectively improve vitality indicators over 12–24 months. Additional research is also needed on platform governance with cultural actors, including trials of context-card requirements and educator guidelines to counter algorithmic standardization [8].

Conclusions. Safeguarding dance as intangible cultural heritage in the twenty-first century requires a measurable, ethically grounded model that communities and institutions can adopt without prohibitive cost. By coupling mentorship-based education with context-rich documentation, responsible digital access, and an indicator-driven "health map," the framework operationalizes the Convention's community-first ethos and the ORF's outcomes in day-to-day practice [1; 4]. Ethical principles are embedded through consent and benefit-sharing templates; metadata standards and preservation guidance convert recordings into reusable learning resources [5; 6; 7]. The result is a practical ecology of support that balances authenticity with innovation, translating international visibility into durable local capacity and intergenerational continuity [9; 10; 11].

References

1. UNESCO. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. 2003. URL: https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention.

2. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International*. 2004. Vol. 56, No. 1–2. P. 52–65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00458.x.

3. Kealiinohomoku, J. An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance. *Impulse*. 1969/1970. (Repr. in: Dils, A., Albright, A. C. (eds.). Moving History/Dancing Cultures. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2001. P. 33–43.) URL: https://www.oberlinlibstaff.com/acceleratedmotion/primary_sources/texts/ecologiesofbeauty/anthro_ballet.pdf.

4. UNESCO. *Overall Results Framework (ORF) for the 2003 Convention*. 2018. URL: https://ich.unesco.org/en/overall-results-framework-00984.

5. UNESCO. *Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*. 2015. URL: https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866.

6. UNESCO. *Guidelines for the Preservation of Digital Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO, 2003. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000130071.

7. *Dublin Core Metadata Initiative* (DCMI). DCMI Metadata Terms. 2020. URL: https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dcmi-terms/.

8. Poell, T., Nieborg, D., Duffy, B. *Platforms and Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity, 2021. ISBN: 978-1-5095-4050-1. URL: https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail/?isbn=9781509540501.

9. UNESCO. *Ukraine — Periodic Reporting & Competent Body (UCCS)*. n.d. URL: https://ich.unesco.org/en/state/ukraine-UA?info=periodic-reporting.

10. Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies (UCCS). *National Register/Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Ukraine (elements portal)*. n.d. URL: https://uccr.org.ua/news/national-register-inventory-of-intangible-cultural-heritage-of-ukraine/

11. Demian, V. Intangible Cultural Heritage in Ukraine from Community to State. *Ethnologies*. 2023. Vol. 45, No. 1. P. 29–41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1111893ar.

12. Качуринець, С. *Значення українського народного танцю в культурній спадщині України.* 2025. URL: http://aphn-journal.in.ua/archive/83_2025/part_1/25.pdf.

13. Лосюк, В. П. Нематеріальна культурна спадщина Гуцульщини: стан та перспективи. *Збірник наукових праць Міжнародної Карпатської Школи: весняна сесія (1-5 травня 2025 року):* перше видання. Яремче-Косів: Наукове товариство імені Шевченка, 2025. 276 с. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alona-Varukha/publication/391366649_EKOTURIZM_KRIZ_PRIZMU_KULTURNOI_TA_PRIRODNOI_SPADSINI_CINNISNI_ASPEKTI/links/6813c739bd3f1930dd6a2cb3/EKOTURIZM-KRIZ-PRIZMU-KULTURNOI-TA-PRIRODNOI-SPADSINI-CINNISNI-ASPEKTI.pdf#page=97.

14. Білошкурський, В. С. Український народний танець «гопак»: фабула перетворень. *Особливості роботи хореографа в сучасному соціокультурному просторі.* 2022. № 42. URL: https://files.znu.edu.ua/files/Bibliobooks/Inshi77/0057321.pdf#page=42.

15. Gapeev, V. K., Gapeeva, I. M. Український народний танець як частина національного світосприйняття. *SWorldJournal*. 2022. № 11-06. С. 26–29. URL: https://sworldjournal.com/index.php/swj/article/download/swj11-06-107/2702.

16. Савчин, Л., Самохвалова, А. Український народний танець у сучасній молодіжній інтерпретації: Історіографія етносьогодення. *Науковий журнал Художня культура. Актуальні проблеми.* 2021. № 17(2). С. 98–105. URL: http://hudkult.mari.kiev.ua/article/view/247980/247482.

17. Плахотнюк, О. Етносвітогляд фольклорного танцю в мистецькому просторі сучасності. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. 2021. № 35-5. URL: http://aphn-journal.in.ua/archive/35_2021/part_5/35-5_2021.pdf#page=4.

18. Квецко, А. Синтез народного українського танцю з сучасними напрямами хореографічного мистецтва. *Молодий вчений*. 2021. № 1(89). С. 106–109. URL: https://molodyivchenyi.ua/index.php/journal/article/download/163/157/.

19. Ільченко, В., Борисенко, Т. В. Інтеграція фольклорної основи українського танцю в сучасні сценічні форми. *Особливості роботи хореографа в сучасному соціокультурному просторі*. 2025. № 135. URL: https://nakkkim.edu.ua/images/Instytuty/nauka/vydannia/SALAPA%20S.V.%205-6_06_2025%20Zbirnik.pdf#page=135