United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Distribution limited

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE
FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF
CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

First session
Ottawa, Canada, 10-13 December 2007

INFORMATION DOCUMENT

EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON THE STATISTICAL MEASUREMENT OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

Montreal, Canada, 27-28 September 2007

FINAL REPORT

In September 2007 an Expert Group Meeting on the Statistical measurement of the diversity of cultural expressions was organized by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) in cooperation with the UNESCO Sector for Culture, as part of the Organization's regular programme activities. The Meeting aimed to map out potential monitoring challenges in relation to the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and, more particularly, to formulate initial recommendations to develop a research agenda for measuring the diversity of cultural expressions. This information document contains the final report as prepared by the Rapporteur, Professor Renato Flores.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This meeting marks the beginning of an exploratory process and was a necessary first step to discuss basic definitions and the possibilities, as well as the limits, of the task of measuring the diversity of cultural expressions. It brought together experts of different nationalities and backgrounds, working on different research fields and advocating different approaches to the very question of diversity, in themselves representative of the "diversity of diversity".

- A first step was made in addressing the question of using statistical evidence in public policy-making, for the purpose of implementing the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

- A broad methodological view on, and pragmatic approach to, measuring the diversity of cultural expressions over the coming years was established. A number of unclear issues requiring further discussion were identified.

- The meeting established the new UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics as the key reference in developing operational definitions.

- Cultural expressions should be examined and measured at all stages of the value chain, from production to distribution to consumption. Measurements should not only look at commoditised cultural goods and services but also "uncommodified" activities (e.g. amateur practices or Internet use). Related statistical tools were debated.

- The diversity of cultural expressions should be measured both at the national and international levels. Relevant definitions to examine social diversity need to be explicitly debated. The enabling environment, i.e. the conditions that allow diversity to flourish, should also be taken into account.

- The meeting identified as an immediate priority determining what statistical information is already available from official sources, and to what extent it is comparable.

- It also recognised as a next priority the definition of a basic set of variables or measurements, in a critical list of sectors, for universal collection. A voluntary open list for additional variables following specific needs of countries could also be of value.

- The experts outlined a number of in-depth research projects to be carried out for a select number of sectors in a given group of countries.

- In developing this preliminary research agenda, the experts decided to adopt an inductive approach, as opposed to aiming for an ideal measurement of all cultural expressions, encompassing more than is currently feasible.

I.   Introduction

This report sums up the discussions and sets out the conclusions of the Expert Group Meeting on the Statistical measurement of the diversity of cultural expressions. The meeting was organized by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) in cooperation with the UNESCO Sector for Culture as part of the Organization's regular programme activities for 2006-07. The main objectives of the meeting were to:

i)   Map out all potential monitoring challenges in relation to the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as the 2005 Convention);

ii)   Identify best practices, review existing methodologies or approaches and available cultural statistics appropriate for measuring diversity of expressions;

iii)   Formulate initial recommendations to inform the deliberations of the Intergovernmental Committee of the 2005 Convention planned for December 2007 in Ottawa, Canada.

Twelve experts from ten different countries, affiliations and outlooks, three staff members from UIS and one staff member from UNESCO's Sector for Culture (see annex for full list of participants) engaged in a two-day brainstorming session on the challenges and possible research avenues in the field of diversity of cultural expressions. Discussions ranged from philosophical aspects and political economy to methodological and statistical issues.

Given the exploratory nature of the meeting, the fact that seven out of the twelve experts were academics, the open language of the 2005 Convention (similar to most multilateral agreements, where words bear often a broad meaning and precise definitions are usually lacking), and the complexity of the issues being tackled, exchanges were initially broad in scope and gradually gained in focus and consistency.

The first day looked at "Measuring diversity: Context challenges and approaches" and began with an opening speech from the Director of UIS, Mr Hendrik van der Pol. Professor Renato Flôres was then chosen as the rapporteur for the meeting. After a brief presentation on the background of the meeting and its potential contribution to the statutory process launched by the First Conference of Parties to the 2005 Convention, the two working documents were presented by their authors. Ms Mirja Liikkanen, who discussed her paper on the statistical implications of the Convention, was followed by Mr Heritiana Ranaivoson who spoke about his theoretical work on a diversity model. Participants were then asked to provide feedback on the documents. In the afternoon session, in an exchange of research approaches and methodologies, the experts presented their individual research interests as well as their vision of the challenges posed by the measurement of diversity.

