Part II

Implementing the CDCE beyond the specificity of cultural goods and services

11 Cultural development and technical and financial assistance on the basis of the CDCE

Antonios Vlassis[1]

Introduction

Given the dual nature of cultural goods and services, between symbolic and material production (Caves 2000), their legal treatment has been the subject of growing interest at the international level. The importance of establishing international norms for cultural industries, or "industries of the imaginary" – *industries de l'imaginaire* – (Flichy 1991), has risen since the early 1990s, based on two major issues: on the one hand, the "cultural exception" (*exception culturelle*) affecting cultural goods and services in international economic exchanges, discussed within the World Trade Organization (WTO); on the other hand, the link between culture and development, formulated within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). However, since the late 1990s, a broad spectrum of actors has offered a new approach to the linkage between cultural exception and cultural diversity and they call for the establishment of a culture-driven international legal tool.

The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (CDCE), adopted by UNESCO in 2005, aims to strengthen international cultural cooperation and cultural development through many tools, such as the setting up of an International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), a multidonor voluntary fund. The CDCE has so far been ratified by 132 States – such as France, Germany, Canada, Brazil, India, Australia, China and South Korea – and the European Union (EU). However, the United States of America (US), Russia and Pakistan, as well as several Middle Eastern and North African countries (Algeria, Iran, Israel and Saudi Arabia) have not yet ratified the CDCE.

Recent research on the CDCE implementation deals with key issues such as the conviction of China by the WTO judges regarding the movie and broadcasting sector (Neuwirth 2010; Vlassis 2012a) and the impact of bilateral trade agreements on the CDCE implementation (Gagné 2011; Richieri Hanania 2012), as well as the ambivalence of Protocols on Cultural Cooperation promoted by the EU (Loisen and DeVille 2011; Richieri Hanania 2012). Nevertheless, cultural development and the CDCE's impact on its evolution still remain a neglected question. Therefore, this chapter aims to fill the gap in the literature on the CDCE by focusing on the financial and technical aid for cultural development on the basis of the CDCE. It highlights the way the implementation of the IFCD has taken place, its institutional implications and its perspectives, as well as some problematic aspects of cultural development, in order to make proposals and recommendations for a better implementation of the CDCE on this matter.

I The IFCD: objectives and function

A The negotiations to adopt the CDCE: difficulties in creating the IFCD

Since the late 1970s, UNESCO has explored how to foster the debate on the links between culture and development, seeking to become the main international arena for the expression of the concept of cultural development. The organization has aimed to promote a change from a strictly economic conception of development to a more enlarged approach, integrating other dimensions such as culture. Several UNESCO meetings and normative tools demonstrate the effort to disseminate the concept of cultural development at the international level and to make the international community aware of the importance to implement policies regarding this issue. The UNESCO International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (1974); the World Conference on cultural policies (MONDIACULT) in 1982; the World Decade for Cultural Development (1988–1997); the report "Our Creative Diversity" by the World Commission on Culture and Development (1996); the International Conference on Cultural Policies for Development in Stockholm (1998); and the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) offer relevant examples of such effort.

In view of all these actions, the inclusion of an International Fund for Cultural Development within the CDCE seems to be one of the most concrete ways for the reinforcement of cultural industries. In this sense, the creation of the IFCD is the result of a request by some developing countries that did not want to make the CDCE a normative tool serving only the interests of developed countries (Bernier 2006; Bernecker 2012). During the negotiations which led to the CDCE adoption, an important number of developing countries – including Senegal, Burkina Faso, Morocco and Andorra – underlined the unequal structure of cultural exchanges and favored the establishment of an International Fund for cultural industries.

