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Executive Summary

The review was conducted using the following parameters; relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. This enabled the evaluators to conduct a systematic objective assessment of all aspects of the Regional Culture Strategy. The following discussions are along these parameters.

Culture defines our identity as Pacific Island people and is the pillar upon which all sectorial work is built. It is seen as being part of the lifestyle of people in the Pacific, but its role has been undermined and undervalued. In most cases culture has been relegated to its visible Culture expressions such as dances, handicraft and folklore.

There is now growing evidence that demonstrates the benefits of culture to national economies. Potential opportunities for development in the areas of creative industries and Culture tourism do exist, especially for small Island economies where the current economic models are not producing the level of development that is required to raise the standard of living and the well-being of people. For Pacific Island countries recognising and harnessing these opportunities present the greatest challenge.

Relevance

At the outset the development of the Regional Culture Strategy (RCS) is a major achievement in itself, along with securing financial partnership with the European Union. It is the first serious attempt to reflect an approach where the potential for culture as an economic driver and pillar for sustainable development is placed at the forefront of development within the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs). The RCS sets out an inclusive vision and conceptual framework through which the connections between culture and development can be clearly identified. It brings together in an integrated manner the enablers of culture such as policy and legislative, institutional aspects; and tangible and intangible Culture components and the engagement of stakeholders at different levels, finding synergies and identifying priorities for development.

The RCS is relevant and supportive of regional frameworks and national policies. It is compatible with international policies and conventions. It is in line with the Leader’s Auckland Declaration in 2004, the Culture Ministers Declaration in 2002; 2014 Framework for Pacific Regionalism and the Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016-2020. It is in step with the renewed call to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s Culture and natural heritage and supports the SAMOA Pathway in recognising that culture is a driver and enabler for sustainable development. It is in alignment with the Strategic Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda adopted by the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development in 2015 calling on the international community to “Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s Culture and natural heritage”, highlighting that the conservation of natural resources drives sustainable development.

The RCS overall purpose, its goals and the objectives clearly respond to the needs of the PICTs. The goals and objectives are relevant and if adequately resourced will contribute to the national economies of these nations, in particular the untapped potential of their Cultural industries and Culture tourism. It provides a framework and guidance to address the lack of developmental progress within the Culture sector, which has been long attributed to the lack of or out-dated legislative and policy frameworks, budgetary constraints, lack of skilled and qualified workforce and the lack of statistical data to provide evidence-based support to increased investment in the sector.

Efficiency

At the regional level, the first five years focussed on developing standard setting tools and conducting baselines studies that were the necessary pre-requisites upon which other
developmental work would be built. A situational analysis was conducted with a focus on the current state of the Cultural industries, identifying the gaps and strengths, and potential that Cultural industries hold for the Pacific. A marketing strategy was developed to determine ways to harness the potential of these industries to become drivers of economic growth. The mapping and planning policy toolkit was designed to guide countries and territories carry out a Culture mapping, planning and policy process. A monitoring and evaluation toolkit for policy implementation and a guide on Culture statistics was also developed to ensure policy design, implementation and monitoring were linked to the development of Culture statistics and indicators for evidence based requirements. A practical guide on mapping of Culture intangible heritage was developed to guide countries, for heritage sector development as well as for use as a cross-sectoral guide. All point to the efficient implementation of the Strategy.

Collaborations with United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Culture Organisation (UNESCO), Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) and South Pacific Tourism Organisation (SPTO) have made headway. Work with UNESCO has resulted in seven additional Pacific Island Countries (PICs) ratifying the 2003 UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural heritage (ICH). Joint work plans with the PIFS on the Pacific Cultural industries Project produced baseline data on Cultural industries, regional consultations and development of marketing strategies for the Pacific. Initial cooperation began under European Union Development Fund (EDF) 10 with SPTO on Culture tourism to be strengthened under EDF 11. Further Cultural industries work in collaboration with other divisions of SPC is also under development under EDF 11.

As highlighted, at the regional level a number of activities and objectives have been met, contributing to the achievement of the overall objective of the Strategy. There is still, however, an acknowledgement that there is much that needs to be done, in spite of the increasing collaboration with other Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) programmes and the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) agencies at the regional level. Better synergies and integration with the CROP agencies and other SPC divisions needs to be further developed and systematised. These collaborations should aim at institutionalisation, whereby culture becomes an integral part of the work programmes and not project driven. This will lend itself to increased impact, sustainability and increased ownership by all stakeholders.

Regional and national declarations and plans of actions need to move beyond rhetoric to allocating specific and increased allocations towards the development of the Culture sector.

Implementation of the Strategy at country level has encountered many challenges. While the goals and objectives remain clear and relevant, it was obvious from the review that most indicators identified are not achievable, realistic or time bound. At this mid-point of implementation, a substantial number of activities identified under the RCS seven national goals are (unduly) delayed. At the design stage of the project a thorough assessment of the risks and assumptions was not conducted and is a contributory factor to the lack of implementation. As a consequence the ranges of activities identified are not realistic in relation to stakeholders’ capacities. Despite this there is no institutional strengthening component built into the Strategy to develop national capacities. The long gestation period for policies and legislation to be endorsed or passed and the relatively modest funds available to the culture sector in most countries was another challenge. Setting the benchmarks so high was unfeasible from the outset. In light of this the number of activities and objectives should be reduced and specific strategies developed to target certain countries only. These countries should be where some work has already been started under certain goals. Other options can be explored including sub-regional groupings, Small Island Developing States (SIDS) or the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG). The appointed body to review the RCS should determine appropriate mechanism prior to identifying the relevant activities for implementation.
There is lack of ownership or buy-in at the national levels due to the limited understanding and participation of national stakeholders at the design stage. Improvements are necessary to ensure ownership and sustainability of the results. A Council of Pacific Arts and Culture (CPAC) working group was established and tasked with the responsibility to develop the RCS. The working group’s consultations at national level were inadequate as evidenced by the lack of awareness and ownership of the Strategy across government, civil societies, and Culture practitioners at country level as well as throughout the different programmes within SPC. This situation is also attributed to the lack of advocacy of the Strategy, after it was developed, by the SPC Human Development Programme (SOC) Culture Programme and the national Culture ministries responsible for Culture and heritage development. High staff turnover and lack of financial resources were other factors identified for lack of ownership. To address this gap it is necessary to review the communications strategy, with specific goals for campaigns and identifiable financial resource for implementation. A resource mobilisation plan and capacity building training need to be developed at the national level, assisted by the SPC Social Development Division.

**Effectiveness**

The development of the RCS was an achievement in itself, providing a framework and direction on Culture development for the region for 10 years.

At the regional level, the first five years of the implementation of the Strategy involved establishing ways of measuring progress towards achieving the strategic objectives. The benefits drawn from the outputs implemented to date are of good quality and are used by the target beneficiaries at national levels. The development of the Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy toolkit has resulted in Culture mapping conducted in a number of countries: Tonga, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Palau and Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), although these are still at various levels of progress with only two countries implementing Culture policies as a direct result. The holding the Regional Culture Statistics meeting led to the development of the Culture statistics mapping in the Cultural industries in the Cook Islands, an example for future work in this area. Cultural industries workshops have led to on-going efforts to revitalise or establish Culture associations and to strengthen Culture SMEs.

At regional level there is need for more structured integration with other SPC Divisions to deliver on results. Similarly at national level, national Culture ministries need to advocate and work with line ministries to mainstream culture into their work plans. There is a need to assess existing country level mainstreaming or leveraging of culture in the different sectors and use that to progress the work in the next five years. This could include working more closely with non-government organisations (NGOs) affiliated with the sectors, identifying champions from these sectors and from NGOs, community practitioners and use of existing models to collate existing information to identify ways forward.

Lack of resources and technical capacities at country level remain the most important challenge to advancing the Culture developmental work at this level. National governments need to prioritise culture development work by making the necessary budgetary allocation for developing the sector. This includes prioritising culture in terms of human resource development planning and training.

**General Findings**

---

1. The CPAC working group was formed to develop strategy with volunteers from Fiji, Kiribati, New Caledonia, Solomon Islands, French Polynesia, Samoa and Papua New Guinea and Palau. Other members co-opted included representatives from the University of the South Pacific and SPC PATVET.
• The RCS is relevant and responds to the needs of the countries. It is supportive and in line with a number of international, regional and national declarations and plans of action. This includes the Framework for Pacific Regionalism and the current Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016-2020.
• Despite the clarity of the objectives among the drafters of the RCS and the clear alignment with international, regional and national policies, the design phase experienced some limitations that are affecting the implementation of the Strategy.
• The main deficiencies include: the assumptions and risks were not identified during the design phase and the lack of involvement/consultations of major stakeholders, the national policy planning, legislative and sectoral stakeholders, thus impacting negatively on the achievement of indicators and subsequently the objectives, goals and overall purpose.
• Some indicators are not specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART).
• There is need to prioritise the goals and objectives for phased implementation in the next five years.
• At the regional level most activities and indicators identified have been reached or are in the process of being achieved.
• Commitment at the regional and national levels by leaders does not translate into tangible financial allocations in most countries; the litmus test of any policy.
• A dilemma facing the Pacific states is one of balancing the preservation of traditional cultural values and ways of life with the inevitable processes of Culture evolution and the demands for innovation that characterise modern Cultural industries.
• In general, economic and social effects tend to be perceived by planning and policy decision makers, at regional and national levels, as by-products of investments in heritage preservation or cultural events, rather than the main intended effects. However, it is proven elsewhere that investment in cultural heritage generates desirable economic and social effects.
• Currently the economic and social impacts of investments are localised, rather than spreading through the wider national and heritage sector in the PICTs due to the fact that funds invested in the sector is modest relative to the needs of the sector and benefits that can be accrued as a consequence.
• Cultural tourism is yet to become a genuine focus of the majority of PICTs tourism ministries with little connections made between the symbiotic relationship between cultural heritage development and promotion and it’s potential to attract increase tourists, thereby creating wider economic benefits to further boost investment in the sector.
• Cultural industries, despite being one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world, are insufficiently untapped in the Pacific.
• Collaboration with other SPC divisions to be strengthened. An integrated approach is necessary with a coordination mechanism within SPC established/improved to avoid duplication and improve potential synergies.
• Strategic partnerships / collaboration with other CROP Agencies are necessary for increased synergies, sharing of resources and for broader representation and impacts.
• With some exceptions, the majority of informants were unaware of the Regional Culture Strategy and highlights the need for an effective Communications Strategy at regional and national levels to promote and advocate. This is to specifically target planning and policy makers, implementers such as government ministries and departments, Culture organisations, local artists and private sector.
• Overall the implementation of activities at the national level has been delayed.
• There is no resource mobilisation strategy, which could have gone a long way in supporting the implementation of the Strategy at the regional and national levels.
• There is need to develop operational objectives as part of the Strategy, including institutional strengthening.
Culture standard setting tools have been developed but this is not matched by effective implementation at the national levels.

Mainstreaming into other sectors is not a zero sum game. A number of sectors are already implementing programmes and projects that take into account Culture considerations or have a Culture component. The idea is to harness this, and to build on existing models and approaches to better mainstream and integrate culture.

Lack of financial and human resource in terms of capacity, specialised skills and knowledge within the Culture ministries contributes to the marginalisation of the sector.

Culture is not prioritised as a field of study for scholarships and training in the context of human resource development plan at the national level.

At the national level there is the tendency for the ministries responsible for culture to work in ‘silos’. To some extent this mirrors what is happening in the regional situation.

French Territories and to some extent the United States (US) territories Culture ministries are well resourced both in terms of finances and human resources compared to other PICs, due to a combination of both history and economic development agendas. Thus more work should focus on countries without direct funding from outside the region.

Culture Mapping conducted in countries does not include mapping of donors and development partners that are already operating in the field. This baseline information, if collected, will contribute to proper identification of gaps and to planning for development activities and mainstreaming purposes.

Where national Culture policies have been developed there is need to further evaluate and assess the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the implementation of these policies at national level.

Integration of culture and heritage subjects, including indigenous languages are hampered by the lack of qualified teachers to teach such subjects and the lack of textbook materials as resources for teaching.

Innovative work is currently undertaken which can serve as a model for other PICTs. This includes work on Culture statistics developed in the Cook Islands, the pilot study on Alternative Indicators of Well-being for Melanesia produced in Vanuatu, the Fiji Performers Rights Association (FIPRA) and within the Cultural industries the Fiji-made branding which have evolved and are operational in Fiji.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are divided into general recommendations; recommendations for the regional level and country level.

Regional

1. CPAC / SPC Social Development Division (SOC): Review the Regional Culture Strategy. There is need to prioritise and reduce the goals and objectives for implementation in the next five years to ensure that they are realistic and achievable given the relative modest funds and the lack of technical expertise and capacities available in some countries. This should be carried out immediately and include the following:

   a. Review the indicators in-line with the revised goals and objectives ensuring that they are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART).

   b. Identify the risks and assumptions build them in as part of the second phase of the RCS.
2. CPAC / SPC SOC: Develop operational objectives to complement the strategic objectives. These include identifying goals, objectives, activities and indicators in the areas of capacity building and resource mobilisation.

