

# **Towards a New Cultural Framework Programme of the European Union**

## **Report of the Working Group:**

Tuula Arkio, Bernard Faivre d'Arcier, Ondrej Hrab, Robert Palmer, Gottfried Wagner, Raymond Weber

**Brussels, 8 June 2003**

***Note:** Although the working group was instigated at the request of the Commission, the views contained in the report are those of the working group, and not necessarily those of the Commission. This report simply forms part of the Commission's formal consultation process.*

## **Table of contents**

<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Full Version of Report</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Importance of Culture</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Europe and the EU, and Europe in the World</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The Vision</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The Artistic and Creative Dimension</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Policy and Strategy Orientation</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Principle Needs to which a New Cultural Programme Should Contribute</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>The Basis of the Programme</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Matching Objectives to Resources</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Financing a New Cultural Framework Programme</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Criteria for EU Cultural Action Projects</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Selection of Projects</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Proposals for Action Lines (pillars) for EU Cultural Programmes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>A. Community support for a limited number of substantial and comprehensive arms-length-projects</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B. Incentives to innovative cooperation</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>C. Pro-active cultural cooperation policy development</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Other Issues</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Pilot period 2004 - 2006</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>22</b>

# **Towards a New Cultural Framework Programme of the European Union**

## **REPORT OF WORKING GROUP**

### **BACKGROUND**

At the invitation of Mr. Nicolas van der Pas, Director-General of the DG for Education and Culture, a Working Group was established to reflect on the issues in respect of a new cultural policy and framework programme for the European Union, and recommend proposals for the main features, which should be considered by the Commission. In particular, the group was asked to identify the major goals, suggest the forms of cultural co-operation, examine support methods, and outline main actions that would likely be most effective in creating European added value and simplifying the management of any future cultural programme. The group was asked to bear in mind the complexity and timescale of EU decision-making, and to be pragmatic in its proposals.

Members of the Working Group were as follows: Ms Tuula Arkio, Mr Bernard Faivre d'Arcier, Mr Ondrej Hrab, Mr Robert Palmer, Mr Gottfried Wagner, Mr Raymond Weber.

The following officials of the Commission assisted one or several meetings of the Working Group: Mr. Jean-Michel Baer, Ms Caroline Mierop, Mr Antonios Kosmopoulos, Ms Fabienne Metayer.

The Working Group discussed the preliminary findings with Ms Dessi Gavrilova, Ms Corina Suteu and Ms Mary Ann de Vlieg.

The Working Group met on 7 occasions. Members also read a wide-range of existing documents and reports, suggested by the Commission and the members themselves. As part of the process, individual members of the group produced working papers, which were circulated between meetings

This report is a summary of the findings of the Working Group and outlines its views and recommendations.

The Working Group believes that this report should be considered as a whole. The proposals flow from a number of principles that are stated at the outset. The proposals are not outlined merely as a set of “options”, some of which might be accepted, while others are ignored. The Working Group believes strongly that the strength of any future framework programme for culture will be its coherence, based on a clearly defined set of core principles and precise objectives, and urges the Commission to be bold and direct in the proposals it puts forward.

The credibility of any new cultural framework will depend on adhering rigorously to agreed principles, and the manner in which these relate to the process of decision-making. For this reason, the Working Group firmly believes that decisions concerning priority actions will in themselves be insufficient without open, clearly understood, well-organised and thoroughly professional methods of implementation of actions through all stages of selection, monitoring and evaluation. Similarly, the choice of criteria to be used in the selection of projects must be carefully developed to serve the main objectives and priorities of the new programme. The Working Group stresses that the importance of stimulating innovative responses from and empowering European cultural organisations and operators should remain at the core of the cultural programme, and that consultation and open discussion must form an ongoing part of the process in order to encourage and maintain a strong sense of partnership with the cultural sector.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The report of the Working Group should be considered as a whole. This executive summary outlines some cornerstones of the comprehensive proposal.

