

**6th Annual Authors' Meeting of the
“Compendium of Cultural Policies and
Trends in Europe”**

**Hosted by the Croatian Ministry of Culture
Zagreb
18-19 May 2007**

MEETING REPORT

Prepared by ERICarts
June 2007

Executive Summary of Immediate Action Items 2007

1. *Deadline for updates* is 1 October 2007.
2. There is a need to *return to the core grid*, which has been developed, refined and expanded over the previous ten years. The grid is a tool which emerged from group discussions and has not been imposed upon from above. Due to the expansion of the grid in recent years, there has not been enough time to address all the questions/indicators presented in the Compendium guide. The task for this year is for authors to go through the information in their own profiles and to check it against the questions and indicators that have been agreed upon. The guide refers to different types of information e.g. basic facts and figures, debates (to include voices from different actors and cultural constituencies, as well as government opinions) and analysis of the implementation of policies or laws, etc. Without introducing new categories this updating year, authors can enhance the existing level of information in order to make possible better comparisons, transversal reports etc.
3. Authors will begin a process of *quality assessment and peer review* of each other's work. ERICarts will send each author a profile from a different country which they are to review and check against the requirements presented in the Compendium guide.
4. Authors are to *double check the comparative and monitoring tables* that were produced by ERICarts from the compendium information, in order to rule out any misinterpretations, missing data or terminology problems which could lead to invalid comparisons.
5. *A meeting is to be arranged by the national authors and their CDCult members to make a presentation of the Compendium to those working in their respective ministries of culture before the end of this year!* The Council of Europe could make a list of the CDCULT members available in the event that the authors do not know who they are. A power point presentation on the Compendium has been prepared and can be shared with authors and CDCULT members for this purpose.
6. The *independence of authors* in certain countries is a delicate issue and there are calls for the CoE to provide mediation support to ensure the flow of information to authors. In case of any problem, authors are to contact Kathrin Merkle at the Council of Europe.
7. The *CoE should continue to pursue co-operation with the EU* on issues related to e.g. the 2008 Year on Intercultural Dialogue and the 2009 Year of Creativity, monitoring the implementation of the UNESCO Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, etc.
8. It was suggested to organize the *next Compendium Authors meeting to coincide with a possible Ministers of Culture meeting in 2008*. Perhaps a common theme could be identified which would act to link these two meetings. A short paper could be prepared for the ministers on the basis of the information and data presented in the Compendium.

9. Pursue the *development of a communication and financial strategy* with participation from CoE, ERICarts, authors' community, outside experts. A first planning meeting is to be organized in the near future. Areas for consideration include: re-evaluation of the target groups e.g. policy-makers, administrators, students; language; different types of profitable products which could generate income e.g. selling ad space to cultural policy journals. Suggestions on experts, consultancies and friends that have experience in preparing communication / business plans for projects of this nature should be sent to ERICarts immediately.
10. *Promoting the Compendium to cultural journalists* both within countries by authors as well as at the European level by connecting to initiatives such as Eurotopics. A list of key cultural journalists from around Europe should be compiled with input from all authors. Once this list is compiled, the Council of Europe will explore the possibility of organising a meeting of these journalists.
11. *Cooperation with other transnational exercises* such as those undertaken by Educult and IFACCA is to be pursued.
12. *Connecting experts* involved in various transnational exercises is extremely important in order to both promote and improve the quality of the work. For example, the Council of Europe will make available the lists of national correspondents working within the context of HEREIN and the Audiovisual Observatory (including contact details) to the Compendium authors and vice versa.
13. The *Council of Europe could approach the OECD* to share information on the methodology it has developed to collect and compare data on public expenditure for culture. This could be done during the upcoming meeting in Istanbul.
14. Jörg Torkler to create an online forum for authors to continue methodological discussions in general as well as on, for example, the proposed *cultural diversity index, new comparative tables on participation and consumption, comparative frameworks on financing data*, etc.

1. Compendium authors meet in Zagreb

On behalf of the Ministry of Culture of Croatia, Mrs. *Jasmina Lokas Strpic*, Head of Bilateral Department of the Directorate for International Cooperation, opened the 6th Compendium Authors' meeting by extending a warm welcome to all participants from the Council of Europe, the ERICarts Institute, national authors from 37 countries and other invited guests. Mrs. Lokas Strpic reported on the results of the recent CDCult meeting held on 9-11 May in Strasbourg which welcomed the 8th and fully relaunched edition of the Compendium. Mrs Lokas Strpic said that the Compendium had synergies with the other projects of the Council of Europe and expressed that the Compendium can be used for future monitoring activities at the European level. Created in 1998, the Compendium has today become a unique policy tool with great prospects for the future and numerous possibilities for growth, offering longitudinal information on changing policies, priorities, public cultural expenditure and legislation in the cultural field in Europe.

2. Overview from the Council of Europe and ERICarts

Robert Palmer, Director for Culture, Cultural and National Heritage, started by welcoming old friends and new faces around the table and thanked the Ministry of Culture in Croatia for hosting the conference. He provided the participants with an overview of developments within the organisation over the past year such as:

- *organisational changes* in the Directorate and the expansion of its remit to include the media by re-incorporating responsibility for the European Audiovisual Observatory.
- *political priorities* for the Council of Europe remain intercultural dialogue and the democratic management of diversity as well as providing technical assistance to regions undergoing transition; and
- the effective running of the *European Court of Human Rights* takes precedence over all other activities which mean that there will continue to be financial cuts across all CoE operations.

Robert explained that he had only been in his new position for the past 11 months and in that time had sometimes felt like 'a foreign body in a well tilled field'. However, he felt that being new to the area placed him in a unique position to see things from a different viewpoint. The Chinese proverb, 'a frog in a well only sees his piece of the sky', which was true for anyone who has been working in a particular field for any length of time, is a helpful reminder that it is possible to become insular, and to forget about the larger world. His challenge was to identify and link Council of Europe activities with a broader perspective.

There is no doubt that the Compendium is a very important instrument for the Council of Europe, but with declining budgets it was impossible to guarantee the current level of funding. All projects funded by the CoE are vulnerable. It is now time for critical self reflection in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the Compendium.

The following are his observations on:

a) country profiles:

- *They are of variable quality.* While some are excellent, others are poorly conceived; some are up to date while others are not, some inaccurate, some lazily updated, while others do not keep hold of the critical issues. Robert had a recent conversation with one Minister who said that he did not use his own country's profile anymore as it does not give him any new information. Robert suggested that the variable quality could be a result of the request for too many complex details; possibly because the authors are not paid enough to carry out the work required; or possibly because the topics are becoming too specialized.
- *That there is too much information in the profiles.* Some commentators have said that the Compendium should be condensed or perhaps separated between core and specialized information. Could this specialized information be provided from other sources?
- *More interpretation:* some of the information requires more interpretation, possibly an extra intelligence layer of analysis.
- *Technical information:* An index is required of key words. This would need to be continually revised and updated.
- *Need for other languages:* for the profiles to be translated into national languages.

b) the project as a whole:

- The compendium *quality*, in terms of the inconsistencies, should be addressed immediately; the Compendium is only as strong as its weakest chapter.
- The Council of Europe needs to be more *proactive* and the authors should inform them if there is any difficulty in getting information from the ministries which they need. The CoE might be able to help ease the flow of information.
- The Compendium needs to be *re-branded*. Robert believed that not enough people know about the Compendium. Others have come across the Compendium at different stages and may need to be re-informed about all of the new developments. It would seem that there were too few users in terms of what the Compendium can offer internationally.
- There is a need for a *financial remodeling* of the Compendium project. Declining budgets of the CoE budgets means that a coherent business plan is required. New (and paid) services and products could be developed which could also reach new users.
- Development of "*real*" *monitoring activities* including *thematic comparative reports* on specific issues.
- *Engage* with civil society and NGOs by reporting more on *cultural trends*. The Compendium needs to open up beyond a closed conversation among experts or between professionals and politicians, leaving the public outside. Progress would be measured by media interest and new stories.

In relation to the new Compendium website, Robert said that he was really pleased with the new developments and thought that it was more user friendly. However, he believed that the search engine could always be improved.

