E.C.C.O.
European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations A.I.S.B.L.

On the classification of the Cultural Heritage sector within NACE
(Nomenclature statistique des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne; Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community).

Elis Marçal (Working Group Referent), Susan Corr, David Aguilella Cueco, Jeremy Hutchings, Conor Newman

Abstract

The community of Conservator-Restorers across Europe has long been aware that within NACE[1] no tax code specific to the activity of Conservation-Restoration has ever been assigned. Likewise, the occupation of the Conservator-Restorer has no corresponding code in the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO)[2]. Although the term 'Conservator' exists in ISCO, it is considered to refer to the curatorial profession. This lack of designation means that no statistical data on the economic profile of Conservation-Restoration can be obtained; the contribution the activity makes to the economy of Europe remains hidden, and the profession continues to be unidentified within ISCO.

There are many reasons, historical and structural, for this anomaly. The 'emergence' of Conservation-Restoration as a specific activity distinguishable from 'restoration' as currently defined in NACE, is a contributory factor. So too is the methodology by which the economic data is compiled and structured with respect to cultural activities, making it even more difficult to situate the activity of Conservation-Restoration. That Conservation-Restoration straddles both the sciences and the humanities further complicates the issue. This paper describes the work undertaken by E.C.C.O. to have the activity of Conservation-Restoration included in the NACE Codes, and how the work subsequently expanded to consider how the field of cultural heritage activities might be classified. The results from the first phase of work simply suggest a way in which Conservation-Restoration can be included in the current NACE classification system with minimal adjustments. The second phase considers how cultural heritage could be developed as a discrete sector in which the activity of Conservation-Restoration would then be situated alongside all other heritage related activities.

Introduction

In 2014, the Working Group began by looking at the structure of NACE Codes and at the recommendations in the European Statistical System Network on Culture Final Report (ESSnet-Culture Report) published in 2012[3]. This Report is a review of current methodologies and frameworks for gathering and organising statistical data on cultural activities at European level. Representatives from National Ministries for Culture participated in the review through a group of European experts nominated from member states under the "Open Method of Coordination" (OMC), and the work was launched, conducted and published by Eurostat.

This first phase of E.C.C.O.'s work resulted in a proposal to have the activity of Conservation-Restoration added to the existing structure of NACE. Subsequently, over the course of 2017, E.C.C.O. became involved in the Voices of Culture (VoC) Structured Dialogue initiated by the European Commission DG Culture and Education. The Voices of Culture Structured Dialogue on "Skills, training and knowledge transfer for traditional and emerging heritage professions"; the work of which was closed and published in October 2017[4]; reflects a paradigm shift in how culture and heritage are perceived at European level. The activities associated with these phenomena are recognised as social and economic forces in their own right.

 That this shift was already anticipated by E.C.C.O. can be seen in the *Declaration of Berlin*. This *Declaration*, agreed by the Presidents' Meeting of E.C.C.O. in 2016, states that the activity of Conservation-Restoration is a resource for society. This is in keeping with the broader understanding of heritage expressed in the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society otherwise known as the Faro Convention (2005). The *Declaration* also takes note of the proposal to establish a group of experts within the EU Framework of the Work Plan for Culture in 2017–2018 to discuss, through the Voices of Culture Dialogue, traditional and emerging professions in cultural heritage, with the focus on skills, training and knowledge transfer.

The second phase of work on NACE paralleled E.C.C.O.'s participation in the Voices of Culture Dialogue on traditional and emerging professions, which sought to identify the various diverse activities and professions that now work in the cultural heritage sector. A link was made between the *mission* or purpose of these activities and the way in which statistical data is captured in a statistical framework proposed in the ESSnet-Culture Report. This proposed framework was re-imagined by E.C.C.O. to demonstrate how a discrete cultural heritage sector might work.

How NACE Works

NACE applies a four-tier, hierarchical classification to twenty-one sectors (Sections A to U) of the European economy, codified alpha-numerically (viz. the NACE Codes). Activities in the sectors are categorized into a linear progression of increasing specificity, comprising Divisions, Groups and Classes. The NACE sectoral classification of interest here is R: Arts, Entertainment and Recreation. Four activity Divisions are recognised within this sector: R90 Creative, Arts and Entertainment activities; R91Libraries, Archives, Museums and other Cultural activities; R92 Gambling and Betting; R93 Sports activities and Amusement and Recreation activities.

