ANALYSIS OF THE CULTURE.MONDO INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF CULTURAL PORTALS
(DECIMA RESEARCH; SEPTEMBER 2006)
SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL DIGITAL ARCHIVES PROGRAM, TAIWAN

WORKING DOCUMENT FOR DISCUSSION AT THE CULTURE.MONDO ROUND TABLE
DUBROVNIK, CROATIA OCTOBER 20-22, 2006

Prepared by Aimee Fullman, Canadian Cultural Observatory, Ottawa[1]

ANALYSIS OF THE 2ND CULTURE.MONDO INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF CULTURAL PORTALS
(DECIMA; SEPTEMBER 2006)

1. BACKGROUND

Culture.mondo is an informal global network in its 2nd year of development that encourages and facilitates communication among experts responsible for creating, developing, and maintaining cultural portals. The Culture.mondo Network is guided by an International Steering Committee comprised of the following portals: Culture.ca (Canada), Canadian Cultural Observatory/Culturescope.ca, 24 Hour Museum (UK), Collections Australia Network, e-Cultura (Mexico), Culturelink Network (Croatia), Kultur.nu (CultureNet Sweden), CultuurNet Vlaanderen (Belgium), and the Program Office of National Digital Archives Program (Taiwan.)

Culture.mondo was launched in 2005 at the *Cultural Portals: New Challenges and Good Practices Round Table,* in Aichi, Japan. Culture.mondo's purpose is to facilitate the development of an online community of public cultural portals through the creation of an international network where cultural portals can share and disseminate knowledge and best practices.

As a first step in founding the network, the Culture.mondo International Steering Committee created an on-line survey, concluded in March 2005, to identify common characteristics of cultural portals. The data shaped the first convening of the Culture.mondo Network which focused around four themes: *partnerships, governance, content management* and *marketing* and *audience needs*. A second on-line survey was created to further develop the existing information base and was concluded by Decima in September 2006 with the financial support of the National Digital Archives Program. The objective of this second survey was to build on the previous comparative analysis on cultural portals worldwide and to inform the 2nd Annual Culture.mondo Roundtable and its four sub-themes: *Web 2.0, International Cooperation, Virtual Communities, and the Measures of Success.*

This analysis of the 2006 Cultural Portal Survey has been compiled using the aggregate results and by examining the three distinct types of cultural portals: multidisciplinary cultural portals, thematic portals, and cultural observatories. Within this document, participants refer to the total number of portals that filled out the survey and respondents refer to those who filled out a specific thematic section or question. This narrative is intended to not to be a conclusive analysis but rather to provide a working document for the upcoming Culture.mondo Roundtable discussions in Dubrovnik, Croatia.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE SURVEY

The 2006 survey sought to specifically:
- ➢ Obtain information on strategies for appropriate marketing;
- ➢ Identify a series of common measures used in the different cultural portals to measure success, in order to establish a "universal portal language;"
- ➢ Put the evaluation criteria in perspective;
- ➢ Identify the measures that are not part of the common indicators;
- ➢ Learn new ways of measuring success that are not common practices at the moment;

➢ Assist countries beginning work on cultural portals;
➢ Receive practical information/statistics;
➢ Understanding the "digitization trend" towards cultural policy delivery;
➢ Understand how different portals provide services to their target audiences.

Commonalities between the 2005 and 2006 surveys include soliciting information on cultural portals' purpose and origin, sources of revenue, nature of content and services, target audiences and performance indicators. The 2006 survey places less emphasis on structure and capacity by moving beyond the fundamental data to discern more specifically the tools and strategies portals are using to establish measurements of success.

The survey results are somewhat limited by the small sampling size of those that responded to questions pertaining to performance measurements. In 2005, portals were asked to identify themselves as a "national" cultural portal understood to be a government initiative. This year, portals were asked to self-classify but were allowed to choose all characteristics that pertained to their portal and thus conclusive evidence of which portals participating are national governmental cultural portals is unavailable. Several questions allowed portals to select multiple characteristics and in these cases statistic breakdowns do not add up to 100% but rather indicate overlapping results.

2.1 Methodology:

Working with Decima Research, the International Steering Committee invited the original 370 portals identified in 2005, as well as an additional 260 portals for a total of 630, to participate in the 2006 online survey. Over 100 portals accessed the survey and the rate of response was 15% based on the 92 completed and partially completed responses obtained. These figures represent an increase of 10% in overall participation from 2005.

