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SUMMARY REPORT

The second Experts’ Meeting on Cultural Policy brought together a group of 23 policymakers, researchers and arts administrators from Asia, Europe and Australia, alongside the 5th World Summit on Arts and Culture, to provide a bi-regional perspective on priority areas in arts and culture and explore areas of mutual interest for intra-Asia and Asia-Europe dialogue.

The gathering was organised in the framework of the WorldCP-Asia, a major new initiative to document the arts and cultural policies of Asia. The initiative is a central component in the development of WorldCP – International Database of Cultural Policies, which was launched at the 4th General Assembly of International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) in Melbourne on 3 October 2011. The launch was held on the eve of the 5th World Summit on Arts and Culture (3-6 October 2011, Melbourne), which was jointly hosted by IFACCA and the Australia Council for the Arts, in partnership with Arts Victoria.

The gathering in Melbourne marked the second in the series of Experts’ Meetings on Cultural Policy organised to stimulate dialogue between governments and civil society actors and facilitate the building of a community of practice comprising of authors of the WorldCP profiles.

The meeting carried forward the deliberations on the Asian chapter of the WorldCP project begun at the 8th IFACCA Asian Chapter meeting (6 October 2011, Melbourne) as well as the discussions on priority areas in arts and culture in Asian...
countries initiated at the first Experts’ Meeting on Cultural Policy (27-28 July 2011, Seoul). It also attempted to identify areas of mutual interest for intra-Asia dialogue on cultural policy in 2012 within the framework of the WorldCP project. Creative industries, heritage and arts education were identified as three key areas of common relevance for future dialogue.

The 2nd Experts’ Meeting was jointly organised by IFACCA, the lead partner of the WorldCP project and the regional secretariat for WorldCP-Asia comprising of the Asia-Europe Foundation (AŠEF), the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea and the Korean National Commission for UNESCO.

Arts and Culture in Asia: Issues, Priorities and Trends

The 2nd Experts’ Meeting carried forward the discussions on issues and trends in arts and culture that began at the Roundtable on Cultural Policy Issues and Trends, chaired by Anupama Sekhar, Project Manager, Cultural Exchange, Asia-Europe Foundation as part of the first Experts’ Meeting on Cultural Policy (27-28 July 2011, Seoul). National priorities and ground realities in arts and culture were discussed in the context of Singapore, Indonesia, Laos, China, Hong Kong, Thailand, Mongolia and India.

Singapore

In Singapore, specific emphasis is laid on the creative industries, highlighted June Gwee, Principal Researcher, Civil Service College, Singapore and the designated author of the cultural policy profile of the country for the WorldCP-International Database of Cultural Policies. The economic imperative is given priority, she pointed out. Another area of focus is arts education. Most recently, Singapore has seen the establishment of the School of the Arts (SOTA), the country’s first independent, pre-tertiary arts school.

Indonesia

Speaking of the Indonesian situation, Linda Hoemar Abidin, Chair of Executive Board of the non-profit organisation, Kelola, explained that the country had no written cultural policies. Regional arts councils existed; however, policies often changed with the membership of the councils. At the federal level, the Ministry of Tourism and Culture does support artists; however, policies are often ad hoc. Tax incentives exist for contributions to social causes and sports in Indonesia; this includes a 5% exemption for contribution to the arts as well. The government is presently preparing the cultural policy of the country, but there is little consultation with civil society in this regard.
**Laos**

In Laos, legislation exists for the management of national heritage, but not for “culture” as a whole, explained Viengkeo Souksavatdy, Deputy Director General, Heritage Department, Ministry of Information, Culture & Tourism, Laos. Heritage remains a priority in the country and Laos is home to two UNESCO-designated World Heritage Sites (the town of Luang Prabang and Vat Phou and associated ancient settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape). The responsible Ministry covers three areas, namely information, tourism and culture.

The protection of heritage vis-à-vis the challenges of industrialisation and development remains a central challenge. Lack of human resources and training in cultural resource management is a key gap that is beginning to be addressed.

There is interest in international co-operation and one key focus area is the prevention of illicit trafficking of movable cultural heritage in partnership with neighbouring countries.