The Compendium needs a bigger brasher approach. It is time to move from a state of adolescence to a state of maturity. The Compendium is heading towards its peak in terms of development.

Now is the time to start planning for change before change imposes itself upon us. LET'S BE BOLD!

Andreas Wiesand, Executive Director of ERICarts, thanked: the Croatian Ministry of Culture, especially Nina Obuljen, for organizing and hosting the meeting; Robert and Kathrin for the productive working partnership between the Council of Europe and ERICarts; the authors for the enormous work they achieved over the past year; and the Finnish, Hungarian and Croatian governments for their financial contributions to the project.

He welcomed the participation of this year's special guests: Sanjin Dragojevic; the Culturelink team; and experts working on the EU study on intercultural dialogue including Judith Neisse, Elka Tschernokoshewa, Jude Bloomfield, Vjieran Katunaric, Simona Bodo and Michael Wimmer.

He welcomed new faces around the table: *France*: Pierre Mayol; *Spain*: Anna Villarroya; *Bulgaria*: Tsveta Andreeva; *Poland*: Jacek Drozda; *Latvia*: Agnese Hermane; *Estonia*: Margaret Tali.

New country profiles were prepared this year for *Slovakia* by Martin Smatlák and *Armenia* represented by Nerses Ter Vardanyan at this meeting. A draft of the country profile for *Turkey* has also been received. Other expressions of interest to participate in the project have come from the *Czech Republic* and *Cyprus*.

Andreas expressed his sympathy regarding the death of Els Baeten earlier in the year. Her memory lives on among her many friends and colleagues. Andreas said that it would be hard to replace the high standard of work that Els delivered over such a long period of time.

It is particularly appropriate that the group is meeting in Croatia during a time of reflection on the Compendium given the fact that the first planning meeting took place in Zagreb at the Culturelink offices almost 10 years ago. Andreas reminded the group that the history of collecting information and data on national cultural policies is directly linked with Culturelink initiatives at the beginning of the 90s.

Jörg Torkler, Medianale Group, invited the group for a walk through the new Compendium which was redesigned to take into consideration the decisions made during the Budapest meeting last year on, e.g. the presentation of new topics as transversal issues, creation of a database of good practice on intercultural dialogue and the outreach to other systems such as HEREIN.

3. Taking Stock of the Compendium I: where the project came from and where it is going

Péter Inkei, Budapest Observatory, introduced the session with presentations by *Sanjin Dragojevic*, University of Zagreb and *Ritva Mitchell*, CUPORE and President of ERICarts.

Péter introduced the self-reflection work of this session as a follow-up to the provocative presentation made by Robert Palmer and the inspiring presentation made by Jörg Torkler of the current state of the Compendium online system. Péter's recent experience of using the Compendium to respond to information requests proved that the Compendium is one of the most useful tools available. In that spirit, the work of the group is to now build upon their experience and be strategic in their thinking about how to make the Compendium a more effective and influential tool on the European level, both in the short and longer term.

Sanjin Dragojevic said that he would speak mostly about the past, but with some critical suggestions for the future work of the Compendium. He started with an overview of the experiences to produce *A Guide to the Current State and Trends in Cultural Policy and Life in UNESCO Member States*. In 1992, UNESCO asked Culturelink to publish a document on all 160 cultural policies in the world. In the end, they produced 130 country profiles. Culturelink took on the responsibility to examine 1000s of documents, held editorial meetings, and prepared country profiles for validation by experts in the individual countries.

He believes that the Compendium is a very important tool in terms of cultural policy development and information provision. However, there are a number of questions which need to be examined such as: who the Compendium is for (target group/audience), the structure, the approach to writing the profiles, the process of editing, the level of expertise required to prepare profiles etc.

From the point of view of *transferability*, he referred to the recent experience that Milena Dragicevic-Šešić and himself had with developing a course on arts policy and management for Arab countries. As professors, they had suggested that cultural policy should be the starting point for the course. However, this was queried by colleagues from Morocco to Bahrain as the basis of the course was not coming from a public provision point of view. Therefore, the importance of the Compendium as an information tool on cultural policy development per se, proved to be very important in order to show them the range and scope of cultural policies.

With regard to *methodology*, one of the main challenges to the Compendium is that the structure needs to be relevant for different types of users. For example, in Central and Eastern Europe, cultural policies are not explicit and therefore the Compendium data is of particular importance in terms of the information it provides for civil servants, researchers, practitioners, students and other groups, such as task forces on changes in cultural policy. He recommended that the Compendium profiles be divided in two parts: the first section focused on core cultural policy structures and issues and the second part focused on new dilemmas, initiatives, perspectives and regional variations, which are different from country to country e.g. in Croatia one of the main issues concerns the role of the non-profit sector. While it is important to have good content on individual country policies, it is also very important to give the context for the various activities, e.g. to find out what is actually happening in relation to certain activities and why. Evaluation and monitoring activities are extremely important, however, much effort will need to be put into developing specific indicators for this purpose. A distinction is to be made between evaluation and monitoring of, on the one hand, the Compendium project as a whole and of national cultural policies, on the other.

Ritva Mitchell thanked the Ministry of Culture of Croatia for hosting the conference and was delighted to have the Culturelink team present. She said that the UNESCO project that Sanjin referred to was a fantastic tool when it was created as it was the first of its kind.

Ritva said that as the Compendium project would soon reach its 10th birthday and that it was time for reflection. She believes that the Compendium is a unique tool, especially given the fact that not many non-profit initiatives in Europe had survived for 10 years. There had been some attempts to set up databases, create monitoring systems but unless they had been part of major organisations, they had not survived. She believed that the Compendium group could improve upon the work achieved and in order to do so one ought to be very self critical. She thanked Robert Palmer for raising many critical issues and for reporting on feedback from users as regards its usefulness.

Ritva prepared a SWOT analysis together with Andreas Wiesand and Danielle Cliche, which was circulated to the participants. She went on to respond to Sanjin’s comments about transferability by referring to the fact that the Compendium is also used a great deal in Asian countries, especially in South Korea and Vietnam. While there are many countries in this region that do not have explicit cultural policies, the Compendium information helps stakeholders to see how cultural policies could be designed and implemented. For example, she recently heard that China was studying the various cultural policy systems in Europe. Other interesting sources of information for these countries are the British Council profiles published on their Visiting Arts website for countries such as Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

Compendium SWOT Analysis

<p style="text-align: center;">Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong community made up of 39 countries - The only existing and comprehensive information system on cultural policies and trends in the world - Information and data is updated on an annual basis - Unique partnership structure involving the Council of Europe an independent research organization, cultural policy researchers, national governments - Flexible and open structure to accommodate new ideas and issues - Open access 	<p style="text-align: center;">Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comparability especially of statistics - Some issues are well mapped – some are weak e.g. arts education - Different styles of presenting information e.g. some profiles include range of debates while others focus mainly on government programmes - Different levels of expertise by individual authors - Financing – means that work is concentrated only within a specific timeframe rather than continuous input - Local awareness of Compendium
<p style="text-align: center;">Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be a monitoring tool for different Conventions and organizations - Increased co-operation with EU, UNESCO and other international organizations in a more systematic manner - Development of specialized services and products e.g. short thematic or comparative reports useful for policy makers - Contribution to the development of well informed future policy makers and managers on Europe wide cultural activities 	<p style="text-align: center;">Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of institutional basis for updating the Compendium profiles in many countries - Reliance on expertise of individual holding “corporate memory” - Loss of focus due to broadened scope and increase in the number of issues to be addressed in the profiles - Language issues - Core financing reduced?

Before breaking up into focus groups to delve deeper into the issues raised thus far, *Péter Inkei* invited the Compendium authors to engage in a general discussion.

Milena Dragicevic-Šešić suggested the focus groups concentrate on the following issues:

- New governance structures and partnerships;
- Quality assurance of the Compendium texts;
- Focus on new issues; and

- Understanding the outreach of the Compendium work. She suggested that the national profiles were not necessarily intended for internal use but for providing access/transparency about policy systems of interest to other countries as well as for comparative purposes.

