



**Contribution to the List of Issues of the Committee on
Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of the United Nations to
the Ecuadorian State, submitted by the Casa de la Cultura
Ecuatoriana Benjamín Carrión – National Headquarters**

On the Exercise of Cultural Rights in Ecuador

Quito, November 2025

Introduction

(1) The Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana Benjamín Carrión (CCE), a public institution established in 1944, submits this contribution to the List of Issues for the Ecuadorian State with the purpose of providing a critical and territorial assessment of the status of cultural rights in the country, within the framework of the State's Fifth Periodic Report to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), which monitors compliance with the ICESCR.

(2) This report complements the State's Fifth Periodic Report (2024) by offering additional information and critical analysis on both progress and setbacks in the fulfillment of cultural rights, particularly in the areas of freedom of creation, access to and participation in cultural life, protection of social memory and cultural heritage, and the institutional autonomy of the National System of Culture.

(3) The CCE is composed of a Territorial System of Provincial Chapters present in all 24 provinces of the country and plays a central role in promoting, circulating, and ensuring access to cultural life, as well as strengthening identity, memory, and artistic creation—core elements of its institutional mission and vision. Through this institutional and territorial network, structural challenges have been identified that hinder the effective realization of Article 15 of the ICESCR, which recognizes the right of everyone to take part in cultural life, enjoy the benefits of scientific progress, and benefit from its applications.

(4) This report is based on an analysis of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage's (MCyP) Institutional Strategic Plan 2022–2025 and its 2024 Accountability Report, as well as on the CCE's institutional and territorial observations.

General Context of Cultural Rights in Ecuador

(5) Ecuador has a constitutional and legal framework that recognizes cultural rights as an essential component of Buen Vivir (Sumak Kawsay). Article 377 of the Constitution establishes the National System of Culture and guarantees the protection and promotion of cultural diversity, universal access to culture, and citizen participation in cultural life.

(6) Since 2016, Ecuador has had the Organic Law of Culture and its corresponding regulations. These instruments define and develop the cultural rights of citizens as well as the functioning of the National System of Culture.

(7) The MCyP's Strategic Plan 2022–2025 defines in Article 5 the set of cultural rights, including: cultural identity; protection of ancestral knowledge; freedom of creation; access to cultural goods and services; artistic training; use of public space; cultural rights of people in human mobility; and rights in the digital environment. Article 6 establishes that these guarantees must be implemented by all entities within the National System of Culture.

(8) However, the practical implementation of these policies reveals a significant gap between normative discourse and institutional or territorial realities. This gap results in persistent inequities in resource allocation, community participation, citizen engagement, and the sustainability of cultural work.

(9) The CCE, as a decentralized institution with national presence, identifies structural challenges that limit the full exercise of cultural rights, including:

- a) centralization of budget and decision-making;
- b) weak mechanisms for participation;
- c) labor precariousness in the cultural sector.

(10) During the 2024–2025 period, Ecuador's cultural sector experienced profound institutional transformations, including the merger of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage with the Ministry of Education, enacted through Executive Decree 60 in July 2025. This reform downgraded the governing body for culture and heritage to a Vice-Ministry within the newly formed Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture.

(11) The merger was presented as part of a governmental “administrative efficiency” policy that reduced the number of ministries from 20 to 14 and resulted in the dismissal of approximately 5,000 public employees¹. However, the cultural sector denounced that this measure prioritizes fiscal criteria over the protection and promotion of cultural rights—concerns expressed through collective letters and public demonstrations.

(12) These decisions have resulted in a setback in cultural institutionalization, affecting the continuity of programs, competitive funds, and cultural development processes.

(13) According to the Cultural Policy Observatory of the University of the Arts, this restructuring was not supported by public diagnoses, impact assessments, socialization processes, or budgetary analyses. Moreover, by reinforcing the centralization of competencies, the reform weakened the institutional autonomy of cultural policy, which had been exercised through a specialized Ministry since 2007.

(14) The elimination of the MCyP as an autonomous entity raised concerns among artistic, academic, and territorial organizations, which emphasized that culture cannot be subordinated to an educational agenda without compromising its cross-cutting nature, diversity, technical specificity, and its capacity to articulate memory, innovation, and citizen participation².

