GOVERNANCE

Core Indicators	Description
STANDARD-SETTING FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURE	▶▶▶ *Index of development of the standard-setting framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity*
POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURE	▶▶▶ *Index of development of the policy and institutional framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity*
DISTRIBUTION OF CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURES	▶▶▶ *Distribution of selected cultural infrastructures relative to the distribution of the country's population in administrative divisions immediately below State level*
CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL GOVERNANCE	▶▶▶ *Index of the promotion of the participation of cultural professionals and minorities in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them*

GOVERNANCE

I. RELEVANCE OF THE DIMENSION FOR CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT

This dimension deals with regulations, policies, measures, institutional mechanisms and cultural infrastructures put in place by public authorities to structure dynamic cultural sectors, strengthen cultural processes, and protect and promote cultural diversity in all its forms.[1] It provides an overview of a country's system of cultural governance and institutionality, thus offering a first insight of the conditions under which cultural rights are exercised. The exercise of these rights is considered a crucial element in the process of developing peaceful societies in which individuals have the opportunity to lead full, creative lives in accordance with what they value, and thus in promoting inclusive, rights-based human development.[2]

Cultural governance encompasses, on the one hand, standard-setting frameworks and public policies and, on the other hand, institutional capabilities and cultural infrastructures. All four aspects are recognized as indispensable for the creation of favourable environments that enable culture to fully contribute to human development.[3] Similarly, UNESCO promotes a cultural approach to development, on the grounds that recognizing the cultural specificity of lifestyles, production methods and forms of governance is vital to sustainable development.[4]

Objective of the Dimension

This dimension addresses the degree of commitment and action by the public authorities in formulating and implementing standard-setting, policy and institutional frameworks and making available infrastructures and institutional mechanisms that serve to achieve participatory and inclusive cultural development, implement cultural rights, promote diversity and boost the development potential of culture.

The aim is to evaluate commitments, efforts and results in relation to cultural governance and institutionality and to address the processes through which cultural policies are formulated and implemented and cultural rights recognized and applied.

Thereby, the purpose is to analyse the standard-setting and institutional system and mechanisms of culture with a view to gain a better understanding of the challenges, potential, and shortcomings in this area in light of national development needs.

II. DATA SOURCES

The standard-setting framework indicator is a structural indicator based on instruments of protection for cultural rights and promotion of cultural development and cultural diversity. Consequently, data is mainly available from the databases of United Nations agencies and from national legislative databases and official journals. Some of the most useful sources of international data are:

- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Pages/WelcomePage.aspx
- United Nations Office of Legal Affairs: http://untreaty.un.org/ola
- UNESCO databases: www.unesco.org

---

1. For CDIS purposes, cultural diversity is understood in its broad meaning following the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001). Article 4 of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005) specifies: "Cultural diversity refers to the manifold ways in which the cultures of groups and societies find expression. These expressions are passed on within and among groups and societies. Cultural diversity is made manifest not only through the varied ways in which the cultural heritage of humanity is expressed, augmented and transmitted through the variety of cultural expressions, but also through diverse modes of artistic creation, production, dissemination, distribution and enjoyment, whatever the means and technologies used." Cultural diversity thus means the manifold forms of expression of the cultures of groups and societies that constitute identity and meaning and are a source of inspiration for the creativity of present and future generations. At least 14 UNESCO standard-setting instruments, including conventions, declarations and recommendations, directly or indirectly promote cultural diversity in this broad meaning (see http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/normative-action/cultural-diversity/).
2. A full analysis of the conditions under which cultural rights are implemented and exercised requires a transversal reading of the whole set of indicators dealing with the implementation and enjoyment of such rights, using the CDIS matrix of indicators.
3. "Human development requires more than health, education, a decent standard of living and political freedom. People's cultural identities must be recognized and accommodated by the state, and people must be free to express these identities without being discriminated against in other aspects of their lives." United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Human Development Report 2004* (New York, 2004), p. 6.
4. UNESCO, *World Report 2009*, pp. 178-181.

The indicators for policy and institutional framework, cultural infrastructures and civil society participation in cultural governance are structural and process indicators. Data is mainly available from national legislative and administrative databases, cultural atlases, directories, national studies and official journals.

> **Note:** In view of the availability of data internationally, the proposed indicators are mainly structural indicators (reflecting the ratification and adoption of legal instruments, their incorporation into national law and the existence of basic institutional mechanisms to facilitate the realization of rights) measuring de jure compliance with internationally agreed treaties and principles and, to a lesser extent, process indicators (showing the policy instruments and efforts deployed de facto to implement cultural rights and internationally agreed culture and development principles). It is hoped that the problems identified and the methodologies developed in the course of generating structural indicators will provide a basis for expanding the range of indicators, thus creating more solid process indicators, and if possible, results or output indicators (which measure de facto enjoyment of rights and the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies implemented).

II.   CORE INDICATORS

1. STANDARD-SETTING FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURE

Introduction

As in other areas of intervention, States' positions regarding culture are officially expressed in the standard-setting instruments adopted at the international and regional levels (which embody the obligations entered into and the principles accepted) and those adopted at the national level (which express the efforts made to operationalize and implement them effectively).

Thus, the level of commitment to internationally agreed standards relating to culture, cultural diversity and cultural rights provides a structural indication of the degree of priority given to culture and the approaches and areas of work prioritized by the public authorities.

In addition, national standards, laws and regulations prescribe action to be taken by the different State administrations and other interested parties in the private sector and civil society and provide valuable information on the main objectives of public action in the cultural sphere. They also play a crucial role in creating environments conducive to the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors and the promotion of cultural vitality.

