

# **MONITORING CULTURAL POLICIES AND TRENDS IN EUROPE**

**3rd Annual Authors Meeting  
11-12 March 2004**

**Hosted by the German Foreign Office  
Berlin, Germany**

**Final Report**

The purpose of the 3rd Annual Compendium Authors Meeting was to:

- 1) Further develop tools towards monitoring cultural policies and trends within the Compendium.
- 2) Enable direct exchange among members of the growing Compendium Community of Practice on proposals to enhance and fine-tune the methodological grid.
- 3) Interact with local actors from the cultural community in Germany as both potential partners, information providers and users.
- 4) Continue discussions with international experts from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and the European Cultural Foundation.

This report provides a summary of the discussions which took place during the two day meeting and includes information on decisions taken by the thematically organised working groups.

## **Welcoming Session**

Mr Wilfried Grolig, Director General, Department for Culture and Education, German Ministry for Foreign Affairs welcomed the Council of Europe, the ERICarts Institute, the Compendium authors and invited guests from the German cultural field to the first authors meeting held outside of Strasbourg. He introduced the eventful history of the house and the significance of the room where the meeting took place – Nazi Reichsbank (1934-1940), Berlin Stadtkontor (1945), Finance Ministry of the GDR (1949), Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party (1959-1989) and where the German Unification Treaty was approved (1990). The history of the house reflects the history of Germany and of Europe and of the important role of the Council of Europe. In looking ahead to the future work of the Council of Europe, Mr. Grolig emphasised its unique structure of member states reaching well beyond an enlarged European Union; one of its main comparative advantages. This is also reflected in the Compendium project which now includes 38 countries and successfully contributes to cultural dialogue and co-operation by deepening knowledge about the diversity of political structures and policies for culture in Europe. He congratulated the members of the Compendium community and emphasised its importance as a flagship project within the Council of Europe. Mr. Grolig also acknowledged that the project requires financial security and informed the meeting of the German Government's commitment to work towards that goal. His final remarks focussed on the further enhancement of synergies between the Council of Europe and UNESCO in the fields of education and culture. Dr. Schoefthaler of the German National Commission for UNESCO has been appointed to follow more closely the work of the Council of Europe and to develop possibilities for closer co-operation.

Ms Catherine Roth, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage at the Council of Europe, thanked the Finnish Ministry of Education, the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, the Hungarian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and the European Cultural Foundation for their support to the 2003 edition of the Compendium, as well as ERICarts – the partner of the Council of Europe in this exercise. She stressed that the Compendium was a very special example of successful cultural co-operation, clearly conceived, methodologically ambitious, inspiring and of obvious usefulness to

policy makers and others interested in latest cultural policy trends and analysis. Its pooling of experience, public accessibility and monitoring potential were much in the spirit of the Organisation and she was very happy to contribute to the project development as well as help secure its financing. She finally emphasized the importance of establishing links with the HEREIN information system on cultural heritage in order to develop a tool for the monitoring of the Conventions of the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage.

Pirkko Rainesalo, Counsellor for Cultural Affairs at the Ministry of Education in Helsinki, former President of the Culture Committee and well known supporter of the Compendium, was elected Chair of the meeting.

### **A Year in Review - Update from the Editors**

Andreas Wiesand opened a joint presentation by the editorial team on the progress made in the Compendium project during the last year as well as on new ideas for its future development. He started by mentioning *a list of "firsts"*: first meeting of the Compendium authors outside of Strasbourg to which an audience of key local actors were invited as well as international experts such as Diane Stukel (UNESCO Institute for Statistics) and Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh (European Cultural Foundation). It was also the first time that some of the authors have been actively involved in the activities of the editorial team to advance the methodology used in the project. He thanked *Vesna Čopič, Mikko Lagerspetz, Otto Hofecker and John Foote* for their dedication to the project and for their work.

Andreas Wiesand mentioned some of the *"success stories"* of the Compendium project during 2003. For example: the Compendium was specifically referred to in the European Ministers Declaration on Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Prevention (Opatija, Croatia, October 2003) as well as in the Council of Europe's contribution to the World Summit on the Information Society, Geneva 2003. The number of Compendium users (visitors per year/number of downloaded profiles) has grown by nearly 100% over the period between 2002 and 2003. The Compendium continues to be used as a teaching tool at universities across Europe.

