

**Monitoring Policies for Intercultural Dialogue and Cultural Diversity in
Europe**

**5th Annual Authors Meeting of the
“Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe”**

10-11 April 2006 Budapest

**Hosted by the Hungarian Ministry of Cultural Heritage
at the Council of Europe Youth Centre Budapest (EYCB)**

MEETING REPORT

Prepared by ERICarts

September 2006

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

- 1. Compendium Authors Meet in Budapest**
- 2. A Year in Review: Reports from the Council of Europe and ERICarts**
 - *The Compendium in the Context of Council of Europe Developments*
 - *Intercultural Dialogue and the Compendium*
 - *Compendium as a Tool for Policy Makers*
 - *Monitoring Activities*
 - *Compendium User Statistics*
 - *Global Outreach*
 - *Original Language Versions of Country Profiles*
 - *New Countries 2006*
 - *New Deadline for Updated Profiles!*
 - *Visibility of Authors*
- 3. Towards Monitoring National Policies and Measures to Protect and Promote the Diversity of Cultural Expressions**
 - *Adoption of the UNESCO Convention*
 - *Monitoring the UNESCO Convention*
 - *European Coalition for Cultural Diversity*
 - *Civil Society and the UNESCO Convention – View from EFAH*
 - *Open Discussion*
- 4. How the Compendium can assist National Governments and NGO's through Monitoring the UNESCO Convention: Introduction to the Working Groups**
- 5. Results from the Working Groups**
 - *Report 1: Participation of Different Groups in Cultural Life*
 - *Report 2: Media Pluralism and Content Diversity*
 - *Report 3: Diversity of Artistic Expressions/Creativity of Individuals and Groups*
 - *Report 4: Democratic Organisation and Management of Cultural Policy*
 - *Report 5: International Cultural Co-operation and Diplomacy*
- 6. Monitoring Policies and Good Practices for Intercultural Dialogue**
 - *Council of Europe White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*
 - *What the Compendium has Achieved so Far*
 - *Compendium Next Steps*
- 7. Compendium as a Policy Making and a Teaching Tool**
- 8. Closing Session**

Annexes

I - Adopted Changes to Compendium Grid

II - List of Participants

Executive Summary

The 5th Compendium Authors Meeting took place in *Budapest* at the European Youth Centre from the 10th-11th April 2006. It was the first time the group gathered in Central or Eastern Europe.

The meeting was organised on the heels of *important developments within the Council of Europe* including the Wroclaw Conference of Cultural Ministers, the Warsaw Summit of Heads of State, the 50th anniversary of European Cultural Convention as well as the adoption of the Faro Declaration on the Council of Europe's Strategy for Developing Intercultural Dialogue.

The *main objectives* of the meeting were to determine in which ways the Compendium could contribute to a future monitoring of the recently adopted UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of a Diversity of Cultural Expressions and to the Council of Europe White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. In this context, the authors reviewed the existing information provided in country profiles, discussed the adoption of new indicators and made proposals for new features.

Monitoring the implementation and impact of the UNESCO Convention was seen as crucial in order to turn this political and legal instrument into an effective one. At the moment there is no clear indication from UNESCO regarding what is to be monitored. In the future, it will be especially important to understand how certain policies are implemented and what their effects are regarding the goals of the Convention. Information to be collected in the Compendium could help to show whether there are developments in national cultural policies resulting from the adoption and ratification of the Convention in different European countries. Lessons are to be learned from other global monitoring exercise such as those undertaken by the OECD.

The *strategy adopted by the Compendium group on intercultural dialogue* was deemed as providing the right mix of policy and practical information. More work is required to provide a critical mass of information from different countries by the end of 2006. The Compendium authors welcome cooperation with the artistic community, especially in the identification of cases of good practice on intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity. The work accomplished by the Compendium group to date (and in the near future) on intercultural dialogue will feed into the Council of Europe White Paper process.

An important discussion on the *definitions of intercultural dialogue* and of what could be considered "innovative" or "good practice" took place. The activities of the Council of Europe White Paper exercise were herald as important for the work of the Compendium to draw upon. The Compendium authors can then determine how this definition is or not interpreted into cultural policy making priorities and action. It was recommended that a glossary of terms used in various chapters of the Compendium be produced.

Quite often Compendium authors are asked to *report on issues/fields where there are no explicit policies*. They sometimes end up identifying cultural policy approaches based on a patchwork of information derived from other policy fields, projects and initiatives. The authors "experiment" on intercultural dialogue is a key example. By combining information on civic and cultural rights, policies and programmes towards traditional minorities or new minority groups resulting for recent immigration flows, those of cultural institutions, etc., helps us to create a picture of government policy which may not have been explicitly defined before.

Establishing links between the Compendium programme and its national correspondents with other transnational exercises and their information/data providers can help to strengthen common objectives, work plans and results. In the end, there could be a coherent system of monitoring which reaches beyond culture as an independent field and establishes it as a truly transversal area of study.

It was found that the Compendium is being *used widely by officials* working for Ministries of culture around Europe when preparing for missions abroad or in the development of new cultural policy strategies. This finding was important as it signals the use of the Compendium as a valuable instrument for policy makers and administrators across Europe; who are facing increasing complexities in their daily work.

As a *teaching tool*, the Compendium is a very useful reference and information source for professors and students; the latter who may one day become future cultural policy decision-makers and administrators. The Compendium fills a need in the training/educational programmes where there are several theoretical, conceptual or management studies available for students to refer to but not a lot of practical information on the policy systems and priorities of national governments across Europe.

The number of Compendium *users from around the world continues to grow*. There is also a high interest among users for information in languages other than English. Outreach within the individual countries was seen as important as the global outreach achieved by the Compendium so far.

New countries will join the 2006 updating cycle, namely, Denmark and Luxembourg. Countries not yet part of the programme are: Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia Herzegovina, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Iceland, Slovakia and Turkey.

Monitoring Policies for Intercultural Dialogue and Cultural Diversity in Europe

DAY ONE - 10 APRIL

1. Compendium Authors Meet in Budapest

Mihály Nagy, Director General of the Hungarian Ministry of Cultural Heritage, opened the 5th Compendium Authors meeting by warmly welcoming the participants to Budapest; the first authors meeting to take place in Central or Eastern Europe. It follows on a series of important meetings held in 2005 including the Wroclaw Conference of Cultural Ministers and the Warsaw Summit of Heads of State, both celebrating the 50th anniversary of European Cultural Convention.

Mihály Nagy emphasised that one of the main missions of the Council of Europe was to promote the development of Europe without dividing lines. The use of new information technologies can help in this regard by enabling greater communication, dialogue and cooperation. On the other hand, there are many obstacles for some European countries to overcome including technical and financial barriers. He revealed that the Internet and websites like the Compendium form an important part of the resources available to him in his everyday work on cultural policy making and in the formation of new strategies and development programmes. It provides policy makers with reliable statistical data and high quality content and analysis which he encouraged the Compendium authors to maintain. It is also a recognised tool which helps to promote the tremendous work of the Council of Europe undertaken over the past 50 years and should be shared and grounded on the European stage. In the context of the enlarged EU, the Compendium could benefit from the strategic partnership agreements concluded and engage in new forms of cooperation wherever useful. He wished the meeting great success.

2. A Year in Review: Reports from the Council of Europe and ERICarts

Kathrin Merkle, Council of Europe, thanked Mihály Nagy and Gabriella Szabó-Pop for agreeing to host the Compendium authors this year. She was pleased to welcome the President of the Steering Committee for Culture of the Council of Europe, Roberta Alberotanza, and the vice-president of the Steering Committee for Culture, Kimmo Aulake, to their first Compendium meeting. Kathrin Merkle opened the joint session of the editorial team by reminding the participants that this is the eighth year of the successful and unique joint venture between the Council of Europe (intergovernmental organisation) and ERICarts (independent research institute) in developing the Compendium information and monitoring system. Kathrin Merkle underlined the expertise of the Compendium authors, representing the “crème de la crème” of cultural policy researchers and the Council of Europe’s gratitude in working closely with them.

The Compendium in the Context of Council of Europe Developments

Each year, Kathrin Merkle provides the authors with an overview of developments within the Council of Europe in order to provide them with a context for their work and to report on recent developments which have implications for the Compendium.

This year was no different. She reported that the Council of Europe is facing a crucial moment in its reform process which has been going on for the past few years. Important decisions are being taken following a period of shrinking budgets for the intergovernmental sector, due in part to the ever growing needs of the European Court of Human Rights. It now seems that the intergovernmental sector will be spared from further budget cuts. The good news is that the culture sector is well established and recognised within this new environment. A new director has been appointed (Mr. Robert Palmer) and the important work of the Council of Europe in the culture field has come back boldly to the attention of its stakeholders especially following the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention and its two Ministerial conferences organised in 2005. The Warsaw Summit of Heads of State reaffirmed government's commitment to culture and set the following priority issues for the Council of Europe programmes: cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion as well as related issues of e.g. citizenship education. The fact that the Compendium has been able to address these Summit priorities makes it an even more pertinent tool for the organisation.

More recently, Gabriella Battaini-Draconi, Director General of the Directorate General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, has been appointed as the coordinator of intercultural dialogue for the whole organisation. One of the main activities will be to develop a White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue over the next year. In this context, Karthrin Merkle was pleased to welcome her colleague Ulrich Bunjes who is working very closely with Gabriella Battaini-Draconi on the White Paper process. It will be a transversal and ground breaking study to which the Compendium methodology, information and experts can greatly contribute as concerns the culture sector.

The debates during this meeting will allow for an in-depth analysis of issues on cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue which are now at stake. Over the past year, the authors took first steps to report on policy developments. The goal for this year is to enhance this policy reporting with cases of good practice; of work happening on the grass roots level.

Andreas Wiesand, Executive Director of the ERICarts Institute, welcomed everyone to the 5th authors' meeting and expressed his gratitude to all the authors for their tremendous work over the past year. He extended his thanks to the Hungarian Ministry for hosting the meeting in Budapest and to the governments of Finland and Monaco for their support to the project edition 2006. He welcomed new faces around the table including: Mr Yashar Huseynli (Azerbaijan), Mr Stefan Capaliku (Albania), Ms Valeria Grosu (Moldova) and Ms Sigrid Royseng (Norway). In particular, Mr Wiesand welcomed Roberta Alberotanza and Kimmo Aulake from the Council of Europe Steering Committee for Culture and thanked them for their ongoing support in this truly transnational venture. Thanks were also extended to Péter Inkei from the Budapest Observatory and his staff for organising a very welcoming first evening at the new Palace of Arts. Last but not least, ERICarts is indebted to Kathrin Merkle with whom it has engaged in a very valuable partnership over the years and who has been a stark supporter and contributor to the common work.

Intercultural Dialogue and the Compendium

Andreas Wiesand emphasised the importance of the Council of Europe's pioneering work in the field of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. The latter which has become an issue of great reflection within Europe especially in view of the renewed debates on nationalism and chauvinism in general or the recent Danish caricature debates in particular. There will always be a natural ambiguity between some cultural expressions. This is not our problem. What we need to focus on are questions such as: what are the goals of intercultural dialogue and how is it promoted among different cultures both within a country and across borders?