3. CPAC / SPC SOC: Review the RCS communications strategy, with specific goals for campaigns, tools employed and identifiable financial resource for implementation over the next five years.

4. Given the potential economic and social effects of the sector within PICTs and in line with the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, current SPC Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and SPC as a technical organisation focussed on “sustainable development that combines economic social, and Culture development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and use the environment sustainably as well as economic growth that is inclusive and equitable” we further recommend that:

   a. SPC begins dialogue with member countries on Culture development and all its facets including heritage, Cultural industries, tourism, statistics and intellectual property rights; as a possible theme at the Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA) level.
   b. SPC management to consider increasing budgetary provision to the SOCSPC Culture Programme for the implementation of development activities under the newly revised Strategy to demonstrate effective commitment and ownership of the Strategy. Priorities to be determined based on consultations.

5. SPC SOCSOC: Improve coordination and collaborations with other CROP Agencies and SPC Divisions. Employ an integrated approach so as to improve potential synergies for an inclusive development approach and to avoid duplication particularly where resources are concerned. We recommend specific agencies and programmes, based on assessed potential and impact that can be achieved in the next five years, be identified for future collaborative work. This to be preceded with preliminary research and based on-going work; consultations with such agencies and programmes to begin identifying areas of collaborations. Possible organisations to strengthen or target close collaborations include Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), SPTO and the PIFS. Possible SPC Divisions include Statistics for Development Division (SDD), Educational and Quality & Assessment Programme (EQAP), Geoscience Division, Land Resources Division (LRD) and Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems (FAME).

   a. At the SPC level we also recommend that an appropriate institutional mechanism be established or identified to facilitate on-going collaborative work among SPC Divisions that is inclusive of the SPC management and the Culture Programme;
   b. At the CROP level we recommend that as a regional mechanism to support the work of culture development, that the CROP Working Group on Sustainable Development be a forum for taking cultural development matters to; and to facilitate the membership of SPC Culture Programme as the representative body for culture and heritage.

6. SPC Social Development Division: The objective of these collaborations should aim at institutionalisation, whereby culture becomes an integral part of the work programmes and not just project or individually driven that will contribute to increased impact, sustainability and increased ownership by all stakeholders.
7. SPC SOC Culture Programme/Culture Ministries: Map donors and development partners that are already operating in the field. This baseline information, if collected, would contribute to proper identification of gaps and to planning for development activities and mainstreaming purposes.

8. SPC SOC Culture Programme: Encourage and support South-South cooperation for cultural industries development. For example Fiji has developed its infrastructure, processes and mechanisms for Fiji-made labelling, authentication, registration etc. Vanuatu is in the process of developing its own mark of authenticity and labelling based on the Fiji model. Such initiatives to be identified and supported by the SPC SOC Culture Programme. Cultural exchanges between the French Territories and other PICs to facilitate exchange of experiences, knowledge and technical expertise. Vanuatu to be used as model that can be replicated by the countries for the development of alternative indicators of wellbeing.

9. SPC SOC Culture Programme: More work need to be done to sell and create awareness on the Cultural industries Marketing Strategy in at least five countries. These countries should be where cultural industries work is the focus of the RCS in the next five years.

10. SPC SOC Culture Programme/Culture Ministries: In the next two years conduct a stocktake of existing country level mainstreaming or are leveraging culture in the different sectors for development work purposes, bringing together both technical and Culture expertise for a more coordinated approach and use that to progress the work in the next five years. This should be done in at least 5 countries. This could include working more closely with non-government organisations (NGOs) affiliated with the sectors, identifying champions from these sectors and from NGOs, community practitioners including churches and use of existing models to collate existing information to identify ways forward. We recommend potential resource sectors include environment, fisheries, agriculture and education. This would complement work at the national level.

11. SPC SOC Culture Programme: Where national culture policies have been developed, while demonstrating the effectiveness of the existing mapping, planning and policy toolkits, need to be further evaluated to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the implementation of these policies at national level. We recommend that the evaluation be conducted mid-way into the next five years of implementation.

12. SPC SOC Culture Programme/Culture Ministries: Work with the EQAP, UNESCO and national education ministries to implement the Education and Culture Strategy and on how to progress culture and heritage subjects’ intake in schools. This should include specific teacher training on culture, inclusion of culture experts in curriculum development and assessment of culture inclusion in the formal and non-formal school systems. We recommend that this target five countries in the next five years.

13. SPC Culture Programme: To collaborate with UNESCO in supporting the development and/or publication of appropriate Culture and language textbooks to be used in schools. This to be a joint collaboration with the national ministries of culture and education to support existing initiatives.
14. Establish an SPC expert group (working group) under the direction of the new Pacific Community Strategic Plan, made up of major relevant SPC Divisions to further examine issues related to culture integration.

15. SPC / SOC / USP: To develop short term and long term education training and capacity building courses on culture in the region. Short term capacity building courses to target the Departments of Cultures in PICTs. Long term training to target inclusion of culture in Diploma and Degree level courses.

Country Level

1. National Ministries of Culture: For the next five years, focussing on five countries, we recommend that areas of focus for policy work at the national level to include mainstreaming culture in the:
   a. National Planning and Policy.
   c. Development of Culture statistics including development of alternative indicators for wellbeing in three more countries that are assessed as ready to begin the process.
   d. Development of legislation to protect Intangible Cultural heritage.
   e. Culture human resources development

2. National Ministries of Culture: Sector mainstreaming to target environment, fisheries, agriculture and forestry. Work on adopting models and best practices already existing in the LRD, FAME and Climate Change Divisions and building on existing approaches to elevate and emphasise culture considerations. This will lend support to collaborative work conducted at the regional level and improve lateral and vertical coordination, and integration.

3. National Ministries of Culture: With the assistance of the SPC Culture Programme, develop resource mobilisation plans to financially support the development priorities identified for implementation at the national and sectoral levels in five countries. This to comprise identifying innovative approaches, potential funding sources, strategic priorities, networking and marketing.

4. National Ministries of Culture and SPC Social Development Division: To facilitate cultural exchanges, shared learning, knowledge, skills and expertise, a south-south framework to be developed and implemented which can either be bilateral or subregional basis. Using international best practices as examples, SPC SOC Culture Programme in collaboration with national Culture ministries in two other countries, to continue support and build on:
   a. Cultural industries development initiatives such as achieved in Fiji to promote and raise the profile of Fijian made Culture products, both domestically and internationally through national branding in Fiji and elsewhere in the PICTs.
   b. Establishment of collecting societies for collection of copyright royalties using the FIPRA as best practice.
   c. Development of the Culture statistics mapping in the Cultural industries in the Cook Islands, an example for future work in this area.
   d. The development of alternative wellbeing indicators such as in Vanuatu.

5. SPC SOC: As part of the operational objectives developed at the regional level, conduct capacity building training and awareness workshop for the Culture ministries/departments and national and sectoral government staff, in the prioritised areas identified, in five
countries. Operational objectives to clearly define coordination, management and financing arrangements of these key national partners. Culture experts in the different sectors should be identified, trained and supported to maximise work and impact in the sectors.

6. National Culture Ministries: Targeting two countries, Culture impact assessment tools to be developed through a coordinated approach by the ministries of culture and the natural resources sector and the departments of environment. This work is to be preceded by an assessment of environmental impact assessment (EIA) tools available in countries and identification and training of a pool of culture experts in the environmental and natural resources sectors.

7. National Culture Ministries: Skills, training and knowledge transfer - traditional and emerging heritage professions. Focus on capacity building for heritage professionals including the transmission of traditional skills and know-how and on emerging professions, including in the context of the digital shift. The participation of education experts and young people to be encouraged. Experts to map existing training schemes and identify emerging skills and training needs in the tangible, intangible and digital heritage field.
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**Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAid</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROP</td>
<td>Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Convention on Culture Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Culture Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPP</td>
<td>Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAC</td>
<td>Council of Pacific Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>European Union Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQAP</td>
<td>Educational Quality Assessment Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Fiji Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPRA</td>
<td>Fiji Performers Rights Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAME</td>
<td>Fisheries, Aquaculture, Marine Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDP</td>
<td>Human Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPO</td>
<td>Historic and Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIES</td>
<td>Household and Income and Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH</td>
<td>Intangible Cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICHCAP</td>
<td>Intangible Cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRD</td>
<td>Land and Resources Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG</td>
<td>Melanesian Spearhead Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBSAP</td>
<td>National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-government organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHH</td>
<td>Pacific Heritage Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICs</td>
<td>Pacific Island Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICTs</td>
<td>Pacific Island Countries and Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIFS</td>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>Pacific Island Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>Regional Culture Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>Republic of Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Social Development Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPREP</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>Small Island Developing States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAS</td>
<td>Solomon Islands Artists Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILMA</td>
<td>Solomon Islands Locally Managed Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPTO  South Pacific Tourism Organisation
SMART  Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound
SDGs  Sustainable Development Goals
TOR  Terms of Reference
TSDF  Tongan Sustainable Development Strategy
TRIPS  Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UNESCO  United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Culture Organisation
UNCDAT  United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USP  University of the South Pacific
UNICEF  United Nations Children's Fund
UIS  UNESCO Institute for Statistics
WIPO  World Intellectual Property Organization
WTO  World Trade Organisation
WUTMI  Women United Together in the Marshall Islands
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Context
Culture defines our identity as Pacific Island people and is the pillar upon which all sectorial work is built. It is seen as being part of the lifestyle of people in the Pacific; however its role has been undermined and undervalued. In most cases culture has been relegated to Culture expressions such as dance, handicraft and folklore.

The Regional Culture Strategy (RCS), if effectively implemented will place culture in its proper place of prominence, as essential to development, progress, sustainable economies and to the long term sustainability of livelihoods and welfare of Pacific Island people. People, particularly in the Pacific Islands, view development, education and political progress and challenges through their culture lens. They are part of the modern developed world living within Culture contexts with particular constraints and expectations. The Regional Culture Strategy, if it gains the active and dedicated support of Pacific Island Countries (PICs) leaders, national decision makers, CROP agencies and donors, will help shape the future of Pacific Island peoples. This means going beyond rhetoric to committing the resources necessary to develop the Culture sector. In this scenario, culture needs to be seen not as an impediment to development and progress but as a vital tool, which if properly harnessed and its potential maximised, could provide answers to the many challenges of development that PICs face.

Pacific Island countries and territories (PICTs) are developing countries that represent one of the culturally richest and most diverse regions worldwide. Within the diversity of cultures lie similarities in beliefs, knowledge, lifestyles and characteristics. These similarities could be leveraged and exploited to reach the 10 goals of the RCS. Culture institutions, decision making mechanisms, traditional roles and other culture traits and structures provide enabling means which should be explored to find entry points in to countries, communities and stakeholders at all levels. Tangible and intangible cultures are known and understood by people, stakeholders, donors, national and regional agencies – however within this vast knowledge of culture, commitment to elevating the value and use of culture within government processes has been minimal. Culture in education, in the natural resource sectors, statistics, planning, health and in many sectors of government although it is an integral part of development has been mostly excluded or ignored when it comes to systematic planning, knowledge management and regional level interventions.

Cultural heritage in both its intangible and tangible forms represents a development tool with an inherent commercial value. Regional and national initiatives are currently trying to balance objectives of development and protection of Cultural heritage with the need for trade and commercial purposes.

The Pacific region’s heritage primarily takes the form of Intangible Cultural heritage (ICH) such as oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festivities, knowledge of nature and the universe and traditional artisanship. In addition there is increasing involvement in both contemporary and urban arts.

Many of the targets of the Culture Strategy have been put in the ‘too hard box’ because of the lack of capacity, resources or interest to conduct the work at country level. However progress under the various goals has seen varying degrees of implementation and success.

Here we define culture as both the medium and message: ‘the social production and transmission of identities, meanings, knowledge, beliefs, values aspirations, memories, purposes, attitudes and understanding. It is also a way of life of a particular set of humans: customs, faiths, conventions; codes of manners, dress, cuisine, language, arts, science, technology, religion, rituals; norms and regulations of behaviour, traditions and institutions’ (Hawkes, 2001). Culture envelopes all aspects
of human dealings: education, family, legal, political, work practices, religion etc. The question is no longer ‘what is culture?’ but ‘what isn’t?’ In this respect culture is both overarching and underpinning.

The Regional Culture Strategy defines culture to “includes the dances, songs, chants, performances and handicrafts that most people are familiar with and that are celebrated at the four-yearly Festival of Pacific Arts. But culture is much more than that; it is about a way and quality of life, and it is about identity, rights, differences and tolerance, sustainable and healthy livelihoods, individual and community creativity and growth and, most importantly, about the future. Culture is also a sector, like agriculture or fisheries or tourism that is definable and requires public and private investment.”

UNESCO defines culture as encompassing the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterise a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs². The Convention on Culture Diversity (CDD, 2005) has since improved on this definition and focus on creative expressions of groups or societies; emphasising the importance of culture for social cohesion and human rights.