>> Description: *Index of development of the standard-setting framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity*

Purpose

This indicator analyses the following aspects:

- the extent to which the key international legal instruments affecting cultural development, cultural rights and cultural diversity have been ratified and/or adopted, and national legal frameworks established to recognize and implement the obligations accepted;
- the extent to which national legislation and regulations govern the interventions implemented by the State and other interested parties which aim to promote cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective;
- the fundamental goals and approaches of public cultural policy and action.

Definition

Standard-setting framework for culture: This refers to the whole body of culture-related constitutional, legal and regulatory provisions in force in a State, and the international, regional or bilateral treaties and instruments it has ratified.

Calculation Method

This is a qualitative structural indicator presented as a checklist. To assess the degree of development of the standard-setting framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity, a number of basic components have been selected and classified into two major levels.

1. **The supranational or international level**, encompassing a number of legal instruments whose ratification or adoption demonstrates the commitment and resolve of public authorities to implement measures that give effect to the principles, areas of action and rights for which they provide. The ratification of an international or regional treaty or the signing of a bilateral cultural cooperation agreement is not a neutral act. It is evidence of a particular concern about the issue addressed and a determination to take action in that regard. This level, whose overall weighting in the final indicator is one third of the total value, comprises four components:

   a. main binding international instruments affecting the cultural sphere that have been ratified by the State (weighting: 40% of the total for the level);

   b. universal recommendations and declarations (also known as soft law)[5] whose content and principles have been specifically incorporated into national laws and/or regulations and therefore integrated into the country's standard-setting provisions (weighting: 10% of the total for the level);

   c. binding regional instruments ratified by the State, revealing the resolve of the public authorities to strengthen, refine and complete the commitments adopted internationally (weighting: 25% of the total for the level); and

   d. bilateral cultural cooperation agreements signed by the State, reflecting an intention to give high priority to the cultural sphere in bilateral relations (weighting: 25% of the total for the level).

2. **The national level**, focusing on a country's domestic law and standard-setting framework, allows an assessment of whether the national standard-setting framework incorporates and builds on the obligations accepted and principles agreed upon at the supranational level and results in, or at least contributes to, the promotion of cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective. This level, whose weighting is two thirds of the final indicator, comprises two components:

   a. the national constitution, the essential consideration being the extent to which it enshrines the main cultural rights[6] (weighting: 1/3 of the total for the national level); and

   b. national laws and regulations, which provide an overview of the national standard-setting framework organizing the actions of the different State administrations and other interested parties in the sphere of culture, indications of which cultural sectors are deemed to be of national priority for cultural, historical or economic reasons, and valuable information about the main goals and approaches of public policy and action in the cultural sphere (weighting: 2/3 of the total for the national level).

A specific value has been assigned to each of the two levels of the standard-setting framework indicator. Thus, the national level has twice the weight of the supranational level, since its impact on the effective realization

---

5. Even though international recommendations and declarations are considered "soft law" insofar as they have no binding force and are not directly applicable, they can have great legal importance. These standard-setting instruments contain guidelines, political declarations or codes of conduct that exert pressure on States and other actors to adopt a particular approach or to act in a certain way in a specific cultural sphere. Recommendations and declarations can become "hard law" in future binding agreements, or can lead to the creation of ordinary law. It is also possible that they may be taken into account and even integrated into national standard-setting and/or political systems (very often as a result of civil society influence). This last assumption is the one analyzed as part of the CDIS "Standard-setting Framework" indicator.

6. As there is no universally accepted catalogue of cultural rights, the list included in the UNESCO World Report *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue* has been taken as the starting point for CDIS purposes. Cultural rights are therefore held to include: (i) the right to an education that fully respects cultural identity; (ii) the right to participate in cultural life; (iii) the right to benefit from scientific progress and its applications; (iv) the right to protection of moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which the person concerned is the author; and (v) the free exercise of scientific research and creative activity.

of internationally agreed rights and areas of action is decisive. The individual items listed for each of the six components are given the same value when determining the totals for each component."

To construct the indicator, the appropriate sheet in the Data Table for the dimension must be completed by answering yes (inserting "Y") or no (inserting "N") in the relevant cell, in light of the situation and context of the country. The benchmark indicator is thus automatically constructed.

Items that form the Data Table for constructing the standard-setting framework indicator are listed below:

SUPRANATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL
Binding international instruments ratified
Universal Declaration of Human Rights[7]
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
Convention on the Rights of the Child
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions
Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage
Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property
UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects
Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict
Universal Copyright Convention
Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works
Rome Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations
Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms
WIPO Copyright Treaty – WCT
WTO Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights – TRIPS
WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty – WPPT
Brussels Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite
Universal recommendations and declarations (soft law) whose content and principles have been explicitly incorporated/integrated into national laws and/or regulations
UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity
Declaration on the Right to Development
Stockholm Action Plan on Cultural Policies for Development (Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development)
Recommendation Concerning the Status of the Artist
Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
Recommendation concerning the Promotion and Use of Multilingualism and Universal Access to Cyberspace

---

7. In principle, and unless country teams state otherwise in reference to national legal systems, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is deemed to be *ius cogens* for the purpose of constructing this indicator and thus to contain imperative provisions expressing the consensus of the whole international community.