Vladimir Bina (the Netherlands) suggested that the issue of data collection for comparative purposes should also be added to the discussions.

Kathrin Merkle reported that as the Directorate General responsible for education, culture, youth and sports would be cooperating more closely with the social cohesion DG, it would be interesting to re-examine earlier efforts of Compendium colleague John Foote to develop indicators linking issues of diversity, dialogue and cohesion. In this regard, she suggested that the Compendium maintain its open approach to addressing transversal policy linkages.

Ritva Mitchell urged the group to maintain their analytical approach to such issues as other sources of information on e.g. intercultural dialogue produced narrow and static descriptions of the current situation, while some authors have already taken the next step to delve deeper into the issues beyond mere facts and figures.

4. Taking Stock of the Compendium II: results of the focus groups

Compendium authors were divided up into several focus groups and were asked to present ideas on the future of the Compendium work according to four issues: governance/partnerships; new issues; quality and outreach. The results were presented by group chairs and the main messages have been assembled below.

Governance / partnerships

- Issues of governance/partnership are linked to the *products that the Compendium can offer* and the ways in which they could be promoted. For example, thematic studies, new comparative indicators with advocacy power or other derivative products.
- *New partnerships* are needed on two fronts – financing partners and partnerships with other transnational exercises producing relevant content such as the Educult network, IFACCA or the ECF.
- A privileged *partnership with the EU and the European Parliament* should be pursued as a priority.
- *Links to national ministries responsible for culture need to be strengthened* e.g. CDCULT members are to be approached by the Council of Europe to ensure that web links are made from their respective national websites to the Compendium.
- Follow up is required on *cooperation with regional initiatives* e.g. in Asia and Latin America.
- A *strategy toward commercial sponsors* could be pursued. Advertising revenue could be raised from e.g. academic journals on cultural policy
- *Authors to have more direct input* into the discussions on the future of the Compendium made throughout the year by participating in a specially organized meeting on e.g. communication and financing strategies.

New issues

Increased attention could be placed on:

- arts education and the broader concept of education for art and culture and what part arts education plays in civic education;
- how culture is promoted within countries i.e., branding and whether such activities are related to audience development and the development of the culture industries as a means to reposition culture;
- youth and seniors;
- the role of culture in community development; and
- creativity and innovation (to be linked to the EU Year of Creativity and Innovation 2009).

On the other hand, many authors feel that the *structure used to prepare Compendium profiles is becoming too large* and that more emphasis and time is required to respond to emerging issues such as intercultural dialogue and cultural cooperation rather than focusing on the core issues and structure of cultural policy including its organization, decision-making processes, sector specific laws and policies, etc. The current amount of issues expected to be addressed by authors is considered to be enormous, especially regarding the limited human and financial resources available. The gaps in the data and missing information should be addressed as a matter of priority. Concentration should be placed on consolidating the information already available and making links to other online sources which provide sector specific information as is already done in the case of heritage issues and policies and links to the Council of Europe HEREIN system.

What seems to be lacking in the Compendium is transversal analysis. Suggestion that each year, one issue could be selected for *transversal analysis accompanied by an annual cultural policy workshop/conference* in cooperation with another organization which is interested in the issue (e.g. comparisons of public expenditure together with the OECD, policies and practices of arms length bodies together with IFACCA or cultural cooperation together with the EU or the LaborCulture). These themes could be announced 2-3 years in advance in order to give everyone time to collect the necessary information. The workshop/conference could be organized following the annual authors meeting. As a first step, additional themes could be added to the new transversal section of the Compendium website on e.g. arts and cultural education, creativity and support to artists, etc.

Monitoring activities should be enhanced and could, for example, start with examining how recommendations produced by the Council of Europe cultural policy evaluations have been implemented or not. Focus could also be placed on monitoring initiatives targeted to the Roma and other minority groups. A new chapter 3.4 could be introduced to accommodate such information.

Quality Assessment / Evaluation

It is extremely important to understand that the quality of the national profiles reflect the state of cultural policy research in the different countries. Compendium authors are in very different and unequal positions as regard the level and quality of national data production and research on cultural policies varies at the source.

The following comments/recommendations were made:

- system of *internal peer review* is to be developed (authors evaluate the work of their colleagues);
- engage Compendium *users better in reviewing / providing critical comments* on the country profiles;
- a *terminology guide* could be developed to assist both authors and users to understand the use of certain terms in certain country contexts. The example of the Eurydice guide was presented;
- in some cases there is *information lacking in certain parts of the profiles* for certain countries. This could be for several reasons: the information could not be collected without substantial effort or the question posed might not fit the context for a particular country. Therefore, it was suggested that where data is lacking that the authors give an explanation why it is missing; and
- an *evaluation of the Compendium project* itself would need to look at: pertinence of the work, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability etc.

Target Group Outreach

The following target groups were defined as the main or key users of the Compendium: researchers, practitioners, policy-makers (national / local), students / professors. Each target group requires different types of information. It was suggested that the authors present 4 different layers or types of information in response to the questions listed in the Compendium grid: descriptive level; an analytical level; an interpretation or value judgment; possibility for public exchange and feedback.

Other suggestions / comments:

- develop a special “Cultural Policy Day” to help raise awareness among target groups;
- civil servants in ministries do not necessarily feel any ownership of the Compendium which is an issue. It was particularly important to have the support of national governments for the Compendium project and for the CoE. More efforts are required to help *civil servants feel part of the stakeholder community*;
- *making country profiles available in national languages* would help to reach other local experts and potentially interested audiences. This includes not only translation of the “local” country profile, but of other country profiles as well to help inform local audiences and target groups about what is going on outside of their country (e.g. journalists specializing in this field do not always speak / read English). The Council of Europe could help persuade national governments to finance translations ;
- country profiles could be translated into languages such as *French, Russian and Spanish* to reach a wider audience;
- *Specialised workshops or courses to be organized for policy makers* to increase the visibility of the Compendium. The announcement of these workshops should come from the CoE as it would raise the profile of the initiative and attract much more interest than if the country expert were to do so on their own;
- authors to identify a few journalists (mainstream and cultural) from their own countries who could be notified when a new profile is posted online, so that they could report on any new

or 'hot' issues. A *training module for journalists* could be developed within individual countries with "symbolic" support from the Council of Europe (e.g. lending their logo to the training materials);

- there is a need to develop a training course in cooperation with *prestigious schools for journalism* e.g. in Lille, in order to help budding journalists discover the stories behind the data and information presented in the Compendium which is not obvious to all.

Some initial reactions from **Robert Palmer**, Council of Europe:

- negotiations and discussions with the EU and UNESCO have already started and there appear to be some new openings. Regarding the EU, the main challenge is to address the question of ownership. A re-launch / re-branding of the Compendium could open up new avenues for partnerships and funding;
- connecting the next authors meeting with the proposed ministerial conference –to take place in Vienna – could be a very powerful tool. The Council of Europe will follow developments on the organisation of the meeting to ensure that Ministers will be present ;
- Compendium authors and ERICarts should be very proactive in making individual contacts with certain experts, consultancies and friends that have experience in preparing communication / business plans and who could advise on a future exercise;
- A list of key cultural journalists from around Europe should be compiled with input from all authors. Once this list is compiled, the Council of Europe will pursue the possibility of organising a meeting/training session;
- Robert is currently working on a more holistic and transversal method of working within the Council and very much supports developing stronger connections between national experts working in the context of HEREIN, the Compendium and the Audiovisual Observatory. Lists of all key persons will be circulated;
- The Compendium community is a very strong group of experts, but also of mentors. It is important for all of us to begin thinking about the next generation of researchers and involving them more closely in the Compendium work. While there are many new (and younger) faces around the table, one could think about next year's meeting and ask all to bring along a "young friend". On the other hand, one could also start thinking about a new version of the Compendium, i.e. Compendium Junior that could act as a training ground and is more "hip" in the way that youtube and wikipedia are in the new Web 2.0 era.

5. Reaching out to other trans-national exercises

Rod Fisher, International Intelligence on Culture, introduced the session whose purpose is to examine the ways in which the Compendium could cooperate with other institutions and activities, in particular the OECD exercise on comparative financing statistics (**Otto Hofecker**) and the Educult network (**Michael Wimmer**) focused on arts and cultural education.