2.0 Overview
2.1 National Level
In the course of this review we recognise that we cannot cover everything, even though on country visits much information was shared with us. What we have attempted to do is to provide an overview of the findings and to give examples that demonstrate and support them. In doing so it was imperative to keep in mind the context and the operating environment in which the Culture ministries, the entities directly responsible for the preservation, promotion and development, perform their functions. The Pacific Island Countries encompass 22 nations and territories that are members of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). They reflect the great Culture diversity of the region in which some 1,200 languages are spoken, with English and French often being official languages. Pacific Island Countries have been traditionally grouped along racial and Culture lines as Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. Economic growth in the Pacific has been comparatively low, with political instability having a significant impact. Governance standards are variable across the region and in many countries the progress observed in the 1990s in sectors such as health and education has declined to a slower pace, or even gone into a reversal of the previously progressive trend (Costa and Sharp, 2011). This is the context which can either generate or immobilise innovative approaches to development.

The diversity of cultures within each country and among the different member countries was often referred to in the course of the interview; and often raised in the context of what culture is in the national context. We do not attempt to broach this discussion here as it is outside the scope of the review. We do, however, acknowledge the Culture distinctiveness of each geographical (provincial/regional) area. At the national level this can present both challenges and opportunities. More importantly we also recognise that governments in the Pacific Islands still treat culture in isolation from other national policies such as trade, development, education, health or environment. International lobbying for these ‘prime sectors’ of Pacific governments over the past decade has been successful, thereby leaving little policy space for mainstreaming of culture.

² 1982 UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies.
2.2 Regional Level

2.2.1 The Regional Culture Strategy

Work on culture at the regional level has been quite recent. PICs Ministers for culture, in an inaugural meeting in 2002, identified the need to have proper management and development of culture in the Pacific. They resolved to address issues such as the lack of national culture legislation in the region; the promotion of Cultural industries; protection mechanisms for culture and heritage; the development of Culture statistics; and the need for support by government and donor partners as a part of this process.

In 2005 the Pacific Plan was endorsed by the region’s leaders. Objective 11.1 of the Plan, ‘to develop a regional Culture strategy and strengthen Culture identity’ aligned with the leaders’ vision of a region ‘where the diversity of the Pacific and its cultures, traditions and religious beliefs are valued, honoured and developed’. In 2010 the Strategy was endorsed by the Melanesian Spearhead Group Ministers of Culture, and in 2012 it was subsequently endorsed by the Pacific Ministers of Culture during the Festival of Pacific Arts held in the Solomon Islands.

Following consultations by the working group of the CPAC and with the support of SPC, the Regional Culture Strategy was designed to strengthen Pacific cultures by providing a framework for Culture policy formulation and development, of which an integral part is the mainstreaming of culture into national development plans through the four pillars of the Pacific Plan for regional integration.

The shared approach taken by the SPC Culture Programme, at the regional level had proved to be especially effective. Through the working group it brought together stakeholders in the Pacific: to discuss issues and map a strategy for a way forward, one that is aimed at eventually addressing the challenges that are currently in place at national and regional levels. The Strategy provides a framework to strengthen existing partnerships and forge new alliances to work together for the development of the Culture sector. It is a first regional attempt at consolidating the often ad-hoc and uncoordinated approach that has come to characterise development efforts within the Culture sector.

2.3 Challenges: The Heritage Sector

From the outset the development of the culture sector in the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) is beset by a number of factors that are perceived as challenges. For far too long the smallness, isolation and distances from export markets have been seen as presenting obstacles to the development of these small island nations. These natural endowments and comparative advantages can, however, can be turned into opportunities for sustainable growth. Development of Cultural industries is one but example of the potential that exists, to shift to a new development paradigm.

Currently the oral nature of Pacific cultures and heritage does present a challenge to its preservation and conservation. For the Pacific “it is not monuments and buildings (tangible heritage) but the story telling, the passing of traditional knowledge from one generation to another and the seafaring trails from one island to another: that is intangible heritage that embodies who we are and forms the basis for the tangible” (Mercer & Teiwa, 2012). The adoption of the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural heritage (2003) recognises the importance of it as a mainspring of Culture diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD, Creative Economy Report 2008), and the Commonwealth have also given prominence to this aspect of Cultural heritage.
The demand for economic and financial growth and the drive for the protection and safeguarding of the intrinsic value of culture and heritage is often a delicate balance that needs to be carefully maintained; and often times are reasons used to ‘leave things as they are’, as already noted with ‘the too hard basket’. The reluctance to maximise economic growth through culture is due also to lack of available opportunities, inward looking policies that have governed culture and traditional institutions and practices leaving little scope for expansion.

Weak policy and legislative frameworks, the lack of resources – financial and human - allocated at the national level and regional level continue to hamper the development of the sector. These root causes are compounded by the sector being considered ‘soft’. The assumption is that the economic and financial growth will naturally result in the development of the so-called soft sectors. This lack of importance accorded to the sector has, as a consequence, resulted in the placement of culture within the government structures for political expediency rather than strategic planning.

3.0 Objectives of the Review

The evaluation was commissioned by the SPC SOC Culture Programme and conducted between August – December, 2015. This is in accordance with the RCS monitoring and evaluation requirements that an independent evaluation be undertaken in 2015, the mid-point of the implementation of the Strategy, to assist in its on-going refinement and revision and to enable the lessons learnt over the previous five years to be incorporated into the second five year period of the Strategy.

The main objectives of the mid-term review were to:

- evaluate the effectiveness of the Strategy in relation to its stated purpose or the overall purpose of the Strategy, (see above);
- assess the implementation of the Strategy at its mid-point;
- discuss and evaluate the continued relevance of the goals and objectives;
- make recommendations, based on the findings, on priorities for the next five years at both national and regional levels.

Additionally, specific areas of review identified include:

1) assessment of the implementation (or lack thereof) towards goals and objectives, and fulfilment of indicators at national and regional levels including the role that SPC should continue to take in implementing the Strategy
2) assessment of the relevance and appropriateness of the goals and objectives of the Strategy in light of:
   a. country and regional achievements and challenges in the area of Culture development;
   b. new regional and international development frameworks (e.g. the Framework for Pacific Regionalism; the SAMOA Pathway and the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); and
   c. arising or pressing global, regional and national issues (e.g. climate change; environmental conservation; rethinking measures of national wellbeing).
3) appraisal of areas of linkages with other sectoral spheres and strategies within and beyond SPC
4) proposals for new directions, recommendations and priority areas for the next five years of implementation of the Strategy for the Council to consider.

The findings of the review are to ‘inform the Council of Pacific Arts and Culture (CPAC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, as well as partners such as Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
(PIFS), UNESCO, University of the South Pacific (USP) and non-government regional organisations on the continued Culture development in the region.’ The review report is also planned to be presented at the 27th Council meeting.

In conducting the review the SPC SOC Culture Programme proposed a suite of relevant stakeholders to be consulted, including Council members (heads of culture departments and divisions in the region), partner organisations, representatives of government institutions in other sectors, civil society sector representatives in the arts and culture fields and private sector representatives. The views of other divisions and sections of SPC were also sought on how:

1) their work currently relates to the Strategy;
2) the Strategy could be better integrated in their work;
3) on how these divisions and sections could contribute at regional and national levels to promoting the overall purpose of the Strategy.

Notwithstanding this, the Consultants made the final decisions on those selected as informants, based on the SPC SOC Culture Programme focal points list provided and their own knowledge of systems and processes at the national levels. That to a large extent the lists coincided is not unexpected, given that the culture sector it is still at an early development stage and those working or formally trained within the Pacific region are few compared to other sectors.

4.0 Methodology
Based on individual meetings and email exchanges with the SPC SOC Culture Programme Adviser, a methodology to review the Strategy was developed by the Consultants. The purpose of the methodology was to describe the overall scope and approach of the review and set out in some detail the proposed evaluation methodology to be adopted by the review team, including stakeholder identification, participatory methodologies, community consultation processes, data compilation and analysis. It was also aimed at ensuring that key stakeholders have a common understanding of what the evaluation plans to achieve and what the deliverables are. To maintain independence of the review, work in countries was organised by the consultants and not through the SPC stakeholders in countries, although the point of contact was through the departments of culture who also were the SPC counterparts.

Methods employed include the following:

4.1 Data Collection Methods

Desk research
At the start of the evaluation an initial review of purposely selected documents provided by the SPC Culture Programme and those identified by the reviewers were carried out. These documents provided background for review of the RCS and included policy and strategy documents, reports such as the CPAC and Culture Report and Working Papers, and research publications. Other relevant documents were sourced during the country visits, particularly sector or programme reports and publications on programme developments or projects that take into account Culture components and considerations.

Country visits
Eight Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) were visited by the consultants including the Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI), Palau, Tonga, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Fiji. Criteria for selection for the first four countries were on the basis that it should be representative of the three sub-regional groupings within the PICTs (Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia). New Caledonia was added where the SPC headquarters is
located and it was critical to obtain the views of the senior executives of the organisation and that of the other Noumea-based programme managers for the evaluation outcomes. It was also an opportunity for the consultants to engage with the New Caledonia government and culture stakeholders including staff of the Jean-Marie Tjibaou Culture Centre. The New Caledonia visit also added value to this work because it is an example of an overseas territory of France with political status of ‘shared sovereignty’\(^3\). The visit coincided with the SPC GCY programme retreat in Noumea and culminated in a preliminary de-briefing with the programme staff. Fiji’s inclusion is due to the fact that the Culture Programme is based, in SPC, Fiji and the evaluators are also Fiji-based, making it cost-effective and convenient.

*Interviews and Focus Group Discussions*

The reviewers conducted semi-structured interviews with key informants pre-selected by the in-country culture Focal Points in consultation with the consultants. A list of questions (refer to *Attachment I*) was prepared and used as a guide during the interviews. New issues raised or learnt were fed back into the questions asked, to facilitate a more in-depth interview. Informants included secretariat and programme managers of regional organisations, government officials representing national agencies and sectoral ministries/departments, Culture experts including performers and artists, Culture and heritage non-government organisations and associations.

Focus group discussions were held with artists and performers in three (Palau, Solomon Islands and New Caledonia) of the eight countries visited. A total of 132 informants were interviewed (refer to *Attachment II*).

*Questionnaires*

A set of questionnaires was developed (refer to *Attachment III*) and translated into French for the French speaking territories. These were sent to all remaining PICTs that were not part of the country visits\(^4\). Only three responses were received despite repeated email reminders and assurances received pledging support for the evaluation work when the first initial contacts were made. These commitments, however, were not followed through. It is important to note at this point that the responses received from the three countries were consistent with the responses provided by the informants interviewed in-country. A number of reasons can be attributed to this including the high staff turnover in-country and as a consequence, the lack of institutional knowledge being passed on; the lack of internal communications and coordination; and the lack of priority accorded to such activity.

*Debriefing*

A debriefing meeting was held with SOC-GCY Programme staff in Noumea at the end of the New Caledonia visit to share the preliminary findings with the Team. This was followed by another meeting held with the Culture Adviser to further discuss findings and to seek further clarifications.

*Synthesis and analysis phase*

The overall objective of the analysis is to provide (some) quantitative and qualitative measure of the three criteria used to review the Strategy i.e. relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. All information collected from the various tools used (interviews, focus groups, country visits, literature research) was combined to verify the information collected

---

\(^3\) There are three French overseas territories: New Caledonia, French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna.

\(^4\) This is to satisfy the inclusiveness, and efficiency and effectiveness criteria due to budget and time constraints
and underpin the arguments in the analysis. Responses received from different communities were compared to facilitate analysis and to allow for quick comparisons between the different prime issues and for the aggregation of overall Strategy performance. In this respect triangulation was used to cross-check quantitative (where available) and qualitative data collected and to distil data from the various tools used.

5.0 Challenges Faced
Without exception the consultants arrived in each country without a programme of meetings confirmed by the national focal points. This is despite the circular letter sent by the SPC Director General to all culture focal points informing of the impending visits, communications via email by the SPC Culture Programme and the direct contacts made by the consultants. Despite this, the country visits, with minor exceptions, were considered successful given the number of informants interviewed. To a large extent this is owed to the goodwill of the informants.

6.0 Outline
Aligned to the terms of reference (TOR) of the mid-term review – to assess the implementation of the strategy (efficiency), to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy in relation to its goals and objectives and discuss the relevance of the Strategy - the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) parameters including relevance, efficiency and effectiveness have been used to guide the evaluation process.

The approach taken in this analysis is two-tiered where relevant:

1) that at the regional level;
2) from the national perspective and while the issues may converge at certain points separate discussion will help clarify or reinforce the issues raised.

Every prime issue of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness are analysed from these two perspectives.

Under the prime issue of efficiency we elected to deal with each goal separately. This review does not pretend to capture everything, because it is impossible to do so, but where relevant we have highlighted specific regional and national examples to demonstrate achievement or the lack thereof and/or challenges in relation to implementation. In addition, there may be some overlaps in addressing objectives/activities under each goal: for example, when operational objectives and performance indicators are considered from different angles under different goals. This is unavoidable.

6.1 Relevance and Quality of the Design of the Regional Culture Strategy

6.1.1 Relevance
This section examines the appropriateness of the RCS - its goals and objectives to the needs of the target beneficiaries, and the quality of the design through which these objectives are proposed to be reached. Under this goal there are four objectives, four indicators and 11 activities.