GOVERNANCE

Binding regional instruments ratified
Has your country ratified/adopted at least one binding regional treaty or instrument relating to culture and/or cultural rights (for example, in Europe, the European Cultural Convention of 1954 or the European Social Charter of 1962, revised in 1996; in Africa, the Cultural Charter for Africa of 1977; in the Americas, the 1988 Protocol of San Salvador; etc.)?
Bilateral cultural cooperation agreements signed
Has your country signed a bilateral or regional cultural cooperation agreement with one or more countries in the last three years?
NATIONAL LEVEL
National constitution
Recognition of the cultural diversity and multiculturalism of the country
Incorporation of the obligation to respect linguistic and cultural diversity
Recognition of cultural rights in the constitution: right to an education that fully respects cultural identity
Recognition of cultural rights in the constitution: right to participate in cultural life
Recognition of cultural rights in the constitution: right to benefit from scientific progress and its applications
Recognition of cultural rights in the constitution: free exercise of creative activity; a person's right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he or she is the author
Recognition of cultural rights in the constitution: choice of and respect for cultural identities; access to cultural heritage; free and pluralistic information and communication; cultural cooperation
National legislative and regulatory framework
Existence of a "framework law" for culture
Existence of a sectoral law on heritage
Existence of a sectoral law on books and publishing
Existence of a sectoral law on cinema
Existence of a sectoral law on television and radio
Existence of other sectoral laws dealing with culture (music, visual arts, performing arts)
Existence of copyright legislation
Existence of neighbouring rights legislation
Existence of legislation on non-profit cultural bodies (cultural foundations and associations)
The budget legislation contains an item or items for culture
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees regulating public assistance and subsidies for the culture sector
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees promoting cultural patronage and sponsorship
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees dealing with the tax status of culture (tax exemptions and incentives designed to benefit the culture sector specifically, such as reduced VAT on books)
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees to create a propitious and diversified environment for the development of local cultural industries (e.g. regulations on company ownership, broadcasting content and percentages, levels of concentration in cultural industries)
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees to create favourable environments for culture and creativity: promotion of arts education
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees to create propitious environments for culture and creativity: protection and promotion of artists' social status
Existence of laws/regulations/decrees to create favourable environments for culture and creativity: promotion of participation of minorities in cultural life, promotion of the cultural expressions and traditions of indigenous peoples.
Existence of other laws/regulations/decrees to create propitious environments for culture and creativity: promotion of participation of young people in cultural life, access to cultural venues and infrastructures for disabled people, advancement of women in the field of culture.
Existence of a system of regulations to develop and apply laws enacted in the cultural sphere (e.g. existence of regulations/decrees implementing copyright legislation)[8]

8. The existence of regulatory frameworks for the culture sector is an indication of concrete political resolve to act in the cultural sphere, since such regulations are usually essential for effective application of the law.

Guidelines for the interpretation of results

■ This is a benchmark indicator with a final value ranging from 0 to 1, with 1 representing the ideal or optimum result. When the result obtained is well below the ideal value, special attention should be paid to areas that appear to be less covered and regulated in order to ascertain the possible causes and consequences of these deficiencies in light of the country's situation.

■ The particular characteristics of the issues analysed mean that this benchmark indicator should be treated with caution. Although it does provide a rapid overview of the degree of development of the standard-setting framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity, its value added derives from a detailed analysis of the individual results for each item in light of the country's situation as well as of the degree of linkage between the different standard-setting levels (international, regional, bilateral, constitutional, legal and regulatory) and the existence of positive synergies and/or deficiencies. Some elements that may be worth analysing on the basis of this indicator are:

a. the overall priority given by the State to culture;
b. cultural sectors (e.g., heritage, cinema, books, etc.) treated as being of national priority from the point of view of standard-setting development and/or those that have no regulatory support or only minimal support;
c. the correlation between ratification of instruments and actual results and impacts, when results are analysed in relation to the other indicators of this dimension;
d. the existence of a consistent regulatory framework designed to protect and promote culture and the culture sector from a development perspective.

2. THE POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

For legislation and regulations dealing with culture, cultural diversity and cultural rights to be implemented in an effective and useful way, their constituent principles, rights and obligations must be translated into public policies. Administrative structures with the requisite capabilities must be in place and be gradually strengthened and adapted to changing contexts, so that policies can be implemented and evaluated. Thus, public policies and political and administrative processes, structures, mechanisms and systems are vital to guarantee and promote effective and efficient management in the cultural sphere that nurtures cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective.

In this context, it is believed that cultural decentralization, understood as a combination of administrative, fiscal and political functions and relationships, plays an important role in ensuring that decision-making reflects as far as possible the citizens' needs and desires (thereby nurturing creative potential throughout the country) and in providing equal access to cultural goods and services.

>> Description: Index of development of the policy and institutional framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity

Purpose

This indicator analyses the following aspects:

■ the priority strategies and areas of action forming the action programme established by the public authorities to promote cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective;

■ the main characteristics of the political and administrative system responsible for implementing the standard-setting framework for culture and for formulating, applying and managing cultural policies (type of bodies and position in the hierarchy, main areas of competence, etc.);

■ the degree to which governance of culture is decentralized.

GOVERNANCE

Calculation Method

This is a qualitative structural indicator that is presented as a checklist. To evaluate the degree of development of the policy and institutional framework for the formulation, implementation and management of cultural policies and measures, a number of basic components have been selected and classified into two major levels:

1. **The policy framework**, entailing a review of the main public policies that exist to promote culture, cultural sectors, creativity and cultural diversity and the explicit integration of culture into development plans and strategies;

2. **The institutional framework**, encompassing the institutional mechanisms that provide input into the country's public cultural policies and, in particular, sees to the operationalization and practical management of such policies. The following are analysed in this level: the main bodies responsible for cultural activities, their position in the hierarchy and their political weight; levels of decentralization in the cultural sphere; mechanisms to support cultural sectors and actors; and the priority given to institutional capacity-building.