In addition, an intense debate took place about the mandatory or the voluntary contributions of Parties to the IFCD. The major concern of the promoters of the diversity of cultural expressions – such as France and Canada – was the international recognition of cultural policies rather than the strengthening of cultural cooperation. Other developed countries such as the US, Japan, New Zealand and Australia, reluctant to the perspective of an international binding tool on the diversity of cultural expressions, were largely skeptical about the establishment of a fund based on mandatory contributions. Finally, the debate was resolved in favor of voluntary contributions, but with the addition of a provision found in paragraph 7 of article 18 of the CDCE: "Parties shall endeavor to provide voluntary contributions on a regular basis towards the implementation of this Convention."

B The IFCD between good faith and low resources

The IFCD is one of the main tools of the CDCE for promoting the development of cultural industries in developing countries and international cooperation in this area. Many countries have poorly developed cultural policies and their implementation remains problematic due to a lack of political will, of expertise and of financial resources. The IFCD is thus a relevant vehicle to support the implementation of the CDCE in the light of cultural development.

The IFCD became operational in 2010 and its implementation is based on good faith and loyalty of the Parties to the CDCE rather than on a strict commitment. The Parties do not have the obligation to contribute to the Fund, unlike other UNESCO normative instruments, such as the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage adopted in 2003 and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted in 1972. Furthermore, the IFCD does not rely on a moral duty of rich countries to help developing countries, but on a kind of financial and assistance partnership. Therefore, the aid is given to the concerned countries which intend to use it for developing their cultural policies and their cultural industries. Moreover, the function of the IFCD is based on a bottom-up approach, since the starting point for the formulation of the IFCD priorities is the perspective of specific cultural target groups and administrative agents from those developing countries. The IFCD resources head therefore towards cultural industries and associations at the bottom of the pyramid, namely cultural actors on the ground. Correspondingly, local administrations and civil society involved have the flexibility for choosing the strategies to be applied towards the implementation of their programs.

The total number of applications received by the CDCE Secretariat to date equals 670. Following a technical evaluation, 295 were deemed eligible for a total value of more than US$35 million. Today, the IFCD supports 61 projects from 40 developing countries with US$3.9 million in funding. More than half of the projects are in Africa, with three projects in each of the following countries: Cameroon, Kenya, Senegal and South Africa; and about a quarter in Latin America, with two projects in each of the following: Uruguay, Argentina, Mexico and Guatemala. More than half of the beneficiaries are non-governmental organizations and around 70 percent of the projects focus on creating new or strengthening existing cultural industries, while the rest relates to cultural policies (Toggler *et al.* 2012: 3). At present, both governmental institutions and civil society organizations are invited to apply for support, whereas private sector enterprises will only be eligible to apply once the Fund has received contributions from the private sector.

Furthermore, in August 2013, only 40 out of 133 Parties of the CDCE had contributed to the Fund and the total contributions received reached US$6,309 million. Most Parties have not been making annual contributions and the frequency of contributions varies from 22 Parties making a single contribution to the Fund, to ten making two, to four (India, Slovenia, Sweden, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia [FYROM]) making three, to three (China, Mexico, Monaco) making four, to two (Andorra, France) making five, as well as one (Finland) making six. In addition, on the one hand, the combined contributions of Norway, France, Finland and Spain reach more than US$3.5 million, and on the other hand, the combined contributions of three international rising powers such as Brazil, China and Mexico are so far very dynamic, reaching more than US$800,000.

In a context of international debt crisis and major budget cuts, the voluntary nature of contributions generates a situation of uncertainty about the financing and the visibility of the IFCD and serious difficulties regarding the elaboration of a structured and coherent approach for strengthening cultural industries in least developed countries. Canada[2] – one of the most involved countries in building the CDCE – has not contributed to the Fund since 2008; Austria, Greece and Denmark since 2009; Spain[3] and India since 2010. Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, the UK and South Korea, very developed countries in terms of cultural industries, have not yet contributed to the IFCD resources. Moreover, the US and Japan – the main contributors to the UNESCO budget (nearly 40 percent)[4] and to official development assistance (ODA) coming from members of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) – are not Parties to the CDCE and do not provide, therefore, technical and financial aid to its implementation. To close this section, it is worth mentioning that, in 2012, the IFCD contributions only reached US$480,000, while they had reached more than US$1.56 million in 2011.