As scientists we have to be aware of the functionalism that may be derived from different movements and which may influence the information available/produced. Our discussions in Budapest should address these questions and find ways of integrating them into our work this year. In this context, several papers have been prepared by ERICarts and the Council of Europe and are available in the information packages. This includes the work of some authors who participated in the intercultural dialogue "experiment" to begin collecting information of relevance for national policies and action. It is now time to move beyond this experimental stage. Proposals have been made to bring the issue of intercultural dialogue and cultural policy into the grid proper, to be addressed by all countries each year as a regular feature. This is to be done in conjunction with the provision of interesting cases of "good practice" which help to illuminate these issues and give them form. The Compendium now has an opportunity to contribute to political discussions and exercises on intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and social cohesion; a challenge which requires the full participation of authors.

Compendium as a Tool for Policy Makers

Based on the results of a preliminary survey carried out last year by ERICarts, it was found that the Compendium is being used widely by officials working for Ministries of culture around Europe when preparing for missions abroad or in the development of new cultural policy strategies. This finding was important as it signals the use of the Compendium as a valuable instrument for policy makers and administrators across Europe and who are facing increasing complexities in their daily work. The Compendium can help them to find their way through the increasingly transversal nature of cultural policy making in Europe today. Indeed the scope of the issues addressed in the Compendium country profiles mirror extensions of the programmes of the Council of Europe including cultural diversity, dialogue or information society issues and bridges many of the cultural policy fields from structural issues to financing and measures which foster creativity. The approach which the Compendium has taken to the issue of cultural diversity is a good example of how transversal issues can be linked into the different chapters of the individual country profiles. A paper has been prepared which shows the close links between the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of a Diversity of Cultural Expressions and the relevant chapters of the Compendium as such. This year, the focus will be on ways to monitor the UNESCO Convention; a suggestion made by Nina Obuljen at the authors meeting last year.

Monitoring Activities

The project took another step in monitoring information and data not only on e.g. legal developments within one country but also with regard to Council of Europe Declarations such as the European Charter on Regional and Minority Languages. The added value of the Compendium in monitoring this Charter is that it goes a step further from the regular monitoring activities within the Council to include cultural indicators and to produce information of relevance to cultural policy makers as a whole.

Compendium User Statistics

In reviewing the statistics available on the use of the Compendium, Andreas Wiesand pointed out that the number of users from around the world continues to grow. This development was somewhat surprising as he imagined that the Compendium had already reached a critical mass of users. This assumption was made because the field of cultural policy is not such a broad

field of interest and there is surely a limit to the number of specialists who would be interested in the information and data provided by the Compendium. In fact, there has been a significant increase in the number of users and an explosion in the number of full profiles that were downloaded from the site in 2005.

Global Outreach

The impact of the work of the Compendium authors is indeed felt worldwide. There were 85,000 individual users at the end of 2005 in comparison to 25,000 a few years ago. There is a high interest among users not only for information from larger countries but also from smaller countries which may be attributable to the availability of these profiles in languages other than English. It is the intention of the project to encourage the translation of more country profiles in either their original language or another such as French or Spanish. The statistics provided on the use of the Compendium also show a regional breakdown of users – the results of which are also interesting. For example: the region of Asia ranks fourth after Eastern Europe; Australia and the Middle East are in 6th and 7th place after Northern Europe. With regard to individual countries, the number of users from China equals those from Belgium and the number of users from South Korea is on a similar level to those from Hungary, Denmark or Austria. These results were surprising as the project was always envisaged as a European tool. Obviously it has become a truly international instrument which should be taken account of by all authors and by the editors, especially in the way that the Compendium information and data is presented and expressed. Another key finding was that the Compendium can currently be accessed through over 400,000 websites world wide. This international visibility is in part due to the efforts of the editors and authors to promote the project during conferences or in project meetings abroad.

One must not forget, however, that it is also important to promote the work of the Compendium locally. To this effect, Costis Dallas informed ERICarts that he is planning to organise several regional seminars in Greece as a means to communicate information about the project and to involve local actors in the preparation of the Greek profile. Outreach within the individual countries is as important as the global outreach achieved by the Compendium so far.

Original Language Versions of Country Profiles

Feedback shows that there is still a demand for additional language versions of the country profiles. These "original language versions" can help to promote the visibility of the project as well as provide useful information on cultural policy systems and priorities targeted to users within individual countries. To this effect, some authors took the initiative to integrate links to local websites throughout their country profiles in the 2005 update cycle.

New Countries 2006

Turning toward administration matters, Andreas Wiesand reported that one of the priorities is to work towards attracting the few remaining countries not yet part of the Compendium system. The good news is that Denmark and Luxembourg will join the project in 2006. Authors were asked to help reach out to their colleagues in countries such as the Czech Republic and Slovakia where no significant progress has been made to date on the official level. Other countries not yet part of the Compendium project are: Andorra, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia Herzegovina, Cyprus, Iceland and Turkey.

New Deadline for Updated Profiles!

A new deadline for updated profiles (**October 2, 2006**) was announced and that there would be additional funding available this year for the work required by the changes in the grid on intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and international cultural cooperation. This announcement prompted several interventions from authors including fears that such deadlines do not allow them to present the full picture of what is happening in their country. Cultural policy priorities are changing very fast and are decided upon at different times of the year in different countries e.g. Spring time in Austria or November/December in the Netherlands. Budgets are also approved at different times and figures are published accordingly, e.g. in Finland at the beginning of the year or in Poland at the end of September. Some reactions:

- Updated information or data can be added to various sections of the profiles and to the information system at any time during the year;
- Two updating deadlines were proposed – one at the end of March and one at the end of September;
- Upcoming changes and developments in policy priorities can be reported on as such – this is also information of interest to the users of the Compendium and indeed for the monitoring activities. Once decisions are made, profiles can be easily updated online;
- If there are no pressing policy issue(s) to report on prior to the October 2 deadline, the author could use the opportunity to improve upon information available in the profiles which one did not necessarily have time to concentrate on before. Authors are highly encouraged to *re-read the annotations in the Grid for Country Profiles*; and
- Authors should focus specifically on responding to new questions/categories in the grid especially those which are to be introduced following this meeting. *This is the priority for 2006!*

Keeping to the October 2 deadline is extremely important due to the annual contractual arrangements with the Council of Europe. As reported by Kathrin Merkle, the ongoing reforms at the Council of Europe do include discussions on the provision of multi-annual programming and budget planning which is, at the moment, not possible. Such reforms, expected to be introduced in 2007/2008, should help to facilitate the organisation of the project and make it more flexible and better able to respond to the varying needs of authors wanting to provide the most up to date information and data during a "fixed time" during the year. Until then, the contract deliverables are to be delivered on an annual basis and the deadline – at least for this year – is to be respected as best as possible.

Visibility of Authors

In a final note, Andreas Wiesand spoke about the need to increase the visibility of the authors on the site. To this end, he asked the authors to send a photo and a short CV to the ERICarts Secretariat for implementation this year. *This information is to be sent before the end of October 2006.*

3. Towards Monitoring National Policies and Measures to Protect and Promote the Diversity of Cultural Expressions

Nina Obuljen (chair) introduced the speakers of this session: Mr Kimmo Aulake, Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee for Culture from the Council of Europe; Mr Victor Kazai Hungarian Coalition for Cultural Diversity; and Ms Sabine Frank, EU Policy Adviser for the European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH).

Adoption of the UNESCO Convention

In her introduction, Nina Obuljen spoke briefly about the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of a Diversity of Cultural Expressions which was adopted in October 2005. It was rapidly ratified by Canada in December 2005, in part due to the fact that they did not have to go through a Parliamentary process in order to adopt the Convention. A simple decision was taken by the cabinet. While the preliminary analysis of the Convention is somewhat ambivalent, there is a consensus that it is a strong political instrument. The main question remains how effective the Convention can become. Monitoring the implementation and impact of the Convention is therefore crucial to turn this instrument into an effective one. The work on the follow up will depend very much on those countries which ratify the Convention and those which are selected to be part of the inter-governmental committee setting the guidelines for its impact and further development.

There are specific articles in the Convention which provide legitimacy for monitoring. The first is Article 9 which calls upon governments to report every four years to UNESCO on those measures they have adopted to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions. The second is Article 19, which explicitly calls on countries to exchange and disseminate information on policies and best practices. There is another important article which the Compendium community should consider, namely, Article 11 which relates to the role of civil society in relation to the Convention. A background table, prepared by the ERICarts Secretariat, provides the group with a first reflection on the links between other Articles of the Convention (6, 7, and 8) and the relevant parts of the Compendium. Articles relating to international cultural cooperation also need to be considered in the context of monitoring. Articles 20 and 21 could be monitored in view of important international instruments on multilateral and bilateral trade and investment; however, it is still unclear how this could be done.

Nina Obuljen reminded the group that in one of the earliest drafts of the UNESCO Convention (July 2004) prepared by independent experts, there was a recommendation to set up a Cultural Diversity Observatory as a body “to collect, analyse and disseminate all relevant information, statistics and best practices” of relevance in this domain. There was wide spread resistance to the idea of setting up a new administrative structure or observatory, mainly because it was too expensive. They also recommended the creation of an advisory board that could address pertinent issues on cultural diversity as it was acknowledged that the Convention had been created without sufficient knowledge, analysis and information. While both of these recommendations were removed from subsequent drafts, the ideas are not lost and have been taken up – in a very serious way – by the members of the Compendium group in its work. The workshops organised during this meeting should build upon the discussions which began at the previous authors meeting in Amsterdam. In the background material provided to the Compendium authors, there are several documents which can help facilitate these discussions including: a copy of the UNESCO Convention; existing Compendium

comparative tables which are relevant to the Convention; and a table linking the articles of the Convention with corresponding Compendium chapters.

Monitoring the UNESCO Convention

Kimmo Aulake thanked the Council of Europe Secretariat, ERICarts and the Hungarian hosts for organising this important meeting. In his presentation, he addressed three issues:

- the UNESCO Convention and why monitoring of national policies and measures is important in the context of its implementation;
- monitoring of national cultural policies and measures and its importance from the Council of Europe perspective; and
- the Compendium as an activity which connects the two.

The UNESCO Convention is a strong political and legal instrument enshrined in international law; albeit with few genuine obligations which bind parties to its implementation. It is an affirmative and permissive instrument which gives parties the right to develop their own cultural policies; the *raison d'être* for the Convention. While there are some provisions concerning dispute settlement, it is highly doubtful whether there will be any case law stemming from the Convention which would establish and demonstrate its application. The current *acquis* is not enough. If we want to show the value of the Convention and to demonstrate that it is not to be used as a protectionist tool or one against human rights, we must be able to show that there is a positive impact. Monitoring activities can help in this regard.

The main questions are whether or not the Convention can have an impact and how this can be determined. If there were clear obligations that would bind parties to the Convention, then it would be easier. Monitoring the provisions of the Convention, while not imposing clear obligations on the parties, is not a simple exercise. We therefore need to develop sophisticated systems to be able to monitor the Convention. This can be done, in the first instance, in the context of Article 9 which calls upon parties to report on existing measures as a first step.