In the case of Division R91 – the field of relevance to this study – no progressional distinction or refinement is applied between Division and Group. This means that, in reality, Division R91 is operating with two, not three, orders. In effect, the classification jumps straight to the next level, where four Classes of activities are distinguished (Table 1): 91.01 Library and Archives; 91.02 Museums; 91.03 Operation of Historical Sites and Buildings and similar visitor attractions; 91.04 Botanical and Zoological Gardens and Nature Reserves. This impacts directly on the level of detail that is captured by NACE. In its current format, specialist activities, such as conservation-restoration, archaeology, and so on, are not identified in the NACE Codes.

The NACE Codes are used at national level for purposes of taxation, and nationally and internationally by organisations such as Eurostat, to generate statistical data on sectoral and sub-sectoral economic performance and contribution. The absence of specialist activities, such as Conservation-Restoration, at the level of Class means that the contribution to economic activity made by these and other specialisations in the cultural heritage sector, is invisible statistically, and, as a consequence, in other ways too. In fact, as recognised in the ESSnet-Culture Report, the NACE Codes operate on a narrow and limited projection of the cultural field. Apart from one reference to 'world heritage sites', the terms 'heritage' and 'cultural heritage' are not used, despite the fact that the term 'heritage profession' is commonplace, and many actors in this field describe themselves, and are employed as 'heritage professionals' or 'heritage specialists'.

Finally, it is important also to note that occupations corresponding to each activity area in NACE are registered on the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). Consequently, as outlined below, achieving recognition of specialist actors in the field of heritage in the NACE Codes is, if not predicated on then at least linked to achieving recognition on ISCO. Furthermore, within ISCO the legal, social and cultural professions form a group requiring tertiary education whose qualifications are calibrated to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF). The Conservator-Restorer falls into this group.

Table 1: 91 Division – Libraries, Archives, Museums and other cultural and natural heritage activities (NACE)

Division	Group	Class
91 Library, Archives, Museums and other cultural activities	91.0 Library, Archives, museums and other cultural activities	91.01 Library and Archives activities
		91.02 Museums activities
		91.03 Operation of historical sites and buildings and similar visitor attractions
		91.04 Botanical and zoological gardens and nature reserves activities

Inserting Cultural Heritage activities into NACE: finding a place for Conservation-Restoration

Considering how Conservation-Restoration activities might be included in the NACE classification, the E.C.C.O. Working Group contemplated what Division 91 might look like were it to be simply renamed *'Cultural Heritage Activities'*, and if Libraries, Archives, Museums and other cultural activities were re-classified to Group level (rather than at Class level) where they would be coded 91.01, 91.02, 91.03 and 91.04 respectively.

As well as opening the scheme to the addition of new Groups, such as Conservation-Restoration (coded 91.05 on Table 2), and reflecting more fully the range of activities at play and emerging in this field, with this revision the schema can now accommodate at the level of Class the growing diversity of activities that exist under the rubric of Conservation-Restoration. Table 2 attempts to populate the schema for illustrative purposes only.

Table 2: Revised 91 Cultural Heritage activities

Group	Class
91.01 Archives and Libraries	• Library and Archives activities /Archiving • Library and Archives Administrative management
91.02 Museums Private collections Activities	• Museums and Private Collections Activities • Curation of Museums and Private Collections • Exhibition design and construction • Museum education • Collections management • Handling and transportation activities • Administrative management • Invigilation
91.03 Built Heritage – Monuments, churches / religious and historic interiors	• Operation of historical sites and buildings and similar heritage attractions • Heritage Buildings management • Heritage architectural consulting activities • Heritage engineering • Heritage guiding • Heritage promotion • Heritage officer
91.04 Historical and archaeological sites and historic landscapes	• Archaeological excavation and survey / Archaeological activities • Heritage site management
91.05 Conservation-Restoration activities	• Heritage Preservation activities • Conservation-Restoration • Preventive conservation • Conservation management • Conservation-Restoration Technical support • Conservation Science
91.06 Craft activities towards restoration	• Application of traditional techniques of production / creation to the restoration of cultural heritage material • Heritage reconstruction / renovation using traditional techniques and new materials