II Financial and assistance aid: projects and perspectives

A New strategies for fundraising

Despite the present financial constraints, the implementation of the IFCD remains so far at the heart of discussions on the CDCE implementation. The sixth session of the Intergovernmental Committee of the CDCE, held in late December 2012, approved 13 projects funded by the IFCD for a total of US$1.07 million. Out of those 13 projects, five come from Parties that had not yet received funding from the IFCD, namely Croatia, FYROM, Indonesia, Mongolia and Montenegro (UNESCO 2013: 4). In addition, five projects received funding of approximately US$100,000, aiming at the promotion and the respect of human rights through creative audiovisual communication (a project developed by IRIPAZ, a Guatemalan NGO); the promotion of sustainable development through creative audiovisual communication (promoted by PASIH, an Indonesian community-based NGO); the strengthening of Mexican cultural industries (developed by a local NGO called CONAIMUC); the development of an open-source platform, ArtSAnow, gathering and sharing pertinent information on the creative sector in South Africa; and the training of culture and artists' associations into business management in Zimbabwe. From a comparative perspective, among the projects approved for funding in 2010 and in 2011, 13 projects had received funding of approximately US$100,000.

The sixth session also approved the five-year fundraising strategy developed by Small World Stories. This strategy seeks to diversify the IFCD's donor base and to triple the IFCD's annual income over five years, from an average of US$800,000 per year over the past five years to US$2.8 million, with at least 30 percent of the income coming from private sector sources. In this regard, the first phase of the fundraising strategy is designed to reposition the IFCD "as a strategic, results-orientated Fund, consolidate existing donor base and increase its visibility" (UNESCO 2012a: 4). The second and the third phase will aim to "secure six partnerships with private sector companies and high net worth individuals, while reaching out more directly to the media" and to put into place a longer-term private sector partnership in order to "channel a percentage of corporate sales to the IFCD" (UNESCO 2012a: 4). For achieving these objectives, Small World Stories has developed two campaigns: (i) the IFCD re-launch campaign for the creation of a new visual identity for the Fund; and (ii) the "Your 1% Counts for Creativity" campaign with the aim of identifying and mobilizing some IFCD projects, as well as showing how "investing in creativity transforms societies" and why it is important to contribute to the IFCD (UNESCO 2012a: 5).

The strategies developed by Small World Stories, however, need to deal with a major identity problem of the CDCE, mentioned by the experts in charge of elaborating an analytical summary for the quadrennial periodic reports of the Parties to CDCE.[5] The conclusions provided by the experts demonstrate that a great number of Parties suffer from confusion and misunderstanding about the scope and the objectives of the CDCE. The experts claim that

> clearer definitions of terms such as "cultural policies" and "sustainable development" and a clear distinction between "intangible heritage"

> that are the scope of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the "diversity of cultural expressions" that are the object of the CDCE are required.
>
> (UNESCO 2012b: 6)

As a result, the experts point out that, on the one hand, few Parties, such as France and Canada, have reported exclusively on policies and measures taken with regard to cultural goods and services that make up cultural industries. On the other hand, nearly half of the Parties have also made reference to policies that "pertain to culture as such" and a third of the Parties have especially included policies with no or little reference to cultural goods and services, "such as cultural heritage and museums, traditional and/or indigenous cultures, cultural practices of national diasporas, as well as artistic creation in general" (UNESCO 2012b: 9).

In sum, the building process of the CDCE proves that the latter is a specific legal tool vis-à-vis other UNESCO international legal tools and its adoption highlights a normative break in the action of the organization. The CDCE purpose includes an aspect of cultural diversity in relation to cultural goods and services produced and distributed by cultural industries, with important trade and economic implications (Graber 2006; Vlassis 2011). Consequently, the new fundraising strategies absolutely need to clarify the nature and the goals of the CDCE in order to improve the visibility and the financing of the IFCD.