**China**

Outlining the key priorities of the Ministry of Culture of People’s Republic of China, Li Hong Qiong, Vice Director, Department of Policy & Law highlighted the prioritisation of cultural industries in the upcoming five year plan of the country. The local film industry remains a priority with 51% of films screened in the country being locally made, added Jia Lei Lei, President Assistant, Chinese National Academy of Arts and Director, Cultural Development Strategy Research Centre. Film production has risen ten-fold in the last decade, he shared.

Creativity and participation of the public in the arts also remain high on the list of the government’s priorities.

In terms of international co-operation, collaborative arrangements exist between China, Japan and Korea in the area of cultural industries.

**Hong Kong**

In Hong Kong, a special administrative region of PRC, 1% of government expenditure is allocated for arts and culture. This funding goes directly and indirectly towards the management of festivals, cultural centres, archives etc.

The development of a cultural district in West Kowloon is currently underway and is expected to open in 2016 with up to 15 new venues, shared Rebecca Yu, Senior Manager (Research & Development), Leisure and Cultural Services Department of the government of Hong Kong.
Given these developments, there is an increasing demand for qualified human resources in the arts. As a result, building up ‘software’ is a major priority and plans are underway to enhance capacities of small and medium organisations as well as to train arts administrators/managers.

**Thailand**

Cultural heritage remains a priority in Thailand. According to Kulwadee Charoensri, Advisor to the Ministry of Culture, Thailand, a major challenge was maintaining the balance between the development of “sufficiency” and “creative” economies in the country.

**Mongolia**

The preservation and promotion of cultural heritage is a priority in Mongolia as well. With the start of the democratic process and the opening of the economy in 1990, greater stress has been laid on freedom of artistic expression and on building cultural institutions. The new cultural policy of the country places people at the centre, said Ariunaa Tserenpil, Executive Director, Arts Council Mongolia. Hence, access to culture for all citizens remains high on the agenda.

Support to and promotion of creative industries is also a national priority. As is the promotion of international co-operation in arts and culture.

**India**

Highlighting the challenges of heritage preservation in the face of development, Anmol Vellani, Executive Director, India Foundation for the Arts and newly-appointed Regional Editor for WorldCP-Asia pointed to some existing gaps in India: lack of policy at the municipal level and absence of listings for heritage sites/buildings. He indicated that it would be interesting to look at the community level for best practices and cited the example of South Mumbai, where the heritage zone has been successfully revitalised with active community engagement.

Arts policy is impacted by taxation policies in India, he pointed out, which in turn affects arts philanthropy.

**Areas of Mutual Relevance and Common Interest**

ASEF stressed that the building of a community of practice and a knowledge network on cultural policy were among the broader objectives of the WorldCP-Asia project. In this context, the Experts’ Meetings played an important role in the identification of areas of mutual relevance and common interest around which dialogue and exchange of best practices could be developed.
The diversity of Asia makes prioritisation difficult at the continental level, acknowledged Timothy Curtis, Head, Culture Unit, UNESCO Bangkok. However, some common areas of interest do exist. Among them is the development of creative industries. The move from manufacturing to knowledge economies has foregrounded the creative industries and the creative economy, Curtis pointed out. He also underlined the need to better understand what ‘culture’ and ‘cultural industries’ mean in different countries and contexts. To this end, cultural policy becomes important, he stressed.

The protection and preservation of heritage in the face of rapid economic growth is another common challenge for several Asian countries.

Education and capacity building in arts and culture emerged as a third common area of interest.

**WorldCP: Research Process**

Korea and Singapore have begun work on their national policy profiles for inclusion in the WorldCP and WorldCP-Asia databases in 2012. Mr. Anmol Vellani, Executive Director, India Foundation for the Arts has been appointed as the Regional Editor for WorldCP-Asia.

In view of the commencement of research by some Asian countries, Ritva Mitchell, President, ERICarts - European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (and co-author of the cultural policy profile of Finland), shared her experiences both as researcher and co-ordinator of the European Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends. Profiles created for the WorldCP database are meant to highlight “the ABC of arts and culture” in the country, she stressed; they are not an academic exercise, but should reflect ground realities. The policy profiles must not merely reflect policy documents, but should serve as examples of evidence-based research.