The inclusion of a Group title "craft activities towards restoration" (code 91.06) acknowledges the existence of craft-based activities that operate exclusively in the arena of cultural heritage, where they coincide with Conservation-Restoration. These represent recognized craft-based skills, often associated with distinct training and apprenticeships, that work specifically within the field of cultural heritage. Due to their heritage-specific nature, it is proposed here that they are assembled in a group distinct from but sharing the same Divisional platform as Conservation-Restoration. Conservation-Restoration is not a creative or an artistic process but it utilises the specialist skills, knowledge and experience of many arts and crafts to achieve an ethically based result. These are required in order to meet the demands of preservation predicated on complex interactions of paradigmatic principles enshrined in international conventions and agreements. A canon of peer-reviewed literature has developed which the discipline of the Conservator-Restorer has itself spearheaded.

Comment

Amongst the many recommendations the ESSnet-Culture Report makes concerning culture is the suggestion that, in order to accurately identify an activity and its allied occupation, the coordinates for the respective Codes in the classification systems employed by NACE and by ISCO must be more closely calibrated. This means that more detailed correspondence of the statistical data within the sector needs to be achieved: where employment data is required it is imperative that the *activities* classified by NACE correspond more closely with the *occupations* classified by ISCO.

Even with the addition of new Groups and Classes, the proposed restructuring of Division 91 still reflects an older perception of what constitutes cultural heritage and where heritage is seen, traditionally, to reside. It does not account for the greatly expanded concept of cultural heritage as a values-driven public resource employing diverse actors and mediators with transversal skills sets that is embraced and promoted in, for instance, the thrust and philosophy of the Faro Convention (2005) and associated literature (e.g. *Heritage and Beyond*).

If this broadened view of cultural heritage is to be reflected in economic data and public policy, it has become apparent that the activities and occupations that make up this sector need to be identified and mapped. That this challenge would emerge as the focus of the *Voices of Culture Dialogue on Skills, training and knowledge transfer and emerging Heritage professions* could not have been foreseen by E.C.C.O. in November of 2015: the Working Group was simply concerned with working out how Conservation-Restoration could be identified within the existing structure of the NACE Codes, and the economic output generated by this activity captured.

Arising from this, E.C.C.O. issued a letter to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) in October 2016 seeking inclusion of the occupation of the Conservator-Restorer. A response was received in April 2017 from a senior statistician acknowledging the points raised by E.C.C.O. and apprising us of the fact that ISCO is unable to 'make any changes to the published information without the mandate to update the classification from the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS)'. We were further advised that the ICLS would be presenting a case for work to start on an update or revision of ISCO in October 2018 in Tokyo, and that review of the treatment of occupations related to Conservation-Restoration would be added to the list of issues to be addressed in any work to update ISCO. In the interim, an entry for Conservator-Restorer to the master version of the Index for Occupational Titles will be added and is to appear on the ISCO webpage when an updated Index is next posted. The Index is considered a 'map between real world job titles and the categories identified in the classification'. There has been no feedback about any developments as of the time of writing.

In the initial phase of this work, which led to the above correspondence, much discussion also took place in the Working Group about whether Conservation-Restoration was an activity, which might be better located within the Scientific and Technical sector (M) of the NACE Codes. Needless to say there was an initial resistance to being thrown in with Arts, Entertainment and Recreation given the scientific methodologies that are employed in Conservation-Restoration, but also because of a concern that this is where the activity of Restoration is already identified and allied to Arts and Crafts. Traditionally, Restoration and Arts and Crafts are grouped together. ESSnet-Culture proposes a new cultural domain 'Art crafts', specifying that "The *creation* function is the main function of art crafts and the whole organization of art crafts originate [*sic*] from creation" (ESSnet-Culture, 335):

This characterisation of Restoration speaks more directly to the skills of the craftsman, raising the possibility of confusion not only in professional identity but particularly so in respect of the very processes that distinguishes Conservation-Restoration from Restoration. Conservation-Restoration is not an activity that creates, replaces or reproduces but rather intervenes to understand, preserve and transmit an authentic material heritage. Restoration, in its broadest sense, may encompass the former actions (create, replace etc.) but only as they are subject to sustaining the cultural legibility or agency of the material heritage which Conservation seeks to preserve.