Considering time, resource and references constraints every attempt was made to reach a representative balance across world regions and types of portals. However, regional imbalances still exist. The survey was offered in two of Culture.mondo's official languages, English and French.

Comparatively, the 2006 survey was designed to allow for more nuanced answers and greater distinction in self-characterization. Information was solicited through 37 multi-choice questions on scope, audiences, management, revenue, content and performance indicators. As a result, more specific and accurate information was gathered. Portals were asked to assign themselves to one of three categories: multidisciplinary cultural portals, thematic portals, and cultural observatories and to select characteristics that represent their status and relationship to government.   A significant decrease in the "other" category for both status and type of portals resulted in a relative increase in classifications for cultural observatories and cultural portals. In addition, the present survey was adjusted to be more representative of cultural observatory services and audiences.

2.2 Participation:

Geographically, the survey is most representative of Europe, with 65% of all participants located in this area. Comparatively, these figures represent an increase in geographical diversity with a greater inclusion of the Americas (21%) and Asia (4%) not withstanding the expected increase in participating portals from the Southern European area (Balkans) due to the Roundtable's location in Dubrovnik, Croatia. Notably geographical diversity has increased despite the unavailability of the survey in Asian languages or Spanish, with participation by Spanish language portals increasing by 5%.

For the second consecutive year a minimum of survey participants responded to questions related to performance indicators and metrics. In 2005, less than half of those surveyed responded and in 2006 the average was even less, with only 30% of participants answering questions, making conclusions difficult. Lack of participation may indicate that most cultural portals do not gather performance measurements, that they are unwilling to provide sensitive information, are unfamiliar with the technological tools available or are simply deterred by survey language barriers which prevented comprehension of these more technical questions.

Developmentally, participants represent a wide spectrum with 32% of portals launched in 2000 or before. The 2005 Survey found that cultural portals are a relatively recent phenomena and these results are confirmed again this year with the 2006 survey demonstrating that the largest growth in portals has occurred since 2002 (62% of cultural portals; 46% of thematic portals and 50% of cultural observatories.) The 2006 Survey does indicate a rise in portal launches with 20% launched in 2006 or expected to launch in the latter half of the year or in 2007.

3. Comparative Characteristics of Cultural Portals:

Portals were asked to self-identify as: *a **cultural portal covering many themes** {previously identified as a national portal covering many themes}(52%); a **specialized thematic porta**l (i.e. dance, music, theatre, museums) (24%); or an **observatory on cultural policy** (17%)* with the classification of *other* representing 7% {a decrease of 30%.}

3.1 General Collective Trends:
- Cultural portals continue to be predominantly non-profit and have strong relationships with government;
- 49% operate under $25,000 USD/ 20,000 €annually;
- Multidisciplinary portals with national scope have the largest budgets
- Cultural portals play a key role in connecting users to fields of knowledge: 92% provide hyperlinked database of cultural resources or research links, 86% offer links to search engines and a majority (60%) offer newsletters;

➢ Primary target audiences are national and or international cultural experts, professionals and policymakers, adults over 25, and educational professionals and teachers;
➢ Content is created and managed through partnerships with external contributors;
➢ Museum and heritage related content remain the largest thematic groups;
➢ Increased congruence of content and services
➢ Increase in digital materials provided online and the use of dynamic tools;
➢ Increase in tourism-related content.

3.2. Portal Management & Governance

A. Annual Budget:

Just under half of cultural portals surveyed operate within a budget of less than $25,000 USD/20,000 € Almost 10% operate with a budget of over $500K USD/400K€ Cultural portals represent the highest funded types of portals since no thematic or cultural observatory portals have an annual budget of over $1 million USD/800K€

B. Status:

By far, cultural portals are non-profit in nature (47%) and 69% promote/provide information on culture in comparison to just 21% that provide news/data solely on the arts. Governmental relationships are prevalent: 28% of respondents identified themselves as a national government or governmental body, 24% are government sponsored, 7% are inter-governmental, and 4% are a Ministry of Culture portal. Financially, over 60% of organizations receive 91-100% of their funding from the public sector or the government and 64% indicate that their portal's 2005 revenues were generated entirely from government or public sector funding. Government influence though is not proportionally carried into services provided or audiences targeted as only 5% cite a mission to provide government/public administration/public services and only 13% and 6% respectively consider policy/decision makers and government personnel an important audience.