- 1. Cultural policies for Europe should become an integral part of European policy, based on the vision of the autonomous value of culture and the arts. A new community programme must relate to key thematic criteria and policy priorities:**
  - Creativity and innovation
  - Intercultural dialogue and competencies
  - Enlargement and cooperation with EU neighbours
  - The role of Europe in the world
  - Deepening of the integration process (European civil society)
- 2. A coherent cultural framework programme must ensure quality, viability, visibility and impact through the development of a clear but limited set of objectives and priorities, the encouragement of synergies across the cultural sector, and the creation of innovative structural instruments that enhance cooperation. The programme should combine both pro-active strategic and policy guidance by the EC and delegation of management and operation, adopting what is commonly referred to as the “arms length principle”. The programme should offer incentives for new types of European cultural cooperation that generate added value; it should create commitment on all levels, public and private. The programme needs to be user friendly and manageable. Priorities must focus on the arts and artistic processes, interdisciplinary (rather than sectoral) approaches and on ensuring professional implementation and dissemination. The criteria should relate to the quality of proposals, and not any form of quota system. A single independent expert jury should provide a lean and consistent professional advisory and selection process in order to prepare the decision-making.**
- 3. The challenges of a changing Europe in a complex world require strong cultural and thought leadership, constant dialogue with the citizens and systematic expertise. The Commission should facilitate and coordinate a cultural strategy, drawing on the capacities and skills of the European cultural sector. A cultural programme for the EU is indispensable, but will only succeed if it is consistent with a clear policy framework and if there are adequate resources to achieve objectives. An effective programme of EU cultural action, which can complement policies and actions in other domains, will be the strongest argument for an increase of the budget and for developing new partnership models.**

4. The future programme must be clearly focused and should operate on three pillars:
  - Community support for a limited number of substantial and comprehensive “arms-length” projects, using strong platforms that offer thematic cohesion, quality, professional management, and facilitate coherent sub-projects by smaller partners. Criteria for platforms are defined in the report.
  - European incentives to innovative cooperation by member states/regions/municipalities, cultural institutions and the independent sector, generating added European value.
  - Pro-active cultural cooperation policy development (including new tools for cooperation).
5. The combination of strategic development and delegation to platforms, the support to a substantially fewer number of substantive projects (with clear objectives and within thematic priorities), and the offer of incentives to encourage new commitments for multilateral cultural cooperation, as well as innovative instruments to stimulating new forms of cultural cooperation, will increase the impact of cultural creators and operators.
6. The twin challenge of effectiveness and democratic legitimacy, which Europe in a global context is facing, requires a convincing cultural response. European citizenship in an open community needs participation and symbolic imagination. However, all current emblematic projects, including the programme of European Capitals of Culture, need radical re-consideration.
7. Pilot projects should be developed in the period 2004 - 2006, to test out and gain experience from the new approach and priorities. An independent working group of experts should be retained to comment on and help monitor progress.

# **FULL TEXT OF WORKING GROUP REPORT**

## **IMPORTANCE OF CULTURE**

The debate on a new EU cultural framework programme takes place at a time when the European Union faces major challenges concerning its economic performance, its internal cohesion, its external role and the impact of enlargement.

The Working Group strongly believes that the European Union is not only facing economic and technical challenges, but also a more comprehensive level of interaction among peoples, cultures and national identities. “The EU is failing to giving an adequate response to concerns of its citizens in a number of areas. There is a growing sense of insecurity among its citizens, an increasing fear of the unknown”.<sup>i</sup>

It seems imperative to recognise cultural aspects of the integration process and to develop new ways of cultural cooperation as a key to develop a new vision for a more coherent and sustainable civil society on a European level. Issues of multiple identities and intercultural competencies, and of a growing sense of belonging to Europe are at the core of cultural interaction. These are additional to current preoccupations with the diffusion of knowledge and the importance of heritage.

From the producers, actors and organisers in the cultural sector, there is a growing awareness of and reflection on the European challenges, and dedication to expanding European and international cooperation. The Working Group became aware of the extent to which groups and individuals across Europe wish to deepen their knowledge and understanding of one another by building networks, creating movements and sharing information and skills. Support and encouragement from the European Union for cultural initiatives by artists, independent cultural groups, networks, foundations and member states must be a key issue to help provoke an innovative re-definition of the relationship between European civil society and European governance.

As far as the wider cultural framework programme is concerned, the Working Group believes that the Commission must pay attention to the wider challenges of European integration and enlargement by the introduction of a smaller number and clearer set of priorities.

“The cultural sector should become an integral part of European policy”.<sup>ii</sup> Cultural policies for the European Union are required and should now be developed.

## **EUROPE AND THE EU, and EUROPE IN THE WORLD**

Built into the consideration of a future cultural framework programme is the need to identify a "wider Europe" in cultural terms. This larger frame of reference takes into account the essence of European cultural history, values and customs, and is different to political or economic frameworks. The Working Group therefore proposes that EU cultural action operates on a broad European geographical perspective, with the EU adopting a lead role. Leadership of a wider Europe will be an important cornerstone of future European cultural programmes, helping to create a better understanding of the wider European cultural arena.

Acting together as Europeans “requires an effort to understand each other better, to identify common interests, and to combat the fear that a bigger EU could mean a loss of identity. A sense of confidence in Europe is needed for us to act together”<sup>iii</sup>, and, the Working Group believes that we need to be better equipped for a new role, which Europe has to play in its relations in the world, and particularly with third countries. A new culture framework programme should reflect the cultural components of a future common foreign policy of the EU.