Comparative Financing Statistics

Otto Hofecker informed the group about the latest developments at the OECD, i.e. their study on the *International Measurement of the Economic and Social Importance of Culture* and the possible links that can be made with the Compendium project.

From the 4-5 December 2006, the OECD convened a workshop in Paris on international instruments to measure the economic and social importance of culture on the basis of a recent report it published on this issue. A summary of the workshop results were circulated along with an extract of a report on the project prepared by John Gordon and Helen Beilby-Orrin. Otto informed the group that due to financing challenges, the OECD project has come to a halt. Unlike the situation faced by the OECD, the Compendium group has been able to continue its work toward comparative cultural statistics despite funding deficits. This is due in large part to the commitment of the authors.

Prior to the demise of its programme, the OECD was able to develop a system which could be harmonized with UNESCO research and with the latest developments at Eurostat. The participants of the OECD December workshop agreed that until now, various exercises had been unable to produce data that could be reliably compared on the international level. One of its recommendations was to work with partners to develop a more detailed (4 digit) classification structure within the culture-related portions of CEFOG. The participants also stressed the importance of the OECD to work collaboratively with other organisations such as Eurostat, UNESCO, WIPO, the UN Conference on Trade and Development and many observatories active in this field.

Given the current realities, Otto recommended that the Council of Europe approach the OECD to share the information that has been gathered in the Compendium. He believes that the Compendium has a lot to offer, much more than the OECD could obtain, even if extra funding was found to continue their activities. Recognition of the Compendium achievements needs to be realized on the international level. A first step could be to organize a meeting with relevant OECD and Council of Europe officials during the upcoming meeting in Istanbul.

Kathrin Merkle reported that she is currently contributing to Council of Europe's contribution to the OECD World Forum on the Progress of Societies in Istanbul, including for a booth to present the Compendium including its achievements in the field of statistics. Following the Istanbul event, the Council of Europe could pursue cooperation with Mr. Giovanni, OECD Chief Statistician and other OECD colleagues.

Andreas Wiesand will also be in Istanbul -at another event- and meet John Gordon, responsible for OECD culture statistics, to discuss future cooperation with the Compendium project. He was, however, somewhat cautious as to the figures currently presented in the Compendium and called on all authors to work together to try and overcome deficits.

Ritva Mitchell stated that whichever organisation was carrying out international comparative research, they were dependent on national data gathering. This was a reminder of the importance of the information the authors collected and a caution regarding the deficiencies in the national data collecting systems. Many of the problems regarding data collection were internal, e.g. in Finland, the municipalities stopped gathering cultural financial statistics, and due to the sheer number of municipalities it was impossible for one researcher to collect this data.

Carla Bodo, who was involved in the OECD research, expressed her regrets at the demise of its programme. However, she is hopeful that the work undertaken in the context of Eurostat will be revived in the near future; especially following the publication of an EU study on cultural economy in Europe last year. On the national level, she fully agrees with Ritva about the data collection within individual countries. In Italy, for example, Carla recently learned that data provided by the regions e.g. Lombardy were inflated by millions of Euro because they included education in the overall figures. It is, therefore, important to first validate data on the national level before moving to the European or international frameworks.

Jean-Cédric Delvainquière informed the group about the intention of Eurostat to produce a “statistical pocket book” on culture at the European level by the end of the year. It will be interesting for the Compendium to examine the results of this exercise and to propose concrete areas for future cooperation with Eurostat. At the moment, the pocket book should include data on: employment and the culture industries.

Otto Hofecker concluded that, in his opinion and in consideration of all comparative exercises undertaken on either the European or international level, that the Compendium is still the best resource. One of the main reasons is because the Compendium works together with national experts who are able to gather and interpret the data provided by national statistics institutes, in comparison to e.g. the US representative, who provided the OECD with data obtained from the Internet rather than having access to actual data. He proposed to reactivate the Compendium working group on statistics and to invite John Gordon to participate in that group.

Arts and Cultural Education

Rod Fisher then invited **Michael Wimmer** to speak on the potential links with the Educult Network.

Following a meeting in 2001 hosted by the Boekman Foundation in Amsterdam, “A Must or a Muse”, a network of civil servants from both education and cultural administrations was created. Since then, they meet on an annual basis. An interesting observation shared by **Michael Wimmer** was on his experience when creating the network and the fact that civil servants working in the arts, culture and education fields did not necessarily know each other within their own countries and that it is very important and central to the work of the network to make such linkages on different levels e.g. among researchers as well as policy makers.

In 2005, the EU Austrian Presidency held another key conference to promote the contribution of cultural education to participation, equality and innovation. In preparation for the conference, Educult prepared country profiles on what was happening in the cultural sector for: Germany, England, Denmark, France, Greece, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Slovenia. They report on policy frameworks, main programmes and projects, target groups, institutional aspects, research and evaluation, training and international co-operation as regard cultural education. The current intention of the Educult network is to create a new European portal containing the following information:

1. Europe-wide programmes, conferences and other cultural education services;
2. a glossary of the main terms to find a common language on cultural education in English, French and German; and
3. country profiles which will be regularly updated.

At present, information is available on the main frameworks and programmes. However, there is a severe lack of quantitative data on the financial resources available and the target groups. A pilot project is currently being developed by Educult and Cultuurnetwerk Nederland which will be discussed at the next Educult meeting to be held in Vienna in June 2007. It would be useful to find a way to promote co-operation between the Compendium project and the Educult network so that the quality of section 8.3 of the Compendium could be enhanced.

Ritva Mitchell responded positively to the suggestion made by Michael and acknowledged that the work on section 8.3 of the Compendium could be greatly improved through such a cooperation with experts in the field of arts and cultural education. She was looking forward to learning more about the country contributions to the Educult project and asked for a list of national correspondents to their project to help facilitate intelligence gathering between their experts and the Compendium authors. This suggestion was seconded by *Péter Inkei* and *Rod Fisher*.

Delia Mucica suggested closer links with the European Audiovisual Observatory (EAO), especially given the fact that it is very difficult for Compendium experts to have access to the EAO's data. She suggested that the CoE / ERICarts could send a joint letter to EAO Bureau to be discussed at the upcoming meeting on 21 June 2007. Delia is currently the chair of the executive council and the Compendium group should take advantage of these meetings to present proposals for future cooperation.

6. UNESCO Convention on Diversity of Cultural Expressions: contributing to the follow-up

Danielle Cliche, ERICarts (chair) opened this session by reminding the group that one of the results of the Budapest Authors Meeting 2006 was an expansion of the Compendium grid to include indicators which could be helpful in a future monitoring exercise on national cultural policies in Europe in the context of the *UNESCO Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Since this time, a new table was introduced and has been continuously updated to monitor the ratification of the Convention in Europe and to report on next steps announced by national governments in its implementation.

In June 2007, the first intergovernmental committee meeting will take place in Paris which is an important step in setting up the mechanisms to implement and monitor the Convention. How can the Compendium group contribute to the next steps? What types of concrete activities can be initiated in the short to medium term? How can the Compendium contribute to the process of national reporting 2011?

She drew everyone's to the book published by Culturelink and edited by Nina Obuljen and Joost Smiers on "Making the UNESCO Convention Work" and asked the chairs from last year sessions to give a short report on what has been achieved and to present some ideas for the future.

John Foote's review of the 2006 country profile updates showed a rich body of content and longitudinal information on *cultural participation and consumption trends* including on time use or audience participation. Additional work is to be made on updating the figures presented in the comparative table prepared by Mikko Lagerspetz. He made a series of proposals for new comparative tables which need to be investigated:

- sector clusters on *broadcasting*, including data on private and public TV and radio or on *literacy* including reading data and library usage;
- GDP share and employment generated by culture;
- social impact of culture is potentially measurable, but not as frequently undertaken as economic impact;
- age based consumption and participation profiles with a focus on youth and on seniors. The German and Finnish surveys currently being carried out could serve as models for other countries to follow;
- household consumption or expenditure on cultural goods and services; and
- religious participation and national minority and immigrant participation in culture. He realized that these are two very different things, but there are relationships between the two.