The rationale that ultimately prevailed on the Working Group to position Conservation-Restoration within the Arts, Entertainment and Recreation Sector was based on a number of reasons: a desire to change the structure of the Codes as little as possible; recognition that the negotiation of values within Conservation-Restoration belongs in the cultural realm; the fact that the craftsmen's skills are legitimately situated within Restoration activities already located in this Section.

Voices of Culture on Skills for Cultural Heritage Professions

During the work of the Voices of Culture Dialogue on the theme 'Skills, training and knowledge transfer and emerging Heritage professions' it was hoped to identify emerging professions in the field of culture and heritage. The need to identify the skills and knowledge in emerging and traditional cultural heritage professions makes sense when contextualised in an expanded concept of cultural heritage, which also includes the ways society participates in cultural heritage strategies. Similarly, in respect of the NACE Codes, it is also pertinent to talk about 'emerging professions' given, as we have seen, the current, narrow perspective on activities in this sector and as experienced by the Conservator-Restorer.

E.C.C.O. argued in the Voices of Culture Dialogue that the skills required of specialist professions, regardless of whether they operate in the private or public sphere, or are considered traditional or emerging, should be differentiated according to the *mission* or *purpose* of their role, i.e. the reasons *why* a profession exists. *Missions* are circumscribed by a set of actions that are informed by specific competences, skills and knowledge[5]. These apply to all professions in the field, and in turn are related to qualifications regarding professional identity and recognition. The need to transmit an authentic cultural heritage has witnessed the 'emergence' of the profession of the Conservator-Restorer, which, accordingly, can be seen as a discrete demographic of professionals with a specific *mission* based on a comprehensive set of competences that have been mapped and published by E.C.C.O. This position is reflected in the report issuing from the Voices of Culture Dialogue on Skills. E.C.C.O. proposed that a link could be made between the *missions* identified in the work of the latter and the 'Functions' identified in the ESSnet-Culture framework.

Connecting the Voices of Culture Dialogue to ESSnet-Culture and NACE

In view of the convergence of the *missions* framework proposed in the of Voices of Culture Report and the *'Functions'* system employed in the ESSnet-Culture Report on NACE, and in light of the influence that the ESSnet-Culture Report may exert on future revisions made to this aspect of the NACE framework, E.C.C.O. decided to revisit its own work on NACE. Out of this phase of the work, a matching proposal was developed that situates Conservation-Restoration within a reconfigured statistical framework based this time on our interpretation of the ESSnet framework proposal.

ESSnet-Culture Report

The ESSnet-Culture Working Group undertook a review of existing frameworks used for the generation of statistical data in the field of culture. The frameworks in question are based on the model developed by UNESCO (1986) and a later Eurostat pilot project „Harmonisation of Cultural Statistics in the EU" (commonly known as LEG-Culture, 2002), where the terminology of Domains and Functions adopted by ESSnet is employed. ESSnet describes a Domain as 'a set of practices, activities, or cultural products centred around a group of expressions recognised as artistic ones'. Functions, on the other hand, are categories or sets of actions carried out by actors within the Domains (e.g. publishing; dissemination; preservation). The broadly sequential order of the list of six Functions deliberately emphasises how they juxtapose and relate to one another in the activities associated with culture. The Report insists that, irrespective of how they are ordered/sequenced, at the heart of the Functions is the act of creation; creation underpins all cultural activity, even the domain of heritage. Actors are professionals having a specific occupation within the sector.

Within the cultural sector, actors can be grouped into a structure according to their roles within culture. As we shall see, a similarly detailed structure can be applied to the heritage sector.