C. Target Audiences :

Although the majority of cultural portals are funded by the public sector, cultural portals are most likely to target the cultural and research community rather than the general public.

Target audiences in rank order are as follows:
1. Cultural experts, professionals and policymakers;
2. Adults over 25;
3. Educational professionals and teachers;
4. Researchers/and or planners;
5. Young people aged 19-25.

By Demographic:

Demographically, portals targeted primarily adults over 25, followed by young people aged 19-25, university students, doctorate and graduate students, high school students, seniors, young people aged 12-18 and children under 11 years of age. University students and doctorate and graduate students fall along the top two primary demographics reinforcing the importance of adults over 19 engaged in research.

By Profession in rank order:

1. Cultural experts, professionals and policy makers (82%)
2. Educational Professionals and teachers (77%)
3. Researchers and/or planners (71%)
4. University students (68%)
5. Doctorate and graduate students (65%)
6. In the "other" category most often cited was culture enthusiasts/professionals/operators (31% within other category)

By Locality:

Portals indicated that more of them were concerned with local and amateur cultural enthusiasts (67%), local residents, local and amateur historians, regional and national tourists than international tourists (37%) which is not intuitive based on the indication that 62% of portals surveyed have international audiences. What this does suggest is that portals that have multiple geographic audiences cater to local or national audiences mores so than their international visitors.

D. Content :

The survey elicited information on 32 cultural topics and revealed that exactly half of these topics are offered by over 50% of portals surveyed with 4% offering "all of the above." Within the more niche-oriented content portals, less than 10% offer the five least popular topics. One third of portals design half of their content for teachers or students demonstrating that the majority of cultural portal information is designed to be used for heritage or arts educational purposes.

Most Popular :

➢ Museums (74%)
➢ Heritage (73%)
➢ Music (68%)
➢ Digital Arts/Multimedia (60%)
➢ Libraries/Archives (60%)
➢ Plastic Arts/Painting, Sculpture (60%)
➢ Theatre (60%)

Least Popular:
- ➢ Archaeology (2%)
- ➢ Cultural Development (3%)
- ➢ All of the above (4%)
- ➢ Cultural Planning (4%)
- ➢ Cultural Policy (9%)

E. Services :

Participants responded to questions eliciting information on forty-six services. Additionally, portals indicated that they offered communications, announcements and library/archive services. These results reinforce the high value cultural portals place on acting as a conduit to resources and partnerships. There is a trend towards congruence of services. The top five common services are provided by more than 75% of participants and 19 services are offered by more than 50% of participants. The high proportion of portals that offer similar services begs the question of how much of the content is shared amongst portals and corresponding rationales. For example, many portals share dissemination of international events leading to greater awareness and distribution. Additionally, portals that provide news services were not asked to reveal their sources so the diversity of this type of content is unknown.

The least provided services represent emerging technologies (aka Web 2.0) or represent a very specific type of portal as most observatories and multidisciplinary cultural portals, for example, do not offer online ticketing services.

In rank order, most commonly provided services are :
1. Database of cultural resources and/or research links (92%);
2. Institution details (87%);
3. Link to search engine/search function within site (86%);
4. News (79%);
5. Listings Guide (77%).

Least often provided from fewest in rank order:
1. Vlog (2%);
2. Wikis (7%);
3. Online Ticketing (17%);
4. Podcasting (20%);
5. Blog/Weblog (23%).

3.3 Multidisciplinary Cultural Portals:

➢ By far have the highest budgets, only type with over $1 million USD/800 K €;
➢ Most likely to have governmental relationships: 32% are national government or Quasi-Autonomous National Government Organisations (Quangos) but 30% are government sponsored;[2]
➢ 57% get 91-100% of funding from government;
➢ 77% are national in scope;
➢ Multidisciplinary in nature, 84% likely to produce original content;
➢ Most likely to be multilingual with 52% offering content in a non-principal language
➢ Primary audiences in rank order: adults over 25, young people 19-25, local and amateur culture enthusiasts, educational professionals and teachers;
➢ Most provided services are: database of cultural resources/and or research links, news, listings guide;
➢ Most likely to use dynamic and interactive tools and services;
➢ Highest dynamic updaters: 42% update dynamically, 55% update dynamically each business day or every day;
➢ Least likely to use performance indicators (84% do). In rank order of use: visits, page views, visitors, and hits.