A specific value has been assigned to each of the two levels of this indicator in consideration of their respective impact and their potential for producing practical effects. Thus, the policy framework has a total weighting of 40% of the final value, and the institutional framework a weighting of 60%. All components included in each of the two levels have exactly the same weighting or value.

To construct the indicator, the Date Table must be completed by answering yes (inserting "Y") or no (inserting "N") in the relevant cell, in light of the situation and context in the country. The benchmark indicator is thus constructed automatically.

The components of the Data Table for constructing the policy and institutional framework indicator are listed below:

POLICY FRAMEWORK
Existence of a national policy/strategic framework/action plan for culture with an allocated budget
Existence of policies/measures to promote access to and participation in cultural life by minorities and other groups with specific needs
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for heritage
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for books and publishing
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for the cinema
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for music
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for television and radio
Existence of sectoral policies/strategic frameworks for other cultural sectors (visual arts, performing arts)
Existence of policies/strategic frameworks for action to promote cultural development and creativity (arts education, social status of artists)
Existence of policies/measures to promote cultural diversity (education and training of cultural audiences, promotion and appreciation of a variety of cultural programmes, encouragement for emerging forms of cultural expression)
Culture included in national development plans, e.g. poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs), the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), etc.

GOVERNANCE

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK
Existence of a ministry of culture or a culture secretariat with ministerial status at the State level
Culture is represented by a State ministry/secretariat in the Council of Ministers (present at regular meetings of the Government)
Existence of a "culture committee" in the parliament/main national legislature
A number of cultural responsibilities are decentralized to regional/provincial authorities, which have a budget for this area (locally allocated or decentralized)
A number of cultural responsibilities are decentralized to local/municipal authorities, which have a budget for this area (locally allocated or decentralized)
In cases of decentralization, the majority of the regional/provincial governments have established special institutional structures for culture (secretariats, departments, etc.)
In cases of decentralization, the majority of the local/municipal governments have established special institutional structures/positions for culture (councillors, directors, etc.)
Existence of organizations dedicated to the promotion of one or more cultural sectors (music, dance, cinema, etc.) at the national level, with public funding in full or in part.
Existence of an authority that regulates audio-visual media (with responsibilities that include granting broadcasting licences, monitoring competition rules, penalizing publishers, distributors and operators of audio-visual services that fail to fulfill their obligations, advisory functions in the area of policies and regulations)
Existence of public systems of subsidies or financial assistance to support the culture sector
Existence of mechanisms and processes for monitoring, evaluating and reviewing cultural policy
Existence of training programmes for officials and/or workers in the public administration for culture in the last 12 months

Guidelines for the interpretation of results:

- This is a benchmark indicator with a final value ranging from 0 to 1, with 1 representing the ideal or optimum result. When the result obtained is well below the ideal value, special attention should be paid to areas and components that are not covered by the policy, institutional and administrative system and mechanisms, and the possible causes and consequences of these deficiencies should be analysed within the context of the country's situation.

- The particular characteristics of the issues analysed mean that this benchmark indicator should be treated with caution. Although it does provide a rapid overview of the degree of development of the policy and institutional framework in place to promote cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective, its value added is derived from a detailed analysis of the individual results for each item in light of the country's situation as well as the degree of linkage between the different levels covered by the dimension (standard-setting, policy, and administrative/institutional) and the existence of positive synergies and/or shortcomings.

- Some elements that may be worth analysing on the basis of this indicator are:

  a. the existence of a consistent and comprehensive policy system or of any gaps and shortcomings, which also provides an indication of the resolve of public authorities to fulfil and implement the standard-setting framework identified above;
  b. the level of overall priority given by public authorities to culture, in view of the extent to which the subject has been developed at the policy level;
  c. cultural sectors deemed to be of national priority and/or those that have no policy and/or strategic support or only minimal support;
  d. the existence of a coherent administrative and institutional framework and mechanisms designed to create favourable environments for the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors and the promotion of cultural vitality;
  e. the main characteristics of the political and administrative system responsible for formulating, applying and managing cultural policies (type of bodies, position in the hierarchy, main responsibilities, political weight, etc.);

GOVERNANCE

f. the extent and essential characteristics of cultural governance and management decentralization processes.

Ultimately, the aim is to consider the inherent potential and challenges of the country's policy and administrative system and mechanisms, ensuring effective management that promotes cultural sectors and processes from a development perspective.

3. DISTRIBUTION OF CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURES

Introduction

Cultural infrastructures play a key role in promoting cultural education, empowerment and participation, fostering integration and reducing exclusion and marginalization while improving citizens' quality of life.

Cultural infrastructures are also crucial in creating environments conducive to the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors and clusters, as they are a source of not only cultural and social but also economic vitality in areas where they are located. Cultural operators face severe difficulties in establishing viable cultural ventures when there is a lack of basic infrastructure, such as access to capital, facilities for creation, production, distribution and dissemination, and training. For these reasons, cultural infrastructure is essential if culture is to "work" for development nationally.