Who are the actors?

The categories referenced by the European Heritage Heads Forum in the ESSnet Report and presented by Erminia Sciacchitano at the Task Force on Economy and Statistics meeting 'Prospects of Cultural Statistics in the EU' in September 2015, identifies the types of professions that are relevant to the cultural sector.

For the purposes of this study two categories are identified as:
- actors employed in a cultural occupation in the cultural sector, e.g. a musician in an orchestra
- actors employed in a non-cultural occupation in the cultural sector, e.g. a theatre administrator

E.C.C.O. applied this categorisation to the cultural heritage sector and, broadly speaking, identifies two types of actors:
- actors whose occupation is intrinsically linked to cultural heritage—they could not exist in any other sector
- actors whose occupation is not intrinsically linked to cultural heritage but who work within the sector. Similar actors can be found in other sectors (a manager or administrator).

Similarly, but independently, the Voices of Culture Dialogue on Skills identified four major categories of stakeholders or groups of actors, viz. the public, policy-makers, mediators and experts. This mirrors the work of the Heritage Heads Forum, where experts and mediators operate/act in relation to culture according to the categories outlined above.

Why are these categories important?

Applying these two categories to cultural heritage demonstrates a comparable genre of relationship exists between actors and a cultural heritage sector. There are actors whose occupation only exists specific to cultural heritage. Likewise, there are actors whose occupation is not intrinsically linked but they can have transversal skills, which can be applied in the field of cultural heritage.

The six Functions in the ESSnet-Cultural sector framework are identified as:
- creation
- production / publishing
- dissemination / trade
- preservation
- education
- management / regulation.

This same complement of Functions applies in cultural heritage as well; and, in fact there may be more; demonstrating the fact that cultural heritage is a phenomenon in and of itself. This contributes to the already compelling argument that cultural heritage should be recognised in NACE as a sector in its own right. Such would allow the requisite education and training to be resourced, enabling the delivery of the appropriate skills, knowledge and competences. In other words, for these various actors to fulfil their *missions* in the field of cultural heritage, it is immediately apparent that they require skillsets, competences and knowledge, i.e. education. In a sector designated 'Cultural Heritage', the *mission* of these actors is to serve cultural heritage, whether applying core skills that fit into the first category, or transversal skills that fit into the second of the model described above. Of critical importance is the fact that some professions are based on a discrete deontology, or code of ethics, because their *mission* may directly impact on cultural heritage.

Developing the ESSnet framework

As an exercise, E.C.C.O. took the ESSnet framework and adapted it by including cultural heritage as a new economic sector.

In the statistical framework proposed by ESSnet, Cultural Activities are arranged into 10 Domains[*], one of which is Heritage – here comprising the now familiar territory of Museums, Historical Places, Archaeological Sites and Intangible Heritage. Libraries and Archives have each been assigned their own unique Domain, accounting for a further 2 out of the 10 Domains.

But if, as pointed out earlier, heritage *per se* is no longer conceived of as fixed assets held in designated places but rather as the *outcome* of diverse activities, interactions and encounters, then heritage *per se* is an aspect of all 9 Domains, including Libraries and Archives, from which it has now been separated. To be sure, museums, historical and archaeological sites are indeed places where heritage assets can be found, but 'heritage activities' are relevant across all the Domains.

In fact, every Sector and Domain generates its own heritage(s). The appeal here is to acknowledge the existence of these heritage resources *and* the specialised field of heritage practice which includes the study, interpretation, conservation, performance, mediation, dissemination, management, stewardship and valorisation of those heritages.

---

[*] The ESSnet Domains are: Heritage; Archives; Libraries; Book & Press; Visual Arts; Performing Arts; Audiovisual & Multimedia; Architecture; Advertising; Art Crafts

Compartmentalising heritage as a Domain undermines the broader, more encompassing, holistic and integrated approach to and understanding and value of contemporary cultural heritage that underpins, inter alia the Faro Convention, the Voices of Culture on Skills work, and a body of international peer-reviewed studies. As witnessed in the Faro Convention and the Voices of Culture dialogues, wider thinking about heritage describes a perspective and tried and tested methodologies to amplify and grow the public good that is cultural heritage.