The RCS is highly relevant to the needs of the target groups and is supportive of the regional and national policies. It is compatible with international policies and conventions.

---

5 The DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance, used by EU and other international donors, include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. This is in line with the requirements of the TOR for Review which focuses on the first three criteria.
The Regional Culture Strategy 2010-2020 is designed to strengthen Pacific cultures by providing a framework for Culture policy formulation and development at the national and regional levels. It also provides direction for future investment, development and growth for the culture sector to enable strengthening of Pacific Culture identity, economic and social development. It consists of seven national and three regional goals. The importance of the culture to the identity of its people has long been recognised within the Pacific region, since 1972 with the Pacific Leaders acknowledging the importance of preserving and conserving its Cultural heritage given the increasing integration of the island economies into the global political, economic and social systems. The establishment of the four-yearly Festival of Pacific Arts was a consequence of that decision.

In the past 10 years, there has been a surge of calls for attention and action to accord culture the prominence it deserves as one of the foundational pillars for sustainable development. At the international level this debate began seriously in 1982. The Pacific region has been slow on the uptake and despite much discourse the role of culture has consistently been relegated to the periphery. In the recent decade however, at the regional level this has been partially addressed with the development of the Regional Culture Strategy. This new development signals a turning point of events: Culture as an emerging priority issue in development discussions, supported by the growing number of CROP Agencies’ commitment, some donor support and as the ‘way forward’, exemplified by the Francophone Territories. What is becoming very clear is that culture can no longer continue to be overlooked just because it does not fit the current paradigm, which does not emphasise culture in development.

The lack of developmental progress within the culture sector can be attributed to the lack of or outdated legislative and policy frameworks, budgetary constraints, lack of skilled and qualified workforce and the lack of statistical data to provide evidence-based support to increased investment in the sector. This is compounded by the absence of a holistic or cross-sectoral approach to development adopted by the PICs. The current (and now outdated) development approach and priorities to-date have to a large extent been driven by international and donor agendas which are not necessarily prejudicial in themselves, (and evidence abounds that point to the social and economic benefits that have accrued as a result) but which could be improved through promotion of sectors which draw on existing Pacific resources, knowledge, heritage and diversity.

The current economic models are not producing the level of development that is required to raise the standard of living and the well-being of people that Pacific governments are mandated to serve. To realise these objectives an innovative, cross-sectoral and transformative development paradigm that takes into account culture, environment and social development needs to be adopted. This demands a holistic approach that goes beyond economics.

The RCS is the first serious attempt to reflect such an approach. It is an approach where the potential for culture as an economic driver and pillar for sustainable development is placed at the forefront of the development debate within the PICTs.

In view of the foregoing the RCS overall purpose, its goals and objectives clearly respond to the needs of the PICTs. The goals and objectives identified are relevant and if adequately resourced will contribute to the achievement of the overall vision and to the national economies of Pacific islands countries, drawing on the untapped potential of their Cultural industries and Culture tourism. At the regional level there has been a litany of declarations, action plans and communiqués where the Pacific leaders have underscored the intrinsic and economic value of culture and heritage and the

---

Footnotes:

6 Leading the charge at the international level are UNESCO, UNCTAD, EU and the Commonwealth.
7 1982 World Conference on Cultural Policies issued the Mexico City Declarations on Cultural Policies.
8 Examples include the Pacific Plan and Auckland Forum Communiqué.
To protect and preserve them. As already noted, at the regional level the RCS goes a long way in supporting these various declarations, communiqués and action plans articulated by the Pacific Leaders. The PICTs Ministers of Cultures’ 2002 Declaration - ‘urges the governments of Pacific Islands countries and territories to give priority to the protection, preservation, development and promotion of our traditional knowledge and culture;’ the Leaders Vision in the Auckland Declaration, April 2004 - “We treasure the diversity of the Pacific and seek a future in which its cultures, traditions and religious beliefs are valued, honoured and developed;’ and the Framework for Pacific Regionalism9, endorsed in 2014. The Framework provides further legitimacy and support to the RCS and the various goals identified therein. The Regional Culture Strategy has, through the Council of Pacific Arts and Culture (CPAC), collectively identified the national and regional priorities of what it considers in urgent need of attention.

Recognizing the Strategic Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda adopted by the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2015; called the international community to “Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s Culture and natural heritage”, highlighting that the conservation of natural resources drives sustainable development and that the World Heritage Convention is an important tool to achieve these goals.

The SAMOA Pathway Outcome Document of the 3rd UN International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (Samoa, September 2014) recognises that SIDS possess a wealth of culture, which is a driver and an enabler for sustainable development. This will further progress work on culture in the region, especially on indigenous and traditional knowledge and Culture expression, which underscores the deep connections among people, culture, knowledge and the natural environment.

Similarly at the national level various Constitutions, national development and sector plans and strategies underscore the centrality of culture to people of the Pacific region and to development. These acknowledgements at the planning and consultation stage are often not taken through to tangible follow-up action or implementation. The RCS, moreover, is aligned to the international instruments of European Union (EU) Culture policies, Commonwealth Foundation Strategy on Culture, UNCDAT Economy Report 2008 and UNESCO conventions.

There is clear correlation and logic between the activities listed in the Strategy, how they are linked to the objectives and the overall goals identified, and how they address clearly the needs of member countries. Despite this, a proper analysis of risks and assumptions is critical to the achievement of any development strategy, programme or project. The risks and assumptions in this case are not clearly identified or managed.

Risks and assumption are usually identified at the planning phase when stakeholders’ analysis and problem analysis are undertaken and which should have been carried out during the development of the Strategy. Whether this was carried out could not be verified by the consultants; what is clear however is that the Strategy does not list any risks or assumptions, contingent upon which the achievement of the goals and objectives are dependent. Overall, the risks and assumptions are the sufficient and necessary test conditions that must exist or be satisfied; only then the objectives and indicators could be achieved. For example: 13 PICTs have developed and are implementing national Culture policies; six PICTs are regularly using Culture impact assessments in development planning; 11 PICTs are using Culture statistics and indicators; is dependent on the buy-in of the mandated ministries, political will of the senior executives of the ministries concerned, and availability of qualified staff and financial resources to fund such operations. These are the necessary and

---

sufficient conditions, which are still non-existent at the national level. This same test can be applied
to all seven goals, objectives and activities under the Strategy.

At this mid-point of the implementation, it is observed that the overall purpose of the Strategy will
be partially met during its 10 year duration. At the regional level and based on the three regional
goals, objectives and activities, a number of activities have been implemented that would lead to the
achievements of the indicators and objectives identified. The RCS as a guide, to the integration of
culture in development, identifying and addressing Culture barriers to development, reflecting
emerging issues, as a standard setting tool and identifying priorities to development; has been
successful. In a convenient and efficient way the RCS identified the challenges and way forward for
future development work. The development of the Culture mapping, planning and policy approach
and toolkit, the regional consultations on Cultural industries and Culture statistics held and the
development of the Intangible Cultural heritage toolkit are examples of activities undertaken to
progress implementation. Collaborations with UNESCO, PIFS and SPTO have made headway
including Cultural industries and Intellectual Property Right (IPR) work with PIFS involving the
intangible Cultural heritage workshops and joint SPTO/SPC Culture tourism initiative under EDF 11,
that are all evidence that a number of activities and objectives have been met, contributing to the
fulfilment of the overall objective of the Strategy.

It is at the national level that the implementation of the activities identified under the seven national
goals that Regional Culture Strategy is weak. Indicators developed under each goal are quite
unrealistic and not achievable in most cases. For example, to state that six PICTs are regularly measuring the contribution of Cultural industries to national economic and social welfare, and 13 PICTs have successfully mainstreamed culture into the national development planning processes, is considered not feasible. Presently mid-way into the implementation of the Strategy only three
countries have developed their national Culture policies – two as a direct result of the Strategy.
Considering that the status quo at the national level during the planning and design stage of the
Strategy was one where ministries of cultures were marginalised and continue to be so, and that
they are fraught with lack of capacity and resources; thus to set the benchmark so high is
counterproductive.

In addition, development of national policies is an extended process requiring extensive
consultations with all relevant civil societies, government departments and ministries, private sector
and academic institutions. National and sectoral polices are long term, spanning 10-20 years, and
once these national frameworks are developed, sectors will have to wait for the next round of
negotiations to negotiate or re-negotiate their ‘space’ within these policies. While some of these
policies make references to culture, it does not enjoy the same status as finance, planning,
education, health or agriculture. Knowing the strategic point of entry will gain the maximum
mileage, yet in most of the PICTs visited that are currently undergoing national strategic and sectoral
policy revisions, the national Culture ministries have not maximised these opportunities. For
example, the Government of Vanuatu is currently developing its National Sustainable Development
Plan with consultations being held around the country. Similarly, the Ministry of Education is
reviewing its national policy. The Solomon Islands Government is conducting provincial consultations
for the review of its Strategic Development Plan and the Department of Statistics is developing its 20
year Strategic Plan. In both situations the Departments of Culture are either unaware or have not
proactively engaged the ministries concerned to lobby for the mainstreaming culture; or as in the
case of Solomon Islands Statistics, to develop separate Culture statistics classifications

It was also observed that the timescale and the range of activities identified are not realistic with
regard to the stakeholder’s capacities. A number of informants who are project partners are either
unaware or do not clearly understand the RCS. These situations warrant a review of the indicators,
which may require a downward revision so that they are SMART. The objectives and goals do not necessarily require revision as they are still relevant, but what may be further required is to prioritise for the next five years what is feasible to achieve.

6.1.2 The Design

The design of the Strategy brings together in an integrated manner the enablers of culture such as policy and legislative and institutional aspects; and tangible and intangible Culture components and the engagement of stakeholders at different levels. The RCS sets out an inclusive vision and conceptual framework through which the connections between culture and development can be highlighted. The Regional Culture Strategy was developed and supported by the CPAC working group, who are representatives of the Culture ministries and departments, and partners from other regional and international organisations. That the RCS was supported and designed by the members of the working group does not necessarily mean that there was support by key implementers at the national and regional level. The lack of extensive consultations at the national and regional levels contributes to the lack of buy-in by sectors, Culture associations and key regional and national stakeholders. As stated the “...Strategy has been formulated after numerous consultations between regional organisation representatives, national Culture development facilitators and experts from PICTs.”

The lead agencies directly responsible for the implementation of each goal and objective, and the partners whose support and partnership are integral to the successful implementation of each strategic goal, are clearly defined, however, this does not necessarily mean that these entities at the regional and national levels were sufficiently consulted during the design of the Strategy - as was confirmed by a majority of respondents who corroborated that they were not aware of the Strategy. For the Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI), Palau and New Caledonia the national ministries/departments of culture had no knowledge of the RCS and even less so by the various government sectors and Culture actors and performers interviewed. Based on the successive interviews held in Fiji, it can be concluded that while there is knowledge of the RCS by certain individuals and ministries such as the departments of Heritage and Arts and iTaukei Affairs, other sectors have no knowledge of the RCS. Due to this limited awareness, support for the RCS is not widespread, including across government sectors. In Tonga, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, when key stakeholders representing the national Culture ministries were interviewed, the responses gathered were mixed from having some knowledge of the RCS to having little understanding of the RCS and the relevance to work currently undertaken in countries.

This lack of awareness or buy-in could also be attributed to a number of other factors such as the lack of institutional memory due to high staff turnover, the lack of advocacy and communication on the Strategy itself, either from regional to national level or within country by ministries directly responsible for culture. This lack of knowledge of the Strategy does not negate the relevance of the Strategy, as the priority areas identified at the regional and national levels have been a subject of on-going discussions by the CPAC country representatives at the regional level.

At the regional level, support for the RCS is not institutionalised across the organisations but it is comprised of committed individuals who form a pool of individuals/consultants who collaborate with the SPC Regional Culture Programme for the implementation of the activities identified. For example interviews with two informants at the USP Oceania Centre revealed that they are unaware of the Strategy and their current programme is not driven by it. Similarly for the SPC programme managers such as those in fisheries, land resource division and health programme, but individuals under these programmes were aware. An integrated approach is required to ensure that other SPC divisions and programmes are collaborating and implementing the Strategy activities in their own
action and work plans. Ownership by key stakeholders at the national level needs to be strengthened and more effort is required to support institutional strengthening by clearly defining coordination, management and financing arrangements of these key national partners. These are activities that can be classified under the operational objectives of the Strategy.

The review of the RCS highlighted that the 10 Strategic Goals and Objectives are well defined, but the Strategy falls short on the operational objectives. Further evidence to support the need for institutionalisation is that most of the activities undertaken at the regional level have been project-based. Because they are project-based, responsibilities and accountabilities for the implementation of these activities have not been integrated into the organisations’ systems and processes which are necessary requirements for institutional strengthening. This further lends support to the recommendation for a revised RCS to also consider developing robust operational objectives, with accompanying indicators and activities as a guide for the national Ministries of Culture and Heritage. In the long term this will also contribute to the sustainability of the Strategy results that are likely to be realised. Capacity building and institutional strengthening for key stakeholders will also contribute to the development of an ‘exit strategy’ – in the event that the donor funding comes to an end, sufficient capacity has been built to continue delivering the Strategy results.