3.4 Thematic Portals

➢ 62% are international in scope;
➢ Least likely to be government affiliated or sponsored;
➢ 67% get 91-100% of funding from the government sources but majority (72%) operate on less than $25,000 USD/20,000 €annually;
➢ Least likely to produce original content (71%) or be multilingual (71%);
➢ Least likely to have content available in a secondary language;
➢ Update frequency: 29% update dynamically but only 44% update dynamically daily or each business day. A far higher proportion update less frequently and 24% update monthly;
➢ Primary audience in rank order: adults over 25, educational professionals and teachers, cultural experts, professionals and policy makers;
➢ Least inclined to partner across all indicators but most likely to track external site links;
➢ 90% use performance indicators: in rank order, visits, page views, visitors, and tied in third are hits and average duration.

---

[2] It is not possible due to survey design to differentiate government national portals or central government agencies from the multidisciplinary portal group.

3.5 Cultural Observatories:

- ➢ Fastest growing type of portal;
- ➢ Observatory's budgets are under $500,000 USD/400K €;
- ➢ 80% target an international audience;
- ➢ Most likely to be a profit making organization, 40% non profit, 33% non Governmental;
- ➢ 55% get 91-100% of funding from government, 27% are government sponsored or a governmental body;
- ➢ Most likely to produce original content (87%);
- ➢ Most frequent content updaters: 73% update dynamically, daily or each business day but least likely to dynamically update;
- ➢ Primary audiences in rank order: researchers and or planners and cultural experts, professionals and policy makers;
- ➢ Least likely to be interactive but most likely to offer discussion groups
- ➢ 87% provide research, 67% provide educational topics, only 33% include the sub-topic of cultural policy;
- ➢ Most inclined to partner across all indicators but least likely to track external site links;
- ➢ 86% of participants use performance indicators in the following rank order: number of visits, page views, visitors and subscribers;
- ➢ 13% measure keywords as a performance indicator but only 9% use cultural policy.

Observatories are most likely to be profit-making organizations but are least likely to charge for publications sales (only 26% do). However, they are the least likely group to offer advertising that may reflect their need to demonstrate impartiality and data integrity.

4. WEB 2.0:

Web 2.0 represents a new concept of development in web content management and services that allows for a greater interactivity between users and sites. This is facilitated through emerging dynamic tools such as: wikis[3], RSS feeds[4], interactive maps, content searches and tools that allow users to contribute their own information. This concept is applied to content gathering and generation, audience outreach, services, and performance measurements.

---

[3] Wiki: type of website that allows the visitors themselves to easily add, remove and otherwise edit and change some available content, sometimes without the need for registration. This ease of interaction and operation makes a wiki an effective tool for collaborative authoring. The term wiki can also refer to the collaborative software itself (wiki engine) that facilitates the operation of such a website, or to certain specific wiki sites, including the computer science site (an original wiki), WikiWikiWeb, and the online encyclopedias such as Wikipedia. **SOURCE:** Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki.

[4] RSS feeds: RSS is a simple XML-based system that allows users to subscribe to their favorite websites. Using RSS, webmasters can put their content into a standardized format, which can be viewed and organized through RSS-aware software or automatically conveyed as new content on another website. **SOURCE**: Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RSS_feeds

4.1 Trends in Emerging Dynamic Tools:

An increase in dynamic tools is evident with a 27% growth in RSS feeds, 26% increase in tools allowing event submissions, and with 12% of portals now formatting content for mobile devices. However emerging dynamic tools, despite their growth, are still rarely offered as multidisciplinary cultural portals are the only group that is likely to offer any of the emerging tools. Observatories, which report the highest concern with user satisfaction, prove to be the least interactive.

Most common dynamic tools used:
1. Search engine functions, 86% with 53% offering both internal and external;
2. Tools allowing users to enter their own cultural events or information (50%);
3. RSS feeds (39%);
4. Interactive Maps (34%);
5. Personal profile page for visitors (30%).

Least common dynamic tools used:
1. Vlogs, 97% do not offer,
2. Wikis, 93% do not offer,
3. Online ticketing, 83% do not offer
4. Podcasting, 82% do not offer.
5. Online authoring tools, 52% do not offer

Dynamic tools used for promotional purposes:
1. Search Engine Optimization (53%)
2. Email campaigns (50%)
3. RSS feeds (29%)
4. Keyword buys (9%)
5. Search engines general (2%)

The comparatively small proportion of participants that did not respond to questions regarding the newer dynamic tools could suggest an unfamiliarity with the tools and or insufficient funds or expertise. As most portals indicated their scope is international it is least likely, although not impossible, that an additional reason for not offering dynamic tools is be due to the insufficient capacity of user profiles to utilize these types of tools.