The second day focused on the "Conceptualisation of the diversity of cultural expressions for statistical purposes: gaps and future perspectives". Following a brief synthesis of the previous day's discussions, participants explored preliminary definitions of two key concepts (cultural expressions and cultural goods, services and activities) central for the development of the diversity model. As an illustration of the difficulty of the subject under discussion, many points from the previous day were reopened, giving the impression that some issues were not completely settled. Ms Lydia Deloumeaux (UIS) then presented the draft update of the UNESCO Framework of Cultural Statistics, which shed light on many key issues. In the afternoon session, the experts set out to define an initial research agenda, agreeing on the

main methodologies to be adopted, the basic set of variables or measurements for universal collection and the issues to be explored, as well as a tentative timeline.

Beneath the apparent state of flux, guidelines were sketched and the group agreed on a common approach. Such a threading line is the subject of this report, which leaves to one side the flow of arguments, vivid commentaries and ripostes that enlivened the debate.

The main conclusions and final recommendations below illustrate the output of the meeting. They are presented in a way that follows the meeting's stated objectives so that its success can be duly evaluated.

II. Conclusions

The conclusions can be divided into five sections.

1.   General statements and questions

a)   ***On terminology and definitions***. Given the nature and the language of the 2005 Convention, an understandable concern about definitions and terms such as *diversity*, *cultural expressions, cultural diversity* or *cultural goods, services and activities*, emerged. Even from a statistical or technical perspective, it was acknowledged that terminology is not neutral but conditioned by the importance attached to each definition or term, which usually results from collective choices or decisions. The solution, for the expert group's purposes, was to concentrate on specific variables and concepts.

For the sake of methodology, the group agreed to follow an inductive approach to the notion of *cultural expressions*, beginning with specific examples, observations and measures. This exercise could allow patterns and regularities to be identified, and therefore tentative hypotheses to be formulated and, ultimately, general conclusions on or definitions of cultural expressions to be developed. This approach is reflected in the research agenda proposed.

Among the many forms of cultural expressions, those covered by the 2005 Convention are expressions of human creativity conveyed through goods, services and activities. *Cultural goods and services* are somewhat clearer concepts. However, no agreement was reached on how to render operational the notion of *cultural activities,* as they often overlap with *cultural practices.* Moreover, if cultural expressions need to be examined and measured in their multi-faceted and value chain dimensions (from production and distribution to consumption), it was unclear to which extent expressions that are not marketed or commodified fell under the 2005 Convention.

b)   Underpinning such attempts to define key terms lay diverse visions of culture which privilege different aspects: cultural identity, collective preferences, quality of life, indigenous/ethnic groups, or even culture as an individual emancipatory experience. Emphasis was also placed on issues of diversity within and between nations. In this regard, the **question of different social/ethnic groups**, as well as that of languages, ethnicity and religion raised much debate on the extent to which the 2005 Convention could or should cover distinctions within national boundaries.

Divergent views emerged, mainly related to the social and political context in each country. Some participants strongly believed that domestic diversity (gender, various social groups, including people belonging to minorities or indigenous peoples) should be an integral part of the measurement. This was reinforced by some country/region experiences (New Zealand, the Netherlands and Catalonia) on data broken down by social/ethnic groups or types of languages. A case in point was the diversity of social and ethnic background of staff and management in cultural institutions. Further discussions will be required to specify and establish agreed measures of diversity at the societal level.

As a necessary first step, experts agreed on the fact that international comparisons where the unit of analysis is (countries) parties to the 2005 Convention could be pursued. The group also concluded that further work was required to start measuring cultural expressions of different social groups within States.

c) Concerning the **theoretical concept of diversity**, the experts agreed on the relevance of variety and balance, and, where possible and meaningful, disparity, as proposed by Andrew Stirling.

Another important conceptual distinction was made and agreed upon between the *supply and consumption of diversity*. With major implications for further research on the diversity of cultural expressions, this distinction entails looking both at diversity as it is made available to different communities, groups and societies, and diversity as it is being used and consumed.

d) Related to the above lies the question of the **limits of the diversity concept.** Experts discussed the different "types of diversity" that would be required to research in order to monitor the 2005 Convention. Different alternatives were suggested, either focusing on geographic diversity (nationality, language, origin of products available) or on demographic diversity (segmentation by ethnic and other social groups). Yet, another possible approach was to draw a distinction between creators/producers, diversity of products/activities, and diversity of consumers as the only way to examine adequately who is able to "express" and how, and who is consuming/participating.