Danielle Cliche presented a *review of activities 2003*. She explained that the project is a process for which new milestones are set each year. There are, however, two standing activities which are maintained each year including the addition of new country profiles and updating the information and data in the existing country profiles. The goal is to include all 48 countries which are signatories to the European Cultural Convention. As of March 2004, 32 countries were posted to the online Compendium information system. New country profiles were produced by Zlatko Teodosievski (Macedonia); Olexandr Butsenko (Ukraine); Marian Fitzgibbon (Ireland); Costis Dallas (Greece); Milena Dragicevic-Sesic (Serbia-Montenegro) and over 20 country profiles were updated<sup>1</sup>. The latter was a complex process for which ERICarts is working together with the Medianale Group to simplify in the future (e.g. through an off-line database system).

Danielle Cliche reminded the group of some first ideas for including *new indicators* that would help collect information/data on emerging issues of political importance. These were presented in the monitoring paper 2003. Throughout the Autumn of 2003, the editors worked together with four Compendium authors to review initial proposals and make suggestions for additions/changes to the methodological grid. The result of this work was integrated into an updated Compendium grid serving as a background document for the 2004 Berlin meeting.

One important task identified in 2003 was to find ways to improve the *visibility* of the Compendium. Several activities were undertaken in that respect:

- Wide spread dissemination of information via the creation of an electronic *newsletter* which has been sent to over 700 subscribers from around the world (users can subscribe to the newsletter via the website).

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for updating country profiles was received in 2002 and 2003 from the European Cultural Foundation.

- A *flyer* was produced in English and copies sent to the Compendium authors for distribution to colleagues, at conferences, to their own networks etc., in order to help raise awareness about this information system and its potential benefits for the users. Additional packages of flyers were made available to the authors in Berlin. In addition a demonstration *CD Rom* was prepared by the Medianale Group and given to each of the Compendium authors to use when presenting the project to local audiences or at conferences where Internet connections may not be possible.
- Presentation of the Compendium to *other bodies around the world* who are considering the development of regional information systems for cultural policies and trends. In 2003, the Compendium was presented in Mexico at the UNESCO/ CONACULTA International Seminar on Cultural Indicators. In 2004, it will be presented in Bangkok at a meeting of ASEAN countries on culture and development.
- Enhancing the *multilingual* aspect of the Compendium is an extremely important activity to help raise its visibility and to disseminate the information and data presented in individual country profiles. To date, the download statistics show that in some cases the number of *downloaded profiles in the national languages* is sometimes higher than that of the English language version. In 2003, an original language version of the Ukraine country profile was posted online. The editors also learned of a Persian language version of the entire Compendium website that has been produced and is available on: <http://www.iranculture.org/research/culpol/index.php>

Ms Cliche presented the *updated web version* of the Compendium including new technical features which help to present information in a more user friendly way:

- Short Cuts: signalling to users where changes or updates have been made in the individual country profiles. Specific icons were introduced to provide a visual overview of changes in legislation, in the organisation of cultural affairs and to indicate where new statistical data has been provided. Links are made to specific updated chapters.
- Customising reports: users can now combine chapters from selected countries.

After having thanked the many partners involved in the Compendium -whose co-operation accounted for the success of the exercise- Kathrin Merkle informed about *recent developments within the Council of Europe* that were of interest to the Compendium. One was the upcoming collaboration with HEREIN, the online information system on cultural heritage policies and practices of the Organisation. The second was an initiative of the Directorate for Social Affairs to create a *social cohesion index* for Europe allowing to monitor, inter alia, the implementation of the new strategy on social cohesion. Within the elaboration of this cohesion index, hundreds of potential indicators were screened, including cultural ones. The Secretariat had already set up internal consultation process that has now been enlarged to comprise the Compendium working group of experts on diversity, dialogue and cohesion.

Kathrin Merkle then presented a paper on *monitoring and the Compendium*. She reminded the group that within the Compendium project, monitoring was understood as an integrated and dynamic activity to report on developments in cultural policies and trends in Europe. The Compendium would not change its character as an information tool. The integrity of the well established system would be maintained. The monitoring function should be an additional asset to be included into the overall system. The monitoring function aims to:

- Collect reliable information and data on cultural policies and trends on a regular basis and over a period of time in order to better analyse/ illustrate longitudinal developments;
- Systematically study pre-selected issues over a period of time;
- Introduce new indicators to collect information/ data on emerging issues of political priority (e.g. cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion);
- Identify models or examples of good practice through the systematic collection of examples/illustrations existing at the national, regional and local levels.

She finally drew the groups attention to the first tables monitoring developments in public financing of culture and in legislation aimed at improving the social and economic status of the artist available on the website under “comparisons”. She acknowledged that achieving a sustainable monitoring activity within the Compendium will be gradual - selectively and realistically adapted to resources available as well as to the availability of data and new partners/information sources within participating countries.