One of the most important provisions of the UNESCO Convention concerns provisions to facilitate cooperation activities which intend to promote cultural diversity. How can we determine what type of cooperation will result directly from the Convention? We need a sophisticated tool to pin point positive developments in terms of international cooperation. This will affect the number of UNESCO member states which will ratify the Convention and how quickly. There is a danger that nothing will happen.

At the moment, there are no other similar instruments like the Compendium which link cultural policy researchers on such a large scale which can already help to determine the changes in national cultural policies and whether they have happened in response to the articles of the Convention or not. Reports on existing measures could help establish the basis for monitoring changes in policies resulting from the implementation of the Convention. The Compendium is also an exceptional resource as it covers a whole policy sector and on such a large geographical scale; this is the comparative advantage of this information system. It is a golden egg of the Council of Europe which other departments within the organisation do not yet have. It responds to the role of the Council of Europe as an organisation which monitors the working *acquis* and we need to reinforce this activity with additional resources. In this context, the Compendium can be used to monitor how member states implement, first the Council of Europe *acquis* in the cultural field and extend to monitor member states

implementation of the UNESCO Convention. Examples of the OECD monitoring exercises can be an example of good practice to follow. For example, the Council of Europe could issue statements on how member states are responding to the *acquis* related to cultural legislation and policy. The Steering Committee for Culture can begin to work on how this can be achieved. Discussions between the Council of Europe and UNESCO in terms of cooperation are taking place including how to use the Compendium as a reporting tool of the member states of the Council of Europe.

One of the main priorities of the Council of Europe is intercultural dialogue; a most challenging concept which needs to be clarified. The Compendium group has the expertise to help determine this definition as well as to develop a cultural policy tool kit with regard to intercultural dialogue. This is a priority for the Committee and it looks forward to working together with the Compendium group.

European Coalition for Cultural Diversity

Viktor Kazai spoke about the European Coalition for Cultural Diversity, which is an umbrella organisation for national coalitions of the same name representing the interests and ideas of local cultural actors/associations on the UNESCO Convention. There are currently 33 national Coalitions for Cultural Diversity around the world; 9 in Europe. The first Coalition was set up in Canada in 2001. The original goal of the coalitions was to contribute to the creation of an international instrument on the protection and promotion of cultural diversity. The European Coalition is now working to encourage governments to ratify the adopted Convention and for the EU to take a leading role as it did during the negotiations. At least 30 countries must ratify the Convention before it can enter into effect. They must submit proof of ratification before June 2007. Once this has occurred an inter-governmental committee (to be selected by a conference of parties) will set the operational guidelines for the implementation of the Convention (to be established at the UNESCO General Assembly in October 2007). The coalitions are lobbying governments around the world to meet this deadline; an ambitious goal. In January 2006, the European Coalitions issued an urgent call for speedy ratification of the Convention by the European Community and its member states. This would send out a clear political signal of the EU's commitment to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity. The EU has, in fact, already issued a statement encouraging all member states to ratify the Convention as soon as possible. In the longer term, the EU will also have to make a proposal for an international development fund as stipulated in the Convention. The European Coalitions will work to ensure that the issue of cultural diversity finds its way into all the internal policy areas of the EU. Specific attention will be placed on:

- a revision of the Television without Frontiers Directive regarding support for and the promotion of a diverse landscape of European works by new operators in the field of audiovisual media (e.g. video on demand);
- campaigning the European Parliament and Council for additional budgetary allocations to EU culture and media programmes (2007-2013) taking issues of cultural diversity into consideration;
- ensuring that cultural and audiovisual services, collective management organisations of intellectual property rights and cultural workers (e.g. performing artists, technicians etc) are excluded from the EU Directive on Services; and
- ensuring that cultural and audiovisual services are exempt from international trade agreements, especially those negotiated in the context of the WTO, or any other liberalisation attempts negotiated through bilateral or multilateral agreements.

Civil Society and the UNESCO Convention – View from EFAH

Sabine Frank explained that the mission of EFAH is to provide information and analysis on European Union legislation, policy and funding for culture as well as to engage in advocacy and networking on behalf of its members. At the moment, EFAH has no agreed/official position on the UNESCO Convention. It will, however, focus its attention on the issues of intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity during its upcoming General Assembly meeting to take place in Helsinki in October 2006.

In 2005, EFAH conducted a survey among its members and their interest in cultural diversity. The results show that quite a lot of work still needed to be done to reach out to the artistic community to engage them in a dialogue on the Convention. While many of its members organise projects, festivals or other activities to promote cooperation and exchange of diverse cultural content, few had considered the impact of the UNESCO Convention on their work, few have an explicit diversity agenda, and when there is one, the key concern is diversity within a particular form of artistic expression. In other words, the interest of EFAH members in cultural diversity and its promotion is bound up in their international cultural cooperation work and does not form an agenda in and of itself. Few of its members have a position on the Convention, with the exception of organisations such as PEARLE or IG Kultur Österreich.

More recently, EFAH has, in cooperation with the European Cultural Foundation, developed a diversity mapping project which may help to focus its member's attention on the issues of cultural diversity. This project will extend the 2005 member survey with interviews and new questions on:

- to what extent its members: reflect on diversity questions, promote cultural expressions which are under threat from socio-economic marginalisation, bring immigrants and minorities into their work, have competences on diversity issues, generate artistic responses arising from conflict situations;
- to what extent their organisational/institutional composition reflects diversity and if there are plans in place to foster diversity;
- obstacles to building intercultural capacities in some institutions;
- good or best practice models;
- where the demands to produce and reflect on cultural diversity actually come from.

There are still open questions regarding the design of their survey e.g. whether it should only focus on ethnic diversity or be extended to age and gender, the choice of organisations, e.g. only those involved in the production of art (diversity in cultural expressions) or networks removed from artistic practices and how diversity is reflected in their functioning.

Sabine Frank informed the group about the upcoming EU Year of Intercultural Dialogue in 2008, and that a budget of 10 million euro was being set aside to promote the issues involved. Activities to be supported include an information campaign, awareness raising events, surveys and studies as well as gathering best practices on intercultural dialogue and development issues. EFAH is involved in advocacy work to improve upon the legislative text. It is specifically concerned about ensuring that the Year will have a lasting effect and that the goal of mainstreaming cultural diversity in all areas of EU policy competency is achieved. EFAH intends to contribute more broadly to the debate by exploring related issues at their upcoming General Conference in Helsinki in October 2006. Some of the main themes will be:

- cultural fusion and artistic renewal;

- public space and intercultural meeting places;
- free speech and cultural sensitivities; and
- Europe as a cultural project.

She then moved on to address the question: why the UNESCO Convention may become important to the EFAH members as they look to the EU for support for their international cultural cooperation projects? EU cultural policy making is beset by two problems. The first is that EU competence in culture is a complimentary one in the context of the subsidiarity clause spelled out in the Treaty of Rome. Jurisdiction and the divisions of responsibility between national governments and the EU have at times been contested. On the other hand, there are obligations imposed upon the EU in Article 151.4 of the Treaty to take culture aspects into account in its actions under other provisions of the Treaty, in particular, to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures. The latter is referred to as the mainstreaming or cultural transversality provision, which has not been acted upon in any significant way. There is only a chance that the UNESCO Convention could help address this problem. On the other hand, the fact that the EU entered into negotiations on behalf of all member states, for the first time, is seen by many as "spectacular". This precedent is important to facilitate the ratification and implementation of the Convention by all member states. The EU will itself become a party of the Convention and therefore will take on responsibilities for: education and public awareness; participation of civil society; promotion of international cooperation; integration of culture in sustainable development; and cooperation for development. The duty to report every four years on measures taken to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions may make the Convention a more significant legal instrument than the EU Treaty's Article 151.4 which has no built in incentive for implementation. The Convention may forge new standards in EU policy making and promises to give the EU's external work a framework of principles. The implementation of the Convention will feature in the discussions of the EU Council, especially its Cultural Affairs Committee. The Commission is planning a communication on cultural policy which will include proposals on how the obligations of the Convention provisions can be realised in EU policies. However, this is only very optimistic speculation about the future. Willingness for policy advancement and commitment from a critical mass of individuals is required to make sure that the Convention becomes an effective instrument for the advancement of cultural policy in the EU.

Sabine Frank concluded by offering EFAH's assistance in making the Compendium more visible among its constituents, especially toward EU officials and the work of the group on good practice for intercultural dialogue.

Open Discussion

Peter Inkei: The original concept behind the development of the UNESCO Convention was to create a legal form of protection against multinational domination, against hegemonies, concentration and monopolies in the culture and media fields. The adopted Convention on cultural expressions seems to bury these original and striking questions and shifts our attention to interculturalism as an instrument of cultural diversity. The objections from countries such as the United States to the Convention were made on the basis of its original concept. As a Compendium author, this situation brings us into difficulties regarding the expectations of our proposed monitoring activities. The indicators we chose should also address issues of market monopolisation.

Danielle Cliche: Proposals have been made to expand the range of questions to be addressed by authors under sub-chapter 4.2.4 of the Compendium grid on media pluralism and content diversity. They encourage authors to provide additional information on the media ownership structure within individual countries; the provision of anti-trust measures to prevent media concentration; data on the share of domestic vs. imported media programmes; and public policies and programmes to support the production and distribution of local content. Such proposals are to be discussed and (hopefully) adopted within the working group sessions.

Kimmo Aulake: Responding to two points. The first point refers to the type of information to be monitored within the context of the UNESCO Convention. At the moment, the provisions of the Convention call for the monitoring of policy measures and not necessarily market data. The Compendium could do both as an independent exercise. The second point refers to the visibility of the Compendium within the EU Commission circles. While there are many Commission officials which are aware of the Compendium, we need to take into consideration certain "hidden agendas" such as: the fact that the EU does not have official competency in the field of cultural policy; the "hands-on" approach of the EU regarding certain cooperation arrangements and the challenges that they would face considering that the Compendium is a network which is not to be influenced by external partners; the sometimes perceived "competition" of the EU toward the Council of Europe etc. Colleagues from the CD-Cult Committee of the Council of Europe have been working to promote the work of the Compendium as its flagship project and will continue to do so, also within its EU related circles.

Andreas Wiesand: Interestingly, the Compendium has been mentioned in several of the working papers and EU calls for tender, beginning with the feasibility study on a European Cultural Observatory and more recently in a European Parliamentary call for a Europe wide study on the Status of Artists; the latter of which builds directly on the work of the Compendium. This is an indication that the professionals working both in the European Commission and in the Parliament are well aware of the Compendium project and its contribution to their daily work. There are many interfaces for the development of future cooperation between the EU and Council of Europe in the culture field; especially with regard to policies to promote intercultural dialogue. Unfortunately, the Declaration of the 2005 Warsaw Summit of Heads of State which sets guidelines on the relations between the Council of Europe and the European Union does not mention culture as a specific area of action. Culture should be put on the Council of Europe's agenda for cooperation with the European Commission.

Vladimir Bina: There is a big difference between rhetoric and data. The EU has been able to facilitate the collection of comparative data on certain areas of competence such as agriculture, while there is very little support for the collection of comparative culture statistics. While the Eurostat LEG exercises have taken some steps forward, there is no support or interest in pursuing the work accomplished to date. There is a lot of lip service from the EU regarding the field of culture and the situation regarding cultural statistics is much to be desired.