(15) As of the date of this report, no guidelines, transition regulations, or explicit plans have been issued to guarantee the preservation of cultural competencies or the continuity of cultural rights under the new institutional framework. Nor have indicators been published to monitor the impact of the merger.

(16) Likewise, the merger coincided with budget cuts to the cultural sector and reductions in specialized technical staff, affecting the continuity of programs, territorial advisory work, cultural mediation, and heritage conservation. Until 2024, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage had a budget of USD 13,452,653.72, executing USD 10,007,978.78 in current expenditure and USD 1,770,369.10 in investment expenditure. As of this report, no consolidated information has been published on the budget allocated to the new Vice-Ministry of Culture.

(17) At the territorial level, budget cuts have deepened the institutional crisis. The Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana reported a reduction of USD 1,141,142.99 for 2025, maintaining an annual budget decrease rate of approximately 18.8% over the past five years, severely affecting its 24 provincial chapters and limiting the execution of projects, cultural programming, maintenance of cultural infrastructure, and the provision of cultural services to the public. These cuts have also affected other cultural institutions in the country, revealing a broader regression in public investment in culture³.

(18) The CCE has warned that these reductions not only threaten the continuity of essential cultural activities but also deprive citizens of fundamental tools to confront social fragmentation exacerbated by insecurity and violence.

(19) In parallel, the State has presented isolated initiatives—such as the First National Policy for the Promotion of Cultural and Creative Industries (2024) and the update of the World Heritage Tentative List with UNESCO (2024)—which, although relevant, do not compensate for the structural effects of budget cuts and institutional instability.

Suggested Questions to the State

1 What technical assessments supported the decision to merge the Ministry of Culture with the Ministry of Education?

2 How will the State ensure that the merger does not undermine the autonomy, cross-cutting nature, or technical specificity of cultural policy?

3 What measures will be taken to guarantee the continuity of programs related to cultural development, heritage, cultural industries, social memory, and decentralization?

¹ *El País*, 26/07/2025.

² *Primicias*, reaction to the ministerial merger, 08/05/2025.

³ Statement on Facebook on the official account of the Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana, 01/06/2025.

- 4 How will the impact of the merger on the exercise of the right to culture be evaluated?
- 5 What mechanisms exist to ensure that the participation of artists, communities, and cultural organizations is binding within the new institutional structure?

Reform of the Organic Law of Culture and Challenges in Cultural Governance

(20) Since 2023, the National Assembly of Ecuador (Legislative Branch) and various cultural sectors have promoted a process to reform the Organic Law of Culture (LOC), with the aim of updating the regulatory framework of the National System of Culture and addressing structural problems identified since the implementation of the current law. This process was critically analyzed by the Observatory of Cultural Policy and Cultural Economy of the University of the Arts (UArtes), which identified advances, critical bottlenecks, and institutional risks⁴.

(21) The UArtes Observatory noted that the legislative debate revealed structural tensions, including: (a) difficulties in reconciling financial self-management mechanisms for cultural institutions with the national fiscal framework; (b) uncertainty about the sustainability of the proposed increase of the share of profits from the Development Bank allocated to the Culture Fund (from 5% to 25%); and (c) concerns about reforms that could affect the historical autonomy of the Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana (CCE) and the structure of its provincial chapters.

(22) In September 2024, the National Assembly's Commission on Education, Culture, Science, and Ancestral Knowledge announced the completion of the final text of the reform, claiming to have incorporated inputs from institutions such as the Ministry of Culture, the CCE, universities, and cultural organizations. However, independent sectors argued that participation was uneven, non-binding, and that the full extent of the modifications introduced was not made transparent.⁵

(23) In October 2024, the Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana publicly questioned the National Assembly's approval of the legal reform without incorporating substantial observations from the sector, warning particularly about the risks posed to its institutional autonomy, its provincial chapters, and programs such as Cultura Viva Comunitaria and the National Orchestras Network⁶.

(24) On 30 October 2024, President Daniel Noboa issued a full veto of the LOC reform bill, citing fiscal infeasibility and deficiencies in the drafting. Under Ecuadorian law, a full veto prevents the Assembly from reconsidering the same bill for one year. This effectively halted the legislative process after nearly two years of work⁷.