Andreas Wiesand closed the group presentation with some specific ideas about *future activities* in the context of monitoring such as the creation of new content databases for more sophisticated monitoring activities which are both horizontal (transnational) and vertical. He mentioned that three Compendium authors were invited to make presentations on some of the key issues to be monitored in the future including cultural participation and legal provisions for the cultural sector; to be preceded by a reminder from Ritva Mitchell of the path which has led us to begin monitoring cultural policies and trends in Europe.

### **Mixed Realities: Bringing Transparency to European Cultural Co-operation<sup>2</sup>**

At the outset of her presentation Ritva Mitchell reminded the group of the fact that in addition to providing individual national country profiles, the Compendium is an important tool for comparisons. She also reminded us of the fact that making comparisons is as old as our civilization. Already Aristotle in his major work *Politics* compared the constitutions of 128 city states, proposing that cultures can learn one from one another – if not always positively, at least in respect of what not to do.

The Compendium construction is a continuous process through which all learn what is required to make relevant comparisons with relevant information. This process has been going on for the past six, seven years. It was, however, ten years ago at the conference “Crossing Frontiers” (Ottawa, Canada) that Mark Schuster presented a provoking paper entitled “The Politics, Compromises and Caveats of International Comparisons”. With a touch of self-irony, the paper clearly outlined how an attempt by a cultural researcher to gather fast (“quick and dirty”) international comparative information on financing of the arts and culture led to a complicated continuation of research and to political complexities, when political decision-makers wished to use deficient data to prove that their efforts had led to a higher level of financing.

Obviously, one now has a much better basis for international comparisons than ten years ago. Besides having more detailed cross-sector data, information can now be acquired over sufficiently long time period which allows us to assess (or monitor) in an objective manner, the extent to which policy efforts have really produced good and lasting results. There is, however, still a lot to do in order to improve transparency both in national cultural policy decision making and in international cultural co-operation.

Carrying out this work is, however, now much easier than it was ten years ago. First of all, the community of practice has expanded tremendously and has become denser. This is, of course, seen through the expansion of the Compendium group of authors. Secondly, much more – or at least better focused – research and development work is being carried out in many central institutions and these efforts are also becoming more interactive. As an example one could mention the interaction between the Compendium authors and the expert groups of EUROSTAT which are now finalising the work they carried out since 1996 to provide a European comparative framework for cultural statistics. Links to the new UNESCO Institute for Statistics and OECD<sup>3</sup> remain important.

Of course there are still difficult problems to be solved, both methodological and practical. On the methodological side one could mention the co-ordination of cultural statistics – not only in the field of financing but also in the fields of education and the media, for example. On the practical side the main

---

<sup>2</sup> Summary of the presentation made by Ritva Mitchell.

<sup>3</sup> OECD was an important partner at the very beginning of the country review programme of the Council of Europe which later has inspired the Compendium.

issue is ongoing funding which is required to carry out the next step to develop systematic comparative indicators which are relevant to both the international community and national governments.

### **Comparing Cultural Practices and Trends in 48 Countries – Are We Ready? <sup>4</sup>**

According to Mr Lagerspetz, the potential of the Compendium as a tool for international comparison of cultural policies has not yet been fully exploited. The reasons are related to problems with: 1) availability of data; 2) the structure and quality of data; and 3) the meaning of data.

The authors of country reports have different levels of access to resources and, at the moment, it does not seem possible to organise a common plan to gather primary data. In other words, the authors must make use of the existing data. Sometimes, information on an issue is simply not available; but usually the authors need to decide whether to include certain data or not. However, the choice of what data to include can be made in a more co-ordinated manner (e.g., what indicators to select; from which years, etc), through which the comparability of reports can be enhanced. The existing data is, however, not always comparable because of different practices of collecting and structuring the data in different countries. To some extent, this is a technical matter and might be possibly overcome by analysing and re-structuring the data available. However, it also reflects real differences in the cultural lives and policies in different countries. For instance, the relative importance of institutional and non-institutional culture varies between countries and in time. For that reason, participation statistics from cultural institutions have different implications in different cases.

It should be added, that even one and the same phenomenon can have different meaning in different countries. For instance, legislation on a specific pension scheme for creative artists would obviously be less important in a country that has a well-functioning universal pension scheme than in another country, where pensions are funded through employment-related insurances. Specific cultural activities, i.e., opera or circus, may have a widely varying position in the cultural lives of people from different countries, and information concerning them has a different bearing on the overall configuration. Accordingly, comparisons across countries is not sufficient, if we fail to put them in their proper context.