E.C.C.O. recommends, therefore, that consideration of the *nature* of heritage, and given that heritage practice is understood as a Function/action that applies across all 91.0 Domains; and actually far beyond the Culture Sector as it is defined; heritage should be accorded sectoral status.

Comment

The thesis outlined above demonstrates that cultural heritage should be developed as a discrete economic sector in the NACE Codes, using the concepts of *missions* as they describe Functions and taking into account the phenomenological characteristics of heritage per se. The activities identified in NACE automatically reflect occupations found in ISCO. By corollary, occupations are described by their competences, which translate into discrete sets of knowledge, skills and competences as currently identified by the European Qualifications Framework in respect of each profession.

Although Eurostat has improved the collection of statistics on cultural activities by broadening its methods of collecting data, such as the EU labour force survey (EU LFS), the problem of identifying activities in cultural heritage remains. Since 2016, for statistical purposes only, some activities have been considered as cultural activities although located outside Sector R: Arts, Entertainment and Recreation. This reflects a statistical attempt to reflect real world activities and has helped to collect some data. However, the same protocol has not been and cannot be used for heritage activities, because the data does not distinguish cultural activities from heritage-related activities. Overall, statistics on cultural employment are obtained based on the cross-tabulation of various data; estimated figures from data provided by subscribing countries, and the compilation of several methods of data collection. There is no comprehensive classification methodology to collect data on heritage employment, and consequently such statistics still remain hidden[6]

The new proposal is as close an approximation as can be developed working within current structures. It allows the sector to be assessed, and changes to be made in keeping with the work that has been carried out to date. This includes the proposed strategy or blueprint arising from the work of the Voices of Culture Dialogue on skills, which speaks to the concerns raised in the ESSnet-Culture Report.

In Conclusion

This document, as it represents the work of E.C.C.O., reflects the imperative, which is of concern to all our members, to have the economic activity of Conservation-Restoration identified within the NACE Codes. It proposes a restructuring of the NACE Codes so that the activity can be clearly identified within an enlarged cultural heritage sector. The proposal to restructure the NACE Codes will require a concerted and coordinated effort by our member organisations at national level and by E.C.C.O. at European level if it is to succeed. A draft of this document was submitted to the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS), which took place in Tokyo in October 2018 and is to be followed up.

Sources

[1] EUROSTAT. (2008). *NACE rev. 2*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-manuals-and-guidelines/-/KS-RA-07-015

[2] ILO. (2012). *International Standard Classification of Occupations 2008 (ISCO-08): Structure, group definitions and correspondence tables*. Retrieved from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/@publ/documents/publication/wcms_172572.pdf

[3] Bína, V., Chantepie, P., Deroin, V., Frank, G., Kommel, K., Kotýnek, J., & Robin, P. (2012). *ESSnet Culture – European Statistical System Network on Culture – Final report*. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/reports/ess-net-report_en.pdf

[4] Ateca Amestoy, V., Aguilella Cueco, D., Baatz, W., Karatza, M., Konstantinidis, K., Marçal, E., … Stanojev, J. (2017, October). *VoC Brainstorming Report Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe – prospectus on "skills, training and knowledge transfer for traditional and emerging heritage professions."* Retrieved from: http://www.voicesofculture.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/VoC-Skills-and-training-Final-report-with-Appendix1.pdf

[5] Aguilella Cueco, D., Hutchings, J. (2018). „From the Surface Noise to the "Voices of Culture" in the Cultural Heritage Sector: hope and expectations from the coal-face of the cultural heritage workforce". Monográico: Las Profesiones del Patrimonio Cultural, Competencias, formación y transferencia del conocimiento: relexiones y retos en el Año Europeo del Patrimonio Cultural 2018". ACRE and GE-IIC Online at: https://asociacion-acre.org/publicaciones/publicacion-monografica-las-profesiones-del-patrimonio-cultural/

[6] Eurostat. (2018). *Guide to Eurostat culture statistics – 2018 edition*. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-manuals-and-guidelines/-/KS-GQ-18-011