B Technical assistance: cooperation between the EU and UNESCO

Technical assistance is non-financial assistance provided by local or international experts, with the aim of maximizing the quality of project implementation and impact, though support to administration, management, policy development and capacity building (Charnoz and Severino 2007: 14). In September 2010, the European Commissioner for Development, Andris Piebalgs, signed an agreement with UNESCO for the establishment of a project called "Strengthening the System of Governance for Culture in Developing Countries", targeted at developing and least developed countries. The project involves technical assistance missions undertaken by specialists in the field of cultural policies and its budget reaches EUR 1 million.[6] In early 2011, in direct connection with the CDCE, a pool of 30 experts was constituted in order to work with public authorities in developing countries and to provide their experience and know-how. Eligible countries are 71 developing countries that are Parties to the CDCE and recognized by the European program "Investing in People".

Following three calls for applications, Barbados, the City of Buenos Aires, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Niger, the Seychelles and Vietnam were chosen to benefit from technical assistance missions. The 13 selected projects deal with a lot of domains of cultural governance, such as the promotion of cultural management and artistic entrepreneurship (Niger, Barbados, Mauritius and Malawi), the improvement of the legal and regulatory framework for the promotion of cultural industries (Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of the Congo), the inclusion of cultural modules in education (Burkina Faso), as well as the development of cultural industries such as music (Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya and Seychelles), visual arts (Kenya), performing arts (Honduras, Cambodia), sculpture (Honduras), handcraft (Cambodia) and the broadcasting sector (Buenos Aires and Honduras). The technical assistance missions took place between December 2011 and December 2012.

III Implications and challenges of the aid for cultural development

A Institutional implications of the IFCD

The IFCD should coexist with several programs dedicated to cultural development. For instance, some programs in favor of international film cooperation allocate financial aid for an annual amount of more than US$30 million, towards all fields of the film industry (training, writing, co-production, distribution, exhibition, education). Among these programs, it is important to mention the French financial aid *Aides aux cinémas du monde*, with an annual budget of €6 million; *Euromed Audiovisual*, a program funded by the EU, with a budget of €11 million over three years (2011–2013); *Media Mundus*, also funded by the EU, with a budget of €15 million from 2011 to 2013; the EU support program to African–Caribbean–Pacific Cultural Industries, with a total budget of €26.8 million; the Francophone Fund for Audiovisual Production from the South (*Fonds francophone de production audiovisuelle du Sud*), with a budget of €1.3 million in 2012; and the program IBERMEDIA, including Spain, Portugal and many countries in Latin America, with a budget of US$5.6 million in 2012.

A closer look at those programs proves that the main issue of cultural development is not only the low available amount of financial resources. Along with the need to strengthen those resources, the major questions concern, on the one hand, the identification of all the programs dedicated to cultural development in order to facilitate the search for cultural funding; and, on the other hand, the coordination of the guidelines applied to those programs in order to ensure consistency in their strategies and to prevent overlapping of their priorities. The search for a better coherence of cultural development policies is necessary in order to avoid dispersion of activities and resources and to assess the impact of funded projects. A better synergy among existing programs is a promising way to improve the geographical distribution of public aid among beneficiary countries and to prevent significant inequalities between countries that receive aid and those that do not (Perroulaz *et al.* 2010: 154).

Furthermore, following the request of four Member States (Algeria, Cuba, Egypt and Venezuela) in 2011, the 36th General Conference of UNESCO took the initiative to restore the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC), suspended in 2006 and also intended to promote culture and development strategies and programs. Although the initiative seems to play a very important role for cultural development, it raises some issues regarding the usefulness of its reestablishment, and the political and institutional implications of this action, but also about the link between the IFPC and IFCD. Consequently, the issue of delimitating competences and priorities between the two funds becomes very subtle. In addition, the reestablishment of the IFPC creates a situation of antagonism regarding the availability of financial and symbolic resources that do not seem to be abundant. The current budget of IFPC is presently US$4 million (Vlassis 2012b).