>> *Description: Distribution of selected cultural infrastructures relative to the distribution of the country's population in administrative divisions immediately below State level*

Purpose

To assess the degree of equity, in relation to the population and the administrative divisions in which they reside, of the coverage and distribution throughout the country of the selected cultural facilities and infrastructures for public use with a view to:

- Promote widespread cultural participation and broad, egalitarian access to culture and cultural life;
- Provide an enabling environment for culture professionals and businesses to create, produce, promote and disseminate their work.

Three categories of basic facilities and infrastructures have been selected as a benchmark or proxy, namely museums, libraries and media resource centres, and exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts. This indicator is also a process indicator that provides additional indications of the degree of practical implementation of the standard-setting, policy and institutional framework analysed in the previous indicators of this dimension.

Note: This indicator presents the general distribution of the selected cultural infrastructures by main administrative divisions immediately below State level (regions, provinces or departments, depending on the country), which may mask large disparities in terms of size, internal population distribution, geographical situation, etc. Consequently, the results obtained can and must only be read in light of the country's context and specificities.

Definitions

For constructing this indicator, the following working definitions are proposed:

Administrative division (departments/regions/provinces): A first step in constructing this indicator is to count the number of selected cultural infrastructures active in each of the main administrative divisions immediately

below State level. For the sake of comparability, the recommended benchmark is the ISO 3166-2[9] *international standard for country codes and codes for their sub-divisions*, which lists the administrative sub-divisions of over 230 countries. The name used for the main administrative division immediately below State level varies from one country to another. Thus, the relevant divisions will be departments in Colombia, provinces in Burkina Faso and Viet Nam and regions in the United Republic of Tanzania.

Museum: A <u>non-profit</u>, permanent institution in the service of society and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits sets and collections of historical, artistic, scientific and technical value or of any other cultural nature for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.[10]

Museums play a key role in the preservation, protection, safeguarding, restoration, appreciation, transmission and interpretation of cultural heritage and contemporary creations. Their very existence is an important evidence of public commitment to cultural heritage and creativity, as they embody public resolve and determination to safeguard, protect and promote heritage and artistic creativity by means of tangible action such as the construction and management of permanent infrastructure.

Libraries and media resource centres: Libraries and media resource centres "occur in a variety of societies, in differing cultures and at different stages of development. Although the varied contexts in which they operate inevitably result in differences in the services they provide, and the way those services are delivered, they normally have characteristics in common, which can be defined as follows: A public library is an organization established, supported and funded by the community, either through local, regional or national government or through some other form of community organization, it provides access to knowledge, information and works of the imagination through a range of resources and services and is equally available to all members of the community regardless of race, nationality, age, gender, religion, language, disability, economic and employment status and educational attainment."[11]

On the basis of this definition, libraries and media resource centres are deemed for the purposes of this indicator to be organizations whose main function is to maintain a collection, and through the services of the staff responsible for their management, to facilitate the use of different types of materials and written and audio-visual media necessary to meet their users' information, research, education and leisure needs, and which are funded by public authorities. This definition includes, for example, national, regional, municipal and community public libraries, public university libraries and specialized libraries, among others, but not primary and/or secondary school libraries. Likewise, if a same space incorporates different functions (library, media resource centre, documentation centre) recognized by the present working definition, for the construction of the indicator, only one infrastructure should be counted for the category of libraries and media resource centres.

As the 1994 IFLA/UNESCO Manifesto states: *"The public library, the local gateway to knowledge, provides a basic condition for lifelong learning, independent decision-making and cultural development of the individual and social groups".* Consequently, libraries and media resource centres are considered to be basic cultural facilities when evaluating cultural infrastructures available to citizens.

Exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts: For the purposes of this indicator, exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts mean physical cultural facilities (such as venues, buildings or physical sites) intended specifically for cultural use, set up and fitted out for this purpose, and devoted mainly to the dissemination, distribution and public performance of theatre, poetry, live music, dance, circus, puppetry, song and variety shows subsumed under Performance and Celebration category.[12] These facilities must have a minimum of 100 seats for spectators. The definition includes indoor venues (such as theatres and auditoria), permanent outdoor sites equipped, set up and fitted out for the performing arts (such as open-air amphitheatres) and arts centres, cultural centres and other multi-domain and multi-purpose cultural venues dedicated to the dissemination of various types of cultural activities as part of their programming (such as performances,

9. See: http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes.

10. This working definition draws on the definition in ICOM, Statutes (2007), http://icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition/.

11. *The Public Library Service: the IFLA/UNESCO Guidelines for Development 2001.*

12. *UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics*, UIS (2009), p. 26.

GOVERNANCE

exhibitions and screenings), provided that they comply with the characteristics and conditions described.[13] Cinemas are not included in this definition, however.

If a same space incorporates various venues for the performing arts, as recognized by the present working definition, for the construction of the indicator, only one infrastructure should be counted for the category of exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts.

This working definition is supply-based and focuses on venues and sites used for the exhibition and dissemination of the performing arts, and not on cultural products, such as concerts or plays, or cultural establishments, such as dance or theatre companies, even when they are wholly or partly financed from public funds. Likewise, it does not include training, research or documentation centres, institutes or firms operating in the performing arts sector if their main activities and functions do not include the dissemination and exhibition of performing arts events in a dedicated venue that comply with the characteristics and requirements indicated.

Data Sources

- Registry/directory/listings of cultural infrastructures and national, regional and international cultural registry/directory/listings.
- National cultural information systems.
- Countries' internal directories. Some directories are online. In other cases they have been published and can be requested, for example, from culture ministries.