Cross-country comparative research can, in principle, make use of two strategies: variable-oriented and case-oriented approaches. The former includes a direct comparison of indicators, while the latter aims at comparing the cases (e.g., the cultural policies of countries) as totalities. From the point of view of the variable-oriented strategy, much can be done to enhance the comparability of the Compendium country reports by simple co-ordination of what data is included. It is also possible to work with different speeds, in correspondence with the availability of data and resources in different countries. Not all data needs to be immediately comparable between all countries. The Compendium grid could give a list of the more basic and important data to be included, along with suggestions for complementary data. A comparison of cases, the overall paths of development of cultural trends and cultural policies, is an even more challenging enterprise. In order for it to be possible, the reports must include descriptive, generalising accounts (including accounts of the historical development); to be facilitated by contacts among participants of the Compendium project.

Regarding the Compendium grid for national profiles, the following is proposed as a set of information and data to be presented in sub-section 8.2:

- a) statistics broken down according to participation in activities provided by publicly subsidised cultural institutions (e.g. museums, libraries and public theatres) and by the culture industries (e.g. cinema, books and newspapers, Internet).

---

<sup>4</sup> Summary of the presentation made by Mikko Lagerspetz.

- b) statistical data for a number of years (1990, 1995, 2000, 2003) which would allow for a discussion of changes over time (where available).
- c) the results of surveys taken in recent years on the cultural activity of social groups differing from each other with respect to gender, age or education. If available, information from surveys indicating the cultural activity of groups broken down according to income, ethnicity, religion should also be included.
- d) Sources where users can access the interview questions used in the participation surveys should also be mentioned.

### **Evaluating and Monitoring Culture Legislation<sup>5</sup>**

Legislation is an extremely complicated topic for a very simple reason. It is supposed to give clear, certain and definite answers to the most delicate and conflicting questions posed by a modern society which literally becomes more complex, sophisticated, differentiated and multifunctional every day. From this point of view, legislation is like a “black box” that either resolves these questions or prevents real action. A first step towards producing quality legislation is to understand its possibilities and limitations; what legislation can achieve and what is beyond its capacity. This level of knowledge or understanding calls for:

1. Reality judgements requiring the availability of specific facts which identify different positions, interest groups, relevant signs or trends in the society, etc.
2. Value judgements based on an understanding of the significance of these collected facts and how they can or must be judged, especially since such facts are not independent of “meaning”.
3. A comparison of the actual state of affairs with standards or agreed upon “norms”.

Together, these elements make up the regulative process.

Law is becoming more and more an instrument of planning and of politics. In addition to law as a normative tool we can also speak of the instrumental role of law. As politicians became more exposed to the constantly expanding needs and demands of their population and interest groups there was an expansion of the legal domain into many areas including culture; the latter of which became a legislative paradise. At the same time, a two fold problem of implementation arose. On one side, there is now a huge number of laws; a real legislative jungle. On the other hand, there is a question of whether the boundaries of what can be handled adequately by legal means have been overstepped. In the case when binding decisions work in very uncertain causal connections we can speak of legal impotence. Where lack of implementation is connected with too many laws one can speak of legal overload or even legal pollution. The result is a gap between a legal state and the rule of law. Everything is indeed regulated, but regulation may not function in practise. A legal state is thus an idealistic approach while the rule of law is a realistic approach. The main question that Mrs Čopič found important was how to improve legislation to become less idealistic and more realistic?

When faced with this task, it is of utmost importance to know or to at least have an idea how others deal with the situation, how they evaluate facts, what kind of actions they take to solve the gap between what is and what should be. The Compendium information system can provide a “helping hand”. It is a tool for all partners involved (including an enormous public of users) through which one can share experiences, monitor and evaluate different legal systems. In principle it can become a reliable information source for those working in the field of legislation for culture. The aim is to better communicate “national stories” in a clear and comprehensive way including information on those solutions found to address complex challenges facing the culture sector in general and cultural legislation in particular.

But How? The Compendium group can learn from the regulatory impact analysis carried out in all OECD member states in 1995 to assess the effect of regulation on society (regulatory impact analysis)

---

<sup>5</sup> Summary of the presentation made by Vesna Čopič.

which covers both legislation in force and that which is in the process of being adopted. The main purpose of the analysis was to improve the quality of legislation, to annul unnecessary regulations and to reduce the overall costs of regulation. Its most important goal, however, was to facilitate a change in the way which regulation is understood. This analytical approach provides an opportunity to resolve social issues via regulation from the point of view of *feasibility* but also of *acceptability* by the subjects to whom they apply, as well as the public (consultation with the public as a key component of the regulation adoption process). All necessary information regarding the costs and benefits of an existing or intended piece of regulation should answer the following types of questions:

- Is the regulation necessary?
- Are there alternative solutions?
- What are the goals of the regulation, or which issues does it aim to regulate?
- What are the principles and key solutions to these issues?
- What financial consequences will it have?
- What organisational measures and activities will be necessary to implement it?