(25) The veto revealed, according to subsequent analyses from the Ministry and independent observers, a lack of institutional coordination during the drafting of the reform. Then-Minister of Culture Romina Muñoz publicly stated that this internal misalignment directly influenced the Executive's decision⁸.

(26) In May 2025, during the 5th UArtes Observatory Meeting, specialists reiterated that the governance of the National System of Culture remains fragmented. The meeting highlighted that the lack of coordination among the Ministry of Culture, the CCE, the Institute of Cinema and Audiovisual Creation (ICCA, undergoing reinstatement), the Institute of Creativity and Innovation Promotion (IFAIC), public museums, and local governments hinders the development of a coherent legal reform with a territorial perspective⁹.

⁴ Observatory of Cultural Policy and Economy – University of the Arts. "The Culture Law Will Be Reformed: Progress, Critical Issues and Perspectives," 09/18/2024.

⁵ National Assembly of Ecuador. Legislative Note No. 99651, September 2024.

⁶ Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana, official statement on the reform of the LOC, October 2024.

⁷ Ecuavisa, "Reform to the Culture Law: Noboa Issued a Full Veto on the Bill Approved by the Assembly," 30 October 2024

⁸ GK City, Post-veto presidential analysis, 28/11/2024

⁹ UArtes Observatory, 5th Cultural Policy Meeting, 05/22/2025.

(27) In parallel, in June 2025, the Assembly's Education Commission initiated a review of the Law for the Protection of Artists, with the aim of expanding labor and social security guarantees for cultural workers. However, this initiative could result in normative fragmentation if it is not organically aligned with the changes under consideration for the LOC. A similar concern applies to the "Law for the Strengthening of the Audiovisual Industry," currently under second debate in the Economic Development Commission¹⁰.

(28) The current situation leaves the National System of Culture operating under a law widely considered outdated by the cultural sector. Cultural institutions continue to lack an updated legal framework that strengthens their autonomy, ensures sustainable financing, improves governance, and enables binding participation from cultural actors.

Suggested Questions to the State

- 1 How does the State plan to resume the reform process of the Organic Law of Culture following the full veto issued on 30 October 2024?
- 2 What mechanisms will ensure that participation from the cultural sector is binding and representative?
- 3 What financial studies are being prepared to support multi-year cultural funding mechanisms?
- 4 How will the reform of the LOC be aligned with the concurrent review of the Law for the Protection of Artists?

Intermittency of Public Financing, Sustainability of the IFAIC, and Reinstatement of the ICCA

(29) Public financing for culture in Ecuador remains one of the main factors limiting the stability of the sector. Cultural promotion funds—particularly those administered by the Institute for the Promotion of Creativity and Innovation (IFAIC)—continue to depend on annual calls for proposals that do not follow sustained criteria, preventing long-term planning and generating discontinuity in cultural processes. This dependence on competitive calls disproportionately affects small, territorial, and community-based collectives, which lack technical capacity or access to direct technical assistance from institutions whose operations are centralized in the capital city.

(30) The absence of a multi-year and guaranteed budget affects project sustainability, continuity of activities, and the ability to develop complete processes of creation, circulation, audience development, and cultural mediation. Cultural management remains governed by a logic that does not reflect the diverse realities of cultural labor.

(31) In February 2025, the IFAIC itself publicly acknowledged these limitations. Its former Executive Director, Jorge Carrillo Grandes, emphasized the need to overcome what he referred to as the "hunger games" of the call-for-proposals system: hundreds of artists competing for scarce funds without a strategic framework to support integral cultural development¹¹.

(32) In response, the IFAIC announced a conceptual shift toward value-chain planning, aiming to finance not only the production of artistic works but also their circulation, distribution, promotion, and audience development. This represents a significant advance, acknowledging that cultural policy must activate full cultural ecosystems rather than solely fund content production.

(33) However, these reforms risk remaining declarative unless stable financing is ensured. The value chain can only function with multi-year budgets, co-financing mechanisms, and clear fiscal planning. Otherwise, the intermittency and extreme competition that define Ecuador's cultural sector will persist.