Finally, the IFCD and other multilateral funds should take account of the major economic contradiction of cultural industries, resulting from a continuous oscillation between artistic creation and industrial cost-effectiveness. In general, many cultural enterprises must take considerable risks and also operate according to market rules. Along the direct financial and technical aid, therefore, developed countries, as well as regional and international organizations, should facilitate the access to bank financing for cultural enterprises in the least developed countries. Like many institutions in charge of bank guarantees, it is necessary to encourage banks to accept the special risk that cultural industries in these countries incur (Kignel, Chapter 17 of this volume). In this vein, they should establish multilateral investment funds in order to ensure a mix of economic profitability and development goals. Those investment funds would seek to introduce an entrepreneurial spirit, allowing for a more dynamic distribution and exhibition of artistic creations (Tiendrebeogo 2010). A notable example is the Francophone Guarantee Fund for Cultural Industries (*Fonds de Garantie des Industries Culturelles*), established in 2003. This Fund aims to mobilize combined financial resources from the *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie* and the private banking sector in favor of the cultural industries from the ECOWAS (*Economic Community of West African States*) countries.

B Challenges of cultural development: the example of the world film industry

Going beyond holistic approaches on the globalization of culture emphasizing the opposition "homogenization vs. hybridization" (Martell 2010: 67–104), it is necessary to mention that the most important current issue regarding multilateral funds for cultural development refers to more balanced and fair exchanges of cultural expressions. More balanced exchanges should seek to overcome, on the one hand, the stranglehold of cultural products from the large media conglomerates and, on the other hand, an ethnocentric structure of some cultural sectors. The world film market provides a good example of those difficulties.

Global box office for all films released in each country around the world reached US$34.7 billion in 2012, up 32 percent over the corresponding total amount in 2008. The increase is due to the growth of the "international" box office (except the US and Canada), which accounted for US$23.9 billion, up 32 percent over 2008's total, while the growth of the US box office, including also Canada, reached US$10.8 billion, up 12 percent over 2008's total. The Asia-Pacific region led global box office growth, up 53 percent over 2008's total, and the Chinese box office grew by 36 percent to US$2.7 billion in 2012, moving it to the second largest movie market in the world.[7]

Furthermore, the trade balance of the US film and television industry is positive, whereas the US suffers from a chronic trade deficit. The US movie and television industry is one of the few that consistently generates a positive balance of trade in every country in which it does business. For instance, it generated US$13.5 billion in film and television services exports in 2010, up 6 percent over 2006. The US movie and television industry also had a positive services trade surplus of US$11.9 billion in 2010, larger than each of the surpluses arising from telecommunications, management and consulting, legal, medical, computer, and insurance services sectors (MPAA 2012).

Nevertheless, a closer analysis of the world film market prompts some reservations regarding Hollywood's domination. According to *Focus World Film Market Trends*, the market share of Hollywood is overwhelming (more than 80 percent) in the Anglo-Saxon world, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, as well as in many countries of Eastern Europe, and South and Central America. On the other hand, a significant number of film markets – France, Italy, Poland, Japan, China, South Korea, Russia and Turkey – are characterized by a dynamic position both of Hollywood productions and national cinema, and an exceedingly small proportion of films from other countries. Finally, a few countries such as the US, India and Egypt are marked by a quasi-dominant position of national films (see Table 11.1).