Bernd Wagner: There is a lot of work to do to translate the provisions of the UNESCO Convention into national cultural policies. At the moment, the main issue for discussion in Germany is how to bring issues of globalisation and the dominance of world markets into a policy framework which also addresses the increasing patterns of migration and the internal

diversity of our countries. Until now, discussions have focused mainly on the former issue, while the latter is only starting to take shape.

Ritva Mitchell: Cooperation between EFAH and the Compendium authors is welcome. She made a proposal to organise a small workshop regarding the case studies and good practices to be collected in the context of the upcoming EFAH Conference taking place in Helsinki in October 2006. This would be of great benefit as the amount of case studies collected so far in the context of the Compendium project is few. The Compendium authors would surely welcome cooperation with the artistic community and we look forward to incorporate case studies on pan-European or inter-regional dialogue in their work.

With regard to monitoring and the UNESCO Convention, we surely need to see this as an ambitious exercise. At the moment there is no clear indication from UNESCO regarding what is to be monitored. In the future, it will be especially important to understand how certain policies are implemented and what their effects are regarding the goals of the Convention. Certain developments happen despite the existence of certain policies and therefore we need to take a broad approach. The concepts prepared so far on the monitoring of the UNESCO Convention are very solid. The implementation of these suggestions would, however, require a great deal of human resources in each of the countries to permanently collect information, data and analysis. We should be ambitious in our goals and consider starting with a selection of indicators which are manageable and do our work well. There will always be room for expansion. At the same time, we should pursue cooperation with other monitoring exercises of the Council of Europe such as the monitoring of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages. Establishing links between the Compendium national correspondents and those information/data providers for other exercise would help to strengthen our common objectives, work plans and results. In the end, there would be a strengthened system of monitoring which reaches beyond culture as an independent field and establishes it as a truly transversal field of study.

Sabine Frank: What type of power is there in monitoring? Do the goals of monitoring activities within the Compendium aim to advance policy agendas? Is the goal to advance the implementation of the Convention by monitoring its provisions? Could it not be the purpose of the Compendium's monitoring activities to look at which measures are in place to promote and advance dynamic concepts of culture and creativity rather than to focus solely or largely on those which are protectionist?

Viktor Kazai: The UNESCO Convention creates an international legal instrument for national governments and a right to develop policies on national cultural goods and services. This is especially important in the context of the WTO and other bilateral / multilateral free trade agreements which treat culture goods and services as tradable items. Let me refer to one example where strong cultural policy measures played an important role. In South Korea there was a strict screen quota for films and television programmes of 30-40%. During this time, the level of local production increased tremendously. At the beginning of 2006, following negotiations with the United States, the South Korean government reduced this level of screen quotas and local production decreased. Through specific monitoring activities, we can surely find other interesting and important examples. However, at the moment, our priority is to ensure that member states ratify and implement the Convention in the first place.

Kimmo Aulake: We are faced with a paradox when it comes to monitoring cultural policy developments in a serious manner. We know that the Compendium is the best forum through which to undertake such activities; however, it is obvious that it can not do everything given the

current financial resources available for the project. We need this information more than ever; however, what is the best way to secure the necessary resources? The Council of Europe can not do this alone.

4. How the Compendium can assist National Governments and NGO's through Monitoring the UNESCO Convention

Andreas Wiesand and *Danielle Cliche* introduced the theme and how it is to be addressed in the afternoon working groups. They explained that the task of the working groups is to evaluate the information and data provided in the Compendium country profiles on different legislative provisions, policy approaches, and measures to protect and promote a diversity of cultural expressions. Groups are to consider how best to harmonise categories and indicators to collect information and data in the country profiles and how to assemble this data in existing comparative and or monitoring tables or in new ones. Packages of information are provided with which to comment including proposed amendments to the Compendium grid.

Danielle Cliche explained that it is important to keep in mind that the Compendium Community of Practice has adopted a transversal approach to addressing the issue of cultural diversity. This means to expand the discussion beyond one particular issue, e.g. on cultural minorities or immigrant communities, and to make transversal links between a variety of policy objectives, programmes and measures which support cultural diversity. These include, but are not limited to: diversity of actors involved in cultural policy decision-making; diversity of artistic expressions and of media structures; diversity of funding sources which individuals and groups have access to for their projects/works; etc. The scope of this approach has made it nearly impossible to create one single sub-chapter within the Compendium called "cultural diversity and cultural policy making" as it addresses so many of the issues reported on by the authors in their country profiles. A road map explaining this approach is made available on the Compendium website. While a comprehensive system which reports and monitors all of these issues in relation to the UNESCO Convention and its provisions does not yet exist, the information in the Compendium country profiles does provide a solid base for this exercise to mature. Some ideas on how to further develop this activity are available. The working groups should reflect on these ideas and make proposals on future monitoring activities referring both to the relevant Council of Europe Conventions and Declarations as well as to national cultural policy priorities and measures.

The Compendium authors were divided into five thematic working groups on:

- 1) Participation of different groups in cultural life;
- 2) Media pluralism and content diversity;
- 3) Diversity of artistic expressions – creativity of individuals;
- 4) Democratic management and organisation of cultural policy; and
- 5) International cultural cooperation.

5. Results from the Workshops

The second day of the meeting was opened with a presentation of the results of the working group discussions which took place on Day 1. Below is an overview of the reports presented by working group chairs and of the discussions which took place in plenary.

Report 1: Participation of Different Groups in Cultural Life¹

John Foote explained that the purpose of the group's discussion was to identify cultural participation indicators for the Compendium conforming to the UNESCO Convention.

Compendium chapter 8 on support to creativity and participation currently addresses: direct and indirect support to artists and to their professional associations and unions; cultural consumption and participation; arts and cultural education; and amateur arts/cultural associations. The goal of our work was to determine how issues of cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion can be integrated throughout this chapter. The following proposals were made:

- Information in sub-chapter 8.2.1 on cultural participation statistics is to be expanded to include data from surveys which monitor the participation of national minority groups or immigrant groups in the cultural life of a community and/or the composition of the audiences at multi-cultural festivals;
- Information in sub-chapter 8.2.2 on policies and measures to promote participation in cultural life is to be expanded with reports on explicit links to the broader issues of civic participation, citizenship, civil society development/cohesion; and
- Information on arts and cultural education, formerly located in chapter 4, is to be moved to sub-chapter 8.3 and is to include a new sub-chapter 8.3.2 on intercultural education.

In review of the Compendium profiles, several authors have included participation statistics broken down according to gender, age and education. Few provide information broken down according to income or regional variations. Even fewer provide information on surveys using indicators such as ethnicity, language or religion. Seen from a wider context, such data would help monitor the effectiveness of cultural policies designed to promote gender equality, the integration of different socially or economically marginalised groups, etc. One of the main challenges is the lack of available and comparable data and the group should use as much as possible standard sources in their reporting. Compiling data on participation rates broken down according to religion may not exist and may be controversial. The group felt, however, that it is an important aspect of cultural participation to study.

Article 4 of the UNESCO Convention defines cultural expressions as those expressions which result from the creativity of individuals and groups in society that convey cultural content defined as the symbolic meaning, artistic dimension and cultural values that originate from the culture industries. In this context, indicators on access of populations to diverse cultural

¹ Mikko Lagerspetz and John Foote were the chairs of this working group. Participants included: Vladimir Bina, Ulrich Bunjes, Marian Fitzgibbon, Sten Mansson, Ritva Mitchell, Sigrid Royseng and Kathrin Merkle.

activities and media content are highly relevant. More work is required in this area and is very important in the context of the UNESCO Convention. The working group recommended that authors provide as much as possible, data and information on:

- visits to different types of public museums and galleries;
- attendance at different types of cultural events;
- media habits including the types of books people are reading, the music (sound recordings) they listen to, the films they see, the newspapers they read;
- use of new media to access diverse content including, for example, the Internet or mobile downloads and communication.

The CUIPX experiment is seen as a useful tool in this regard.

Key sources to consult are: studies on EU household spending, general social surveys with cultural components, EU Barometer, public opinion surveys including values and attitudes (e.g. World Values Surveys), national polls which often track participation trends, recent UNESCO studies.

A new comparative table developed by *Mikko Lagerspetz* compiling existing data in the Compendium on visits to museums, theatres and cinema was discussed by the group. The data has been organised according to the number of visitors (in '000s), per capita and 5 year trends. The group supported his work, encouraged all Compendium authors to review his findings and to fill in the missing gaps.

Indicators for the development of new comparative tables on cultural habits based on population surveys (e.g. EU Barometer survey) were presented by *Sten Mansson* and include: visits to museums, theatres, concerts, cinemas and libraries; daily media consumption (e.g. reading daily newspapers or books); singing or playing instruments; dancing or acting; computers and the Internet in the home; and household expenditure on cultural goods and services.

The group proposed to introduce a new "experiment" which integrates information and data on participation trends from a smaller number of countries into comparative tables where appropriate.

Responses from the *Compendium group* started with a report from *Andreas Wiesand* on surveys carried out by the Zentrum für Kulturforschung which provide information on the differences in cultural consumption between different religions. His studies found that while there is not a great difference between the participation patterns of Catholics and Protestants, there is a difference in the way they express their love for public events and festivities; the former being more outspoken than the latter. The children of orthodox parents are among the most active in traditional art fields. Persons with a Muslim background were found to be estranged from the cultural life of the country.

Ritva Mitchell urged Compendium authors to make more use of the secondary data available from existing surveys. As Compendium authors, we can not initiate such large scale and expensive participation surveys. The problem is that we are highly dependent on the work of other organisations to collect the data we require. Ms Mitchell asked the ERICarts Secretariat to review European and international reports and surveys and inform authors about new sources as they become available.

Vladimir Bina outlined one of the basic problems the group faces to present comparative information. At the moment, two different sources have been used: cultural participation statistics (e.g. number of visitors to museums, theatres etc) and data generated from population surveys. We have quite a lot of data on the number of visitors but we do not yet have information on the background of these visitors. *Carla Bodo* furthered that authors need to provide a more clear distinction between two very different types of data: 1) *attendance data* (number of visitors to museums, number of theatre tickets sold, etc), which are measured through statistics and audience surveys, on the one hand; 2) *participation data* (population rate involved in the various cultural activities: visiting museums and exhibitions, attending musical and theatrical performances, reading books and newspapers, etc.) which can be measured only by sample surveys, on the other hand. Both types of data are important and are needed for two different reasons. Attendance data -where increases can be determined by higher frequency by the same persons - are indicators of artistic and economic success: they cannot be considered, though, as social indicators = indicators of success in outreach to wider audiences. The latter can be measured only through participation sample surveys, well correlated with sociodemographic features (e.g. age, gender, profession, etc). Authors should be encouraged, as much as possible, to use both types of data sources.

In conclusion, the authors were encouraged 1) provide as much information and data available in their country; 2) report on new national participation surveys which can be of interest to other countries (e.g. new survey in Germany on the participation of the 50+ generation in cultural life); 3) consult standardised Europe wide or international surveys mentioned in this report. Online discussions on the development of common indicators and issues of comparability could continue among a group of interested authors.