The reviewers found that the overall purpose and the goals identified in the RCS are not well understood by the majority of the partners interviewed at national levels. For example, an informant who was also a participant in the Sub-regional Meeting on Endangered Culture Mapping held in Fiji pointed out that he was unaware that the meeting was related to the RCS. This highlights the need for a comprehensive advocacy strategy to promote the RCS at the regional and national level, targeting decision makers, implementers such as government ministries and departments, Culture organisations, local artists and private sector.

A consistent challenge faced by the SPC Culture Programme and the culture ministries and departments at country levels is the lack of human and financial resources. With few exceptions, most governments within the region do not prioritise culture, and the lack of pro-activeness and specialised technical skills and knowledge on the part of the ministries and departments directly contribute to the marginalisation of the sector.

6.2 Efficiency

Here we assess the efficiency of the implementation; how well activities implemented have contributed to the achievement of the objectives.

The RCS has identified the target areas requiring the most immediate attention and providing the greatest opportunities for growth and development for the culture sector An examination of the reports submitted by PICTs to the CPAC, and the responses gathered from informants during the country visits and from questionnaires received reveals that there has been some progress made, but there is still a lot of work to be done towards realising the overall purpose of the Strategy. While the key outcomes, outputs and activities are well defined, a considerable number of activities at the national level have not been implemented. The delays are significant and have the potential of derailing the achievement of the overall objectives and goals of the Strategy.

It is also worth noting that a substantial portion of the activities reported to the CPAC and those implemented by other sectors and reported in this section are independent of the RCS or are ‘home grown’. These are highlighted to demonstrate the need to assess existing country level activities that are integrating culture in the different sectors and to use this to leverage culture and progress mainstreaming work during the next five years.
Progress at the regional level is much more encouraging through the SPC Culture Programme and in partnership with other CROP Agencies, international organisations and external donor agencies. The development of a mapping and planning approach and toolkit; the joint collaboration with PIFS on the Cultural industries targeting Fiji, Samoa and Solomon Islands; and the promotion of mapping in partnership with the Commonwealth Foundation are some examples of the achievements at the regional level. This is despite the Culture Programme, for a long time, having only one staff and only recently an additional technical staff member recruited under the Cultural industries Project funded by EU and ACP. The Culture Programme continues to be hampered with limited resources, both financial and technical.

In total 82 activities were identified and if implemented in its entirety will contribute to the achievement of the 37 objectives (outputs) and ultimately to the 10 goals (outcomes) as identified. A number of informants at the national level agree that these objectives cannot be achieved during the lifetime of the Strategy. As noted, considerable delays have been experienced in the implementation of many activities based on the 10 year lifetime of the Strategy.

Three yearly implementation plans identified under the monitoring framework were not made available to the reviewers. However, a review of the reports presented by countries to the CPAC comprised sections on plans for succeeding years or recommendations for future work by the CPAC. Whether these constituted or ultimately contributed to the development of the implementation plans and/or workplans at national levels and to further guide management is unclear.

A majority of informants interviewed cited the lack of financial and human resources to implement activities related to the RCS, as a major drawback. Competing priorities within the Ministries that culture sits in is a continuous challenge. A systematic approach to resource mobilisation is needed to assist in implementation of national activities. The role and financial support of development partners and donors are critical to the implementation of the activities and the achievement of objectives. This is illustrated in a number of projects discussed below. The identification of these projects is not only meeting the needs of the countries to protect and promote their Cultural heritage, but also foremost is that it is in accordance with the mandate of these organisations. That these mandates are in accord with the overall purpose of the Strategy is particularly strategic.

Activities under each goal are discussed separately for better appreciation and reporting. We note from the outset that the ensuing discussions, as indeed with other descriptions provided under all activities identified, do not claim to be comprehensive but provide specific examples as to the extent of implementation to fulfil the stated objectives though not necessarily as a result of the Strategy.

6.2.1 Goal 1: Mainstream Culture into National Social and Economic Development Planning and Policy

Under Goal 1 there are four objectives, four indicators and 11 activities. Three of the 11 activities identified have been implemented to some extent and contribute directly to the achievement objective: ‘Develop and implement national culture policy’. As precursor to the development of the national Culture policies, a regional workshop on Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy (CMPP) was conducted for members of the Council for Pacific Arts and Culture in March 2010. The development of a Pacific Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy Toolkit workshop immediately followed to guide national Culture practitioners and policy makers on processes to develop national Culture policies. As a consequence, six national Culture ministries10 in collaboration with SPC Culture Programme are
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10 SPC project funded by EU (Component 1) "Structuring the Cultural Sector in the Pacific for Improved Human Development" targeted the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Tuvalu, Tonga, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.
at various stages of Culture mapping. In the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) a Culture mapping exercise was conducted in four states (Kosrae, Pohnpei, Chuuk and Yap) in 2010; in Vanuatu the scoping study for Culture mapping is yet to be completed. With financial assistance under the French Pacific Fund, Culture mapping was also completed in French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna. More follow-up actions are needed as only two of these countries, Solomon Islands and Tonga, have gone on to develop and endorse their respective National Culture Policy in 2013. In Palau, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Samoa and Fiji, the Culture Policy is at various stages of development.

An inaugural Pacific Region Culture Statistics Meeting was held at the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) in Suva, Fiji from 25 to 27 May 2011. The meeting focused on building of capacity in relation to Culture statistics in both the statistics and Culture sectors.

Eight of the remaining activities identified are still far from being implemented. These include the development of resource mobilisation strategies for the implementation of the Culture policy; review and contribute to the development of national plans and sectoral policies; develop and publish appropriate Culture impact assessment tools and methodology; conduct awareness raising on the need for Culture impact assessments in development planning; build national capacity on Culture impact assessments, including at community level; conduct national capacity building workshops on Culture statistics and indicators and forming partnerships between national statistics offices, planning departments and ministries of culture.

Directly linked to the activities are four indicators and with the exception of Indicator 1.1.1 where some progress has been made with the development of the three national policies (Papua New Guinea (PNG), Solomon Islands and Tonga), the remaining indicators are still far from being achieved. Further evaluation though is required to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the implementation of these policies at the national level, which is outside the scope of this mid-term evaluation. For the remaining three indicators substantial work still needs to be done to deliver on the objectives (outputs) identified, which will require changes to planning and implementation and a potential revision to the indicators due to lessons learnt in the first five years of implementation.

Based on most of the informants’ responses received, discussed below are some of the issues which, in our assessment, are the underlying reasons.

The underlying assumptions made in the identification of these activities and indicators are that the PICTs national Culture ministries have the necessary competency to undertake these activities. This is not the case and for far too long these ministries have been marginalised and relegated to the periphery. Ministry of National Planning and Finance informants interviewed have had extremely minimal contact with the national Culture ministries. This includes RMI, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, and Tonga in the lead up to the development and the implementation of the national plans. This means that Culture planners are not proactive in identifying strategic points of entry in other key Ministries and agencies responsible for planning and development. As noted (Teiwa & Mercer, 2011) “They must negotiate a hard position, make the connections, and establish a voice and a presence in the development of strategies and action plans to reach long-term goals. So Culture planners must be there and make themselves heard from the very beginning. Moreover, they must be there not as outsiders shouting from the wings but as vital components of a ‘growth coalition’. They must persuade public and private sector authorities – on behalf of communities, and with their support and sanction – that these are the structures, rituals and sites of our local life that you are planning.
This is why Culture planning must be integral to other planning processes and not appended as an afterthought.”

Most of the informants interviewed, including the national ministries of planning, are not aware of the RCS, including a Director of Culture who stated that he is not conversant with the details. A number of PICTS are undergoing revisions of the country’s national development plans and specific sector plans such as the Education Policy and in all cases the national ministries of culture are not visible. For example, the new government in place in Solomon Islands, through the Ministry of Planning, is currently doing provincial consultations for a new National Development Strategy (2016 – 2035) that would have five objectives. According to an informant of the Ministry of Planning the five objectives could cover almost anything; however it is dependent on the sector to drive the inclusion of their ministries agenda into the Strategy development process.

Knowing the internal processes and mechanisms as the first step towards mainstreaming the RCS into national development plans and budgetary processes is critical. In Vanuatu for example, the informant responsible for planning within the Prime Minister’s Office stated that he was unaware of the RCS and noted that the Vanuatu Culture Centre, the organisation responsible for the promotion and development of the Culture sector, had not made any concerted effort to engage with the planning unit or to promote the RCS at the national level. A sentiment shared by a number of key sector informants interviewed. The buy-in and endorsement of the Council of Ministers is necessary to in turn give the mandate to the relevant ministry for implementation. This is yet to happen in Vanuatu. Similarly in Tonga the Ministry of National Planning directly responsible for the development of the Tongan Sustainable Development Strategy (TSDF) was unaware of the Strategy.

Institutional and capacity development is required to improve the capacities of those directly responsible for Culture development in all its different facets. Interviews with the Public Service Commissions, that are responsible for human resource development and recruitment within government, confirmed that culture and heritage is not a prioritised field of study for scholarships and training. This is the case in RMI, Tonga and Fiji, with informants further stating that the onus is on the ministry or department to present their needs and to articulate their case before the Commission. Prior to 2014, RMI Public Service Commission (PSC) developed its 3 year Strategic Plan with the assistance of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid)11, the latter focussing on the development of the workforce. At no time did the Ministry of Internal Affairs make a case for human resource development in respect of the Culture sector.

The lack of integration of the RCS into National Development Plans are the result of a lack of understanding of the potential of the sector and its contribution to economic and social development planning. Consequently the ministries responsible for culture are often ‘shunted’ from one portfolio to another for political expedience rather than as a result of strategic planning. This has been the case in Solomon Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu, RMI and Tonga. Culture is often placed under Ministries / departments that are structurally weak; lacking the necessary financial resources and the right mix of qualified skills and expertise to drive development within the sector.

6.2.2 Goal 2: Protect and Promote Culture Rights

Under Goal 2 there are three objectives, seven indicators and 11 activities. For certain PICT members a number of activities have taken place under this goal. Most of the informants interviewed shared the view that some activities implemented are not a direct result of the Strategy. Overall an

11 Now called Department of Foreign Affairs Trade (DAFT)
examination of the indicators identified show that there is still some way to go to achieve these. At the regional level, SPC has worked in collaboration with UNESCO to increase ratification of UNESCO Conventions. The review team was not able to establish whether the development of guidelines on best practices in the region has been produced.

Discussed below are some of the legal and non-legal instruments initiated. Furthermore, this section will focus on the recent developments just prior to or since the Strategy was endorsed.

**Legal Instruments**

Review, updating and passing of new legislation has taken place in some countries as detailed below.

In French Polynesia a draft monument conservation bill was developed in 2012 and approved in principle by the French Polynesian Economic, Social and Culture Council (CESC) for the introduction of legislation for conserving historical buildings and objects.

Fiji’s Copyright Act (1999) covers related rights (Neighbouring Rights) and traditional Culture expressions and amended in 2009 to cover offences arising out of presumption arising from label, mark or foreign certificate. A draft bill on the protection of traditional knowledge and Culture expressions is awaiting further action by the Attorney General’s office. Fiji has established a Culture intellectual steering committee to better protect the interests of Culture producers.

A bill to strengthen the historical and Culture preservation of Palau in accordance with the goals and objectives of Palau’s Culture Policy has been developed and is awaiting the approval of the Legislature. The protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expression of Culture bill is awaiting its passage by both houses of the Palau Congress. It covers ownership rights, moral rights, informed consent, and enforcement. A second bill that is still under development is the Registry for Traditional Money of Palau. The purpose of this bill is to have all traditional money of Palau registered with its background and history.


The Samoan Language Commission Act (2014) was passed to ensure the Samoan remains a vibrant language, to declare the Samoan language as an official language, and to establish the Samoan Language Commission to provide its functions, duties and powers, and related purposes. The Public records Act 2011 was passed by Parliament in January 2011. The Act establishes the National Archives and Records Authority and the National Archivist.

Solomon Islands Protected Areas Act (2010) makes reference to Culture protected areas, especially heritage designated areas. As a member of the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG), Solomon Islands has endorsed the MSG Treaty on Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture in force (2012). The Government of Solomon Islands in collaboration with SPC commissioned a WIPO report for addressing the Culture Intellectual Property of the Festival of Pacific Arts held in Solomon Islands.

For Kiribati, in 2010 a public policy consultation on Traditional Knowledge (TK) Policy with a draft bill on the Protection of Traditional Knowledge prepared and is awaiting approval by Parliament. In 2011 a national consultation on the Intangible Cultural heritage (ICH) 2003 convention was held by Kiribati Culture Division of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Cabinet has in principal granted approval and
work is still in progress for actual accession. Kiribati acceded to the WIPO Convention in 2013. The Ministry of Commerce in 2013 conducted national consultations on copyright and related rights.

The Tuvaluan Cabinet in 2013 endorsed the ratification of the Convention on Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural heritage, but no further work has been done since.