An online forum for persons in the group to begin building these tables could be developed. The data could then be used to monitor those articles of the Convention referring to participation.

Carla Bodo reflected on the information and data presented in the chapters on *cultural minorities and on intercultural dialogue as they relate to diversity*. Some of the responses are quite long and not necessarily focused. Others are very focused but not detailed enough. One of the problems is that intercultural dialogue has been taken into account throughout the entire Compendium and some authors just made cross references to other chapters, which is confusing. Carla reported that the cultural minorities' chapter was better taken into account and that there is now a much clearer picture about the distinction between traditional and historical minorities and new minorities. The same can be said of legislation on cultural minorities and the ethnic composition of new minority groups. She proposed to put intercultural dialogue and minority issues out of Compendium profile and to work on them as a transversal analysis. The cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue spaces on the new Compendium website is a good starting point.

Oleksandr Butsenko reported on the expanded *international cultural cooperation* chapter. He saw that it is closely related with intercultural dialogue and mentioned the importance of international relations as a tool to avoid stagnation and isolation. He reported that in many cases, the country profiles presented interesting information and agreed with Carla that this could be treated as a transversal issue outside of the core information presented on cultural policies. For him, it would be necessary for authors to elaborate innovative policies and practices and to begin developing a mechanism to monitor international cultural cooperation, especially as it relates to the UNESCO Convention. For example, indicators could be developed to begin monitoring training in this field especially as regards the impact of government policies on the mobility of cultural professionals and young people. This is particularly urgent as more and more artists are withdrawing their participation at international events due to visa problems (including the rising costs of obtaining a visa). In the latter case, the group could begin collecting data on: the costs of visas to individual countries, the time it takes to obtain a visa, etc. Such information would help to promote transparency across cultural borders and to isolate the main challenges faced by artists.

Vladmir Bina has looked at the aims of the UNESCO Convention, the data for the *Netherlands* and the manner in which these data could be combined with the data in the Compendium. He sees room for improvement. In the Netherlands there are two focal points in this context:

- One point concerns the domestic culture industries. Substantial effort is being made to develop new policy measures and to monitor the effectiveness of these measures. This is a joint project of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- The other focal point is the cultural participation of minorities in the Netherlands due to the fact that 10% of the population belongs to non-western minority groups. In 2005, the Social and Cultural Planning Office conducted a research on the living conditions of cultural and ethnic minorities which contained an extensive section on cultural and media use. The results of that research are currently being published.

He believes that there is not enough available data broken down according age, education level, gender and where possible to ethnic origin, for the purpose of really monitoring the Convention. Vladimir proposed that the Compendium group could produce such tables itself or with the participation of experts from individual countries, which would be much more meaningful and which will attract attention to the Compendium.

Vesna Copic suggested that instead of setting up observatories for cultural diversity on the national or international level, information platforms for cultural diversity could connect existing players in a more coherent and organized way. In this kind of open structure, players such as the Compendium could become relevant partners on both the international and national level. In fact, the ability of the Compendium community to address transversal issues such as cultural diversity is one of its main strengths.

On the national level, she observed that there is not enough knowledge about what cultural diversity and this Convention means. For example, in *Slovenia*, cultural policy makers believe that cultural diversity relates to minorities rights, promotion of their cultural activities and protection of linguistic diversity. They are not aware that cultural diversity relates also to majorities, and that it is about promoting and protecting creativity and the cultural life of all people. The question is how to measure or monitor this cultural vitality. Vesna proposed to create a cultural diversity composite index with three fields which could be measured: local conditions for cultural artistic creativity, domestic cultural production, and local cultural industries. These indicators could focus on conditions for cultural practice, level of cultural consumption and support for both. For example:

- non-profit and commercial entities per 1000 inhabitants;
- % of cultural employment per 1000 inhabitants;
- non-profit activities such as festivals, fairs or parades per 1000 inhabitants;
- public expenses per capita; and
- GDP part for culture.

Group Discussion

Robert Palmer informed the group that the latest CDCULT meeting had approved its earlier mandate to continue discussions with UNESCO and the EU in relation to monitoring the Convention. He said that it was important for the Compendium work to keep 'ahead of the game' and to develop the means necessary to step in when UNESCO was ready. Robert had also spoken to UNESCO staff at a recent conference in Essen which endorsed the interest in collaborating on this issue. Robert reiterated that the Compendium work is the most advanced work in this field and he encouraged authors to continue their work which serves as a model.

Judith Neisse suggested that the group take note of mechanisms used to monitor other UN Conventions, for example, aimed at combating violence against women. In this case, both governments and shadow representatives from NGOs and associations were involved in the monitoring process. It is important to have alternative systems for monitoring official policy as they can provide a more balanced point of view.

Rod Fisher followed-up on comments made by Olexandr regarding the mobility of artists as part of an indicators package to be used to monitor the Convention. In this context, chapter 2.4 and its sub-chapters on international cultural cooperation are extremely important. Rod suggested that authors try to include more examples or cases in their responses which directly relate to the principles of the Convention. For example, in the UK, a £200 visa charge for visiting artists has been recently introduced. He also informed the group about the results of a recent research study he completed for the ECF on cultural cooperation structures in Denmark, France, Latvia, Poland, Portugal and the UK, the results of which could be linked or incorporated into the respective country profiles.

Reactions to **Vesna Copic's** suggestion to develop a cultural diversity composite index:

- **Rod Fisher** informed the group of an interesting creativity index model developed in Hong Kong and will forward additional information on this index to ERICarts.
- **Mikko Lagerspetz** is somewhat skeptical of creating indexes which are to address more complex or broader issues. More interesting will be to define indicators / components of an index rather than the end values which an index is suppose to produce.
- **Andreas Wiesand** agreed that it will be difficult to develop a diversity index. He referred to the attempts of Richard Florida to develop a creativity index, which for a while, was quite popular. The results, however, were in stark contrast to the reality and the popularity of his index is starting to slowly fade. On the other hand, Andreas said that one could try to develop a diversity index as there would certainly be a lot of interest, and it could become a potential income generator.
- **Ritva Mitchell** suggested that a small group of authors could be formed of those who were interested in and had experience working with cultural indices in their research. For example, she had used the Cultural Vitality Index created by Colin Mercer or the Purchasing Power Parity in relation to the CUIX figures and found them very useful.
- **Kathrin Merkle** is keen to see the development of the index components, the individual ingredients. This exercise could set the foundation for developing products for attracting sponsors or marketing tools for the Compendium.

7. Intercultural Dialogue: building bridges between the work of the Compendium, the Council of Europe White Paper Process and the ERICarts study for the EU

Milena Dragicevic-Šešić (chair) opened the session by inviting *Kathrin Merkle* to provide the group with an update of the Council of Europe's White Paper Process.

Update on CoE White Paper Process

Kathrin Merkle explained that the intention of the White Paper process is to develop a coherent and long-term policy for the promotion of intercultural dialogue in Europe and beyond. A core report of ca. 50 pages will be published at the end of the year with a second volume containing all annexes, references, cases of good practice and main findings of the ongoing consultation process which the Council launched a few months ago. A first draft of the report will be submitted to the Committee of Ministers at the beginning of October and then to the members of the CDCULT and cultural specialists, and then to foreign ministry delegations. The results will be presented during the launch of the EU Year on Intercultural Dialogue on 8 January 2008, in Ljubljana. An important conference will be held in the last week of June in Lisbon which will determine the major themes of the White Paper.

The consultation process has been an incredibly complex exercise involving governments, local and regional authorities, ethnic and religious groups, civil society organizations, experts and the general public. The tools of the consultation process have been: questionnaires, discussion forum, written reports and individual contributions (partly garnered through a special internet forum). The process closed at the end of May 2007. Some highlights:

1. In March, a meeting was held of youth organisations and national committees of the CoE campaign 'All different- all equal'.
2. Consultation with the Organisation of 400 Non-Governmental Organisations
3. A conference on the religious aspect of intercultural dialogue in San Marino which was very important. There is an ongoing debate in the CoE on how religious issues should be dealt with more systematically. One proposal was to set up a body that would deal with the issue on a regular basis, another proposal was to organize annual fora on interreligious dialogue.