*Report 2: Media Pluralism and Content Diversity*²

Cas Smithuijsen reported that the starting point for discussions was the content of a book published by the Open Society Institute entitled “*Television across Europe*”. This Europe wide publication provides a portrait of the situation in specific countries, with an overview of existing regulation in Europe; including the EU Directive *Television Without Frontiers*. The latter provides a regulatory framework and is an important reference for our work on monitoring media legislation which aims at safeguarding pluralism as well as ensuring free trade of audiovisual products within Europe. He reported that the group had also discussed the WTO and UNESCO regulations. Two articles of relevance were found in the UNESCO Convention on broadcasting and media: Article 6.2.h on measures aimed at enhancing diversity of the media including through public service broadcasting; and Article 7.b on measures to promote access to diverse cultural expressions from within their territory as well as from other countries of the world.

In review of the indicators and information provided in sub-chapter 4.2.6, the group stressed the importance of working with the European Audiovisual Observatory and for authors to consult the statistics made available from the EAO before carrying out their own research on media structures, the share of domestic vs foreign programmes, etc. In the Compendium responses, some countries provide extensive information about media legislation and policies (e.g. Slovenia). Those which do not, are encouraged to consult the "Television across Europe" report as an important source of information.

² Cas Smithuijsen and Viktoras Liutkus were the chairs of this working group. Participants included Péter Inkei and Nina Obuljen.

Some proposals for improving the annotations in under 4.2.4 were made in order to broaden the requirements beyond the structural issues of the media in the different countries and encouraged authors to provide additional information on the main debates currently held among media professionals in their country regarding media pluralism and content diversity. They also proposed to add a new question on media issues and programmes related to young people as well as to minority groups. The example of the Bulgarian profile was given which reports on a project entitled the *Voices of Exclusion: Minority Empowerment through the Media*. Authors should also consider adding more information about cross border exchanges and flows of media products in their countries.

What does cultural diversity really mean in the context of this chapter of the Compendium? The strategy is to examine the means of support for the production of a plurality of content as well as the existing policy measures and their effects. Attention should be placed, in the first instance, on both the international and national levels by providing interesting examples which confront media concentration e.g. media producers exchanging their products in a non-commercial system e.g. through festivals. In addition, authors are encouraged to report on the production of regional programmes and the possibilities to broadcast such programmes nation-wide.

The group concurred that the Compendium should not focus solely on television broadcasting, but expand the information presented to include radio broadcasting and print media (e.g. newspapers and magazines). They also suggested looking at new technologies and the very important question of how to keep a balance in the supply of all kind of audiovisual products through these new technologies (including Internet distribution).

The *Compendium group* welcomed the report and suggestions made by Group 2. They agreed that it was important to use a common basis or source in providing media statistics in the country profiles and welcomed further cooperation with the European Audiovisual Observatory in this regard. Authors are to consult the EAO online system and its yearbook when providing data on the media structures in their countries. ERICarts can make web links from the relevant chapters in the Compendium profiles to information provided on the EAO system. Beyond this promotion of inter-institutional cooperation, Compendium authors can provide added value to explain and contextualise the data provided in collection of the EAO and other institutions and that we should work in a cooperative manner whereby different information systems complement each other.

*Report 3: Diversity of Artistic Expressions/Creativity of Individuals and Groups*³

Carla Bodo presented the results of the group by stating that its main task was to clarify the differences between the Compendium sub-chapters on cultural minorities, intercultural dialogue and on social cohesion. A concrete proposal was presented by *Tatiana Fedorova*. The goal was to help authors better understand the difference between these sub-chapters and to streamline the approaches to reporting.

When examining the information and data already provided in the Compendium profiles responding to questions raised in sub-chapter 4.2.1 on cultural minorities, the group observed that a lot of information is available on the general laws applicable to cultural minority groups including cultural rights extended to "traditional" or "established" minority groups. There is currently little information on "new minorities" such as immigrant communities or minorities

³ Carla Bodo and Tatiana Fedorova were the chairs of this working group. Participants included: Kimmo Aulake, Stefan Capaliku, Danielle Cliche, Ilkka Heiskanen, France Lebon and Bernd Wagner.

which have been living in a certain country for a long time but are not officially recognised by law (e.g. the Turks in Germany). Information on civic rights is extremely important to include in the responses as it is almost impossible to speak about cultural rights of new minority groups when they, in many cases, do not have basic civic rights to be educated, to have access to health insurance, to vote etc. Proposed amendments to the indicators listed under sub-chapter 4.2.1 are important to help fill this information gap.

The discussions of this working group then naturally proceeded to examine the information presented in the "experimental chapters" on intercultural dialogue and on social cohesion. They considered the proposal to integrate this information into chapter 4 of the grid proper referring to recent policy debates. Information on good practices is especially important and could be found from an unlimited spectrum of activities and areas ranging from artistic creation to training, awards, festivals, public events, media productions etc. Authors are encouraged to provide as many details as possible on these cases of good practice. The following set of proposed fields was adopted:

- project name and duration of project;
- country (e.g. initiating country);
- intervention level (e.g. European level, EU, national, regional, local project);
- locations (e.g. in which countries, regions or cities the project takes place);
- project partners (identify key partners);
- sector (e.g. music, theatre, film);
- objective of the project;
- main activities;
- target groups;
- results/evaluation/lessons to be learned;
- contact details and web links;
- additional resources (e.g. pdf files of relevant information, pictures, web clips etc.).

The *Compendium group* welcomed these changes and again re-emphasised that the Compendium should link to other bodies specialising in these fields such as the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. Connections should be also explored between the Council of Europe and the EU, especially in the context of their plans to dedicate 2008 as the Year of Intercultural Dialogue. The sum of efforts undertaken by the Council of Europe in this field are to be better promoted including the results of the intercultural dialogue working group, the Opatija Declaration on Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Prevention, the planned White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, efforts of the Compendium authors to collect information on national policy approaches to intercultural dialogue, etc.

Another observation made by the Compendium group was the difference in terminology used by authors when replying to questions on cultural minority groups. *Bernd Wagener* encouraged authors to, as much as possible, use the terminology proposed in the revised Compendium grid and integrated into the Guide to Preparing Country Profiles 2006. *Olexandr Busenko* proposed that the Compendium authors use internationally recognised standard definitions of, e.g. cultural rights, which would help facilitate monitoring activities in this regard. In some countries, even the majority population do not enjoy cultural rights.

A final suggestion was made by *Ritva Mitchell* for authors to include information on the situation and position of the Roma communities in different countries including: legislation giving them certain rights (e.g. civic, cultural), cultural policy measures, programmes, etc.

These could be presented in the form of thematic case studies. Existing sources can be used, such as the information generated through the Roma Forum, the joint Council of Europe-European Union programme to advance equality, tolerance and peace for the Rome (EIDHR), etc.

*Report 4: Democratic Organisation and Management of Cultural Policy*⁴

Delia Mucica reported that the group's task was to evaluate information and data provided in the Compendium country profiles on the diversity of actors involved in cultural policy making, diversity of funding sources and diversity of cultural institutions in the context of the UNESCO Convention.

The group first reviewed the information presented in sub-chapter 2.2 on "Competences, Decision-Making and Administration". They noticed that there are specific differences in reporting and authors need to be more specific about the competences of different bodies, i.e. whether administrative, legislative or financial. For example, there are some central ministries with cultural competence which do not draft regulation and are only executive bodies in the strict sense. These clarifications should be translated into the comparative table on policy making bodies in order to provide a more accurate view of the cultural policy making system (e.g. arm's length bodies and cultural funds or foundations may be the same in terms of operation and competencies). More generally, given the complexity of the existing administrative and legislative architecture, there appears to be an urgent need to build a common understanding of the categories used in the Compendium, via a glossary of terms.

With regard to the UNESCO Convention, the group recommended that authors report on how their countries are preparing to ratify and implement the articles of the Convention, for example, by setting up special offices to work on the follow-up, by establishing a forum of stakeholders from both the public and private sector and from the national, regional and local levels to discuss the implications of the Convention, etc.

The group asked whether there is a correlation between the diversity of policy making bodies and their respective competencies, of funding sources and of cultural institutions and the diversity of cultural expressions. How does the mandate of different bodies reflect the intention to promote and protect diversity of cultural expressions? Are there any plans on the national level to monitor developments?

The following proposals were made in the context of the articles of the UNESCO Convention which encourage information sharing and transparency and about the enhancement of public sector and management capacities in the cultural public sector (Article 9 and Article 12). Authors are to provide information on:

- the national contact point and/or relevant bodies that have been involved in gathering data and information about cultural diversity policies in preparation for the adoption of the UNESCO Convention; and
- the competencies of different bodies related to the aims of the Convention, either as existing mandates or as proposed changes. Such information would help to build a clearer picture of the architecture of the system, bearing in mind the role of central, regional, local and inter-ministerial committees.

The *Compendium* group discussion began with a question of where information on those bodies responsible for implementing the UNESCO Convention should be placed. On

⁴ Vesna Čopič and Delia Mucica were the chairs of this working group. Participants included: Jean-Cédric Delvainçière, Yashaz Huseynli, Franz-Otto Hofecker, Sabine Frank, Hristina Mikic and Veronika Ratzenböck.

the one hand, it could be reported on under sub-chapter 2.2. However, it could also be addressed in sub-chapter 2.4 where information related to cultural cooperation is presented.

Carla Bodo was against reporting on the bodies responsible for the implementation of the UNESCO Convention under sub-chapter 2. 2; which more generally deals with the structure of cultural policy-making in the different countries and the relationship between the different levels of government.

*Report 5: International Cultural Co-operation and Diplomacy*⁵

Oleksandr Butsenko reported that the group considered and discussed the Compendium sub-chapter 2.4 on international cultural co-operation and a proposal by *Andreas Wiesand* to subdivide it into four or five categories. The working group agreed that in the context of globalisation, European enlargement, immigration, social and political transformations, the information provided in this section of the Compendium is as important as ever. In this context, the group made a proposal to restructure this chapter in order to facilitate a more systematic approach to the collection of policies and measures aimed at facilitating international cultural cooperation as well as to future monitoring activities. See Annex 1.

Following a presentation of the restructuring of sub-chapter 2.4, *Maria de Lourdes Lima dos Santos* clarified that the provision of interesting examples or case studies of trans-national co-operation between professionals and cultural institutions (in sub-chapter 2.4.4) can be enhanced with a link to information (e.g. documents, websites etc) in its original language with a short abstract or summary in English to be provided in the country profile.

Within the *Compendium* group discussion, *Cas Smithuijsen* asked for the word "diplomacy" to be dropped from the title of this sub-chapter and recommended that it be replaced by "policy". In order to avoid confusion with the chapter on policies (chapter 4), it was agreed to simplify the title of chapter 2.4 to "international cultural cooperation".

Revisiting the question on where information on those bodies responsible for implementing the articles of the UNESCO Convention should be placed in the Compendium grid, it was decided that it is more appropriate for authors to report on this issue in sub-chapter 2.4. Responsible actors for policy and programmes related to cultural diversity or for intercultural dialogue more generally can be reported on in sub-chapter 2.2.