The Tāoga Niue Act of 2012 provides for additional protection for Traditional Knowledge and Expression of Culture. A number of legislations have been amended to comply with the provisions outlined in the Tāoga Niue Act, and as such the Customs Act (1966) is amended to include “Export of antiquities and protected objects”, the Archives Act (1992) and the Immigration Act. In 2014 the Government of Niue submitted its instrument of accession to the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Convention.

In 2013, an Act to create the Guam Trademark Commission was passed. The Commission was tasked to develop policies and recommendations for the Guam Trademark and Intellectual Property Rights Act and the Guam Culture Trademark Act.

At the regional level SPC is working with the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) on the implementation of the model law on the Protection of Traditional Knowledge. Upon request, assistance has been provided to eight countries. Cook Islands in 2013 adopted a Protection of Traditional knowledge Act.

Non-Legal Instruments

Fiji is the only country, apart from Australia and New Zealand that has established collecting societies for the collection of copyright royalties that is through the Fiji Performers Rights Association (FIPRA). Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands are making some headway and efforts are underway to engage FIPRA to assist Solomon Islands to establish up its own collecting society for copyright royalties. Fiji, through the Fiji Arts Council, has established a register of artists and database for Cultural industries custodians and producers. Fiji has also developed protective measures such as labels of origin/authenticity, geographical indicators and/or trademarks for creative goods. Vanuatu is developing its own labels of origin/authenticity, geographical indicators and/or trademarks, modelled on the Fiji-made experience.

Development and dissemination of user-friendly materials, including audio visuals to raise understanding and awareness of Culture assets have taken place to some extent. The Endangered Cultural heritage project, initiated by SPC and funded by EU, is a good example of this and is focused on the mapping of the ancient Punatua site on Vaitupu Island in Tuvalu. DVDs, brochures and posters were produced of the sites and have been donated to schools and libraries around the country for educational reference of Culture developments and undertakings.

In 2013 the Kiribati Government approved the annual celebration of a National Culture Day to demonstrate and promote Cultural industries, knowledge and skills, products and custodians. National Culture Days are also celebrated in other countries of the Pacific Region.

Tonga reported during the 25th CPAC meeting the initiative to establish a safeguarding system on Intangible Cultural heritage. In 2015 Tonga launched a publication titled “Traditional knowledge and Wisdom – Themes from the Pacific Islands”. The project, in which six countries participated, was supported by the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP), which comes under the auspices of UNESCO.
The Historic and Preservation Office (HPO) in RMI, as a requirement under the US National Parks from which it derives its mandate and funding, and with the assistance of SPC Culture Programme, recently developed its Strategic Plan to guide the functions of the office. In 2015 RMI ratified the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural heritage.

Meetings and workshops supported, through the UNESCO Japanese Funds-in-Trust, include: a Sub-regional Meeting in the Pacific for the Promotion of Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural heritage held in Fiji in 2008; Sub-regional capacity building workshop in the Pacific and a national consultation meeting in Tonga on the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural heritage Tonga convened 2009; a series of national consultation meetings on the Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Cultural heritage through the strengthening of national capacities in Asia and the Pacific which both PNG and Samoa attended in 2011. Additionally, SPC is working with UNESCO to increase ratification, promotion and implementation of international conventions. Consequently, since 2010 seven countries have ratified the 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural heritage.

Of the remaining activities identified there are now two qualified legal officers competent in Culture legislation drafting, currently based out of Fiji and Papua New Guinea. The Pacific Way, once a weekly television programme distributed to 20 PICTs in the Pacific region to promote and showcase the work of Pacific Island producers, is no longer in operation.

Under the activity to actively partake in the negotiations of the inter-governmental group on traditional knowledge, expressions of culture and genetic resources, as well as the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Doha Agenda negotiations on traditional knowledge and expressions of culture, there are only three World Trade Organisation (WTO) member nations in the South Pacific (Fiji, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands). The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) is the peak representative body for the small island nations of the Pacific representing sixteen countries. PIFS has been active in these negotiations, representing its member countries and it is anticipated that to a large extent it does represent the countries interests on traditional knowledge and expressions of culture.

Overall achievement of the seven indicators identified under Goal 2 is still far from complete. For example:

- five PICTs have established functioning collecting societies; to-date only Fiji has a collecting society.
- by 2015 one legal officer from each PICT is qualified in Culture legislation drafting; only two from Fiji and PNG are fully qualified in this area.
- 10 PICTs have enacted traditional knowledge legislation; it is very unlikely that this will be achieved by 2020.

6.2.3 Goal 3: Develop and maintain Culture sites, spaces and infrastructure.

Under Goal 3 there are three objectives, 12 indicators and 10 activities. Certain PICT members have made some progress towards achieving the 12 indicators but there is more work to be done to consolidate and build on what has been attained. At the regional level, for the documentation of best practices of public and private and community engagement to promote Culture events to promote sites etc, a Regional Training on Heritage Management Plan Development was organised in
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12 Australia, the Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Marshall Islands, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu
Suva 2014, followed by a Micronesia Workshop for Management Plan Development with communities held in Yap, FSM.

Work that had been carried out before the RCS include a culture mapping by SPREP (2005 – 2010) in Kiribati, which covered all culture related sites for protected areas (KPA) so they could be documented and successfully submitted to the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP). Data collected on sites, in particular the associated intangible traditional knowledge, can form the basis of the cultural mapping. All sites and data submitted to UNESCO for ratification on Safeguarding ICH in Kiribati were taken from the culture mapping completed by SPREP, as an excellent example of effective collaboration and finding synergies and complementarity among different or similar projects.

During the 25th CPAC French Polynesia presented its intention to implement its classified historical site plan on Maraetaata site in Paea and Opunou Culture and natural sites on Moorea. French Polynesia is inscribing Taputapuatea on the World Heritage Listing. This should be one of the sites listed in 2017.

The Guam Museum is under construction at the cost of US$27million while another two village museums have opened in southern Guam. Work on culture sites, spaces and infrastructure have expanded rapidly in Guam with the preparation of the Festival of Pacific Arts in 2016. The Government of Guam, through the Department of Chamorro Affair, requires all public buildings and facilities where the total cost of construction, remodelling or renovation exceeds the sum of US$100,000 to set aside one per cent (1%) of the total cost for the acquisition of works of art. This provision also applies to buildings in public areas that are subsidised by the federal or Guam government. Interviews with the Department of Culture in New Caledonia revealed the same requirements are applied to newly or renovated building constructed in New Caledonia.

In 2012 the Department of Culture and Heritage in the Solomon Islands, in preparation for the Festival of Pacific Arts, received substantial funding from government. The funds were used to upgrade and maintain Culture storage and exhibition facilities within the museum. In addition an indoor Auditorium and National Art Gallery were built. The Festival village built during the Arts Festival has now been converted into a National University with plans to maintain a Culture Village within the University as a centre for learning Solomon Islands culture and heritage. Plans are in the pipeline to build a Crafts Market in 2016, which will support and promote Cultural industries development.

In contrast office space for Culture activities is extremely limited in Tonga and the Tonga National Culture Centre and the Queen Salote Memorial Hall are the current venues for holding Culture activities.

In RMI, during the time of the review, the museum had just recently reopened after being closed for two years; however the future reduction in the COMPACT funding will affect long term operation and sustainability of the organisation. Funds granted by the US Institute of Museum and Library services exclusively targets library services, computer training and staff. The Ministry of Environment has been involved in mapping of all historical site listings, mostly on war relics; with a marine conservation protected area established in 2008 with an action plan developed in collaboration with a number of partners13. The Waan Aelõñ in Majel (WAM), a project that represents a partnership between culture and the youth sector, has been 15 years in operation. The revival of traditional mat

designs and weaving that the Marshallese were once known for through the University of the South Pacific (USP), RMI centre, exemplifies culture work that is on-going which the Historic Preservation Office has been supporting.

With the support of Taiwan, the Palauan National Archives was constructed and include the civic centre building and the Bureau Arts and Preservation Office. Work is currently underway for the restoration of physical sites that have been abandoned, with the support of the Palau Visitors’ Authority (PVA).

Recent Culture and natural sites in the Pacific in the World Heritage listing, that can be related to the RCS, include Hawai‘i Volcanoes National Park Natural (Hawai‘i Island) and the Levuka Historical Port Town, Fiji (2013). Sites included before 2010 are the Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site (2010; Marshall Islands), Chief Roi Mata’s Domain Culture (2008; Vanuatu), East Rennel (1998; Solomon Islands), Lagoons of New Caledonia (2008), Phoenix Islands Protected Area (2010, Kiribati), Rock Islands Southern Lagoon (Palau), and Kuk Early AgriCulture Site (2008, PNG). Progress from other countries not visited during this review has not been included.

6.2.4 Goal 4: Expand Pacific Cultural industries

Under Goal 4 there are five objectives, five indicators and seven activities. At the regional level there are two activities identified. Most of the activities listed have not been implemented and as a consequence only two of the five indicators have shown progress.

Under the EU funding, Fiji, Samoa and Solomon Islands are partners in the project ‘Enhancing the Pacific Cultural industries’. SPC and PIFS worked collaboratively in an earlier project to produce baseline data on Cultural industries and conduct initial training workshops on Cultural industries. In 2010 a regional consultation on Cultural industries was held in Suva Fiji, organised by the SPC SOC! Culture Programme. Recommendations arising out of the consultation included amongst others: identifying and using Pacific models of linking trade and culture; developing protocols related to uses of expressions of culture, drawing on traditional knowledge; and re-establishing the Pacific model of master/apprentice to enable Culture masters to pass on their skills and knowledge.14

Culture statistics and mapping of Cultural industries have been developed in the Cook Islands, providing a model for further work in this area.

The Fiji Arts Council, in existence for 20 years, is currently being revamped under the project to establish improved systems and governance. Samoa and Solomon Islands have recently established arts councils. As already noted elsewhere in this report, efforts are now underway to engage FIPRA to assist with the establishment of a Solomon Islands collective society for authors and performers.

There has been significant progress in Fiji in its development of the Cultural industries sector. The Fiji Government under the auspices of the Ministry of Women organises an annual National Craft Fair where women of the 14 Provinces from around the country come together to display and sell their crafts. Under the Ministry of Commerce, Fiji-made branding has evolved and is now operational. Fiji Arts Council is a member of the Compliance Committee. With systems and processes in place, craftspeople are now recognized and a total of 94 licenses had been issued, 43 of which are to women. The effect on retailing has been substantial, with retail shops now ‘forced’ to deal directly with producers as the license holders. In terms of a way forward, SPC can further assist countries like
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14 SPC Regional Consultation on the Cultural Industries Report, 2010
Fiji, which are progressing in the area of Cultural industries and also use examples and approaches adopted by Fiji as good practice for other countries.

In 2012, the Entrepreneurial Development Sub-regional Workshop for Culture Producers was held in Guam following the 25th Guam Micronesia Island Fair. Representatives from the region attended the four day workshop sponsored by the SPC and PIFS. Following the workshop, a non-profit organization was formed specifically to provide support to culture producers and artists in their business practices. Separate legislation was also passed providing $200,000 for a “Made in Guam” Business Incubator Program.

To provide assistance to art and literature, French Polynesia established its Art and Literature Council in 2012. Under its Country Act, industrial property titles lodged with the National Industrial Property Title Institute (INPI) can now be protected in French Polynesia in the same way they are in mainland France with regard to the duration of such protection, as long as they have been previously “recognised” by the country.

The Division of Culture in Solomon Islands is working on establishing and strengthening national culture agencies, arts councils/bodies and local arts groups. Attempts are underway to revive the Solomon Islands Artists Association (SIAS) to bring together artists, weavers, shell makers, handicrafts producers and carvers as a way of valuing traditional knowledge and practices. The RCS was catalyst to revive the Solomon Artists Association (2011) and the Solomon Islands Music Federation, with informants who are members noting that these are still work in progress. In 2014 a national development workshop for cultural industries in Solomon Islands identified five Strategic Priorities: Involvement of youth in industry; Intellectual property rights and legal protection; identifying training opportunities; developing performing arts and marketing venues and gaining access to equipment; and capacity building for collectives. The challenge now is the implementation. SPC in collaboration with PIFS, the Culture Division in the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Solomon Islands Arts Alliance, held management training to support the growth of the Solomon Islands’ Culture sector.

For RMI the branding “Be Marshallese – Buy Marshallese” is a joint collaboration between the Ministry of Trade and Chamber of Commerce. The traditional mat weavings and design revitalisation project, first launched in 2006 has extended to other parts of the country.

At the regional level, for the 2012 Festival of Pacific Arts held in Solomon Islands, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in collaboration with the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) undertook a scoping mission to report on the intellectual property and traditional culture expression management for the Festival; the findings of the study are being used to inform the upcoming Festival.

6.2.5 Goal 5: Mainstream Arts and Culture in Education and Training

Under this Goal there are four objectives, eight indicators and four activities. Two activities are identified at the regional level for implementation by SPC; these have not been implemented. At the national level, of the four activities identified work has progressed on two. Of the eight indicators identified, little progress has been made. The Pacific Heritage Hub (PHH) began internal consultations with USP academic teams from different disciplines to develop an under-graduate course on heritage management as part of requirements of the MoU with the Australian Government. The formal establishment of this course has been stalled due to certain institutional adjustment requirements and approval by USP. On the initiative to include management, leadership
and administration studies in tertiary institutions, a start was made with the holding of a Regional Training on Heritage Management Plan Development at USP in 2014.