Reinstatement of the Institute of Cinema and Audiovisual Creation (ICCA)

¹⁰ *Legislative committee begins review of the Artists' Defense Law*, 18/06/2025

¹¹ *IFAIC, Statements by Executive Director Jorge Carrillo Grandes on value-chain planning*, creatividad.gob.ec, 02/28/2025.

(34) In April 2025, Ecuador's Constitutional Court authorized the process to reverse the merger between the IFAIC and the Institute of Cinema and Audiovisual Creation (ICCA). This merger, implemented years earlier, had been widely criticized for undermining the technical specialization required to serve the film and audiovisual sector.

(35) The Court's decision was celebrated by the audiovisual community, which had argued that the merger weakened institutional support, reduced technical capacity, and affected strategic investment. The reinstatement of the ICCA implies, in principle, the recovery of an institution with a specific mandate in film policy, promotion, audiovisual preservation, and industry strengthening.

(36) Nevertheless, reinstating the ICCA does not resolve the structural issue of financing. Both the ICCA and the IFAIC require sustained, multi-year financial models to fulfill their mandates. Without stable financing, the institutional separation risks multiplying administrative structures without addressing budgetary fragility¹².

Labor Precarity, Decentralization, and Access to Cultural Goods

(37) The intermittency of public funds generates labor precarity among artists, cultural managers, technicians, researchers, and workers across the cultural chain. Much of the sector depends on temporary contracts, project-based fees, or competitive calls. This prevents the establishment of stable and sustainable cultural careers, contrary to international cultural rights standards.

(38) This precarity disproportionately affects women, youth, Indigenous peoples and nationalities, Afro-descendant communities, and territories outside Quito and Guayaquil, where access to institutional networks, opportunities, and financing is more limited.

(39) These structural conditions deepen historical and territorial inequalities and directly affect compliance with Article 15 of the ICESCR, which recognizes the right of all persons to take part in cultural life and to enjoy the benefits of scientific and artistic progress.

(40) Although the State asserts that cultural policies are implemented with a territorial and decentralized approach, budget execution remains highly concentrated in Quito and Guayaquil. The 2024 Accountability Report of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage (MCyP) shows that 65% of cultural investment is concentrated in three provinces.

(41) The provincial chapters of the CCE, which constitute the institutional network with the greatest territorial presence, face technical, administrative, and financial limitations that prevent them from guaranteeing the full exercise of the right to culture.

(42) The absence of an equitable budget allocation system weakens cultural access in rural, Amazonian, and coastal regions, contradicting the principle of territorial equity established in the Government's Creation of Opportunities Plan 2021–2025.

(43) The right to access and benefit from culture is not guaranteed equitably. MCyP data are not disaggregated by territory, gender, or population group, preventing an accurate assessment of the impact of current policies.

(44) There are significant gaps in infrastructure and access to public space. In rural, Amazonian, and border areas, public cultural spaces are scarce or nonexistent.

(45) Existing public infrastructure lacks sustainable public financing mechanisms for maintenance, which compromises the free and adequate use of cultural spaces.

(46) Regarding access to cultural assets, there is concern over the lack of institutional protection protocols during periods of social unrest. In October 2025, the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE) denounced police and military siege around the Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana during social mobilizations¹³.

(47) Such incidents endanger both heritage assets and the public's right to free and safe use of cultural public space.

Suggested Questions to the State

¹² Ecuador close to reversing the merger of the ICCA and IFAIC", Constitutional Court approves the process, creatividad.gob.ec, 11/04/2025.

¹³ El Diario, "CONAIE denounces police siege in the surroundings of the CCE," 10/12/2025.

- 1 How will the State ensure the financial sustainability of the IFAIC and the ICCA through multi-year budgets rather than exclusively annual calls for proposals?
- 2 What actions will the State take to guarantee that the value-chain model announced by the IFAIC is effectively implemented with stable financing across all phases (creation, production, distribution, circulation, and audience development)?
- 3 What measures will the State adopt to address labor precarity in the cultural sector resulting from discontinuous financing?
- 4 What mechanisms will be established to ensure that cultural workers in the provinces have equitable access to funding and opportunities, avoiding concentration in Quito and Guayaquil?
- 5 What territorial evaluation mechanisms exist to measure the impact of cultural policy?
- 6 What protocols are in place to protect cultural institutions during periods of social crisis and to guarantee free and safe public access to them?