Mrs Čopič believes that the Compendium can be positioned to help prevent the production of useless legislation or the misuse of legislation through the exchange of experiences in the different countries involved in the project. This should take place via a restructuring of information and facts currently found in Chapter 5 of the Compendium Grid and by adding new questions for the national experts to address in their profiles which can be framed in a similar manner as those prepared by the OECD regulatory impact analysis. These include questions regarding cultural legislation or general legislation for culture:

- Legislation in force in the different countries
- Regulations to implement legislation;
- Organisational structures to transfer the adopted legal solutions into practice;
- Funding for the implementation of the law; and
- Information systems to monitor its implementation.

By including an ex-post evaluation mechanism, the Compendium is no longer just a descriptive tool supplying facts, but has turned into a force to drive processes. Is this too ambitious?

## Open Discussion

Diane Stukel led the discussion by first informing the group about the activities of the new UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS), Montreal, which was formerly a UNESCO Division based in Paris. The new institute inherited a data base of statistics which was full of inconsistencies and gaps. After an interim phase when the collection of data was suspended and instruments reviewed, a new approach was developed with less emphasis on institutional data and more stress on a policy based approach. One example was book production where the administrative data on printed press did not provide the user with e.g. data on readership. Such data needs to be collected differently through household surveys. The UIS will conduct a similar exercise to the one undertaken by the EUROSTAT LEG group on cultural participation. This will only be a one-off exercise, as was the Eurobarometer on cultural participation in the EU member states. The UIS is also considering to conduct a survey on adult education.

Regarding the EUROSTAT exercises, Vladimir Bina informed the meeting that the work of the three LEG groups was coming to an end. These groups had, over the past years, developed indicators and frameworks to collect data in the following areas: public cultural expenditure, employment in the cultural field and participation in cultural life. Final reports from each of these groups were being prepared. According to Mr. Bina, there was a recent discussion in Luxembourg to set up new Task Forces around the following themes: culture industries, social cohesion and the information society. Frameworks for these exercises would need to be developed in the near future and synergies with the work of the Compendium community of practice could be sought.

## **Day Two: Improving the Compendium Grid to Monitor Cultural Policies and Trends**

The following text reflects some of the main results of the four working groups organised on day two of the Compendium authors meeting. The main task of the working groups was to review proposals made by some of the authors to amend the Compendium methodological grid. These proposals were later discussed in plenary and adopted collectively by the entire group. Members of the different working groups agreed to continue their exchange over the next months as well as to consider to creating platforms based on community of practice software.

### ***WG1 - Reorganising Chapter 5: Legal provisions for the cultural field***<sup>6</sup>

Based on a comprehensive proposal made by Vesna Čopič (and summarised in her presentation on Day One), this working group was given the task of adopting or amending a plan to reorganise the information provided in Chapter 5. This plan does not imply that the information currently available in the country profiles is no longer applicable. Rather that new information be added which provides the users with an overview of both general legislation which has an important impact on culture as well as specific legislation for culture as a separate field. An additional proposal was made for authors to describe how such legislation is interpreted in practice. The final proposal adopted by the working group shall be included in the Compendium Guide 2004.

### ***WG2 - Participation in Cultural Life and the “CUPIX Experiment”***<sup>7</sup>

At the end of 2003, several Compendium authors participated in the development of an experiment to collect data on the price of cultural goods and services, now known as the “CUPIX Experiment”. The task of the working group was to review the first results of the experiment and to make suggestions for transferring the exercise out of the experimental phase into an index which can be integrated into the Compendium information system. It was suggested by many members of the group that this new sub-project of the Compendium will be extremely interesting for users of the information system, even those from outside of the cultural field.

The working group acknowledged that it is very difficult to decide on those items which could make up a basket of cultural goods and services across Europe. Which goods are most important and can provide information on both participation in cultural life as well as access to cultural goods and services? What data is already available from existing statistics or from the EUROSTAT?

It was recommended that both market driven and politically defined prices (e.g. cinema and museums) should be included and then be related to the GDP per capita incomes of the different countries to make the prices more comparable. Activities pertaining to the information society were also recommended to be included because of their importance for access to culture more generally. During the open plenary session, Mario Azzopardi pointed to the danger that the new cultural price index includes areas which are only relevant for a small part of the society, e.g. the opera, but other areas that are more popular like carnival or soap operas are not covered and should be considered.