It is important to note that while at country level the culture portfolio has frequently been shifted around in different ministries, the practice in some PICs has been to place the culture portfolio either under Ministry of Internal Affairs, Home Affairs or Education.

A Pacific Culture and Education Strategy 2010-2015 was also launched the same time as the RCS. Its principal aim is to:
1) raise the profile of culture in education at all levels
2) increase opportunities for training and education for the culture sector itself
3) raise the level of priority given to culture by governments.

While there has not been any activity implemented under this strategy at the regional level, at the national level a number of informants within the education sector drew attention to various initiatives already in place.

In 2015, the Public Education System (PSS) of the RMI incorporated Marshallese language studies as part of the curriculum from Elementary to High School level and a law was passed requiring all newspapers to be bilingual. Challenges faced include identification of teachers who are skilled in Marshallese language, chants and storytelling.

In 2012, the Guam Department of Education (DoE) approved the standards for a full year course curriculum for teachers as part of a Chamorro Culture Arts program for middle and high schools. Other initiatives are in place to support the teaching of Chamorro language and culture in schools.

As reported in the 25th CPAC meeting currently the TVET program at the Kiribati Technical Institute concentrates on the modern technologies and skills and traditional arts and culture have not been integrated.

Prior to the launching of the RCS the Palau Language Commission was established (2009) and a new curriculum framework for Palauan studies for grades 1 – 12 was created (1993). In 2012 a law was passed that Palauan language be taught in all schools. The lack of implementation of the law is attributed to the lack of qualified teachers to teach the language and resource materials. A revised dictionary sponsored and approved by the Palau Language Commission was published in 2015. At the time of the review, the MOE in partnership with the Palau Conservation Society were reviewing the science curriculum with the aim of localising it.

Progress in Education and Culture in the Solomon Islands prior to the RCS included an Education for All assessment done in 2000 which recommended that the Solomon Islands Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) develop educational programmes with a focus on vocational skill. A curriculum revision process initiated by the Ministry of Education Human Resource and Development (MEHRD) in 2005 highlighted that the existing syllabus and learning materials had not generated the kind of student achievement expected by parents and employers. In the 1990s the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) began developing materials, titled ‘Nguzunguzu’, drawing on local traditions and culture. This project appears to be on hold at the time of the review. In 2014, a study undertaken by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), East Asia and Pacific regional office noted the need for a curriculum reform to address the potential role that education content

---

15 Education For All: The Year 2000 Assessment Education For All Country, Report By Solomon Islands National Country Co-Ordinator Johnson Moffat Ramoni
has played as a causal factor of conflict in the Solomon Islands\textsuperscript{16}. Areas identified to be considered for reform include language policies, history teaching, and instructive and structural approaches concerning identity, including ‘Western’ imposed approaches during colonial times versus traditional approaches.

An informant of the Tongan Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) listed work already accomplished or still on-going to include the following: A Tonga Language Policy, Tongan studies including Tongan language and Tongan Society and Culture are now taught from primary level to Form 7. From Form 1 - 7 the medium of instruction is 50/50 – Tongan and English. Work on developing readers – bilingual stories for Class 1 – 6.

In Fiji local languages are used as medium of instruction in first 3 years of primary education and English thereafter, but use of English as the medium right from Class 1 is common in urban schools. Fijian is a subject taken from secondary level education and is part of students overall assessment for internal and external exams. Culture studies have also been introduced at all levels of education in Fiji. Fijian Language studies and Pacific Studies are both offered at the University of the South Pacific.

Samoan language is used at all levels of education from primary to tertiary levels. All papers that are presented in Cabinet are translated into the vernacular language before being debated or discussed. Progress in culture studies in Samoa has been boosted by the use of ICT to promote Culture events, traditions, practices. Samoa Language is offered at the degree and masters level at the University of Samoa. From these examples it is evident that work in the Education and Culture sector has seen progress in the last 5 years especially in the inclusion of culture and indigenous languages in the formal and non-formal education systems.

\textbf{6.2.6 Goal 6: Promote funding and investment in the Culture Sector}

Under Goal 6 there are four objectives, five indicators and four activities. The majority of informants recognised the lack of development in the sector is primarily due to the lack of financial resources. Budgetary allocation provided is usually to cover operational expenses only with no allocation made for development programmes. In many instances the ministries of culture have had to rely on donor funding to progress development work in the sector.

Overall the French and USA territories fare better and continue to receive budgetary increases to their Culture sector, through France and the USA. For example, as presented during the 25\textsuperscript{th} CPAC meeting French Polynesia reported the total financial grant assistance received was more than XFP57million in 2012 and increasing to XFP96million in 2013. This grant assistance was inclusive of financial allocations to Culture associations and allocations to subsidiary bodies and other Culture institutions. As already mentioned an allocation of USD$27million has been made for the construction of the Guam Museum, scheduled to be completed prior to the 2016 South Pacific Festival of Arts.

The Fiji Department of Heritage and Arts has received increased funding in the latest 2016 budget. Other Culture institutions have received increased budgetary allocations but not to the extent expected. Noteworthy is the increased and separate allocation provided to the Department of Heritage and Arts for the implementation of the Levuka Management Plan (and for Cultural industries specifically). This however is tied to a specific project and represents capital expenditure.

The challenge lies in whether there will be sufficient operational budget to maintain implementation into the future.

At the 25th CPAC meeting Tonga reported that “we only prioritise what is to be achieved within each financial year”. An informant of the Department said that funds provided are for operational purposes only, to meet the salaries of staff but with no budgetary allocation for development purposes. This is also the case for the Tuvalu Culture Department and as reported in the 25th CPAC (2012), only AUD$22,739 which was 0.06 per cent of the overall budget. More than 75 per cent of this allocation was for salary with the remainder going to other miscellaneous expenses. This is a situation that is common to most ministries in Pacific Island Countries.

For the RMI, FSM and Palau, budgets have decreased across all government ministries as a result of the global reduction in the COMPACT budget. Currently the Historic Preservation Offices are funded by the US National Parks Service.

Budget support of the culture sector has not changed much although there have been instances of increase in funding in some areas. A resource mobilisation plan should also include proposing new innovative approaches such as, Culture sites, spaces and attractions leveraged, to invite funding from sources other than government. Increased efforts, targeting statutory and private companies and donors, should be made to provide bridging funds and to elevate the recognition of culture as a potential sector for development for income and employment creation.

6.2.7 Goal 7: Mainstream Culture in Other Social and Economic Sectors

Under this Goal there are three objectives, five indicators and six key activities. In general there has been limited collaboration by the ministries / departments of culture with other social and economic sectors at the national level. At the time of the review many described the work of the Departments of Culture as working in ‘silos’. Many informants agreed that coordination mechanisms such as NBSAP committees in-countries and Climate Change DRR mechanisms in-countries and regionally, ought to be put in place or improved in order to avoid duplication and to improve potential synergies.

Work on mainstreaming culture into other social and economic sectors had been pursued at regional and national level both prior to and since the RCS, while others have been deliberate. At the regional level the culture programme commissioned a Culture audit on the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands Region 2008-2012 with support from SPREP to ensure that culture and heritage is mainstreamed into the Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas of the Pacific Islands (2014-2020). Further collaboration with SPREP will be beneficial in terms of future work in the areas of culture mapping and eco-cultural tourism (underway currently). For example, work on safeguarding ICH in Kiribati, sites and data used was sourced from the culture mapping done by SPREP from 2005 to 2010 for culture related sites in Kiribati under protected areas (KPA). Collaboration with SPTO has begun under EDF 11. On-going work with PIFS on the cultural industries project has progressed and negotiations with USP to introduce culture management studies are in process. The SPC Culture Programme was part of the technical steering committee that supported the development of the ‘Alternative Indicators for Well-Being for Melanesia’ project, which was developed as an optional add-on tool to standard household surveys, to enable countries to compile culture statistics that would provide valuable information on aspects of cultural practice for informed social and economic analysis.

The SPC Culture program has also been involved in numerous activities at regional and national levels but this falls far short of institutionalising culture into the sectors for long-term impacts. There is a need for systematic mainstreaming into the different sectors and this is to be preceded by a
stocktake of what is happening in the sectors to be able to identify entry points and opportunities for collaboration or culture inclusion.

At the national level progress on mainstreaming into the social and economic sectors has not been evident. Most of the on-going culture related activities in the natural resource sector has been home-grown and not linked to the work of the Culture ministries/departments. As lead agencies, the national Culture ministries have not initiated discussions on the development and use of Culture impact assessments in natural resource planning and management, neither has it encouraged the reforestation/plantation of endemic and indigenous trees/plants for Culture use and enjoyment. No guidelines have been developed for use by resource management or other sectors including health, tourism, trade and commerce.

A number of informants acknowledged that they are already addressing Culture issues and concerns in their work, but they lacked the Culture expertise to effectively mainstream culture into their work. The Departments of Culture could harness these independent initiatives by ‘piggy-backing’ and extending their own mandate using the resources and technical expertise of the sectors. Developing an inter-government agency approach is a way of working with the different sectors - coming together to consult and discuss Culture issues and identifying actions for implementation within the context of the available financial and human resources.

Natural resource and environmental sectors including climate change, biodiversity and food security attract substantial donor funding; have established structures, mandates, international linkages, national and local counterparts partnerships, expertise and experiences. In the last two decades, culture has been a pillar and fundamental part of this work, through documentation of traditional knowledge and practices in fisheries and agriculture, working with traditional institutions and mechanisms in communities and protection and safeguarding of indigenous sites and spaces, strengthening traditional management systems within Culture governance systems. Finding entry points into these existing structures and mechanisms, building linkages, working with identified stakeholders would add value to existing work and progress Culture mainstreaming.

For the Fiji Department of Forests work currently carried out includes, conducting research on community adaptability to climate change (CC) and developing a logging monitoring system. On the issue of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), an Environment Working Group has been set up under the auspices of the Department of Environment. The Department of Heritage and Arts is not part of this, yet the Group is tasked with conducting an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and the Culture impact assessment (CIA). The majority of the informants within the Department of Fisheries, Forests and other sectors visited agreed that the Department of Heritage and Arts needs to do a lot more, be more visible and to articulate the need to develop culture for economic and financial gains as well as its intrinsic value for Culture preservation.

Work with the Fiji Bureau of Statistics (BOS) has started but much more needs to done. A UIS–UNESCO–SPC Pacific Region Culture Statistics Meeting was held in Fiji in 2011. One informant agreed that the workshop was a good start, however if implementation is to be successful the SPC Culture Programme needs to lobby directly or through the ministry responsible for culture for the inclusion of specific questions in the national Household and Income and Expenditure (HIES) surveys. To date no attempt has been made by the Department of Culture to engage the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) in its development work. The same informant noted that a better approach would be to develop a separate classification for culture under ‘Industrial Classification’ or ‘Occupational Classification’ which is currently undertaken by at the regional level by the SPC Statistics for Development Division.
Kiribati reported at the 25th CPAC meeting on the growth of Culture and heritage tourism under the Ministry of Tourism in Kiribati. In addition, culture and heritage is embedded in the NBSAP. It further acknowledges the main element in the whole process is the involvement of resource owners and users at the community level, who hold the long term key to biodiversity conservation.

In Vanuatu, as already noted, there is little or no coordination between the Vanuatu Culture Centre (VCC) and other line ministries and departments. In addition, the different components of culture placed under different entities (Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Internal Affairs and VCC) are not favourable for long term development.

In Tonga many informants acknowledged that the Ministry of Internal Affairs, under which the Department of Culture sits, does not have the technical capacity to work with other sectors and a lot of work is done in isolation of other sectors. Culture information collection currently being carried out by other sectors have not been related to the RCS and are not linked to any work done by the Department of Culture. For example the Ministry of Fisheries is documenting traditional fishing methods and knowledge in eight of the islands, with plans to extend the work to other remaining islands. Interviews conducted with Ministry of Education officials acknowledged that culture is a cross-cutting theme however in numerous cases it is only referred to during the planning stage but never prioritised for development action.

In Solomon Islands, work on the documentation of culture, use of cultural norms and practices in the Fisheries Sector, the Environment sector and Forestry sector have been initiatives prior to the RCS and continue to be done without the knowledge or contribution of the Culture Division. For example, on fisheries management, the Ministry is working with villages using existing village mechanisms to strengthen fisheries management through collaborative work with village institutions. A partnership with the Department of Environment is looking at innovative ways of using culture as the instrument to build an Ocean Environment. The Ministry of Forestry is required to work using a bottom up approach where the consent of communities, the customary owners of land, must be obtained (90 per cent of the land is customary owned). The Culture Division should look for entry points into these initiatives to be able to impact existing mechanisms and approaches. The Division could play a coordinating role, for instance in situations where major development projects by government are implemented without proper environmental and Culture impact assessments being carried out. It should also build on existing initiatives such as Ministry of Agriculture and SPC Land Resource Division (LRD) ‘Kaikai Framework’ to revive the use of local food to improve foods and dietary patterns for improved health – a candidate for future collaboration.