Although it was stated that the 2005 Convention can and should be useful for a local initiative (at a community or county level), there were diverging views on whether it was feasible to consider the particularities of expressions within national boundaries. The question was raised as to whether, when the concern about the protection and promotion of expressions is focused on a specific, or rare, group or activity, it may be more a matter of *singularity (or exception)* than *diversity*.

Furthermore, several experts thought it desirable to include in the scope of any measurement, "amateur" practices in areas like singing, acting or dancing. However, a key issue in dealing with these is how to distinguish the boundaries between professional and amateur, especially in the case of developing countries.

Ultimately, measuring attitudes in general, degrees of social participation and other related behavioural variables, such as "amateur" practices, may be difficult at an international level. Beyond comparability issues, there is the problem of how the discrete categories are defined by the practising social groups themselves.

e) ***On the comparability of the diversity of cultural goods, services and activities***, it was deemed important to distinguish between gathering data than can be compared and comparing the actual impact of policies or policy progress. While it seems logical and pragmatic to consider ways to produce data according to a common standard, this does not imply that the level of diversity in each country is "comparable"; differences in diversity levels measured according to a standard framework do not necessarily mean that one country is "more diverse" than another. There is need to continue discussions on this issue.

f) ***On the commodification of cultural expressions***. Cultural expressions generate cultural goods and services which, in turn, can be (or become) commercial (or not). Since many forms of expressions may be market driven, it is increasingly difficult to separate domestic from international in markets, especially in the context of information networks. Around this debate, a useful technical element emerged that clarified differences between commodified and non-commodified goods, services or activities. Whilst commodified goods can usually be measured through economic/trade statistics, non-commodified goods/services/activities have to be identified through household surveys and qualitative studies.

g) There is a strong ***interaction between (marketed) cultural activities and services and intellectual property rights (IPR),*** which reflects the changing nature and importance of copyright in the digital age. While the connections between copyright protection and diversity are still unclear and ill-defined, IPR may have a paradoxical effect on diversity, either by enhancing it, fostering the creation of products and their distribution or by depleting it, developing new entry barriers for users.

2. Key concepts and dichotomies

a) ***As regards diversity in general,*** the expert group discussed and accepted a basic theoretical model to analyze diversity which draws on developments to measure diversity in other fields, and which has been tested in cultural domains such as publishing and music. The model is ideally based on three components:

> - Variety – number of cultural types (e.g. in book publishing, it refers to different genres of books, such as literature, academic books, comics, art books, etc.)
> - Balance – market share, frequency or any measure of the proportion of a particular type within the population
> - Disparity – a more controversial dimension, not generally accepted or meaningful, and relating to the distance among types

Discussions dwelled on how to deal with the disparity dimension of cultural expressions, as it is usually related to a distance defined within a hierarchy of types. The proposal that efforts should concentrate first on aspects of variety and balance was made and accepted. It was also agreed that it is not realistic to expect one set of indices to fit all cultural activities; methodologies for measuring

diversity are broader than a set of indices. Finally, it was concluded that any model should be applied to both supplied and consumed diversity.

b)   The occurrence or outcome of diversity usually requires an **enabling environment** understood as the set of conditions that allow diversity to thrive and flourish. Questions were raised as to how these conditions could be qualified and measured, as well as on their respective roles in supporting the diversity of expressions.   Several enabling factors were evoked, notably freedom of expression, ethnic diversity and social networks. Moreover, participants proposed to look at the availability of technology, infrastructure, educational capacity of the labour force, representation of social groups within institutions and social and cultural capital.

c)   Important **dichotomies to take into account when measuring diversity**:

Supply of diversity	Demand / consumption of diversity	*For a given good, sector, activity, etc.*
Supply of diversity	Distribution of diversity	*For a given good, sector, activity, etc.*
Stocks	Flows	
Foreign	Domestic	*Origin of goods, services, activities. Important for exports*
Rural	Urban	
Commodified	Non-commodified	*For good/object, activity, expression, etc. Also includes dimensions of paying vs. non-paying or profit vs. non-profit or traditional knowledge vs. commercial knowledge*
Tangible heritage	Intangible heritage	
Physical/analogue	Digital	

Not all the above dichotomies can be applied with the same ease to measure the diversity of cultural expressions. For example, depending on the market or field, assessing the demand for diversity may be extremely complex. However, data on distribution is, in most cases, easier to obtain, and indirect guesses can then be made on how demand is shaped by a given supply-distribution combination.