With regard to the results of the consultation process: Until this moment, 2/3 of the committees have replied and overall, 1/3 of questionnaires have been returned (1/2 of state bodies, but only 10% of the NGOs from the culture sector). An example of one recent respondent from the NGO world: *"..if intercultural dialogue is a technique that mainly helps us to see better the differences, shared and mainly not shared, values and understanding basic cultural concepts, then it is useful and fostering it makes sense. Such a position can be afforded when the overarching rules constituting basic rights are not questioned. In general, we suggest: let us talk less, let us integrate various cultures into our structures, decision-making, not only theoretically but physically. Let us make place for our different neighbours. Their language will change - ours too; totally non conceptual, yet effective."*

Work on the White Paper brings together all the organs of the CoE. The *Parliamentary Assembly* is working at this moment on 3 major studies on: the relationship between state religion and the individual; blasphemy, religious insults and 'hate-speech'; and a study of Muslim communities. The *Human Rights Directorate* is currently producing 2 manuals on hate-speech and religious

symbols. It is also studying the possibility of a new Declaration on Human Rights in a Multicultural Society. It is not interested in coming up with another theoretical concept, but promises to bring the issue down to the level of peoples lives. It will include advice on dialogue, non-discrimination, diversity guidelines etc. There is currently a paradigm shift occurring in this sector at the CoE. The idea of equality of opportunity is being replaced by equality of results, which calls for enabling action and much more work being geared towards the enabling conditions of equality.

EU Study on National Approaches to ICD

Andreas Wieand informed the group about ERICarts study for the EU on National Approaches to ICD. All information is available from the project website: www.interculturaldialogue.eu including: data on the share of traditional minorities and new immigrants, an overview of member states which have ratified and implemented specific human rights conventions, short papers commissioned to experts on challenges facing different sectors such as heritage, performing arts, a list of key resources, etc. He took the authors on a tour of the website and invited them to participate by providing comments on e.g. comparative data.

For the purposes of the study, the following definition of ICD has been developed:

"Intercultural dialogue is a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different cultural backgrounds. Among its aims are: to develop a deeper understanding of diverse world views and practices; to increase participation (or the freedom to make choices); to foster equality; and to enhance creative processes."

Andreas also circulated a questionnaire on the main impulses or reasons for governments to adopt policies and programmes to foster intercultural dialogue and invited the authors to fill them in.

Robert Palmer added that the ERICarts study on behalf of the European Commission was a very central part of the Commissions work in the field of ICD and in setting the agenda for submissions on the ICD Year 2008. The study will be central to the launch in January which will have a number of events and projects to mark the celebrations. The study will also help the Commission to make the difficult choices in deciding which projects to fund in this field. The launch will be an equal EU and COE effort.

The Compendium Authors Report

Tsveta Andreeva (Bulgaria) outlined two main challenges:

1. ICD is important for all levels of government and administrators, but the question remained how to deal with the complexity of ICD as a transversal issue. How does it fit properly into cultural policy administration and funding systems? In Bulgaria, the Ministry of culture plays a minor role in comparison to other Ministries responsible for education, youth, minorities, ethnic diversity and social inclusion.
2. There is currently not enough visible evidence of the cooperation between the CoE White Paper and the EU Year of ICD 2008. In many countries, the same individuals are correspondents for both the CoE and EU activities and other agencies were not involved. She sees that the White Paper is a very refined instrument and the process could be linked better to the EU activities. While the joint official launch on 8 January was to be a historic

occasion, Tsveta questioned the need to wait for this date as it would be too late for some important sharing to take place in the process. She suggested that the CoE should encourage the national governments to support better connections between the two processes. She also suggested that the ERICarts website created for the ICD project should be promoted widely by the Commission as it does not yet have any other web-based instrument.

Oleksander Butsenko (Ukraine) completely agreed with the necessity to change the approach to ICD. He said that it was very important now, for example in Eastern countries, to show that ICD is not just the obligation of the state to sustain or maintain the existing situation for cultural minorities. It was necessary to show some innovative approaches to dialogue and to present key studies and to share information as, in many cases, especially at local and regional level there is a lack of information and understanding of ICD issues. In the Ukraine there are over 100 nationalities and, like elsewhere in Europe, the situation is changing in terms of rapid migration. He would also like to see some indicators to help prepare for future developments.

Jean-Cédric Delvainquière and Pierre Mayol (France) prepared a paper on developments in France which lead to ICD strategies and programmes. This was based on 3 main axes:

1. Historical background of multiculturalism, e.g. the universal approach to culture first decreed in 1959 to make culture (masterpieces of humanity not just national culture) accessible to everyone. This led to interest in the cultures of the world and international cultural exchanges. Pompidou decided to establish a centre devoted to modern culture. This was followed by the establishment of a culture innovation fund for innovative cultural projects. The concepts prevailing up to the early 1980s remained in the framework of multiculturalism, with different cultures co-existing – national and foreign, traditional and modern etc.
2. At the beginning of the 1980s there was a shift from multi-culturalism to interculturalism. In 1981, a new law authorized foreigners to create and run associations. This was the starting point of the creation of numerous community associations active in the cultural field mainly linked to the different immigrant populations such as Portuguese and Spanish etc. The Arabic World Institute was also established. At this time, the effects of the economic crisis were being felt and there were growing difficulties for the second generation immigrants mainly originating from North Africa. This led to a massive demonstration in 1983. The political answer at that time was to focus on education as a priority area with additional public funds made available to help improve the situation and integration of these people. The role of culture has been acknowledged in assisting economic integration and social cohesion, in particular through an intercultural approach. So the question remained: which culture or whose culture? The following generation of people with foreign origin, but with French nationality, still suffered from a lack of recognition of their cultural roots. At the same time, there was a growing recognition of emerging sub-cultures or urban cultures and the creation of specific programmes to support e.g. the cultural expressions of young people with an immigrant background as well as an increase in the number of foreign literature available in public libraries and translation schemes.
3. The recent period has seen the creation of national institutions that both symbolize and acknowledge various traditions such as the new museum “Quai Branly” or the Cité d’Immigration (to be opened in July) and the future Museum of the Euro-Mediterranean Civilizations that will be created in Marseilles in the coming years (there is also an

interesting museum in Grenoble). This demonstrates that the approach remains focused on the promotion of exchanges with foreign cultures, on the one hand, and the recognition of a diversity of publics and cultural expression, on the other.

On the other hand, France's constitution still fosters equality for every individual without distinction. A paradoxical situation arises thus, where one can see that much has been done, but at the same time the major legislative text still has difficulty with the notion of diversity. This means that France has not adopted the Charter on Minority Languages, even though much has been done at the local level to foster ICD and to provide support for minority languages.

Mikko Lagerpetz (Estonia) gave an overview of how ICD is seen in his country. There are very few immigrants in Estonia compared to other European countries. The main group is those who came to Estonia during Soviet rule, the first in the late 1940s and the last during the late 1980s. Policies tend to focus on the Russian minority, with the most significant measures being learning the Estonian language and support for cultural associations. This can be described as essentialist identity. However, when talking about integration into society, there has been a thorough change of the economic structure since the 1990s, from the manufacturing to the services sector, which has led to unemployment in many sectors, especially affecting minorities. There has also been uneven development of the regions, which has also had an effect on the minorities.

With regard to integration programmes, the socio-economic dimension has had a low profile and policies have been insensitive to cultural issues. This became clear at the end of April 2007, when there were street riots in reaction to the government position to remove the Soviet-time monument (soldier) from a place of prominence to the military cemetery. One could say that these street riots are a manifest of something other than just a protest over the monument, i.e. political conflict, youth unemployment etc. This act of moving the statue was seen by the Russian minority as an attempt to isolate their interests from the general public space. Some Estonians might also argue that this was an attempt to remove Soviet nostalgia and guide them towards the mainstream culture.

The majority and minorities live very separate lives. The issue is less about knowing each others culture, and more about not being engaged in each others culture; the Estonian majority fears of a Russian threat and the Russian minority fear that they are losing their identity. There is a need for social dialogue and channels for mediation. In this context, ICD is not just about culture, but starts with wider integration problems such as empowerment of minorities and social dialogue.