Thus, the Hollywood industry does not succeed in prevailing in some of the most important markets in terms of box office in which the national cinema has an important place. Specifically, in 2009, the market share of national films rose to nearly 30 percent in Italy, Germany, Poland and Russia and nearly 40 percent in France; it reached up to 50 percent in South Korea and Turkey, nearly 60 percent in Japan and China, 80 percent in Egypt and 92 percent in India. These countries represent a

Table 11.1 National film markets 2005/2009

Countries	*Market share of national films 2005/2009 (in %)*	*Film production 2005/2009*
USA	86/91.8	699/677
France	36.8/36.8	187/230
Germany	17.1/27.4	146/220
United Kingdom	33/16.5	78/116
Italy	24.7/24.4	86/133
Russia	27.7/23.9	86/78
Turkey	n.a./50.9	n.a./69
Brazil	12/14.3	47/84
Mexico	n.a./7.5	24/54
Argentina	11.9/16	41/101
Australia	2.8/5	31/38
China	60/56.6	260/456
Japan	41.3/56.9	356/448
India	92.5/92	934/819
South Korea	55/48.8	83/138
Egypt	n.a./80	n.a./35

Source: European Audiovisual Observatory (2010).

total film market of US$13 billion, more than half of the global film market revenues (excluding the US and Canada), with a total population of 3 billion people, nearly 45 percent of the global population. In addition, India is still the world's largest producer of movies (819 in 2009), followed by the United States (677), China (456) and Japan (448). Moreover, the combined film production of France, Germany and Italy reached 583 feature films in 2009.

At the end of the day, concentration in the film market remains flagrant. In fact, in 2012, 11 countries' combined box office[8] represented more than 75 percent of the global box office and, in 2009, ten counties reported 82.6 percent of the total movie theater admissions worldwide (Acland 2012: 17). In sum, few countries are at the heart of the worldwide film industry; they produce, distribute and consume the largest number of films. As a result, a thorny problem to be faced by the funds addressing cultural development such as the IFCD remains the need to rebalance global cultural flows and to foster a more equitable opening to non-national and non-US cultural expressions.

Conclusions and recommendations

Implementing international norms is "almost always a contested process", requiring actors to exercise "a great deal of discretion and autonomy to translate them into action" (Avant *et al.* 2010: 15). Cultural development has been so far the Cinderella of international development cooperation and culture still remains the poor relation compared to other aspects of sustainable development (social and environmental concerns) and other motives for granting development assistance, such as economic, environmental, humanitarian and national security purposes (Degnbol-Martinussen and Engberg-Pedersen 2003: 17). The pace of change, however, is slow but pragmatic in order to expand cultural development within the global governance of culture. Even though a gap still exists between principles and practices, the IFCD seems to be an essential mechanism for global solidarity to promote the diversity of cultural expressions. Four main aspects of its implementation still remain problematic and deserve greater attention from stakeholders:

- What is at stake? The paramount issue of cultural development consists of fairer and more balanced exchanges of cultural expressions. Beyond the opposition "homogenization vs. hybridization", the IFCD and other multilateral funds on cultural development should deal with two points: the domination of cultural products coming from a few media conglomerates, and the ethnocentric structure of some cultural markets.
- Clarification: In order to improve availability of financial resources and the visibility of the IFCD, involved actors and the UNESCO Secretariat (Vlassis 2014) should highlight the original scope and the concrete meaning of the CDCE and emphasize its particular nature, especially compared to other UNESCO normative tools.
- Incorporation: It is necessary that the involved actors incorporate cultural development within other dimensions of sustainable development and integrate culture into international aid for development and cooperation. In this sense, cultural development should adapt to the new changes of the landscape of official development assistance, and especially to the increasingly influential "new" donors, such as the rising powers of China, Brazil and India, and numerous private foundations and philanthropists, as well as to innovative finance mechanisms, such as financial transaction or many types of taxes (Summer and Mallett 2013: 2).
- Coordination: The involved actors should develop mechanisms for coordinating priorities between the IFCD and other multilateral funds for cultural development. It is necessary to establish a dialogue among those actors with a view to increasing synergy and reducing overlapping situations. In view of this goal, cultural development needs a political agenda setting concrete objectives. This point relies on the political will of the most involved countries and on their commitments to improve coherence and define strategic orientations. In any case, this political agenda should give an answer to the acute question mentioned in the report of the World Commission on Culture and Development "Our Creative Diversity":

> is culture an aspect or a means of "development", the latter understood as material progress, or is culture the end and aim of "development", the latter understood as the flourishing of human existence in its several forms and as a whole?
>
> (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996: 13)

Notes

1 This contribution was carried out with support from David Constant Fund, managed by the King Baudouin Foundation. The author thanks Christine Merkel and Karsten Xuereb for their helpful suggestions to this chapter.