Calculation Method

To construct the indicator, the relevant cells must be completed on the appropriate sheet of the Data Table stating, for each of the country's administrative divisions as identified in accordance with the "Definitions" section (provinces, departments or regions):

- the name of the administrative division considered (name of the province, department or region concerned);
- numerical values for cultural infrastructures (i.e., the number of museums, libraries and media resource centres, and exhibition venues dedicated to the performing arts) open, operational and accessible to the public;
- the number of inhabitants, according to the most recent national census.

> **Note:** Do not forget to refer to the working definitions adopted by the CDIS to identify the administrative divisions and cultural infrastructures selected for consideration.
> Likewise, when one cultural infrastructure fulfills the requirements for more than one of the listed categories of infrastructures in the working definitions, it should be counted in each of these categories. For example, if a cultural center incorporates both a library and an exhibition venue, according to the working definitions, this cultural center should be counted once as a library and once as an exhibition venue.

On the basis of these data, the following are automatically constructed in the Data Table:

- The percentage of the country's total population living in each of the country's administrative divisions relative to the country's total population;

- The percentage of museums, libraries and media resource centres and venues dedicated to the performing arts present in each of the country's administrative divisions as a share of all the country's museums, libraries and media resource centres and venues dedicated to the performing arts;

---

13. The working definition proposed draws heavily on the final report "Les infrastructures culturelles dans la municipalité; Nomenclature, recensement et état des lieux" compiled by Serge Bernier and Pascale Marcotte for the Ministry of Culture, Communications and the Status of Women, the Culture and Communications Observatory of the Quebec Institute of Statistics and Les Arts de la Ville (2010).

■ The relative standard deviation for each of the three categories of selected cultural infrastructure, as well as the average relative standard deviation across all categories of cultural infrastructure, which serve to measure the variation of results from the mean and thus as a proxy indicator for the equality of distribution across administrative divisions and by population.

Guidelines for the interpretation of results

■ This is a descriptive and exploratory indicator whose purpose is to evaluate levels of equity in the distribution of the selected cultural infrastructures by administrative division and by population. The results can be used, in particular:

a. to evaluate the overall harmony and homogeneity of coverage of the selected cultural infrastructures around the country;
b. to identify the administrative divisions (and the populations living in them) that are in a situation of disadvantage;
c. to identify the administrative divisions and population groups that have higher levels of coverage;
d. to visualize the situation of provinces, departments or regions with particular conditions (outliers) that call for a specific effort of interpretation and contextualization (for example, a region with large internal disparities in the distribution of population and the selected infrastructures may obtain a relatively low score when in fact there are areas within it that have a level of infrastructure coverage by population far above the average and other areas with a level far below the average; and vice versa).

■ The average relative standard deviation, as well as the relative standard deviation for each of the three categories of selected cultural infrastructure, serve to measure the variation of results from the mean and thus act as a proxy for measuring the equality of distribution across administrative divisions and by population. A situation in which the types of infrastructure are distributed among the population with perfect equity would yield a ratio of 1. For example, if the administrative division concerned is home to 10% of the country's population and has 10% of all its libraries, it will have a ratio of 1, and this division can thus be said to have balanced infrastructure coverage relative to its population, in comparison with the rest of the country. However, if an administrative division has 30% of the country's population and 15% of its libraries, the ratio will be 0.5 (less than the 1 which provides the standard of perfect equity) and can be considered as disadvantaged. Conversely, an administrative division that contains 10% of the country's population and 30% of its libraries will have a ratio of 3, and will thus clearly be very well placed relative to the rest of the country.

■ In interpreting the results, it is advisable to pay special attention to the situation of regions/departments/provinces whose levels of selected cultural infrastructures coverage are low in relation to the percentage of the population they represent and to other regions, and which are thus in a situation of relative disadvantage. It should be recalled once again that this indicator evaluates overall levels of equality in the distribution of cultural infrastructures by population and territory and that the goal will not always necessarily be an absolutely equitable distribution of infrastructures. So that, to raise their significance and relevance, differences and imbalances must be interpreted and contextualized in light of the country's situation as regards geography, policy, occupation of the territory, etc.

■ It should also be emphasized that this indicator provides information about the relative level of disadvantage of parts of the country's territory and the population living there, but particularly about overall inequalities in terms of distribution of the coverage of the selected cultural infrastructures throughout the country in relation to the percentage of inhabitants living in each administrative division. Therefore, this indicator requires a substantial effort of contextualization for its interpretation. In fact, the interpretation of the result obtained will differ depending on national contexts, and a qualitative analysis of the different elements composing it will be required to obtain a fuller picture of the degree of coverage and access to basic cultural infrastructures by territory and population. For example, in many countries it is possible that there will be outliers that ought to be analysed specifically in light of the country's situation. This will be the case, for example, for a region that contains the State's capital. It can be presumed that the region will have a larger percentage of cultural infrastructures than other regions of the country (15% of the total) and at the same time a proportionately larger percentage of the population (25% of the total). It can be

consider that for the most part, it would be a mistake to regard these regions as overall disadvantaged. One possible explanation to be analysed in greater detail using supplementary data would be the existence of major disparities within this administrative division itself with, for example, very well equipped area, containing 10% of all national infrastructures but only 5% of the country's total population, and another containing only 5% of the total infrastructures but 20% of the country's total population. The result for the administrative division considered will be low overall, when it actually contains the most favoured area in the whole country. The average tends to blur differences and extremes, which is why contextualization and interpretation of results are needed.