6. Monitoring of Policies and Good Practices for Intercultural Dialogue

Péter Inkei (chair) introduced the speakers of this session: *Ulrich Bunjes* (Council of Europe) *Veronika Ratzboeck*, *Els Baeten*, *Kathrin Merkle* and *Danielle Cliche*. He explained that the purpose of the session is to discuss how to optimise the information available on intercultural dialogue provided in the Compendium and to consider ways to enhance the collection of information and data in the future. Questions on how to refine the indicators currently in use within the Compendium grid and proposals for additional or alternative ones will be put forward for open discussion.

⁵ *Maria Lourdes Lima dos Santos* and *Oleksandr Butsenko* were the chairs of this working group. Participants included: *Els Baeten*, *Valeria Grosu*, *Una Sedleniece*, and *Andreas Wiesand*.

Kathrin Merkle explained that a separate paper or "road map" to the session was prepared by the Council of Europe and ERICarts in order to help facilitate the discussions. It shows that the Compendium group is not starting from scratch, but is building on activities taken over the past few years starting with the 2nd Authors meeting (2003) in Strasbourg and a presentation by the former coordinator of the Council of Europe project on intercultural dialogue, Simone Bernhardt. This was followed-up by working group discussions at the 3rd Authors meeting in Berlin (2004) where first indicators to collect Compendium relevant information on intercultural dialogue were presented. At the 4th meeting in Amsterdam (2005), authors volunteered to participate in an "experiment" to collect information on policies and programmes aimed at fostering intercultural dialogue from the point of view of the culture sector. This 5th meeting in Budapest plans to take further steps forward, especially in the context of the political priorities set by the Heads of State in Warsaw 2005 and the resulting transversal activities taking place within the Council of Europe.

Council of Europe White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue

Following on a presentation made by *Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni* at the 4th Authors meeting in Amsterdam (2005), *Ulrich Bunjes*, Central Division of the Council of Europe, updated the Compendium group on the process to produce a White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue and about concrete activities to take place over the next year.

While it is true that the issues related to intercultural dialogue have been at the forefront of the Council of Europe's activities for many years – such as human rights, equality, access, etc - intercultural dialogue as a specific priority is a more recent development. It first appeared in Council of Europe documents in 2000 and now permeates the Council's priorities and work plan.

Taking into consideration the Opatija Declaration on Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Prevention (2003), the Faro Declaration (2005), and other Ministerial documents and initiatives, the Council of Europe adopted a strategy on intercultural dialogue (Faro Strategy) which outlines certain concerns: that intercultural dialogue should not just become a sectoral policy in itself, rather it should pervade all of the policies of the Council of Europe; and that the Council is to develop new initiatives in the area of intercultural dialogue with member states, civil society, local and regional authorities. It is the official strategic policy document of the Council of Europe for the promotion of intercultural dialogue. The Faro Platform was created as meeting place where the Council of Europe can cooperate with all partners.

The work of the Council of Europe will develop its programme according to three strands: setting standards and policies, building of competencies and running of practical projects and programmes.

Cooperative action in the field of intercultural dialogue will be developed within countries, between countries in Europe and between Europe and its neighbouring regions i.e., the countries on the southern shore of the Mediterranean Area, the Middle East and Central Asia.

Five priority areas for action on intercultural dialogue have been set to:

- 1) promote the equal dignity of everyone, e.g. activities of the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance, those involved in human rights issues or hate speech, Youth Campaign for Diversity, Human Rights and Participation;
- 2) promote cultural diversity in everyday life e.g. programmes to promote participation of social groups in every day life, language, role of heritage;

- 3) promote competencies necessary for living together in multicultural societies e.g. in education programmes and in programmes for training teachers;
- 4) protect freedom of expression and to strengthen the responsibility of the media e.g. the Danish “caricature” issue;
- 5) secure equal access to rights in multicultural societies.

Ulrich Bunjes stated that the Council of Europe had examined all of its activities that might be linked to intercultural dialogue and found approximately 100 relevant and very diverse programmes or activities in this area.

The organisation is seeking synergies and partnerships on intercultural dialogue with other agencies and organisations such as the Arab League Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (ALESCO), the Anna-Lind the Europe Mediterranean Foundation for Dialogue between Cultures, the OSCE. Cooperation between the Council of Europe and the European Union on the issue of intercultural dialogue has been re-emphasised in the recently published Juncker Report⁶ (April 2006). Through the Faro Platform, the Council of Europe will cooperate with UNESCO to harmonise their approaches to intercultural dialogue and to develop common priorities and projects throughout the year to come.

All of this work on intercultural dialogue will feed into the Council of Europe’s preparation of a White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue 2006-2007. It is expected that the White Paper will not only be a policy document but is to be the result of a very active process of consultation with as many stakeholders as possible including the various expert committees within the Council of Europe, member states, institutional partners, local and regional authorities, civil society organisations, etc. It is expected that the White Paper will be organised into three parts. The first part will attempt to define the very complex term intercultural dialogue as there are currently few shared definitions. The second part will provide policy guidelines and recommendations for various levels of intervention/actions e.g. local, national and European, including norms and standards, competencies/abilities and practical programmes. The third part will contain a collection of examples of good practice; the latter must be clarified as there is no clear definition of what good practice is in relation to intercultural dialogue. The White Paper is expected to be finalised during the summer of 2007. It will be presented to the Committee of Ministers in Autumn of 2007, in time for the upcoming EU Year on Intercultural Dialogue 2008.

Ulrich Bunjes stated that a very important activity will be to maximise the visibility of the work of the Council of Europe on intercultural dialogue. At the moment, they are considering the creation of a prize for good practice by the media. Existing instruments like the Compendium are invaluable tools for promoting its work on intercultural dialogue.

The work accomplished by the Compendium group to date (and in the near future) will feed into the White Paper process. It is currently one of the more comprehensive tools in a specific policy area. He encouraged authors to communicate with experts working in other areas of policy including, human rights, language, media, education, youth, social policy etc., who are also working on intercultural dialogue. It will be one of the tasks of the White Paper process to identify the links between these policy areas.

What the Compendium has Achieved so Far

⁶ See

http://www.gouvernement.lu/salle_presse/actualite/2006/04/11conseil_europe/english_mod.pdf#search=%22Juncker%20Report%22

Veronika Ratzenböck started by reporting that it has been very difficult to respond to the questions posed in the Compendium on intercultural dialogue in the absence of a clear framework and definition of intercultural dialogue. The background papers on the White Paper exercise will certainly help in this regard. In Austria, the majority of action has been taken on the city level, where some initiatives concerning intercultural dialogue can be identified. For example, there are local authority departments for intercultural dialogue and international activities. The city of Salzburg has developed a strategy on cultural diversity which includes support for intercultural projects. There were also weekly (30 minute) media programmes produced by the public broadcaster and regular programmes broadcast on private radio, etc. The latter however, are made by minorities for minorities.

On the national level, there is no official definition of intercultural dialogue and there are no explicit cultural policies promoting intercultural dialogue. Intercultural dialogue is not yet a priority in Austria and is not recognised as a tool contributing to cultural diversity in Austrian society. Responsibility for developing policies to promote intercultural dialogue has not been assigned. It is even difficult to receive information from the government on intercultural dialogue. In many cases, the existence of the UNESCO Convention is deemed to be enough.

There is no reflection on the concept of intercultural dialogue within the universities and therefore there is no theoretical context for intercultural dialogue. *Veronika Ratzenböck* explained that intercultural dialogue in Austria is currently only understood as projects for minorities and immigrants and does not reflect the five priority areas as mentioned in the presentation by *Ulrich Bunjes*. No links have been yet made between intercultural education and the artistic field. She looks forward to the definitions and frameworks to be provided by the Council of Europe White Paper exercise and hopes that it will have a positive influence.

Els Baeten gave a report on how authors have responded to the questions posed last year in the "Compendium experiment" on intercultural dialogue and made some remarks on the possibilities for comparing the information. At the moment, there is a lot of information in the national contributions. It is indeed very interesting to see how the national approaches differ from each other. This richness of variety means that it is very complicated to carry out a comparison of the different national approaches toward intercultural dialogue as different definitions of intercultural dialogue were used in the contributions. She explained that intercultural dialogue was interpreted as programmes and strategies to support the activities of cultural minorities which, from her point of view, normally belongs to the sub-chapter on cultural minorities (4.2.1). *Els Baeten* said that reports on policies and strategies to stimulate intercultural dialogue should include those aimed at cultural integration in a broader sense. In this context, the Italian contribution provided information on strategies for stimulating civic participation and political representation. How broad or narrow should we interpret intercultural dialogue in our responses? She found the Finnish contribution to be very useful in terms of the general distinctions made between internal dialogue (within a country) and cross-border dialogue. Many authors provided information and data on the different types of minorities living within their countries which is very useful to help understand the national contexts. Examples of intercultural dialogue and exchanges between traditional minorities and new minorities could be interesting to explore.

The Compendium group discussions began with warm words of thanks to *Ulrich Bunjes* for his comprehensive presentation on the White Paper which, according to *Kathrin Merkle*, re-assured them that they have adopted the right strategy to provide a mix of policy and practical information on intercultural dialogue.

Cas Smithuijsen re-emphasised the urgent need to adopt a definition of intercultural dialogue as well as to set criteria which would help authors determine what could be considered "good

practice" or "innovative" examples; the latter is a challenge faced by the Compendium authors in their work. The White Paper exercise can help provide a framework for the work of the Compendium, especially as regards the translation of what intercultural dialogue means and how this is or not interpreted into cultural policy making priorities and action.

Ritva Mitchell spoke about the future of the Compendium in monitoring certain policy standards and instruments. As regards cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue, the UNESCO Convention and the Council of Europe White Paper will greatly assist in this task. The intention of the latter to set standards for policy making is a very important contribution and one which the European Union does not deem as part of its responsibilities, especially in the culture field. It is therefore a highly appropriate and welcomed initiative for the Council of Europe to undertake. She looks forward to the contribution the Compendium group can make to this process.

Referring to the responses from authors, *Ritva Mitchell* explained that it is important for the group to also report on what governments are not doing. As illustrated in the contribution from *Veronika Ratzenböck*, this is also valuable information. In Finland, there is no one explicit policy document on intercultural dialogue. However, when looking at different policies, projects and initiatives we end up seeing a policy which may not yet be defined. Combining information on civic and cultural rights, policies and programmes towards traditional minorities or new minority groups resulting from recent immigration flows, those of cultural institutions, etc., helps us to create a patchwork picture of government policy. Quite often we are reporting on fields where there are no explicit policies and Compendium authors may find themselves in a position of "inventing policies" or contradicting official statements by stating that indeed they do exist – just not yet in an integrated manner. The group could also consider reporting on other actors outside of the public policy making sphere and examine the role of multinational corporations or at least the role of the private sector. For example, in Finland there is a big political dispute on the infringement of rights of the Sami people to their land which are being challenged by multinational logging companies.

Mikko Lagespetz is worried that many of the issues associated with intercultural dialogue including civic participation, empowerment of minority groups etc., are outside the competence of the Compendium group. Do the authors have the competence to analyse the information available and to determine the real impact of intercultural dialogue programmes and policies across all policy making sectors? Distinctions need to be made between the broader questions and those related specifically to the culture sector. *Ulrich Bunjes* agrees that the Compendium cannot look at the entire range of issues cutting across the policy spectrum and that this is one of the challenges of the Council of Europe White Paper exercise to find the points of interaction and threads that bind them together.