3.   **Data on diversity**

a)   There are **severe limitations in current data** to measure the diversity of cultural expressions. In terms of data coverage, there is a high availability in some regions (OECD) and lack of data in others, such as Africa.

b)   Concerns were raised about **comparability issues in assessing diversity**, particularly in terms of whether diversity allows for a comparative effort and how to account for differences between countries (e.g. in attitudes in social participation.

c) ***Comparability and the matching of different levels and actors*** pose additional challenges. This issue needs to be explored carefully through specific lines of enquiry, such as the analysis at country level of variables related to diversity in films (TV broadcasting, movie theatre exhibitions, DVD copies, exports), or diversity regarding museums (museums, visitors (locals and foreigners) and total population).

d) Although existing data presents major limitations, there was full agreement on the ***desirability of a study on the availability and comparability of existing data***. This could serve as a benchmark for the future development of indicators and statistical capacity. All official sources, like censuses, household surveys and other studies, should therefore be examined as possible sources of primary and secondary data as well as of more specific data (collected under UIS coordination).

e) ***Ensuring continuity in data collection*** is crucial for any monitoring effort, as well as for the evaluation and assessment of changes in the diversity of cultural expressions (loss of diversity, endangered languages, impact of globalisation, etc.). The fact that many surveys are carried out at irregular intervals results in discontinuities of definitions and indicators. The eventual applicability of the World Values Survey and the Living Standards Measurement Survey was discussed in relation to linking culture with social capital and practices.

4.   Issues for further research

A number of questions related to the causal relations between diversity and other variables should be further explored. The following research topics were suggested:

a) ***Linking specific policies and measures to diversity***. A series of questions were raised: How to ensure the interface between research and policy making geared to the protection and promotion of diversity? How to evaluate the impact of policies and measures developed? Which data would be needed for this? There is almost no standardized accounting or mapping of cultural policies and levels of support, either from national or local governments, for the promotion of cultural expressions. There is therefore a need to study the size and scope of cultural and industrial policies themselves and their effect on diversity. In this regard, a clear distinction was made between the use of evidence and data before and after the development and implementation of policies.

Given the multidimensional nature of diversity and before any implementation of policies and measures, it would be important to define the concrete objectives to be achieved (foster international exchanges in a given economic zone, while promoting openness to other cultures and forms of expression, for instance). Evidence on the actual situation in terms of diversity should be produced to inform *ex-ante* the development of policies and measures. Once policies have been implemented, an *ex-post* evaluation should be carried out to look at the initial measures of diversity and show their evolution in the period under consideration.

b) ***Diversity's impact on people's lives.*** Surprisingly, there may be a negative correlation between engagement in cultural activities and levels of personal satisfaction and individual perception of quality of life. Deriving from this limited example, a key question emerges regarding how diversity may affect people – the

ultimate purpose of protecting and promoting diversity – and what the social and economic consequences of diversity as a social choice may be.

c) ***Role of the digital technology and the Internet on diversity issues.*** Participants observed that the Internet was certainly a medium that deserved particular attention as a key cultural expression. A possible area of research would be to assess, using statistical evidence, the validity of the "long tail" hypothesis whereby the Internet enhances and increases diversity by creating niche markets and allowing works and products with limited demand to thrive or if, on the contrary, the best-sellerisation and star system phenomena predominate and demand remains concentrated on a few products.

5. The final agenda

In the midst of all discussions related to the concept of diversity of cultural expressions, and while grappling with complexity inherent to the joint consideration of markets, technologies and the manifold cultural policies, the group managed to define, in broad terms, an agenda of research efforts to be pursued. It comprises the following points:

1. Actions regarding data collection (to be conducted in partnership with UIS):

a) Define a basic set of variables/measurements for universal collection.

This set should encompass a minimum number of cultural expressions (performing arts, arts and crafts, fairs and markets, for instance) and cultural goods and services (such as music/publishing/cinema, museums and monuments). The experts decided to start with cultural expressions that are highly visible and consumed by broad sections of society, such as cinema, and contrast them with cultural expressions that are important, but whose consumption is less intensive, such as theatre and cultural tourism. It should also take into account a review of existing data from the viewpoint of the 2005 Convention, and the possibility, stated in section 3 above, of using existing national surveys for obtaining additional data on the topics of the Convention. Use of an open list of suggestions or existing data, to be filled in by the Parties, could help in the choice of the final universal variables.

While conducting the review, the availability of statistics related to the *enabling environment* should also be checked. Basic among these are education, labour force profiles, societal diversity and data on actors/institutions; ancillary industries should also be investigated.