- Similarly, in interpreting the results it must be borne in mind that in cases where the number of selected infrastructures in the country as a whole is homogeneous but extremely low, it may appear that an encouraging result has been obtained, with low levels of inequality in coverage and access between regions and citizens, whereas in fact all regions and all citizens are in a situation of deprivation and marginalization because the cultural infrastructures network is virtually non-existent throughout the country. Similarly, if the incremental number of infrastructures increases in all administrative divisions and distribution remains unchanged, levels of inequality in the distribution will not change either, even though the level of coverage and overall access to cultural infrastructures have increased in absolute terms.

- Some further elements that may be worth analysing on the basis of this indicator are:

  a. the level of equity in the distribution of each of the types of cultural infrastructure analysed, and of all of them together, which may provide interesting pointers to matters such as the level of cultural decentralization;
  b. differences of coverage for the different types of cultural infrastructures by administrative division;
  c. cultural infrastructures by region and population, thereby identifying areas that may be disadvantaged as regards of coverage of cultural infrastructures; etc.

- Lastly, it is worth collating the data obtained from this indicator with other results from the CDIS matrix, such as data on participation in cultural activities (Social Participation dimension) or household spending on cultural goods and services (Economy dimension).

4. CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL GOVERNANCE

Introduction

Participation and access are essential to cultural empowerment,[14] to the implementation and enjoyment of human rights and to progress towards inclusive human development. The promotion of pluralism and cultural diversity largely depends on opportunities for access to and participation in policy and decision-making. Consequently, the participation of minorities and marginalized groups in shaping the standards and policies that regulate and influence their cultural life is an expression of the right to take part and participate in cultural life, as recognized by Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,[15] the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities[16] and a number of human rights instruments adopted at the international and regional levels.[17] Thus, the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities explicitly acknowledges their right to participate in decision-making and requires that national policies and programmes take legitimate interests of people belonging to minorities

---

14. Understood as a dynamic, evolving process whereby individuals are gradually able to develop knowledge, skills and capabilities for understanding, appreciating and enjoying different forms of cultural and artistic expression in a critical and open spirit.
15. "Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits."
16. The rights of people belonging to minorities is set out and defined in the 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. The Declaration is the first complete universal instrument to establish norms in this area, which include the right to enjoy their own culture, to participate in cultural life and in decision-making about the minority to which they belong, and to establish and maintain their own associations.
17. For example, see Article 15, paragraph 1 (a), of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and resolution 10/23 of the Human Rights Council, which highlight three main interrelated components in the right to participate in or form part of cultural life, namely (a) participation in cultural life, (b) access to it and (c) opportunity to contribute to it. This right also includes the right not to participate.

into account. In regard to cultural policies and measures, the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions promotes participatory systems of governance that are open to a variety of voices, including civil society,[18] in policy-making and in the design and implementation of measures and programmes so that they take into consideration the particular conditions and needs of all members of society. Similarly, the Convention urges Parties to create in their territory an environment that encourages individuals and social groups to create, produce, disseminate, distribute and have access to their own cultural expressions, paying due attention to the special circumstances and needs of [...] various social groups, including persons belonging to minorities and indigenous peoples.[19]

One of the intrinsic characteristics of culture is that it involves a large variety of actors (artists, creators, audiences, professional associations, civil society, legislators and decision-makers, cultural industries, etc.). Consequently, and looking beyond the participation of minorities and marginalized groups, culture requires broadly based participatory processes to formulate and implement useful and effective policies and measures that meet the needs of the individuals and communities for which they are intended. On this point, the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions acknowledges the fundamental role played by civil society in protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions and the importance of encouraging its active participation in the preparation, management, evaluation and implementation of cultural policies and measures. [20] These indispensable processes of participatory cultural policy-making can also serve as a model for other policy areas, such as the environment and education.

Good cultural governance practices should encourage civil society participation in decision-making. This can be achieved through specific legislation or institutional agreements and mechanisms that ensure civil society representation, thus effectively promoting pluralism and cultural diversity, and combating socio-cultural exclusion. The aim is thus to ensure that representatives of civil society, and culture professionals and minorities in particular, are suitably represented, consulted and have a say in decisions that affect them so that, as far as possible, they feel a sense of shared responsibility for these decisions.

>> Description: Index of the promotion of the participation of cultural professionals and minorities in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them

Purpose

This indicator evaluates the opportunities open to civil society – and to culture sector professionals and minorities in particular – to participate in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them, both nationally and at the regional/municipal/local level.

To this end, the existence or non-existence of specific institutional structures and mechanisms to promote civil society involvement in cultural governance is used as a proxy, and their main characteristics are examined.

Definitions

For constructing this indicator, the following working definitions are proposed:

Minorities: Article 1 of the 1992 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities refers to minorities on the basis of their national or ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity and provides that States shall protect their existence. There is, however, no internationally agreed definition of which groups constitute minorities.