Anna Villarroya (Spain) reported on several factors which could influence intercultural dialogue. For example, economic factors of globalisation, which are affecting the labour market and increasing unemployment. Some parts of the population believe that the problems in the labour market are due to immigrants as they accept lower salaries; in aggregate terms salaries are low.

Spain has had traditional minorities for centuries, but the pressing issues are related to the new immigrants. Some of these issues are related to education, social services, housing and employment. Choices regarding which school to attend are becoming a major issue, with the formation of ghettos as a result of the concentration of immigrants in public schools. The government is attempting to redistribute the immigrant population throughout the private and public school system. Personal security is also an issue, with the rise in the number of thefts using violence, many of which are perpetrated by foreigners, leaving the general perception that immigration is bad.

There is also a perceived threat of cultural erosion of the host population by the new immigrants. For example: Catalonia has its own language, culture and traditions. The host population sees immigration as a threat to its language, which is a minority language in Spain.

In terms of policies, the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs had just passed a strategic plan on citizenship and integration. Some of its aims are interculturality, equality of rights, and equal opportunities. It aims to foster a consciousness among immigrants of belonging to the Spanish community, a respect for the common values of the EU, the rights and duties of residents in Spain, the official languages and the social rules of Spanish society. Some other measures include:

- a Spanish Observatory for Racism and Xenophobia;
- an Action Plan on Social Exclusion of the Roma and others who are experiencing social integration issues;
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has an action plan addressed specifically to Asia and the Pacific, regarding economic and security issues;
- the Ministry of Culture has a number of programmes, including the setting up, in 2001, of an Asia House and since then an African House, Arab House and Israel House relating to ICD;
- the Ministry of Education has allocated extra resources for integration of immigrants into the school system;
- free language courses are available for immigrants;
- a Sports Bill will be introduced to combat racism and xenophobia in sport; and
- a Centre has been set up to combat violence against minorities.

Milena Dragicevic-Šešić then opened up the floor for discussion.

Ritva Mitchell noticed a clear difference in the understanding of ICD between the ‘western’ and ‘eastern’ European countries and urged authors to ‘go a bit deeper’ when they were writing their contributions in order to help readers better understand the meaning of ICD in different parts of Europe.

Jacek Drozda said that in countries like Poland, without the multicultural population of countries like the UK, it was difficult to elaborate some kind of scheme related to interculturality. In his opinion, ICD should not be entirely linked to ethnicity within countries, but to also consider how different elements of other cultures beyond national borders are integrated into either everyday culture or new forms of artistic expression.

Jude Bloomfield argued that every country had some kind of ethnic variety. However, there was a need to rethink the national narrative of homogeneity. While it was fully accepted that every country had various elements of diversity, she said that one theory that existed for a long time was that interculturality implied interdisciplinarity. However, she believed that ICD should be linked to social identity, as many scars were left behind if each country did not rediscover all the influences that led to its development; that all history and memory is linked to the present, what one chooses to remember or forget.

Milena Dragicevic-Šešić agrees that it is important to find a way of keeping the collective memory of different influences alive; even when minorities have disappeared due to genocide etc. In Serbia, only the theatre sector has dared to address the issue of genocide when politicians and others did not want to discuss it anymore. This is an example of bottom-up cultural politics.

Andreas Wiesand asked Jude if she considered the empowerment strategies occurring in certain countries e.g. quotas in selection boards, as a transitory element or whether these were to stay. There had been problems with a quota system in the field of gender, where some female artists did not want to “wear the gender label”. *Jude* said that while she was unsure about the continuation of the quota system in cultural situations, she believed that in the Netherlands the quota system had led to more interculturality within institutions.

Milena Dragicevic-Šešić invited the various experts involved in the EU study to provide some initial comments on the themes being addressed.

Intercultural dialogue and heritage

Simona Bodo, heritage expert, presented the results of her work for the EU study by stating that the heritage sector, and the museums sector in particular, has understood ICD as a goal to be obtained or a final destination rather than as a process to be ingrained in a museum’s practice or in the process of encouraging reactions from different audiences. She identified three main policy approaches taken by museums to respond to the growing diversity of their audiences:

- celebration of difference: better recognition of cultures, mainly directed at autochthonous audiences to show the richness of other traditions;
- integration of migrant communities, into mainstream cultures, via enhancement of literacy, language, history etc.; and
- compensation for the misrepresentation of the culture of migrant communities including the promotion of self awareness and the creation of links to their cultural background.

All three approaches can be argued as essential. They help create the situation for increased encounters among people with different backgrounds, however there are some limitations:

- autochthonous and new audiences have mostly been kept separate. Interaction has usually been avoided by keeping different audiences apart, which has led to stereotypes being reinforced;
- there is a notion of heritage as a received patrimony that has to be preserved and transmitted, rather than an interactive process; and
- they tend to see ICD as a predetermined outcome rather than an interactive process.

Museums that are interested in developing process-oriented intercultural heritage education projects suggest that it is not so important to aim at the acquisition of competencies and skills related to a specific discipline or culture as to aim at development of those attitudes, behaviors, relational skills that are indispensable for an individual to live in a world of increased interaction and contact between different cultural practices. This approach focuses more on methodology than content because the intercultural potential of a given topic does not in itself guarantee the success of an intercultural project. These museums will be better able to respond to the growing diversity of their publics by working on all types of collections. They imply a long-term commitment by participants in projects, through interaction and engagement.

In conclusion, Simona suggested that greater attention should be paid to policies, strategies and programmes that aim at developing 3rd spaces, where individuals can cross the borders and labels of belonging and where they can be treated as creators rather than consumers of identity.

Milena Dragicevic-Šešic said that Simona has raised some interesting issues for all, for example how to overcome the labels of belonging. One example she encountered was the creation of a Roma Pavilion at the Venice Biennale. Normally, the notion of a Pavilion is based around a 'state'. Some artists questioned why they have to be in a Roma Pavilion instead of being part of the exhibitions of the countries in which they live.

Intercultural dialogue and the performing arts

Jude Bloomfield, started her presentation with an observation that the Compendium authors used the terms cultural diversity, interculturality, international cultural diplomacy and ICD as if sometimes they all meant the same thing. It is important to differentiate these terms to see what is really meant by intercultural dialogue as a process and to understand that there may be phases or precursors to ICD that may not necessarily lead to dialogue in the end. She suggested that there is sometimes a formulative notion of dialogue, that it is written down and that it goes on between the 'learned'. It is not helped by the fact that most inter-religious dialogue takes place at an elite level. However there are forms of dialogue which take place on a different level e.g. in her own community she had recently met with representatives of the Hassidic community and they were involved in an intercultural project with the local Orthodox Muslim community on a drugs project. So intercultural communication can be used as a tool to control, protect or set boundaries for certain communities e.g. in policing gender issues.

The performing arts have been pioneers in the area of ICD and not in a form of dialogue that is formal in speech or text. It is a dialogue which has created a type of 3rd space that Simona Bodo mentioned. These developments have taken place over the past 20 or 30 years without entering into either a formalized debate within the theatre sector or indeed without much political input. The performing arts as a sector creates spaces that are experimental with identity and which allow people to 'play'. It has the capacity to open up itself to new ideas which could provide inspiration to other sectors.

In her research, Jude found that while the Netherlands and the UK were at the forefront in legislative terms to diversify audiences, management, participation, she also found innovations elsewhere. Some examples:

1. An autonomous 'black' theatre scene has emerged in countries such as the UK, the Netherlands and to some extent in France due to the self organisation of independent ethnic artists. One example in the UK is Tara Arts, which always plays to mixed audiences, carries on outreach work in schools and works with audiences. They did a trilogy on East Indian migration to Britain; working with children to get them to tell their own stories and to go home and get their families involved in telling their stories of migration. These stories were used as a prologue to the play which encouraged the families to attend the performances, thus creating new audiences as well as being deeply intercultural. This shows that some activities that are labeled ethnic are in fact intercultural in a transformative way.
2. Groups of mixed ethnicity e.g. the Black Blanc Beur hip hop dance company in France is intercultural in composition, in the way that they integrate hip hop music, dance, Chinese

acrobats, classical ballet etc. and in the use of non traditional spaces for their performances. In 2003, they received funding from the government - after 20 years of being in operation.