4.2 Content Authenticity:

Cultural portals update their content frequently, with over 2/3 updating each business day, daily or dynamically (36%) demonstrating a high value on new, original and updated content. 81% of portals do generate their own content focusing on text and images but video and audio files are still rarely offered. While online authoring tools are becoming more popular the majority of portals do not offer moderated or non-moderated Internet forums or online news and discussions groups.

Most content is provided through cooperative partnerships between external and internal collaborations. This trend is on the rise. Content is rarely exclusively provided by external contributors (44%), but overall, their contribution has increased 46% over the past two years. Just

under half (46%) of organizations that use external contributors do fund this work. On average, 64% of external contributors are compensated suggesting built-in performance expectations and more formalized partnerships or contracts rather than user-based contributions of whose authenticity and accuracy can not be guaranteed. These external contributions are most often in the categories of more advanced technological services such as audio feeds, video feeds, podcasting, and discussion groups. However, wikis and vlogs are almost equal in terms of outside versus internal contribution.

Interestingly, the majority of portals (69%) do not post personnel profiles of staff or contributors suggesting that the majority of content on cultural portals is attributed to the portal or organization. Particularly for observatories that primarily aim to reach cultural experts and decision makers this is a surprising trend away from transparency and the promotion of staff and contributor expertise and credentials.

5. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND NETWORKS IN VIRTUAL SPHERES:

The 2005 Survey found that cooperative partnership goals included:

> ➢ Increased partnerships;
> ➢ Funding partners to ensure viability;
> ➢ Avoiding duplication of services;
> ➢ Meaningful connections/win-win situations;
> ➢ Interoperability;
> ➢ Service provision to partners;
> ➢ Networks of partners.

Participants in the 2006 survey overwhelmingly (76%) indicated a willingness to engage in international cooperation by agreeing to share web stats and indicators; 80% are willing to share their individual responses with the Culture.mondo Network. However, only 13% have already shared web stats indicating there is an eagerness to share knowledge as well as the fact that there are some roadblocks. Speculation on impediments includes translation needs, respect for privacy, or competition. Thematic portals (28%) and multidisciplinary portals (25%) are least likely to want to share data (28%), while in contrast all but one cultural observatory was interested and willing to share performance indicators.

The majority of portals do promote through partnerships with cultural organizations (83%), including the exchange of online links (67%). Most also disseminate online newsletters (64%) and 16% consider other institutions, organizations and networks to be an important audience. Statistically, 34% of portals measure the value of partnerships, 70% use this information for funding applications, 21% measure data sharing while only 16% considered organizations/institutions/networks to be an important audience.

The majority of portals indicated an international and/or national geographical coverage and use geographic location as a measurement in determining success: 57% measure user's country of origin, 51% measure domestic versus international visits and 14% obtain information on the user's city of origin. There is a large overlap of common areas of influence; 32% cover Europe and 12% of portals

cover Hispanic regions but 22% target content to all countries. Additionally, 20% determine language preferences.

While language barriers to partnering do exist, 58% of participating portals consider English to be a principal language and 40% make some content available in a non-principal language which is most predominantly English followed by Spanish.

It is unknown at this time how many of the participating portals are current partners or directly link to the Culture.mondo Network site or to other members of the network.

6. MEASURES OF SUCCESS:

6.1 Tools of the Trade: Data Collection

It is impossible to discern from the survey how many portals actually measure performance indicators. The following analysis is based on the portals that did respond to this section of the survey. Of those that did respond to these questions, 71% use software or technology to collect web metrics. Technology preferences fall out along the self-identified portal classifications: observatories prefer webalizer, multidisciplinary portals alone prefer internal statistic servers and thematic portals primarily utilize tools not included in the survey. Collectively, cultural portals prefer Awstats followed by Webalizer and internal statistics. Across the board and collectively, portals utilize IP addresses as the preferred method of collection. Despite the great number of portals that provide multilingual content few collect information on user language preferences. This is notable as user satisfaction is ranked highly as a key performance indicator and it could be argued that language is a large component of "user-friendly" services.