---

18. Article 3 of the Operational Guidelines of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions dealing with the role and participation of civil society provides: "For the purposes of this Convention, civil society means non-governmental organizations, non-profit organizations, professionals in the culture sector and associated sectors, groups that support the work of artists and cultural communities."
19. See Article 7.1 (a) "Measures to promote cultural expressions" of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.
20. See Article 11 "Participation of civil society" of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

To construct this indicator, the following working definition of "minorities" has been adopted: "The term 'minorities' [...] designates marginalized or vulnerable groups who live in the shadow of majority populations with a different and dominant cultural ideology. These groups share systems of values and sources of self-esteem that often are derived from sources quite different from those of the majority culture. The term "minorities" embraces four different categories of groups:

- Autochthonous or indigenous peoples, whose line of descent can be traced to the aboriginal inhabitants of the country having a particular relationship with their territories and an accentuated feeling of ownership of what they consider to be their land;
- Territorial minorities, groups with a long cultural tradition who have lived in national contexts where minorities are numerous [...];
- Non-territorial minorities or nomads, groups with no particular attachment to a territory;
- Immigrants who will tend to negotiate collectively their cultural and religious presence in a particular society."[21]

Organized representatives of culture sector professionals: To construct this indicator, a broad working definition applicable to very diverse national contexts is used. The term "organized representatives of culture sector professionals" is thus used to mean any association, union, non-profit organization, network, non-governmental organization, guild, foundation, corporation or organized representative structure independent of government and legally constituted or at least publicly recognized (by being affiliated to an international network, federation or association, for example) whose main function involves the defense and promotion of the interests of its members and the attainment of aims relating to its activities. It may be general in character (cultural associations) or sectoral (such as professional associations of arts managers, cultural educators, producers or museologists).

Calculation method

This is a qualitative process indicator presented as a checklist. To rate the degree to which public authorities promote participation by civil society in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern it, a number of basic components have been selected and classified into two major segments, then assigned an equivalent weighting.

1. **Participation by organized representatives of minorities** analyses, both nationally and at the regional/municipal/local level, the existence of consultation and participation mechanisms for minorities and the main characteristics of these mechanisms.

2. **Participation by organized representatives of culture sector professionals** analyses, both nationally and at the regional/municipal/local level, the existence of consultation and participation mechanisms for culture sector professionals and the main characteristics of these mechanisms.

To construct the indicator, it is necessary to complete the relevant Data Table by placing an "X" in the "Reply" cell provided in accordance with the context and situation of the country. The benchmark indicator is thus automatically constructed.

The components of the Data Table for constructing the civil society participation indicator are listed below:

---

21. *Our Creative Diversity*, p. 71

PARTICIPATION OF MINORITIES
National level
Are there institutional mechanisms or organic structures (periodic meetings, committees) providing a framework or neutral forum for dialogue between representatives of minorities and administration officials in processes related to the formulation, management, implementation and/or evaluation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them? *These mechanisms or structures could be exclusively dedicated to culture or could be dedicated to broader issues that may treat culture as a thematic or transversal issue.*
Can they be considered active (official meeting held in the last 24 months)? Or not (no official meeting held in the last 24 months)?
Are they permanent in nature (e.g. committees)? Or ad hoc (e.g. meetings)?
Are their resolutions binding? Or are they consultative?
Regional/municipal/local level
Same elements at the regional/municipal/local level
PARTICIPATION OF CULTURE PROFESSIONALS
National level
Are there institutional mechanisms or organic structures (periodic meetings, committees) that provide for participation by representatives of culture sector professionals (guilds, associations, networks, etc.) in processes related to the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them?
Can they be considered active (official meeting held in the last 24 months)? Or not (no official meeting held in the last 24 months)?
Are they permanent in nature (e.g. committees)? Or ad hoc (e.g. meetings)?
Are their resolutions binding? Or are they consultative?
Regional/municipal/local level
Same elements at the regional/municipal/local level

Guidelines for the interpretation of results

- This is a benchmark indicator ranging from 0 to 1, with 1 representing the ideal or optimum result. In all cases, interpretation of this indicator requires a substantial contextualization effort. In fact, the interpretation of the result obtained will differ depending on the national context, and a qualitative analysis of the various components of the indicator will be required to obtain a fuller picture of the extent to which public authorities promote civil society participation in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them. In particular, it is advisable to analyse the two constituent segments of the indicator separately to identify the characteristics and peculiarities of the consultation and participation mechanisms for culture sector professionals and minorities at the national level as well as at the regional/municipal/local level.

- Some factors that may be worth analysing on the basis of this indicator are:

  a. the overall level of priority given by public authorities to the promotion of a participatory system of cultural governance;
  b. the peculiarities, challenges, shortcomings and/or progress of efforts to promote the participation of culture sector professionals and of minorities in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them;
  c. the existence or non-existence of systems, mechanisms and models that help to ensure that culture sector professionals and individuals belonging to minorities are properly represented and have a say in decisions concerning them; and
  d. any differences in treatment between the national and/or regional/local/municipal level.

GOVERNANCE

////////////////////// **GUIDELINES FOR THE OVERALL ANALYSIS OF THE DIMENSION** //////////////////////////

■ A comparative reading of the indicators of the Governance dimension yields information on the correlation between the ratification of international instruments, the development of a national standard-setting and regulatory framework mechanism, the formulation of policies to implement it and the organization of an institutional and administrative system, including cultural infrastructures, to encourage participation by all. A comparative reading thus provides an overview of the model of governance as well as of the "density" of the cultural institutionality currently operating, which can be of assistance in identifying its strengths and weaknesses and in analysing the connections between the different links of this model of governance.

■ Correlating the results of the indicators of this dimension with other CDIS indicators is also crucial. A transversal reading of the indicators of the Governance dimension together with other indicators for dimensions, such as Economy, Social Participation, or Communication, yields valuable information on the extent to which cultural rights have been enshrined and are being implemented. Likewise, a detailed analysis of particular components of the indicators for this dimension can be useful for completing or illustrating the results of indicators for other dimensions. If the Economy dimension reveals that a particular sector is contributing strongly (or particularly weakly) to GDP or employment, for example, it may be worth studying its level of coverage in standard-setting and policy terms and the existing infrastructures in order to obtain pointers to its real development potential.