3. Some theatres established in the 1960s were linked to alternative cultural politics and new social movements which produced e.g. experimental children's theatres, working class theatres etc. They were often based in areas of industrial decline where the population became very diversified and had high levels of immigrant populations. These theatre groups had to be innovative to relate to this developing environment. Examples are the Theatre Royal Stratford in East London and Ness in the Netherlands.

Some other interesting strategies currently being developed:

- in terms of diversifying audiences, there is a moving on from a quintessential, multicultural, diversity type of approach to one which infiltrates institutional strategies. One example of this is the Theatre Cyclone in Rotterdam which decided that 30% of its board and programme would be decided on the basis of proportional representation of the local community. However, this approach was limited in terms of an intercultural approach;
- there is an understanding that different audiences have different socialization places and need to be reached in new ways; this requires a change in the form of theatre and type of public spaces;
- new 3rd spaces are being created. For example, the Theatre of Refugees in Italy perform in spaces such as the Milan central train station to reach larger audiences. They have been able to attract new types of funding e.g. from Amnesty International;
- new types of cultural diplomacy are being created where performing arts companies involve new relationships with diverse actors, international exchanges, new touring circuits, workshops etc. These are two-way relationships. All of these forms of ICD go beyond formal discussion formats.

Intercultural dialogue and EU Youth programmes

According to **Judith Neisse**, there are 75 million young people aged between 15 and 25 living in Europe. While national, regional and local level governments are the main actors addressing youth, there are several EU programmes which directly or indirectly address youth and intercultural learning, such as LEONARDO, SOCRATES and CULTURE 2000. More specifically, the EU Youth programme is a mobility and non formal education programme targeted at those aged between 15 and 25 years. It offers a framework for co-operation, also with third countries. Since 2006, the EURO-MED Youth programme has been carried out with ten southern and eastern Mediterranean countries outside the EU.

Judith examined how this programme was interpreting ICD in the framework of its developments for young people around Europe. She identified four elements:

1. ICD is a factor contributing to European integration and enlargement and gives identity to young people living inside the European border;
2. ICD is perceived as a tool to promote cultural understanding, including with other cultures outside Europe;
3. the EU programme acts to strengthen fundamental values e.g. freedom, democracy, anti-racism, anti-semitism etc.; and

4. ICD is interpreted in the content of non-formal education for young people in Europe and international co-operation outside Europe.

She presented several observations and recommendations regarding the European Youth and EURO MED Youth programmes such as:

1. The European Commission should clarify, in the framework of the 2008 Year of ICD, what exactly is meant by intercultural learning in its youth programmes. In all the assessments of youth programmes, including self assessments, none have addressed the vision, meaning, or definition of Europe with regard to the term intercultural learning or dialogue, or even what are common values in Europe. The concept of intercultural learning is used in a very ambiguous way; sometimes it is the method, sometimes the tools or process, sometimes the activity and sometimes the result or impact.
2. Many quality criteria could be applied in the assessment, in terms of impact, of all the EU programmes that are aimed in some way at fostering the learning of young people, e.g. ownership, institutional change, changes in perception.
3. There is a need to modernise the dialogue between young people. In the absence of any clarification or definition of ICD and ICL, young people will fill the vacuum with their own understanding of these terms. According to an assessment of 150 youth associations following EURO MED II programme, they see ICD and ICL as being mainly related to interfaith dialogue and learning.
4. In the Mediterranean region, the age range of the programmes is discriminatory and should be changed. Young men often have to do military service and young women are not allowed to spend the night away from their families. Students are also excluded from the programme.
5. Europe is financing a youth programme for the elite. ICD should include all segments of society.
6. As long as there are handicaps to mobility in terms of visas, in particular the countries of the south Mediterranean, ICL will be hindered and mobility will not be allowed to flourish.

Judith also proposed several conceptual recommendations:

1. for the EU youth programmes, ICL should be used instead of ICD;
2. there is a need to define the concept of ICL. Is it about personal skills, well-being, skills of citizens, or the collective capacity of youth organisations?
3. quality indicators for assessment need to be drawn up; and
4. it is important to develop the links between ICL, international co-operation and development co-operation. In the Mediterranean region, the concept of youth work is almost absent and most associations are under the control of the government.

Traditional and new cultural minorities, formation of hybrid identities

Elka Tschernokoshewa raised three points which emerged from her work for the EU study on IDC regarding hybrid identities:

1. When talking about cultural dialogue and minorities, one forgets that minorities are already in dialogue; they have 2 cultures, 2 languages, stories from two traditions. They are able to switch between two viewpoints and the majority can learn from minorities in this respect.
2. Hybridity can be understood through the following illustration: hybrid persons are like hybrid cars which run on both gasoline and electricity. Hybrid persons also are running on different types of energies. Hybrid societies are run on different sensibilities, energies, resources, experiences which are used to solve common social tasks.
3. It is difficult to develop a set of indicators to examine or understand hybrid spaces or dialogue spaces. The key is to being with a few simple indicators. For example the availability of television programmes from different countries and in different languages.

Evaluation of Compendium responses on intercultural education

Marion Fitzgibbon (Ireland) had examined a number of the country entries on intercultural education and found that the term has been widely interpreted. Some Compendium responses provide specific information on actions in their country, more detailed information on aims and financial resources available for national programmes, participation in EU programmes, transnational exchanges, foreign language studies etc.

According to ***Vjeran Katunarić***, national responses did not necessarily address the questions posed in the Compendium grid. In the event when competency for intercultural education lies with e.g. the Ministry of Education rather than the Ministry of Culture, authors should nevertheless provide such information and show how it relates to actions undertaken in the cultural sector.

When examining the issues that have an impact on the process of ICD, the Compendium countries can be viewed in three categories:

- the old core EU countries that are ‘old’ immigration countries;
- new member countries, which are emigration countries; and
- non EU countries, which are also emigration countries.

These countries can also be divided into policy types:

- the so called ‘liberal’ policies, where teaching is monolingual, as in England, Scotland and Wales, partly Austria, and France; and
- those countries where education is carried out taking into consideration the linguistic needs of minorities.

Another interesting observation can be made in terms of the curriculum for intercultural education:

- countries which include intercultural education as part of the general school curriculum: Malta, Ireland, the UK, Netherlands, Estonia, Italy, Belgium, Canada, Austria, San Marino, Georgia and Italy.
- countries which do NOT include intercultural education as part of the curriculum: Albania, Moldova, Croatia, Serbia, Poland, Romania (apart from the Hungarian universities), Finland and Russia.
- Information not available in Bulgaria and Macedonia.

Vjeran concluded by recommending two new questions to be added to the Compendium grid: how prestigious is intercultural education or civic education in the school system in comparison to other subjects?; and what is the impact of intercultural education as perceived by students and teachers?

Michael Wimmer could understand the inconsistencies in the national responses as interculturality is understood differently by colleagues working either in culture or in education institutions. The differences extend to terminologies used and the content delivered. For example, in the field of education, intercultural education, intercultural pedagogy, intercultural learning and intercultural dialogue are all used. In the culture sphere, one talks about cultural innovations and structural reforms to rebalance social differences. One needs to be clear about what is being talked about and differentiate between interculturality, inter-institutionality and internationality. The concept of intercultural dialogue can also be understood as relating to gender, religion, language in schools and the arts. At the moment, there is a danger that the latter element is lost in the discussions. Once upon a time, the arts were an attainment of European enlightenment because they went beyond their cultural institutions. They represented something different, something transcultural. In addition, one needs to be aware of the top down system that exists in institutions, in which the white haired, white male is prevalent and to make a distinction between formal and non-formal education systems.

Andreas Wiesand closed the conference by thanking all the participants, the Council of Europe, and the Croatian Ministry. He said that ERICarts had learned greatly from the contributions and he hoped that authors had too. These annual meetings are the soul of the Compendium project and without them the project would not be so successful.