**6.2.8 Goal 8: Strengthen the Culture Sector at the regional level**

Under this Goal there are seven objectives, eight indicators and 20 activities. Implementation of activities and achievement of indicators are at various levels of development. Of the 20 identified, work has begun on seven or so contributing to the partial fulfilment of about four of the objectives identified. In 2012 the second biannual meeting for Ministers of Culture (the first held in 2002) was held to coincide with the Festival of Pacific Arts held in the Solomon Islands. It provided an opportunity for culture ministers to be updated on developments in the culture sector, at country and regional level, and on the work of development partners such as PIFS, SPTO and UNESCO. The Regional Culture Strategy (2010–2020) and the Pacific Culture and Education Strategy (2010–2015)
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were two key documents endorsed during the meeting. Subsequent meetings are dependent on availability of funds, a meeting was not held in 2014 due this reason.

The Pacific Heritage Hub (PHH) was established in 2012 with initial funding of AU$ 200,000 from the Government of Australia. The initial PHH team was comprised of the Manager, Communication Specialist, and Programme Assistants. The PHH Office is hosted at the Oceania Centre for Arts, Culture and Pacific Studies at USP. Since its establishment a number of activities have progressed, including starting internal consultations with USP academic teams from different disciplines with a plan to develop an under-graduate course on heritage management as part of the requirements of the MoU with the Australian Government. The formal establishment of such course, however, requires certain institutional adjustments and approval by USP. With financial assistance under UNESCO/Australian Funds-in-Trust, a regional training on heritage management plan development was held at USP in 2014. The Fiji pilot workshop was followed by a Micronesia workshop for management plan development with communities held in Yap, FSM, in the same year. PHH is now developing a module on the topic based on the above two activities for use for future capacity building activities in the Pacific. A major challenge for the HUB is the continuation of its core funding. Alternatives are also being considered for the relocation of the HUB and SPREP is a possibility, but a decision on that will have to be made by the Steering Committee if it is to eventuate.

The SPC Culture Programme, in partnership with the Commonwealth Foundation, has completed a film mapping and a follow-up film production will be made to boost the Pacific film sector. Efforts to establish a Pacific film production fund are still on going.

An established and functioning Pacific Culture think-tank is yet to be achieved. A Culture lens toolkit developed and used to profile other sectoral initiatives, plans and strategies has not started.

At the sub-regional level in 2011, the Heads of Delegation of the Guam Micronesia Island Fair (GMIF) met for the first time. At the 27th GMIF, Guam presented a draft resolution supporting the creation of the Micronesian Council of Culture, Art and Tourism which was signed by all members present.

6.2.9 Goal 9: Develop Culture standard – setting tools.

Under Goal 9 there are three objectives, five indicators and eight activities. At the regional level the SPC SOC Culture Programme, in collaboration with other agencies, has developed a number of standard setting tools for use by member countries. Overall, the reviewers consider the indicators and activities identified under this goal at the regional level have been achieved. Consultations, baselines and standard setting tools were key foundational activities upon which all other activities were built. For example, work on the Cultural industries would be uncoordinated if a baseline was not first established. Culture mapping, planning and policy development would not have been possible if the toolkit were not being developed first, as Culture ministries in countries were not exposed to this type of work.

In 2010 a study was commissioned by SPC on Valuing Culture in Oceania Methodology and indicators for valuing culture, including traditional knowledge, in Oceania. The methodology and indicators were the first essential step in formulating a regional culture strategy to maintain and strengthen Pacific Culture identity, for the consideration of Pacific leaders in 2010. The Regional Culture Strategy was the final outcome of this process.

---
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In 2012 a Pacific Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy toolkit was developed. As noted previously, six national Culture ministries in collaboration with SPC Culture Programme have completed the Culture mapping, planning and policy (CMPP) using the toolkit as a guide. With financial assistance under the French Pacific Fund, the CMPP project was also completed in French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna. Three of the countries targeted have in place Culture Policies, two of which as direct result of the Culture mapping, planning and policy toolkit.

Implementing, Monitoring and Evaluating Culture Policies: A Pacific Toolkit was commissioned and developed in 2012. It was drafted after the sub-regional Policy Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop held in Fiji in 2011. The toolkit is designed primarily to provide guidance to countries that are developing and implementing a national or local level Culture policy. During the evaluation there was no strong evidence to suggest that the ministries directly responsible for culture were using the monitoring and evaluation toolkit in policy implementation, even for the three countries that have Culture policies in place.

The Inaugural Pacific Region Culture Statistics Meeting was held at the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) in Suva, Fiji 25 - 27 May 2011. The meeting was organised by the SPC SOC and co-funded by the UNESCO UIS, SPC’s Statistics for Development Programme (SDP) and Human Development Programme, with financial assistance from the UNESCO Office for Pacific States, and in collaboration with PIFS. The objective was to ensure policy design; implementation and monitoring were linked to the development of Culture statistics and indicators. Recommendations included more collaboration between NSOs and Culture agencies (ministries, departments and divisions), the development of joint action plans to pursue Culture statistics in-country, and the building of capacity in relation to Culture statistics in both the statistics and Culture sectors. In Vanuatu, collaborations between the SPC Demography Programme and the Vanuatu National Statistics Office (VNSO) have seen the inclusion of some core Culture statistics which have been included in the 2012 Pacific Living Condition Survey.

In 2012, the Entrepreneurial Development Sub-regional Workshop for Culture Producers was held in Guam following the 25th Guam Micronesia Island Fair. Representatives from the region attended the four day workshop sponsored by SPC and PIFS. Following the workshop, a non-profit organisation was formed specifically to provide support to Culture producers and artists in their business practices.

6.2.10 Goal 10: Strengthen PIFS capacity to implement Objective 11 of the Pacific Plan, in collaboration with SPC.

Under this Goal, there is one objective, one indicator and two activities. In the assessment of the reviewers, the two activities have been implemented. At the 25th CPAC meeting, PIFS presented an update on the joint work programme between SPC and PIFS. Collaborative work on a Cultural industries promotion work plan is being rolled out, with a number of workshops held at country and sub-regional levels.

6.3 Effectiveness
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Here we examine the contribution made by the project results (objectives) to the achievements to the overall purpose.

The development of the RCS was an achievement in itself, providing a framework and direction on Culture development for the region for 10 years.

At the regional level, where they have been implemented, benefits drawn from the outputs are of good quality and are used by the target groups. The development of the Culture Mapping, Planning and Policy toolkit has resulted in Culture mapping being conducted in a number of countries: Tonga, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Palau and FSM, although these are still at various levels of progress with only two countries developing Culture policies as a result. Cultural industries workshops held have led to the ongoing efforts to revitalise Culture associations. Holding the Regional Culture Statistics meeting has led to the development of a Culture statistics mapping in the Cultural industries in the Cook Islands, a model for future work in this area.

It is acknowledged, however, that there is still more to be done. Collaboration with other SPC Divisions for an integrated approach needs to happen. Under Goal 9, while the strategic objectives identified have been achieved the quality of the achievements of the indicators that contribute to these strategic objectives need to be further examined. For example: the number of countries incorporating the Culture mapping, planning and policy toolkit in policy development; number of countries using policy monitoring and evaluation toolkit in policy implementation; number of countries making use of the Culture statistics and indicators toolkit, including informing national budgetary processes, are yet to happen. Under Goal 8, evidence of other sectoral initiatives, plans, strategies and frameworks integrating culture as a fundamental factor (integrated work plans, MOUs, joint projects); the number of regional, Culture civil society organisations and networks registered, resourced and fully operational; and number and profile of other sectoral initiatives, plans and strategies and frameworks integrating and demonstrating that the Culture lens have been used, are results that have not been realised. Improvements are necessary to ensure that the overall purpose of the RCS can be achieved in terms of quality, reach and availability. So at one level, while the standard setting tools have been developed, and a strengthened culture sector at the regional level achieved, it is the institutionalisation and whether they are actually being used that constitute the ultimate test, as previously discussed.

At the national level, while some progress towards achieving the strategic objectives can be observed, overall the achievement of the objectives to contribute to the attainment of the goals and overall purpose are inadequate. Under Goals 1-7 numerous examples can be cited to demonstrate this. Under Goal 1, for example, the following objectives have not been realised: to develop and implement national Culture policies; integrate culture into national planning and implementation; make Culture impact assessments an integral part of development planning alongside environmental impact assessments; and develop and mainstream Culture statistics and indicators. As a consequence the Goal to ‘mainstream culture into national, social and economic development planning and policy’ has not been realised.

As a consequence the target groups including the national planning offices, finance, national statistics offices and resource sectors are yet to access the results. In reviewing the RCS, risks and assumptions must be identified to ensure meaningful indicators and activities are developed if the benefits to the target groups are to be realised.

The effectiveness of the Culture ministries depends primarily on their ability to leverage financial support, and feedback from the countries visited suggests that they have obtained relatively little support so far. With regard to the regional level, the Culture Programme core budget has financed
staff but still has limited resources for development work. In addition to this, one factor affecting the progress at national and sub-regional levels is the lack of targeted capacity-building. There is a need for the capacity building concerning the implementation of action programmes. The focus of the RCS is the strategic objectives, but in failing to identify the operational objectives, as such, limits the effectiveness of the Strategy. In addition, as identified in the Strategy there is a need to develop resource mobilisation plans and the suggested review of the Strategy, provide this opportunity.

7.0 Monitoring and Evaluations

A broad framework for monitoring progress is set out in the Strategy, but its practical application at the national level is weak. Indicators identified provide the basis of evaluating the progress made towards the achievements of the objectives. From the outset the architects of the RCS acknowledge the dearth of available data and the need to develop and collect Culture statistics to establish baseline data for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Member countries are required to report, along with other regional organisations, at the annual meetings of the CPAC. Assessment will also be undertaken as part of the process of developing the three year implementation plan, and at the end of each plan. An evaluation midway into the implementation of the Strategy and a final evaluation at the end of the Strategy are identified.

A weakness in the monitoring and evaluation framework is that most indicators identified are not time bound. The implementation of activities that would lead to the achievement of the objectives is left open ended, implying that for all 10 goals and corresponding objectives, indicators and activities the measurement of success can only be truly assessed at the end of the Strategy when the final evaluation is conducted. This does not allow for progressive assessments to be made and for corrective measures to be taken by relevant stakeholders for a successful implementation. Neither is it used as a management tool for periodic assessment and review. The lack of specific timelines also seems to suggest on the part of the national Culture practitioners that it is ‘business as usual’ when it comes to reporting at the regional level, with real no incentive or motivation to deliver. An indication of this is the quality of reporting by countries during the CPAC meeting that displays to an extent the lack of rigour and analytical assessment required for such reporting.

However, despite the above, reporting on progress made towards achieving the objectives is an achievement in itself when compared to previous CPAC meetings. A contributing factor to the lack of comprehensive reporting can be the lack of financial, human and other resources, as well as time to collect and analyse the data required for the report and limited capacity with regard to data collection and analysis. Additionally, the results of the reporting process have not stimulated targeted action to the extent that could be expected, significantly impacting the outcomes of meetings held which are either very general or are not followed through.

It is noted that it is dependent on the countries to identify priorities for action, and implicit in this is that these would be the areas that they are to report on. This, however, is not coherent with the number of indicators identified. In many of the Goals, corresponding indicators are quite high when it comes to the number of countries that are required to deliver. So the element of choice embedded in the notion that countries have a choice (to prioritise) is not quite correct. But if indeed it is left to the countries then the overall impact on the indicators would be very low, which simply means that the goal has not been achieved. In the recommended revision it is important to consider these points, particularly where the indicators are concerned.

Resolving the above does not necessarily require a revision of the objectives, but what may also be necessary to revisit and update for the remaining five years of the Strategy are the indicators and activities. Such an update should take into account the status quo at national level such as the lack of budgetary support and the lack of qualified staff. To also facilitate enhanced reporting and
monitoring progress towards achieving the strategic objectives. Consideration should be given to which activities relate to which indicator.

8.0 Partnerships

The Culture Programme has worked to establish and forge close partnerships with international and regional organisations. Although there is still room for improvement, when one considers the (low) level of resourcing to date, these strategic partnerships have contributed to the achievements of a number of activities. This includes UNESCO work on increasing ratification and implementation of international conventions and UNESCO UIS for Culture statistics. There is also work with WIPO on the development and implementation of the traditional model law on traditional knowledge, an initiative that has been on-going since 2002; and the collaboration with the Commonwealth Foundation on film mapping and as member of the Board of International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies.

At the regional level collaborations with PIFS on the development and promotion of Cultural industries across the PICTs is gaining ground and momentum. Work with SPTO under the EDF 11 for Culture tourism initiatives, biosecurity issues and marketing, and its link to Culture tourism and Cultural industries will further advance the work of the Programme. Collaborations with USP through the HUB and with Secretariat of the Pacific Board for Educational Assessment (EQAP) and the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) and indeed with those already mentioned still need to be strengthened in the next five years.
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