Social Memory and Cultural Heritage

(48) The right to social memory is an integral component of the cultural rights recognized by the Constitution of Ecuador and the Organic Law of Culture. However, its implementation faces structural weaknesses that limit citizen participation, heritage protection, and the social use of cultural spaces.

(49) Institutional conflicts persist between the Ministry of Culture and Heritage (MCyP) and the Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GADs), particularly in cities where responsibility for heritage management has become a matter of political dispute. In 2025, the Municipality of Quito publicly denounced that the State had failed to transfer committed resources for heritage management, affecting projects in the Historic Center and in patrimonial neighborhoods¹⁴.

(50) A notable example of this tension occurred in Guápulo (Quito), where a real estate project in a heritage area was suspended amid cross-accusations regarding missing permits, lack of community consultation, and deficient coordination between the Municipality and the Ministry of Culture.

(51) A further institutional conflict emerged between the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of Guayaquil regarding the administration of the Anthropological and Contemporary Art Museum (MAAC). In 2025, journalistic reports highlighted a lack of clarity in the museum's governance, risks of activity suspension, and pressures to transfer its management to local authorities without a defined technical roadmap¹⁵.

(52) In the field of social memory, the Museum of Memory, inaugurated in Quito in 2025, has faced criticism for its incomplete development, lack of adequate technical guidelines, and limited participation of victims and human rights organizations. National media reported that the museum opened with empty rooms, partial content, and insufficient technical teams, raising concerns about its role as a space for symbolic reparation¹⁶.

(53) Despite these challenges, the State has advanced partial initiatives, such as the update of the Tentative List for World Heritage in coordination with UNESCO, which represents a technical improvement. However, this update does not compensate for structural weaknesses in financing, governance, and community participation in heritage projects¹⁷.

(54) There is an absence of effective cultural mediation policies in museums, archives, heritage centers, and memory spaces. Without defined participatory processes, these spaces risk becoming static structures disconnected from affected communities and younger generations.

¹⁴ *Primicias*, reports on heritage conflicts in Quito and Guápulo, 03/07/2025.

¹⁵ Ecuavisa, "MAAC at risk due to dispute between the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of Guayaquil," 2025.

¹⁶ "Incomplete: Criticism of the Memory Museum inaugurated in Quito", 2025.

¹⁷ UNESCO, communiqué on the update of Ecuador's Tentative List for World Heritage, 2024.

Suggested Questions to the State

- 1 What mechanisms exist to ensure community participation—including that of Indigenous peoples—in heritage and social memory projects?
- 2 What protocols are applied to ensure coordination between the Ministry of Culture and GADs in heritage projects, preventing administrative disputes that may affect conservation?
- 3 What actions will the State take to correct the technical and participatory deficiencies identified in the Museum of Memory?
- 4 How will the update of the Tentative List for World Heritage be linked to actual plans for financing, cultural mediation, and community participation?

Cultural Diversity, Ancestral Knowledge, Interculturality, and Freedom of Expression

(55) The Constitution of Ecuador and the Organic Law of Culture explicitly recognize the cultural diversity of the country and guarantee the rights of Indigenous, Afro-descendant, and Montubio peoples to preserve, revitalize, and transmit their knowledge, languages, and cultural practices. The Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage (2022–2025) reaffirms these commitments, particularly in the areas of cultural identity, protection of ancestral knowledge, and the use of ancestral languages.

(56) However, the practical implementation of intercultural policies remains limited and fragmented. There is no sustained national policy for the revitalization of ancestral languages nor a continuous financing system for community cultural projects. Actions reported by the MCyP in coordination with the National Institute of Cultural Heritage (INPC) focus on isolated workshops or calls that do not respond to long-term structural needs¹⁸.

(57) Unequal access to public budgets and cultural services particularly affects Indigenous peoples and nationalities. The overall reduction in public funding for culture in 2025—including a cut of more than USD 1.1 million to the Casa de la Cultura and its provincial chapters—has a disproportionate impact on Indigenous and Afro-descendant territories, where institutional presence is limited and cultural projects depend on small yet essential funds.

(58) The participation of Indigenous peoples and nationalities in the governance of the National System of Culture remains marginal. Existing mechanisms—such as consultative councils or temporary committees—are not binding, lack their own budget, and do not influence strategic or normative decisions. This contradicts the principle of interculturality that the State itself defines as a transversal axis.