The working group will first investigate which data is already available, how they can form an eventual combined price index and then engage the Compendium authors to provide them with actual information on current prices.

---

<sup>6</sup> This working group was chaired by Rod Fisher. It was opened with a presentation by Mario Azzopardi.

<sup>7</sup> This working group was chaired by Dorota Ilczuk. It was opened with a presentation by Péter Inkei.

### ***WG3 - Cultural Diversity, Social Cohesion, Intercultural Dialogue: Adding New Indicators?***<sup>8</sup>

The Compendium Authors had been asked by both the Council of Europe and the European Ministers via its Opatja Declaration on Intercultural Dialogue to begin collecting information and cases of good practice on the issues of cultural diversity, social cohesion and intercultural dialogue. Participants of the working group recognized the importance of these issues and also acknowledged the work that has been done by the Council of Europe, UNDP, OECD as well as by some governments and NGOs. The participants of the workshop, were to:

- possibly identify several indicators that would be feasible for inclusion in the new grid
- translate decisions into what could be called a “future-oriented strategy for the Compendium” that would cover the three issues in a pertinent manner: conceptually mature and up-to-date, practically useful e.g. with precise indicators and examples of good practice.

In this context, the working group was to consider proposals made by John Foote in a written contribution submitted in Autumn 2003 as well as in an extended presentation made at the beginning of the workshop. A copy of his presentation is accompanying this report.

The Compendium grid was originally constructed on the basis that *cultural diversity* is not linked to just one aspect (trade, intercultural dialogue or minority issues) but should rather be addressed in a horizontal manner meaning that information on this issue can be found in many areas of the Compendium from sub-chapters. For example: on language policy, media policy, policies for official and unofficial minority cultural groups, gender questions, support for artists and arts education, arts associations and cultural centres, cultural industries development programmes or in the sub-section on general policy priorities which mainly refer to principles of freedom of expression, participation in cultural life, protecting cultural identities and fostering creativity. In Foote’s Autumn 2003 contribution, cultural diversity is defined as a term which is most commonly used to:

- signify the pluralistic ethno-cultural identity and origin of cultural creators, producers, distributors and audiences. In this context, cultural diversity is usually considered a demographic or a *people* term;
- refer to *diverse* works of art, film and literature, transmitted by *diverse* media, accessed by *diverse* audiences with *diverse* effects.

Cultural diversity is found in local, regional, state or provincial, national and international spaces and is increasingly reflected in government policies and programs. Indicators of cultural diversity can, therefore, include traditional Census-based population identifiers (age, sex, education, income, residence/place of work, language at home/at work...) and survey results such as opinions, participation rates, knowledge, ethno-cultural origin and identity and belonging/attachment.

Comparative tables on some of these issues have been prepared and added to the Compendium website which allows for future monitoring of developments in this expanding policy field.

Proposals were made to group together some of the relevant sub-sections within Chapter 4 of the Compendium Grid under an umbrella heading of Diversity, Dialogue and Cohesion. Two new categories within the grid were also proposed to begin mapping the main actors responsible for programmes and policies addressing intercultural dialogue and social cohesion respectively as well as to identify examples or case studies which such actors would recognise as “innovative” or “good practice”.

The Working group tried to map the situation and discuss what kind of information is available and how these issues could be dealt with. Reservations were expressed regarding wording, definitions, comparability as well as availability of data and research. The debate mostly focused on the addition of new sub-sections within Chapter 4 on intercultural dialogue (new sub-section 4.2.5) and on social cohesion and cultural policies (new sub-section 4.2.6), especially on the scope of the information being requested and about the sub-titles to be used in this chapter. One suggestion was to change the sub-title heading to “social change and cultural policy”.

---

<sup>8</sup> This working group was chaired by Nina Obu ljen. It was opened with a presentation made by John Foote.

Catherine Roth and Kathrin Merkle reminded participants that these topics were extremely important for the Council of Europe regarding its' mandate and current priorities. Mrs Merkle informed the group about a set of indicators being developed by the DG III (Social Affairs Directorate, Council of Europe) towards the creation of a new Social Cohesion Index. A subset of relevant cultural indicators was also defined, but so far only available in French. The information would be made available in English language to members of the group following the meeting. It had been suggested within the Council of Europe that the Compendium Community of Practice act as a forum through which culture related indicators for social cohesion could be further elaborated. Within the Compendium exercise, a limited number of indicators on cohesion, could help to structure the collection of relevant information/data. Mrs Merkle suggested that based on the excellent work being undertaken in Canada to create a framework for studying diversity, intercultural dialogue as well as social cohesion, a 3-page conceptual framework could be prepared presenting an integrated approach to these issues and guiding future Compendium action.