## **THE VISION**

The vision that underpinned the deliberation of the Working Group can be stated as follows.

Culture is a system of values that influences what we live by and what we live for: memory, being a part of history, relationships, kinship, place, community, emotional fulfilment, intellectual enjoyment, free expression and a sense of ultimate meaning. The importance of culture and the value of artists and the artistic process in Europe must be set in an enlightened political context of the European Union, and resides in the acceptance of the need for creative exchange, tolerance, crossing boundaries (physical, historical and intellectual), working together, and striving for an understanding of the other.

Therefore, cultural action of the European Union must ensure the maintenance and foster the cultural development of Europe, and an understanding of and appreciation for the complexity of the European cultural ecosystem. This is a creative process, and a joint venture by all the peoples of Europe. It is the anthropological, spiritual and artistic core of Europe, in all its diverse forms that must be acknowledged, celebrated and enhanced.

Any new cultural framework programme must pay special attention to the artistic dimension of the cultural process.

## **THE ARTISTIC AND CREATIVE DIMENSION**

The arts, which encompass wide-ranging forms of artistic expression, are vital to European society, and to the well being of European citizens. The complexity and variations of cultural practice in Europe must be embraced strengths. The Working Group stresses the importance of artists and creators in European cultural programmes. Artists are not simply instruments of cultural policy; they are often innovators and drivers of that policy, and their creativity must be valued in its own right. Creative expression is an important component of European economic and social integration. Art is a domain where new ideas are generated, mediated and tested. Artists though their work can offer imaginative ways of interpreting and dealing with important world issues, and their contributions will help illuminate many of the critical issues that a new Europe is facing. The Working Group asks the Commission to ensure that art, artists, cultural groups and cultural producers become central to the delivery of any new cultural framework.

Creating Europe also means promoting the creative diversity of Europe. The Working Group firmly believes that Europe’s competitive advantage lays in its creative diversity that must be recognised, nurtured and enhanced through EU policies and programmes.

## **POLICY AND STRATEGIC ORIENTATION**

Central issues of cultural concern in Europe relate to diversity, pluralism and intercultural dialogue. In today's knowledge-based societies, with increasing mobility, migration and integration, cultures are rapidly becoming trans-boundary creations that are exposed and exchanged. The means of achieving national and international networking, cross-border collaboration, trans-cultural co-operation and reflection suggest that culture must be increasingly regarded as a process, rather than a finished product. This is especially important in a Europe where the Union has been formally enlarged, and where globalisation is increasingly shaping production, consumption and identity. Issues of diversity will need to be re-considered where forms of intolerance, xenophobia, racism, prejudice and discrimination have emerged, and where tensions between migration, citizenship and governance have intensified. With such challenges, understanding the relationship with "others" has acquired a new urgency. The process, of which the successor programme to Culture 2000 will form a part, must be continuous and multi-lateral; the end result may not be entirely manifest from the beginning.

The Working Group believes that artistic and creative processes have a special relationship to the market, and often do not conform to conventional market mechanisms. Products of culture cannot be treated as any other manufactured products. There is an urgent need for the EU to develop approaches and regulations that are relevant to certain types of cultural products that are created outside the commercial market place and that do not adhere to its processes. Such cultural goods may require special protections. Although this issue may be considered to be outside the scope of a future cultural framework programme, it is nevertheless central to the process of European cultural development. The arguments for and meaning of "cultural value", which are different from "economic value" should be articulated clearly, and reflected in future EU cultural programmes. It will also be important to examine initiatives that help define new cross-fertilising relationships between the innovative aspects of artistic, cultural production and competitiveness, especially in sectors of the cultural and creative industries.

Other concerns of the Working Group focused on the notion of European cultural space, which should be promoted and encouraged by the EU. A cultural public space, which fosters and links the expression of cultural initiatives, will become an essential cultural dimension of an enlarged Europe. Such a cultural space must be open to all Europeans and to all groups, especially those that are currently marginalized or that feel they are operating outside the traditional boundaries of culture. The Working Group wishes to stress the importance of recognising the value of and supporting cultural groups that operate "at the margins" or outside traditional cultural structures. Often such individuals and groups are operating at the vanguard of development. The inclusion of emerging projects, of non-mainstream initiatives, of cooperation schemes that operate beyond traditional channels or beyond support by institutions that have been privileged traditionally by certain cultural policies or practices will require special processes of information and selection. Such groups often fall outside the conventional forms of information flow (such as calls for applications and communications in formal journals), and are often unable or find it difficult to meet traditional criteria that apply to more established organisations. The Working Group advises the Commission to develop new approaches to ensure the involvement of marginal and non-traditional cultural operators in future EU cultural programmes.