Classifications and concepts should be in accordance with those in the forthcoming UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics, though the special needs of the Convention will often require further disaggregations and adjustments. It is expected that this effort should deliver the following outputs:

i) **A manual with definitions of basic concepts and variables** related to the Convention's needs and objectives: the manual should render operational, for measurement purposes, such concepts and variables. Some may appear in the text of the Convention itself, but the idea is not to re-open discussions on interpretation, but rather, in a more modest pursuit, to define a relevant set of terms, taking into account a realistic view of the different

measurement capabilities among partners, and trying to ensure the best possible compatibility among them;

ii) **A report on the availability and potential contribution of existing national and international organizations' statistical databases** for the purposes of the Convention;

iii) **A "Statistical Yearbook**" to be regularly published (although not necessarily on an annual basis) by UIS, keeping track of data relevant to the Convention.

b) Consider the possibility of using, in a selected number of Parties, a survey like the **annual household survey** for an in-depth study of specific questions related to the diversity of cultural expressions.

2. *Actions regarding specific projects, aiming at conveying a deeper view on selected themes of interest*

a) Two topics were selected to be investigated in a specific project – involving two or more countries – to shed light on aspects deemed to be important for encouraging best practices in measurement:

i) **Select a specific policy and evaluate its impact** on the diversity of the related sector or good;

ii) **Carry out an in-depth investigation of the *dynamics of diversity*** in one or several contexts, while also taking into account the role of the corresponding enabling environment. A concrete proposal was made on this:

Investigate, for a subset of partners (chosen with the aid of the UIS), the dynamics of the following sectors: books, theatrical performances, movies and recorded music. The methodology adopted should be the same, in all countries, and two main dichotomies – foreign/domestic and supply/distribution – should be included in the analysis. The priorities and interests of each partner should also be outlined, and their corresponding motivations found. Cases of imbalance – whether in exports or domestic output/production – should be identified and described. The French team of experts can contribute to this effort given their similar research in the French market.

b) Finally, several experts expressed an interest in contributing to the ultimate goals of the meeting, either by proposing specific research projects or by combining them with their own research agendas. After the meeting, Mr van den Broek opened up the possibility of an interesting exercise of developing a matrix containing all possible and desirable choices for measuring the diversity of cultural expressions, both internationally and nationally, following the approach used by the Netherlands Social and Cultural Planning Office. Professor Flôres expressed his interest in pursuing a more in-depth analysis of the UIS dataset on international cultural flows, and Ms Joëlle Farchy the desirability of launching a project to validate statistically the thesis of the "long tail" effect of the Internet on diversity.

III.   Key Recommendations

❖   UNESCO should commission a study on the availability and applicability of current data for monitoring the 2005 Convention;

❖   This study should be followed/complemented by studies/surveys of key sectors on the lines of current UIS surveys on press, broadcast, and cinema, paying attention to the implications for the measurement of the diversity of cultural expressions;

❖   Resources should be made available to continue discussions at the international level in order to produce a set of internationally agreed statistical definitions relating to the diversity of cultural expressions.   Early advice from the Intergovernmental Committee on the extent of the applicability of the 2005 Convention to sub-national groups, such as indigenous peoples and other socio-economic groups, would help in developing recommendations for monitoring arrangements.   In addition, clarification on the distinction between forms of cultural expressions considered as intangible heritage requiring safeguarding and cultural expressions requiring protection and promotion will be most useful.

IV. Conclusion

The differing views and manifold doubts related to concepts, variables and measurements of interest were patent. This reinforces the need and importance of meetings like this one, so that consensus lines can slowly emerge, enabling the partners to pursue a more objective follow up of the results of the Convention, as well as create a background for deeper evaluations. Universal agreement, in a diversity context, would however be a paradox.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Experts

Ms Françoise Benhamou (France) is a Professor at the University of Rouen and the Centre d'économie at the University of Paris 1, Panthéon Sorbonne. She is also a Professor and member of the Scientific Committee at the Institut national du patrimoine in Paris. She is a member of the Executive Board of the Association for Cultural Economics International (ACEI). She has published many books and papers on cultural economics and on the measurement of diversity.

Ms Suzanne Dumas (Canada) began her career at the Institut de la statistique du Québec (ISQ), specializing in economic impact studies using Quebec's intersectoral model. With more than fifteen years of statistics experience in five other ministries, she has been head of statistics at the Ministère de la Culture, des Communications et de la Condition féminine (MCCCF) for six years, liaising with the Observatoire de la culture et des communications du Québec (OCCQ). As a MCCCF representative, she has contributed to many OCCQ publications and is involved in a number of joint OCCQ projects, including one to estimate Quebec's cultural balance of trade. She has published more than twenty economic impact studies in various sectors.