2 Since 2006 and the arrival of the new government of the Conservative Party in Canada, the latter has displayed a big reluctance towards cultural industries issues, with a clear effect on the CDCE implementation. In 2012, the government of Stephen Harper announced major budget cuts, affecting the CBC/Radio Canada, the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA), the National Film Board, the Library and Archives of Canada, as well as the Coalition for Cultural Diversity. In late 2012, the CCA, Canada's largest arts advocacy agency, wound down operations after 67 years because of federal funding cuts.

3 Spain has a very dynamic action regarding development aid for culture. In relation to the Millennium Development Goals worldwide, the Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID) has supported 18 joint programs towards the theme "Culture and Development" with a financial allocation of US$95.6 million. The beneficiary countries have been Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Senegal, Turkey and Uruguay. Furthermore, from 2009 to 2013, the AECID has financed the UNESCO Culture for Development Indicator Suite, aiming to establish a set of indicators regarding how culture contributes to development at the national level. However, because of present public debt and deficit crisis in Spain, the cultural sector is suffering from severe budget cuts, with an effect on Spanish actions towards cultural development.

4 Since late 2011, the United States have put their contribution to UNESCO on hold, following the majority vote on making Palestine a full Member of the organization.

5 Article 9 of CDCE on "Information sharing and transparency" stipulates in paragraph (a) that the "Parties shall provide appropriate information in their reports to UNESCO every four years on measures taken to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions within their territory and at the international level".

6 Originally, the EU announced its wish to contribute to the IFCD, as a Party to the Convention. Taking account of the rules and regulations of the EU budget, this turned out to be impossible. The solution was to establish a cooperation program instead.

7 Since the 1980s, only a part of the total revenue generated by films comes from movie theaters. However, films that benefit from a significant advertising campaign and have commercial success retain an important advantage on secondary markets such as television, DVD or video on demand.

8 US/Canada (US$10.8 billion), China (US$2.7 billion), Japan (US$2.4 billion), UK (US$1.7 billion), France (US$1.7 billion), India (US$1.4 billion), Germany (US$1.3 billion), South Korea (US$1.3 billion), Russia (US$1.2 billion), Australia (US$1.2 billion) and Brazil (US$0.8 billion).

Bibliography

Acland, C.R. (2012) “From International Blockbusters to National Hits: Analysis of the 2010 UIS Survey on Feature Film Statistics”, *UNESCO Institute for Statistics Bulletin*, 8 February.

Avant, D.D., Finnemore, M. and Sell, S.K. (2010) *Who Governs the Globe?*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bernecker, R. (2012) “Article 18. International Fund for Cultural Diversity”, in S. Von Schorlemer and Peter-Tobias Stoll (eds) *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions Explanatory Notes*, Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag: 465–480.

Bernier, I. (2006) “La négociation de la convention de l’UNESCO sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles” in P. Lemieux (ed.) *La diversité culturelle: Protection de la diversité des contenus culturels et des expressions artistiques*, Québec: Les Presses de l’Université de Laval: 83–129.

Caves, R.E. (2000) *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Charnoz, O. and Severino, J.-M. (2007) *L’aide publique au développement*, Paris: La Découverte.

Degnbol-Martinussen, J. and Engberg-Pedersen, P. (2003) *Aid: Understanding International Development Cooperation*, London: Zed.