The editors and Ms Obuljen suggested that the group should continue its discussion online and arrive at 4-5 test indicators for the issues of intercultural dialogue and cohesion which could be tested in as many Compendium countries as possible during 2004. The results could then be posted to a newly created area of the Compendium information system where other "experiments" would also be housed. At the same time, it would also be useful to start collecting information on main actors, their approaches and good practices in those countries where such information is available to the authors. Eventually, and based on the results of the 2004 exercise, the editors and the authors' group would fine tune the new strategy with a view to enhancing the methodological grid in 2005. The group agreed to this approach, underlining that this was all work in progress and that there might be a need to re-formulate categories/questions, especially with a view to policies aimed at intercultural dialogue.

#### ***WG4 - Collecting Data on Public Financing of Culture<sup>9</sup>***

The main discussion centred around a proposal made by Otto Hofecker for the Compendium Community of Practice to adopt a simplified version of the EUROSTAT framework on public financing for culture. The proposal by Mr Hofecker was modified during the workshop session.

Carla Bodo, Jean Cédric Delvainquière and Otto Hofecker – all members of the EUROSTAT exercise on public expenditure of culture - gave a short summary of their final LEG group meeting which took place in Luxembourg in early March 2004. At this moment several countries have adopted the EUROSTAT framework: Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands. In addition, statistics collected via the EUROSTAT framework only include direct expenditure. Indirect expenditure through tax alleviations, reduced VAT rates etc., were not included. The classification of domains is still difficult due to overlapping of areas.

As for the Compendium exercise, the workshop emphasised that wherever possible expenditure should be classified according to current and capital expenditure. Both of these should then be subdivided according to direct expenditure and transfers to institutions/organisations/enterprises and transfers to other levels of government. This is important in order to avoid double counting and to facilitate comparisons of consolidated data. Alternatively, comparisons could be made of gross expenditure.

In the final analysis, the working group proposed the following guidelines for authors to follow when providing statistics in the various sub-sections of Chapter 6:

- Consider all levels of Government (state, regional/provincial, municipal/local etc)
- Consider all cultural expenditure, including for education and communication even if it is not within the portfolio of the Ministry
- Consider actual, not allocated expenditure, where available.

---

<sup>9</sup> This working group was chaired by Carla Bodo. It was opened with a presentation made by Otto Hofecker.

A revised Table summarising the decisions taken during the working group regarding the collection of sector specific data is included in Annex 1.

### “Taking the Compendium into the Future”

Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh, Board member of the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam, introduced the structure and work of the ECF. One of the ECF’s main objectives is the promotion of intercultural dialogue across Europe. Its work rests on three pillars: grants, projects, and policy development. She also introduced the group to the ECF plans to create a Laboratory of European Cultural Co-operation. The LAB, she explained, is not meant to be an “Observatory” but an instrument to actively facilitate cross-border co-operation in the cultural field providing compatible information, best practices and innovative pilot projects – a platform for a public European space.

Andreas Wiesand thanked Kathinka Dittrich for her comprehensive presentation of the ECF and LAB activities and especially for the support her foundation had given to the Compendium project in 2002/3.

Mr Wiesand presented a paper on the future development of the Compendium information system as well as concrete activities that would make up a multi-layer monitoring system for cultural policies and trends in Europe. He first pointed to the achievements of the Compendium and linked them to recent debates about the feasibility of a cultural "Observatory" as recommended by the European Parliament in its 2001 report "The Unity of Diversities: Cultural Co-operation in the European Union". The recommendation dealing with cultural co-operation was quite compatible with the editors’ desire to enlarge the Compendium into a regularly updated monitoring system of cultural trends, policy or legal developments and good practices at the national and on the European level. The Compendium, with its new functionalities, would represent an "integrated" approach to cultural policy research and would possibly complement plans for a "Laboratory of European Cultural Co-operation" as proposed by the European Cultural Foundation.

But what are the next steps? Andreas Wiesand invited the group to come up with additional proposals to develop monitoring activities within the Compendium platform. From his point of view, new enhanced databases would be required that could host and manage a wealth of new content. A preliminary study of the main types of content and the technical infrastructure required for a fast, user-friendly retrieval and monitoring system, identified the need to create additional (interrelated) databases which serve different information needs and partners. These databases could be grouped around the following types of information which would then be inter-linked through the existing Compendium country profiles:

- *Statistical trend monitoring*, including e.g. funding trends or the proposed "CUPIX" index (prices of cultural goods / services);
- *Institutional background information* (e.g. via web links or addresses/functional descriptions, where links are not available). This type of information is presently integrated into Chapters 2 and 9, but may soon require a different approach, especially if details on NGO, regional bodies and European institutional developments are to be added;
- Retrieval of *political documents and laws* in their original version with English summaries, which contain basic information that could be monitored;
- *Case-studies*, i.e.. "good practices" in the field of intercultural dialogue or on the results of diversity-related policies, which are frequently mentioned in political declarations.