Compendium Next Steps

Kathrin Merkle reviewed the elements presented in the "road map" to the session prepared by the Compendium editors and reiterated the 3-fold strategy as being to:

1. incorporate policy and programme information produced by the Compendium authors during 2005 into chapter 4 of the grid ;
2. consider intercultural dialogue as a transversal issue to be addressed in other relevant chapters of the Compendium grid including on international cultural cooperation and on arts and cultural education;
3. enlarge the initial good-practices collection into an "independent" and more visible section within the Compendium website.

Surely, more reflection is required to elaborate parameters or indicators on what "good practice" means in the context of the Compendium and its work.

Danielle Cliche started by thanking all the authors who participated in the "Compendium Experiment" 2005 and to the whole group for agreeing to move beyond this experimental phase. She summarised the specific proposals and amendments to the grid which have been adopted by the Compendium group throughout the course of this meeting more generally and during the workshop sessions in particular. In the cultural policy context, intercultural dialogue is seen as part of the cultural diversity "tool-kit". Referring to the cases of good practice, a list of items has been elaborated and a form will be sent around to all authors to fill in. These cases will form a separate and distinct part of the Compendium information system which will also include cases collected by the Council of Europe group on intercultural dialogue. In addition, the ERICarts Secretariat will reorganise the national country profiles according to the changes in the grid.

Gabriella Szabó-Pop informed the Compendium authors about the work of the Council of Europe project group on intercultural dialogue and the cases of good practice collected through a survey sent by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe to member states' Ministries of Culture in 2005. At the moment, the results are summarised in a tableau and presented on the Compendium website. She would like to see more information from these cases included online. *Kathrin Merkle* responded that, until now, the exercise mentioned received a response rate of less than 50% and it is expected that more information on cases of good practice will be collected through the White Paper exercise. Synergies with the Compendium are evident, welcomed and will be further developed in this regard.

7. Compendium as a Policy Making and a Teaching Tool

This session was chaired by *Ritva Mitchell* and *Andreas Wiesand* who, in their opening words, emphasised the importance of the Compendium among policy makers as a reference tool which provides them with a comprehensive and basic information package on policies and measures for culture in the different countries. Referring to the results of the survey made at the beginning of this year, *Ritva Mitchell* added that, in her discussions with policy makers, they are very interested in having a continuous flow of updated information and news from the Compendium which is difficult to achieve at the moment because the system is updated once a year. She called on other authors to inform the group about their experiences, especially those tied closely to the policy making process.

Vladimir Bina reported that his colleagues frequently asked him to consult the Compendium and to collect information on how other countries respond to policy questions which they are currently tackling. *Una Sedleniece* explained that in Latvia, her department of cultural policy planning uses the Compendium as a regular working tool. According to *Vesna Čopič*, in Slovenia, the Compendium is used in the process of preparing for missions abroad, bilateral agreements etc., and in response to requests from the Cabinet on the cultural policy priorities in other countries.

One of the challenges mentioned is that not all policy makers across Europe are able to use the Compendium due to the fact that the information is in English. *Olexandr Busenko* has been publishing translations of different profiles in Ukrainian in order to inform policy makers as well as students. Others reported that they receive requests from colleagues and students in their countries for translations of different country profiles in their own language.

As a teaching tool, the Compendium is a very useful reference and information source for professors and students; the latter who may one day become future cultural policy decision-makers and administrators. The Compendium fills a need in the training/educational programmes where there are several theoretical, conceptual or management studies available for students to refer to but not a lot of practical information on the policy systems and priorities. *Ritva Mitchell* spoke about her experiences using the Compendium in her MA and PhD courses on comparative cultural policy. The comparative tables are very important for her students to understand the differences in the systems across Europe.

The Compendium is used as a teaching tool by many of the authors not only in their courses in Europe but also in their teaching work at universities in other world regions such as in Asia. At the moment it has been used in universities in Shanghai, Singapore and Bangkok where courses in cultural policy are emerging.

Cas Smithuijsen reported that he is creating a guide to cultural policy targeted to younger students (18 years old and under).

Otto Hofecker suggested that links from university home pages and departments for cultural management or cultural policy be made to the Compendium website. He also asked those using the Compendium as a teaching tool to share feedback they receive from students who are studying comparative research methodologies or who are using the country profiles in their dissertation work.

Kathrin Merkle announced that, more recently, Prof. Xavier Dubois has set up a new course on cultural policies and management at the University of Strasbourg. The Council of Europe has been invited to run a module on “L’Europe de la Culture” and uses the Compendium in its lectures.

Viktoras Luitkus reported that his students are to include references to the Compendium in their final exams as well as in their dissertations. They not only use the policy information available, but also the data on financing and participation in their work. It is important for them, who are mainly Lithuanians, to understand the different processes and issues being discussed in Europe.

8. Closing Session

Roberta Alberotanza closed the meeting by reiterating that the Compendium is a flagship project of the Steering Committee for Culture due to its outstanding quality and because it represents both the spirit of the work of the Council of Europe and the European Cultural Convention. The Compendium is a masterpiece of cooperation and provides a wealth of knowledge for use by politicians, policy makers and researchers. She expressed her appreciation for the quality of the debates held during this meeting and is convinced that the continued work on cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and the good practice section will be an extremely important activity in the future. She thanked the Compendium authors and editors for their professionalism and outstanding work over the past years. She expressed her gratitude to the Hungarian government and to Ms Gabriella Szabó-Pop for hosting this event in Budapest.

ANNEX I

Towards an Integrated Approach to Diversity, Dialogue and Cohesion

Restructuring Compendium Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 8

The following changes have been made and adopted by the 5th Compendium Authors meeting. They are considered as a first step towards integrating information on cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion collected by Compendium authors over the past year.

Some new questions are introduced within existing chapters. Proposals have been made to shift some sub-chapters to other parts of the grid (not requiring change to information collected). In some cases, new chapters have been proposed.

2. Competence, decision-making and administration

2.1 Overall description of the system

- Breakdown of competence at the different levels of government including:
 - national/federal government;
 - provincial/regional government;
 - municipal/local government.
- Which level of government plays the most important (and co-ordinating) role in the governance structure of cultural policy in your country (e.g. the central authority or the local or regional governments)?
- Please identify and describe the role of the main actors which play an important role in cultural policy in your country. For example:
 - Actors: e.g. the Parliament, Ministries responsible for culture, government councils, or co-ordinating bodies for cultural affairs at the regional or local level, specialised committees, arms-length bodies, cultural funds or foundations, etc.
 - Competences: e.g. executive functions; administrative, legislative and financing competences; advisory role; operations; etc.
- **NEW!** Have there been changes to the architecture of this system in recent years in which new bodies have been created, for example, to facilitate the representation and participation of national cultural minority or immigrant groups within cultural policy making processes e.g. via specific councils, committees or working groups? If the answer is yes, please provide information on their role and mandate.

2.2 Inter-ministerial or intergovernmental co-operation

- Please provide a description of how the Ministry of Culture -- or responsible body -- co-operates with other Ministries on matters related to culture, including communications, finance, urban planning etc (*inter-ministerial co-operation*).
- Are there committees set up to facilitate inter-governmental co-operation (between different levels of government - state, regional/provincial and local/ municipal)? Please provide examples of their main cooperation activities or projects.
- **NEW!** Are there any inter-ministerial committees or inter-governmental networks responsible for promoting intercultural dialogue?

2.4 International cultural co-operation

2.4.1 Overview of main structures and trends (NEW numbering)

- Please describe important historical developments, main institutional structures, political trends and major bi- and/or multinational strategies during the past 5 years. Please indicate important political documents in this field.

2.4.2 Public actors and cultural diplomacy (NEW numbering)

- Describe the roles of central and important regional/local authorities and the relationship between main ministries e.g. for foreign affairs and for culture.
- What is the role of publicly mandated cultural agencies and institutes (such as the British Council or Institut Français)?
- What are the major instruments used in international cultural relations, such as co-operation treaties, co-production agreements (e.g. film co-productions) or state guarantees for major international museum exhibitions.

- What are the major developments in trans-national co-operation in the field of cultural education and training?
- Please provide a short assessment of trends in public financial support for international cultural co-operation in your country.

2.4.3 European / international actors and programmes (NEW numbering)

- Describe the participation of your country in major programmes of multilateral co-operation of :
 - the Council of Europe, UNESCO and the EU (particularly as concerns Art. 151.2 and 3 of the EU treaty).
 - other trans-national organisations and networks, including those of larger geographic regions (e.g. Nordic Cultural Co-operation) or language areas (e.g. Francophonie or Taalunie).
- Which ministry(ies) and/or other bodies are responsible for implementing and monitoring the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions?

2.4.4 Direct professional co-operation (NEW numbering)

- Provide examples or case studies of trans-national co-operation between arts and heritage institutions, local cultural bodies (e.g. trans-border exchanges), professional associations, networks and other NGO actors.
- Please give examples of sector specific trans-national cooperation in fields such as theatre, dance, film, music etc., including conditions and/or public and private funding of such activities.

2.4.5 Cross-border intercultural dialogue⁷ and co-operation (NEW !)

- Describe government programmes to support trans-national intercultural dialogue. Are these programmes channelled via intergovernmental organisations or directly with specific countries, “multi-cultural” cities or specific groups (e.g. Roma people’s organisations)?
- Does the government support specific trans-national activities of young people or youth groups? Are there funds and programmes available for such activities (e.g. travel grants, language or cross-cultural training courses)?
- Describe activities of important NGOs that facilitate trans-national intercultural dialogue activities. Please provide some examples of their projects.

2.4.6 Other relevant issues (NEW!)

For example:

- Importance of “culture in development” programmes in your country (please provide examples).
- Activities and organisational provisions for diaspora communities (individuals from your country organised in communities abroad)
- Other important activities, e.g. large international cultural events or sector-specific activities which are particular to your country.

⁷ As defined in the Council of Europe Opatija Declaration.

4. Current issues in cultural policy development and debate

4.2 Recent policy issues and debates

4.2.1 Cultural minorities, groups and communities (NEW title and reformulated questions)

- Which are the officially and non-officially recognised cultural minority groups in your country? If possible, please distinguish between established communities, newly formed groups and immigrants.
- Please provide information on their composition in terms of population statistics as well as on the official and non-official status of these groups.
- Please identify the political or legal basis for their civic rights (e.g. citizenship, education, health, social insurance etc.) and for their cultural rights (e.g. to participate in cultural life, to protect and develop cultural and linguistic identity(ies), to create, etc.)
- How have these rights been translated into cultural policy? Can a particular cultural policy approach towards these cultural minorities, groups and/or communities be identified? Is there specific legislation covering these groups?
- Please provide examples of targeted measures and support programmes referring to:
 - Arts and heritage sectors e.g. performing arts (music, dance, theatre), visual arts;
 - Media e.g. television programme production and distribution;
 - Events e.g. festivals, special celebrations;
 - Strategies e.g. citizenship participation.

4.2.2 Language issues and policies (NEW Numbering!)

- What are the official languages in your country? Which are the other main language communities in your country which are not officially recognised?
- How are they recognised in your country's cultural policy structures and programmes?
- Are there specific measures to support the creation and dissemination of culture and media products in both officially and non-officially recognised languages?
- What are the main debates on language pluralism in your country?