European Audiovisual Observatory (2000–2010) *FOCUS World Film Market Trends.*

Flichy, P. (1991) *Les industries de l’imaginaire. Pour une analyse economique des medias*, 2nd edn, Grenoble: Presses universitaires de Grenoble.

Gagné, G. (2011) “Free Trade and Cultural Policies: Evidence from Three US Agreements”, *Journal of World Trade*, 45(6): 1267–1284.

Graber, C.B. (2006) “The New UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity: A Counterbalance to the WTO?”, *Journal of International Economic Law*, 9(3): 553–574.

Graz, J.-C. (2010) *La gouvernance de la mondialisation*, 3rd edn, Paris: La Découverte.

Loisen, J. and De Ville, F. (2011) “The EU-Korea Protocol on Cultural Cooperation: Toward Cultural Diversity or Cultural Deficit?”, *International Journal of Communication*, 5: 254–271.

Martell, L. (2010) *The Sociology of Globalization*, Cambridge: Polity.

MPAA (Motion Pictures Association of America) (2012) *Theatrical Market Statistics*, Washington DC: MPAA.

Neuwirth, R.J. (2010) “The ‘Culture and Trade Debate’ Continues: The UNESCO Convention in Light of the WTO Reports in *China-Publications and Audiovisual Products*: Between Amnesia or *Déjà Vu*?”, *Journal of World Trade*, 44(6): 1333–1356.

Perroulaz, G., Fioroni, C. and Carbonnier, G. (2010) “Trends and Issues in International Development Cooperation”, *International Development Policy*, 1: 143–160.

Richieri Hanania, L. (2009) *Diversité culturelle et droit international du commerce*, Paris: La Documentation française.

Richieri Hanania, L. (2012) “Cultural Diversity and Regional Trade Agreements: The European Union Experience with Cultural Cooperation Frameworks”, *Asian Journal of WTO & International Health Law and Policy*, VII 2: 423–456, September; also Online. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2087639 (accessed 22 July 2013).

Summer, A. and Mallett, R. (2013) *The Future of Foreign Aid: Development Cooperation and The New Geography of Global Poverty*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tiendrebeogo, T. (2010) "La perception et les modes de gestion des risques liés au financement des secteurs d'activités culturelles", *Contribution au Symposium La gestion des risques dans le financement de la culture*, UNESCO, Paris, April.

Toggler B., Sediakina-Riviere E. and Ruotsalainen M. (2012) *Evaluation of the Pilot Phase of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity*, Final Report, Paris: UNESCO, September.

UNESCO (2004) *Avant-projet de Convention sur la protection de la diversité des contenus culturels et des expressions artistiques*, CLT/CPD/2004/CONF.201/2, Paris, July.

UNESCO (2012a) *Fundraising Activities: Report on the Use of the Funds Intended for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)*, CE/12/6.IGC/6, Paris, November.

UNESCO (2012b) *Strategic and Action Oriented Analytical Summary of the Quadrennial Periodic Reports*, CE/12/6.IGC/4, Paris, November.

UNESCO (2013), *Secretariat's Report on the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)*, CE/13/4.CP/8, Paris, April.

Vlassis, A. (2011) "La mise en œuvre de la Convention sur la diversité des expressions culturelles: portée et enjeux pour l'interface entre le commerce et la culture", *Etudes internationales*, 42(4): 493–510.

Vlassis, A. (2012a) "Ouverture des marchés cinématographiques et remise en cause de la diversité des expressions culturelles", *Revue française de Géoéconomie*, 62: 97–108.

Vlassis, A. (2012b) "Développement culturel: la relance du Fonds pour la promotion de la culture et ses implications politiques et institutionnelles", *Revue électronique de l'Observatoire des politiques culturelles*, October.

Vlassis, A. (2014) "L'UNESCO face à l'enjeu 'commerce-culture': quelle action politique pour une organisation international", *Politique et sociétés* 32(3), forthcoming.

World Commission on Culture and Development (1996) *Our Creative Diversity*, Report, Paris, UNESCO.