Mr. Wiesand also reported that proposals had been made to extend the structure beyond national country profiles to include trans-national and intergovernmental European institutions, foundations, networks and their legal documents, policies and support programmes which could be developed on the basis of the information presented in the "Handbook of Cultural Affairs in Europe"<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Edited by A. J. Wiesand/Zentrum für Kulturforschung in co-operation with the Council of Europe, CIRCLE and ERICarts, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition Baden-Baden 2000.

In a final note, Mr. Wiesand explained that the expansion of the Compendium into a full fledged monitoring tool would require a great deal of additional resources. He has prepared a draft work and financial plan, "Towards a Future 'Multi-Layer' Monitoring System of Cultural Trends in Europe", accompanying this report.

### **Open Discussion**

Costis Dallas welcomed the proposals made by Andreas Wiesand to enrich the Compendium with different layers of content. He emphasised the need to open up the discussion among authors (which could be seen as a "closed group") to different communities including the public. He suggested that this could be accomplished by adding an open forum to the website using, for example, an appropriate community of practice software.

Lluis Bonnet emphasised the nature of the Compendium Community of Practice as a unique asset and the project having advantages as both an intergovernmental exercise as well as a project being led by independent and leading cultural policy researchers from all over Europe. He supported the provisional suggestion made by the editors and some of the authors to improve the training function of the Compendium and proposed co-operation with the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC).

In this regard, the meeting strongly supported the existing linkages with other relevant organisations such as EUROSTAT Leg Groups, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the European Cultural Foundation. Representatives of these groups/organisations participated in the meeting and all welcomed the call for enhanced co-operation and exchange.

Ritva Mitchell informed the group about discussions held with the Eurocities network who are interested to build up a similar "Compendium Structure" on urban cultural policies. This project is in the development stages with first grids being prepared and circulated in Spring/Summer 2004. The work could greatly benefit the Compendium authors and provide links within the individual country profiles to city-level policies and cases of good practice.

Catherine Roth, Council of Europe and Pirrko Rainesalo, Chair of the meeting, emphasised co-operation with such organisations and reported that additional efforts would be made to reach out to the European Union.

Cas Smithujzen reported on a survey he made among the Compendium authors regarding the length of time they needed to prepare the annual updates of their profiles, which was on average 3-4 weeks per year. Clearly all changes to the existing grid should take into consideration both the human and financial resources available to the project (which were quite meagre in comparison to the importance and usability of the project as well as the recognition it receives around the world). Mikko Lagerspetz furthered Smithujzen's concern by warning that one should be careful not to adopt a too ambitious programme so that one would not be able to manage even the updating process once a year. Of course, authors supported the various innovative proposals to enhance the Compendium but also asked that a balance had to be found between the "depth" and "breadth" of the work to be done given the current budgetary framework.

### **Closing**

The meeting was closed by Ms Roth from the Council of Europe and Mr Grolig from the German Foreign Office. Both speakers, in their conclusions stressed the pertinence and quality of the Compendium information system and its researchers' network. Both speakers committed to look at the issue of adequate resources for the project in the future, a project which should stick to its high ambitions.

## ANNEX 1

Table 2: Public Cultural Expenditure: by sector, by level of government, YEAR

Field/Domain/Sub-domain	Direct Expenditure	Transfers (to institutions)	Transfers (to other levels of government)	Total	% Total
<b>Cultural Goods</b>					
Cultural Heritage					
<i>Historical Monuments</i>					
<i>Museums</i>					
Archives					
Libraries					
<b>Arts</b>					
Visual Arts (including design)					
Performing Arts					
<i>Music</i>					
<i>Theatre and Musical Theatre</i>					
<i>Multidisciplinary</i>					
<b>Media</b>					
Books and Press					
<i>Books</i>					
<i>Press</i>					
Audio, Audiovisual and Multimedia					
<i>Cinema</i>					
<i>Radio</i>					
<i>Television</i>					
<b>Other</b>					
Interdisciplinary					
<i>Socio-cultural</i>					
<i>Cultural Relations Abroad</i>					
<i>Administration*</i>					
<i>Educational Activities</i>					
Not allocable by domain					
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100%</b>			

Source:

\*when not allocable by domain