Most common performance indicators in rank order are:
1. Number of visits
2. Number of page views
3. Number of visitors
4. Number of hits
5. User's country of origin

Least commons performance indicators in rank order from fewest used are:
1. Bounce rate
2. User's city of origin
3. Page reject rate
4. Number of content contributions by partners
5. Language preferences

However, "key" performance indicators in rank order are unique visitors, public awareness, website user satisfaction, visitor sessions, and page views. Notably, two statistics support the idea that a portal's value is not determined by cost: only 6% measure cost-per-visit despite the high level of government sponsorship and the only main performance indicator predominantly used to support funding applications or requirements is the number of stakeholder partnerships.

General Trends:

➢ Monthly unique visitors-63,635 (decrease from 2005 of 8,000)
➢ Monthly visitor sessions- 48,901
➢ Number of page views-425,132
➢ Average visit duration time-14.6 minutes (100% increase from 2005)

Of the 15 promotional tools that were surveyed, the top 6 are used by more than 50% of respondents.

Favored Promotional tools require no output costs and are listed in rank order:
1. Partnerships with cultural organizations (83%)
2. Conferences and special events (74%)
3. Exchange of online links (67%)
4. Online newsletters (63%)
5. Search Engine Optimization (53%)

Least common promotional tools are more expensive in nature and in rank order by fewest are:

1. General search engines (2%)
2. Keyword buys/pay per click (9%)
3. Viral Marketing(15%)
4. TV/Radio Ads(16%)
5. RSS feeds(29%)

The least likely used promotional tools may indicate the costs involved with using these techniques or may indicate that these are not the best strategies to reach desired audiences.

6.2 Establishing Common Measures:

Currently, there are enough common measures for portals to benchmark against one another. The 2005 and 2006 surveys have indicated that cultural portals are willing to share statistics and partnerships are highly valued. It is doubtful that portals would be against establishing common measures. This topic is ripe for discussion at the upcoming Round Table in order to discuss why certain metrics are preferred over others and to discern any impediments to using the more technologically advanced and dynamic measurements.

Primary motivations in collecting key performance indicators are driven by the desire to determine product improvement strategies, promotion of the portal to a target group, and supporting funding applications. However, a high percentage of responses to how portals collect information for their primary motivations were indicated as "other" and the majority of portals for two consecutive years did not respond to questions pertaining to performance indicators. Of those that did respond, less than half rated their site's performance as good or excellent based on their collected web metrics suggesting that the measurements used are not adequately meeting the primary motivations for

gathering data. Thus, improving data correlation to portal needs could be achieved by identifying more accurate common measures of success by discussing common challenges, motivations and the most useful metrics for each portal participating.

7. Conclusions

The 2006 survey provides information on the quantity of cultural portals using services and specific types of performance measurements within a small proportion of respondents. Gaps in the survey include eliciting information on capacity of cultural portals and motivations behind services provided, why certain performance measurements are preferred over others and determining conclusively which portals participating are governmental cultural portals.

Bearing in mind the survey's limitations, the most interesting conclusions that can be drawn from the survey are as follows:

- ➢ Government affiliation and sponsorship do not seem to have a positive relativity to utilization of performance indicators;
- ➢ Government influence is not proportionately carried into services provided;
- ➢ Preferred keyword measurement does not correspond to thematic interests and audiences;
- ➢ Most portals who have local or national audiences as well as international scope cater to their local or national visitors;
- ➢ There is an increased congruence between services and content provided by portals;
- ➢ Measurements used by portals may not be adequately meeting their primary motivations for gathering data.

For Further Investigation:

- ➢ Why are certain performance measurements preferred over others?
- ➢ Why are more technologically dynamic measurements not more widely used?
- ➢ Why did less than a third of participants respond to questions pertaining to performance indicators?
- ➢ What is the appropriate balance between user content submission and portal accountability?
- ➢ Does popular content have any type of relationship to the type of services offered?
- ➢ How much overlap is there between posted cultural news and events worldwide and is this important?
- ➢ Of the services and content that is not free, how is the market rate determined?
- ➢ How well do the members of the Network partner, what are the current partnerships that participants are engaged in amongst each other?
- ➢ Why is language preference not a key performance indicator?
- ➢ Are measurements used adequately meeting the primary motivations for data gathering?
- ➢ Of the most common measures of success, which are the most useful?
- ➢ How are content and services provided affected by constraints in capacity? What are these constraints? Are they financial or technical in nature?
- ➢ What standards does government funding of cultural portals require and how does this affect content, services and audiences?