Ms Joëlle Farchy (France) is a Professor of Information and Communication Sciences at the University of Paris 1, Panthéon Sorbonne and a researcher at its Centre d'économie. She is a member of the scientific committee of the forum PlanetAgora, an international association to promote cultural pluralism. She is a high-level expert at the Conseil supérieur de la propriété littéraire et artistique (French Ministry of Culture). She has published several books and papers on cultural economic and on cultural diversity.

Mr Renato Flôres (Brazil) is a Professor at the Graduate School of Economic, at Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro. His interests include development and international trade, economics and philosophy and the use of stochastic methods in economics and finance; areas where he publishes regularly. He holds visiting professorships in France (Institut de Sciences Politiques, Paris), Portugal (Faculty of Law, University of Coimbra and ISEG, Technical University of Lisbon) and is associated to the Institute of Development at the University of Antwerp, in Belgium. His research on cultural diversity focuses on its relation with the WTO's rules and procedures, the historical links of diversity and welfare, and on the measurement and testing of diversity and its economic role.

Mr Desmond Hui (People's Republic of China) is Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research at the University of Hong Kong, consultant and advisor to the British Council Creative Industry Unit and advisor to the UN Inter-Agency Committee on cultural industries statistics in Asia and the Pacific. He is Chief Author and Editor of the *Baseline Study on Hong Kong's Creative Industries* and *A Study on Creativity Index..*

Ms Mirja Liikkanen (Finland) has been working at Statistics Finland since the late 1970s, primarily on culture and media statistics and different surveys, and has been the national coordinator for cultural statistics in Finland since 1991. She is currently a senior researcher at the Unit of Culture, Media and Time Use, which she headed from 1987 to 1997. She was also the Head of Leisure Surveys in 1981, 1991 and 2002. Her research works are focused on edited books and numerous articles on leisure, cultural participation and audiences.

Mr Jim McKenzie (New Zealand) has been employed by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage and its predecessor, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs for fifteen years. Since 2002, he has held the position of Policy Manager at the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. His responsibilities include the management of the government's cultural statistics programme. This programme is a joint initiative with Statistics New Zealand based on the New Zealand Framework for Cultural Statistics established in 1995. He is also responsible for heritage policy issues.

Mr Alex Michalos (Canada) is the Chancellor of the University of Northern British Columbia, Emeritus Professor in Political Science and Director of the Institute for Social Research at UNBC. He has published 22 books and over 95 refereed articles, and founded or co-founded six scholarly journals. He is the President of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO's Sectoral Commission on Natural, Social and Human Sciences, and a past President of Academy II (Humanities and Social Sciences) of the Royal Society of Canada, and of the International Society for Quality of Life Studies.

Mr Heritiana Ranaivoson (Madagascar) is a Ph.D. Student and teacher at the Centre d'économie at the University of Paris 1, Panthéon Sorbonne. His fields of research include cultural diversity, industrial economics, intellectual property rights and the analysis of cultural industries.

Mr J.P. Singh (United States) is an Associate Professor in the Communication, Culture and Technology Program at Georgetown University and Editor of the Blackwell journal Review of Policy Research. He is Chair of the Science, Technology and Environmental Politics section of the American Political Science Association; Ex-President of the International Communication Section of the International Studies Association; and Vice President of the Policy Studies Organization.

Mr Andries van den Broek (The Netherlands) is Senior Researcher at the Social and Cultural Planning Office and leads the research group on 'Time, Media and Culture', which focuses on issues related to time-use and culture. He studied political studies/sciences at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam, political philosophy at the University of Hull and obtained his Ph.D. from the Catholic University of Brabant with a study on the sociological meaning of generations. He is co-author of numerous publications.

Mr Manel Verdu (Spain) has been a technical researcher at the Technical Office of the Department of Culture and Media of the Generalitat de Catalunya (autonomous government) since June 2004. He is mainly responsible for coordinating the production and diffusion of cultural studies, information about the Department of Culture and Media's cultural public policy and studies on public expenditure on culture.

UNESCO / UIS
Hendrik van der Pol, Director of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics
Simon Ellis, Head of Science Culture and Communications, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
Claude Akpabie, Programme Specialist Culture and Communications, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
Lydia Deloumeaux, Assistant Programme Specialist Culture Statistics, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
Guiomar Alonso Cano, Programme Specialist, Section for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, UNESCO