(59) The absence of prior, free, and informed consultation in cultural policy development remains a structural gap. The reforms to the Culture Law debated in 2023–2024 did not include specific procedures for the participation of Indigenous peoples, a point criticized by national organizations during the legislative process.

(60) Article 15 of the ICESCR recognizes the right of every person “to take part in cultural life and to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.” The Constitution of Ecuador (Art. 21) guarantees the right to free artistic creation and production, without censorship or interference.

(61) However, recent years have seen tensions between freedom of creation and institutional control. A paradigmatic case was the controversy surrounding the performance by the band Mugre Sur during Quitofest (December 2024), which included critical expressions regarding President Daniel Noboa. Following the performance, the Metropolitan Council of Quito requested explanations from organizers and participating public institutions.

¹⁸ *Institutional Strategic Plan 2022–2025 of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage (sections on cultural diversity, ancestral knowledge, and interculturality).*

(62) This case reflects political and moral pressures on artistic creation and highlights the absence of protocols to protect cultural freedom of expression in relation to State and local authorities¹⁹.

Suggested Questions to the State

- 1 What long-term policies exist for the revitalization of ancestral languages beyond workshops or isolated calls for proposals?
- 2 What annual budgets are allocated to community projects in Indigenous, Afro-descendant, and Montubio territories?
- 3 What mechanisms ensure binding participation of Indigenous peoples and nationalities in cultural policy formulation?
- 4 How will the State ensure that the ministerial merger does not undermine the epistemological and cultural autonomy of Indigenous peoples?
- 5 What measures will the State take to prevent cultural expressions critical of authorities from being subject to pressure or sanctions?

Digital Environment and Technological Access to Culture

(63) The 2022–2025 Institutional Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage explicitly includes the right to the “digital environment” as part of cultural rights, proposing to guarantee access, production, and cultural circulation through digital platforms. However, no clear indicators or monitoring mechanisms have been reported to evaluate its implementation.

(64) The digitalization of heritage, archives, collections, and cultural services remains uneven and fragmented. While the State has reported progress—such as projects included within the Tentative List for World Heritage—these efforts lack robust strategies for public access, platform interoperability, or digital literacy for communities with limited connectivity.

(65) The COVID-19 pandemic exposed and widened existing digital gaps, especially in rural, Amazonian, border, and Indigenous communities. Although the State incorporated some digitalization initiatives in previous years, these did not consolidate into long-term public policies or dedicated budgets.

(66) The Ministry of Culture has announced projects to digitize cultural assets and archives, but no public data exist on the share of the cultural budget allocated to technological infrastructure, server sustainability, platform development, or digital accessibility. This lack of transparency hinders an assessment of real progress in fulfilling the right to the digital cultural environment.

(67) Digital gaps also affect artists and cultural managers. Lack of access to distribution platforms, technological tools, electronic payment systems, and official cultural promotion channels limits their ability to participate fully in contemporary cultural life.

(68) The absence of specific digital accessibility policies particularly affects persons with disabilities, older adults, Indigenous communities, and rural populations. There are no national guidelines requiring platforms of the National System of Culture to meet universal accessibility standards or to ensure the availability of content in ancestral languages.

(69) Promotion programs such as those administered by the IFAIC do not systematically include resources for digitalization, multimedia creation, or technological access, despite the fact that a significant part of the contemporary cultural ecosystem operates on digital platforms. This further widens the gap between urban sectors with greater infrastructure and community sectors with limited connectivity.

Suggested Questions to the State

¹⁹ *Primicias*, “The controversy over the performance by Mugre Sur,” 12/07/2024.



- 1 What percentage of the cultural budget is specifically allocated to digitalization, technological infrastructure, and digital accessibility?
- 2 What measures is the State implementing to reduce the digital divide in rural, Amazonian, and border communities in the cultural sector?
- 3 What guidelines exist to ensure universal accessibility on platforms of the National System of Culture?
- 4 How does the State ensure that heritage digitalization processes are accessible, free of charge, and publicly available?
- 5 What strategies are applied to include ancestral languages in digital platforms for cultural management and heritage?