The policies documented in the national cultural profiles should not only reflect explicit cultural policies, Mitchell noted, but include implicit ones as well. Implicit cultural policies such as tax, trade or labour policies, which indirectly impact cultural professionals, goods and services are equally significant, she acknowledged. While much emphasis was laid on explicit policies in the past, the importance of implicit policies on arts and culture is currently being recognised. Timothy Curtis also emphasised the growing importance of policies made by Ministries such as trade on the direction and shape of arts and cultural policies at the national level, in addition to those specifically made by the Ministry of Culture.
Mitchell stressed the common relevance of certain global issues in the arts and culture for both Europe and Asia. Differences in priorities did exist within Europe when the European Compendium process began nearly two decades ago, she pointed out. Cultural policy models in Europe are diverse as well, she acknowledged.

The key areas proposed by the structure of the WorldCP database will be relevant for all countries, highlighted Mitchell. The issues are relevant to all; the differences are in the details, she elaborated. The proposed structure will enable comparative analysis.

Speaking of the uses of the WorldCP database, Mitchell emphasised its importance as a teaching tool for cultural policy and arts management courses and as the basis for research projects (for instance, the impact of taxation on the arts, social security systems for artists and cultural professionals).

In the course of the discussions on the development of WorldCP-Asia, the importance of independent researchers was highlighted. In the Asian context, it was anticipated that some countries may choose to work with research teams instead of individual researchers.

The issue of regional cultural policy profiles was also briefly discussed. Regional profiles are being written in the European context, as in the case of the Catalonia. However, these profiles have not yet been included in the European Compendium, which remains a database of national profiles. In the Asian context, regional profiles could be considered for Hong Kong and Macau. Some European cities are also trying to develop their own policy profiles, as cities are increasingly emerging as important funders of arts and culture.

With the launch of the WorldCP database and the start of the research process in pilot countries in Asia, discussion focused on some of the challenges faced or anticipated by authors of the national cultural policy profiles. Dr. Kiwon Hong, Chief Researcher, Korea Culture and Tourism Institute and the author of the profile of South Korea highlighted problems of definition with regard to ‘culture’ in the specific context of the country and the political system therein. She also highlighted the need for the national profiles to include the reality of the arts and culture sector in the country as against merely reflecting policy documents. The challenge, she acknowledged, was to balance the ‘dry’ information related to policy with the ground realities. Another potential challenge in some contexts would be balancing independent views with the official government position.
**WorldCP-Asia as an Opportunity for Dialogue**

Beyond the commissioning and inclusion of profiles in the *WorldCP* database, a key focus of the project remains the building of a ‘community of practice’ among the authors. To the end, regular meetings such as the series of *Experts’ Meetings on Cultural Policy* will continue to be organised to facilitate greater dialogue not only between Ministries of Culture and cultural policy researchers, but among authors of the national cultural policy profiles of Asian countries as well.

Dr. Kiwon Hong also stressed the importance of using the framework of the *WorldCP* project to stimulate policy dialogue at the local level in various participating countries.

The importance of dialogue platforms such as the *Experts’ Meeting* in promoting mutual understanding of each other’s national cultural policies among Asian countries was acknowledged by Li Hong Qiong, Vice Director, Department of Policy & Law, Ministry of Culture, China.

**Existing Information Systems on Arts and Culture**

The newly-launched *WorldCP website* (see screenshot to the right) will be developed as a continuously-updated international database of cultural policies. A regional database, *WorldCP-Asia* will also be made available in the coming year.

The search-by-country feature on the *IFACCA website* collates information on news, events and publications in the arts for most countries of the world (see screenshot featuring results for South Korea to the right).
culture360.org, the arts and culture portal managed by the Asia-Europe Foundation, focuses specifically on information from the 46 member countries of the Asia-Europe Meeting. The Countries section of the website (see screenshot featuring Singapore to the right) collates relevant news, events, opportunities and feature articles from across the portal.

This Summary Report was prepared by Anupama Sekhar, Project Manager, Cultural Exchange, Asia-Europe Foundation in November 2011.
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