4.2.3 Intercultural dialogue: actors, strategies, programmes (NEW Numbering!)

- Please describe whether intercultural dialogue is an issue and/or a priority of cultural or other policies in your country?
- If so, please provide information on the main cultural policy document(s) identifying intercultural dialogue as an objective or priority of the government (strategies, decisions, white papers)?
- Please indicate the main public actors responsible for implementing the programmes and policies to promote intercultural dialogue in your country at national, regional and local policy levels. Provide examples of their priorities and activities.
- **NEW!** Please indicate the main private actors addressing the issue of intercultural dialogue in your country (e.g. third sector associations, religious groups, culture industries).

- Please provide some examples or cases of good practice⁸ which could be recognized as innovative and why (indicate criteria for selection) such as:
 - Inter/multicultural and inter-religious programmes and activities
 - Infrastructure/cultural institutions and centres set up for intercultural purposes
 - Inter-linguistic programmes (within the formal or non-formal education system)
 - Support for the production of new and hybrid cultural forms.

4.2.4 Social cohesion and cultural policies (NEW Numbering!)

NB. Social cohesion is defined by the Council of Europe as “the capacity of a society to ensure the welfare of all its members, minimising disparities and avoiding polarisation. A cohesive society is a mutually supportive community of free individuals pursuing these common goals by democratic means” .Some of these issues have recently gained more attention in the light of increased immigration of people with different cultural backgrounds. In response, some European countries have developed different policies and measures aiming at (equal) access to culture as a means of reducing social imbalances and fostering common values.

- Is social cohesion a cultural policy issue in your country?
- What approach has been adopted (or is being considered) by national, regional or local authorities to develop policies or programmes aimed at facilitating social cohesion using culture and the arts?
- Who are the main actors involved (e.g. public, private or civil society actors)?
- What examples or cases of good practice would such actors recognise as “innovative” (e.g. measures fostering cultural and civic action and participation, Internet based community networks etc.)
- Are there any public opinion reports on values conducive to social cohesion such as cooperation, trust, respect, reciprocity or other reports/studies on actual engagement of the population (e.g. volunteerism, donations, participation etc.)?

4.2.5 Media Pluralism and Content Diversity (NEW title and numbering!)

- Please provide data on the organisation and ownership structure of the media sector in your country (public, commercial and not-for-profit).
- **NEW!** Are there anti-trust measures to prevent media concentration?
- **NEW!** What is the share of domestic vs. imported media programmes?
- Describe the main/recent debates among media professionals (e.g. relations between public/private broadcasters in the context of EU competition policies)
- What type of support does the government provide for the production and distribution of local content?
- Are there designated arts and culture TV channels or regular programme series with cultural or artistic content?
- **NEW!** Are there specific training programmes for journalists to sensitise them to culture related issues and conflicts to ensure a diversity of views?

⁸ Information on cases of good practices could be found from an unlimited spectrum of activities and areas ranging from artistic creation to training, awards, festivals, public events, media productions etc. Please indicate for the cases chosen: project name and duration of project; country (e.g. initiating country); intervention level (e.g. European level, EU, national, regional, local project); locations (e.g. in which countries, regions or cities the project takes place); project partners (identify key partners); sector (e.g. music, theatre, film); objective of the project; main activities and results; target groups; lessons to be learned; contact details and web links; additional resources (e.g. pdf files of relevant information, pictures, web clips etc.).

4.2.6 Culture industries: policies and programmes (NEW Numbering!)

- **NEW!** How are the culture industries defined in your country?
- Please provide available data on the independent culture industries in your country (e.g. market size, the number and size of such companies, import/export data)
- Which are the main policies, strategies and measures which provide support for the growth of independent culture industries in your country as well as for the production and distribution of local content?
- Which are the main challenges to small and medium sized culture industry companies in your country?
- **NEW!** Are there specific training and education programmes available for culture industry professionals?
- Please identify cases of public, private or third sector partnerships which are part of new "creative industry" strategies.

4.2.7 Employment policies for the cultural sector (NEW Numbering!)

- How many people are estimated to be working in different areas of the cultural sector in your country? Please distinguish between employees of cultural institutions and self-employed, freelance workers. Has there been an increase or decrease in these numbers over the last decade?
- Briefly describe specific policies or strategies to stimulate employment in the cultural field; whether in public sector culture institutions or private sector culture industries.
- If possible, please provide information on the salary levels of employees working in public cultural institutions. Are they comparable with others professionals such as doctors, teachers, and judges?

4.2.8 New technologies and cultural policies (NEW Numbering!)

- Please describe recent developments and measures to include "information society"/new media in cultural policy frameworks.
- Do culture provisions form part of overall government strategies on the "Information Society"?
- Are there specific support schemes or measures for artists working with new technologies?
- Please provide cases/examples of public-private support for media arts projects and/or structures (e.g., exhibitions, labs or networks).

4.2.9 Heritage issues and policies

NB. Information on heritage law(s) is to be reported on in chapter 5.3.3

- Is there a specific integrated approach to heritage policy and management in your country? If so, please describe.
- **NEW!** Please refer to recent debates or major developments on heritage policies in your country -- e.g. digitisation of heritage assets, cultural tourism, cultural heritage of different cultural groups or immigrant communities, etc.?
- Please provide examples of innovation models or experiences of heritage education and outreach programmes?

4.2.10 Gender equality and cultural policies (NEW Numbering!)

- How is the principle of gender equality/equal opportunities reflected in cultural policies and in cultural policy making?
- Are there public bodies or specific strategies which support women as professionals in the cultural labour market, for example, quota schemes or mainstreaming programmes.
- If available, please include data on the representation of women in key decision-making positions in cultural institutions and in important cultural policy making positions (e.g. Ministers).

4.3 Other relevant issues and debates (NEW Numbering!)

This is an open space for authors to briefly describe those policy issues and debates which are not covered by the categories above and are of particular importance in your country.

5. Main legal provisions in the cultural field

5.3 Sector specific legislation (Remains the same)

EDITORIAL CHANGES MADE TO ANNOTATIONS TO AVOID DUPLICATION WITH INFORMATION COLLECTED IN CHAPTER 4.

5.3.7 Culture industries

- Is there any overall legal framework to specifically promote and develop the private sector culture industries?
- Please list and briefly describe individual sector laws or regulations applicable to the culture industries, such as competition laws, VAT or other tax regulations, specific laws regulating the private media and/ or independent productions, fixed book prices, etc.
- Have there been any major changes in recent years?

5.3.8 Mass media

- Identify the public Broadcasting Act in your country and the most recent /impending amendments.
- Which regulations are in place to promote the diversity of media structures and programmes (e.g. ownership regulations, quotas on the share of foreign programming, production and distribution of local content)?
- Does the Broadcasting Act outline specific cultural obligations which public broadcasters must follow? Please describe.
- Are there specific articles regulating media programming in different languages?

8. Support to creativity and participation

8.1 Direct and indirect support to artists (Remains the same)

8.1.1 Special artists funds

8.1.2 Grants, awards, scholarships

8.1.3 Support to professional artists associations or unions

8.2 Cultural consumption and participation (NEW Numbering!)

Explanatory note: Authors are to make a distinction between *cultural consumptions* (audiences=number of visitors), and *participation rate* for cultural activities (to be measured through sample surveys)

8.2.1 Trends and figures (NEW Numbering!)

Explanatory note: Authors should provide statistical data for a number of years (1990, 1995, 2000, 2004 or 2005) which would allow for a discussion of changes over time. Latest figures should be accompanied by per capita (or per 1 000 inhabitants) to allow for comparability. Authors are to indicate the source where users can access the interview questions used in the participation surveys.

- Provide a table of statistics broken down according to participation in activities which are
 - heavily subsidized by the state (e.g. at opera performances, national museums or public libraries);
 - without large public subsidies (e.g. press, private television, Internet etc);
 - capturing participation rates at local level popular culture events (e.g. carnivals, street theatre festivals)
- Please indicate the main developmental trends over the last ten years. Has there been a marked increase or decrease in certain fields or activities? If so, please describe/explain the reasons for such changes.
- Have there been any surveys taken in recent years on the cultural activity of social groups differing from each other with respect to gender, age or education.
- **NEW!** Are there any surveys monitoring the participation of national minority groups or immigrant groups in the cultural life of a community, the composition of the audience at multi-cultural festivals. If so, what are the results?

8.2.2 Policies and programmes (NEW Numbering!)

- Please identify and describe public initiatives and programmes to promote participation in cultural life such as "museum passes", voucher programmes for youth or seniors, literacy campaigns, co-operation programmes between schools and cultural institutions, or any other strategies. Have there been any major changes in recent years?
- Has there been a recent debate in your country on minimum cultural provision and access to culture? If so, briefly summarise and mention any effects it has had on policy planning and policy making.
- **NEW!** Is there an explicit policy linking participation in cultural life to the broader issues of civic participation, citizenship, civil society development/cohesion?

8.3 Arts and cultural education (NEW Numbering!)

8.3.1 Arts and cultural education (NEW Numbering!)

- Please describe the landscape of higher arts education in your country.
- Which government body is the main actor responsible for arts education and training in your country? Please describe its main programmes or initiatives in the past five years. How has the focus changed?
- **NEW!** What has been the impact of e.g., the Bologna process on higher education, on their structures, curricular or programmes? Have performance based indicators/targets been introduced?
- Are there any new programmes in schools which promote the use of new technologies e.g. connecting schools, education programmes in libraries, new technology courses for arts students, technology based projects for school children, etc.
- Do cultural institutions provide “out-of-school” arts education programmes?

8.3.2 Intercultural education (NEW Category!)

- Is intercultural education part of the general school curricula?
- Is intercultural education mainly administered by cultural or educational policy making bodies? Does this mainly occur at the national, regional or local level?
- What are the main goals of intercultural education programmes (e.g. to focus on shared national values and identity; to promote tolerance, multilingualism, equality; to inform students about world cultures, religions, traditions, etc)?
- Are there examples of initiatives taken by art and music schools to introduce into the general curriculum: artistic experiences from other parts of the world; multiple historical/contemporary references to the artistic works of local immigrant or national cultural minorities’?
- Are there efforts to develop cultural citizenship as part of arts/cultural education aimed at increasing students’ knowledge of human rights, citizens rights and responsibilities, understanding of different world religions, influences of different cultures within a given society, etc.?

8.4 Amateur arts, cultural associations and community clubs (Remains the same)

8.4.1 Amateur arts (NEW title)

- What are major trends or developments in the status or role of amateur arts (voluntary or socio-cultural activities) in the last decade?
- Are these activities supported by cultural policies of either municipalities, regions or perhaps even the State? If so, how are they supported? In which field(s) are they most prominent/concentrated? What is the role of voluntary associations in these fields?
- Have there been any major changes in recent years in any of the issues affected by the previous questions?

8.4.2 Cultural houses and community clubs

- Please describe the landscape of cultural centres in your country, e.g. (reading centres, youth clubs with cultural activities, neighbourhood/community/intercultural centres, etc.) Can you provide statistics?
- Who is mainly responsible for them/funding them?
- Are such centres primarily a cultural issue in your country?