In all future programmes dealing with culture, the EU ought to prepare itself for surprising outcomes. The Working Group believes that it will be essential for the Commission to work flexibly, test and develop new approaches through pilot projects, and maintain a continuous feedback loop of evaluation. The piloting of new approaches and projects must not wait until 2006; the process should begin now. The process of involving the cultural sector in the development of new programmes and evaluating pilot projects should continue.

## THE PRINCIPLE NEEDS TO WHICH A NEW CULTURE PROGRAMME SHOULD CONTRIBUTE

The Working Group proposes a new cultural framework programme that takes into account the following:

- *The place of culture at the heart of European integration*,<sup>iv</sup> not only in relation to its economic value, but centrally because of its cultural and creative importance.
- *The promotion of cultural diversity in all its forms across Europe.*
- *The new challenges the community is facing*<sup>v</sup>, notably:
  - o The enlargement of the EU<sup>vi</sup> and the wider European cultural area (“ring of friends”)
  - o The increasing importance of intercultural dialogue<sup>vii</sup> and competencies
  - o The challenges of the globalisation process<sup>viii</sup>
  - o The need for increasing cooperation between the different regions of Europe
- *The need to connect Europe with its citizens*, by
  - o Community building, strengthening the sense of belonging and creating a cultural European citizenship
  - o Creating a European public space through culture and communication
  - o Safeguarding and stimulating diversity and the common dimension of Europe’s cultures<sup>ix</sup> (added European value)
- *The creative potential of Europe and the uniqueness of Europe’s cultural diversity*, by paying special attention to
  - o The understanding and protection of artistic expression, creativity, the creative process, artists and those who create
  - o Innovations in the knowledge and information society
  - o The social and economic importance of culture and the socio-economic implications of cultural production, dissemination and exchange
- *The increasing challenges of international cooperation*<sup>x</sup> *beyond the EU*, which ask for
  - o a strong cultural component of Europe’s relations with the third countries<sup>xi</sup>
  - o intercultural partnership programmes as a complement to foreign policies of the EU
- *The need to ensure that EU support generates “added value”* in European terms, in relation to cross-border cultural understanding, co-operation, and sharing best practices in policy development.



## THE BASIS OF THE PROGRAMME

The Working Group considered proposals on an acceptance of the following bases for any decision concerning a new cultural framework programme:

- ☐ The *Treaty* established by the European Union<sup>xii</sup> and article 151 (which stresses subsidiarity and excludes any harmonization)
- ☐ The new *Constitutional Treaty* to be adopted by the Intergovernmental Conference in 2004 which will create a
  - o Different context from the one in which the Treaty of Maastricht was signed<sup>xiii</sup>
  - o A constitutional climate of increased importance of shared values and objectives beyond economic and political integration and cohesion
- ☐ An *enhanced cooperation* between member states and on *supportive competencies* of the EC (and *qualified majority voting* in the Council)
- ☐ A new and essential *partnership between Community institutions and civil society institutions*.

The Working Group shares the requirements for Community action in the field of culture expressed by the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council<sup>xiv</sup>

- ☐ For a more *coherent* approach to action<sup>xv</sup>
- ☐ For a *structured framework*<sup>xvi</sup>
- ☐ For the creation of *new strategies*, where appropriate<sup>xvii</sup>
- ☐ For effective *synergies with relevant areas and actions of the Community*<sup>xviii</sup> and the implementation of Article 151/4
- ☐ For greater *visibility*<sup>xix</sup>

The Working Group shares concerns of the cultural field across Europe<sup>xx</sup>, as well as some member states and the European Parliament, regarding certain aspects of the current programme, and strongly pleads for the following:

- ☐ *Flexibility* to adapt to artistic evolutions and innovation, and methods of monitoring that are in keeping with the needs of the creative process
- ☐ A good mix of *proactive strategic and policy guidance* by the EU and delegation of management (*arms length principle*)
- ☐ More *autonomy for cultural operators* allowing also process oriented action and longer term planning
- ☐ *Specialists and expert* driven selection based on intrinsic *quality* of projects, by means of an open, fair and thorough system of evaluation and decision
- ☐ *No sectoral approach to be favoured*; interdisciplinary approaches across sectors to be actively encouraged
- ☐ *No assignments of quotas* to member states, with all judgments based on criteria of quality, creativity and effectiveness against clearly stated objectives
- ☐ *Special incentives* for certain applicants from acceding and non-acceding states that are under-represented or disadvantaged by the procedures of application
- ☐ *Need for an open exchange of information* between programmes and projects, to develop a collective approach to learning that will be of benefit to all
- ☐ *Lean and user-friendly administration*, shorter cycles of decision and payments.

## MATCHING OBJECTIVES TO RESOURCES

The Working Group strongly recommends the development of an explicit pro-active cultural strategy of the Community and its authorities. An enlarged European Union, with a new constitutional treaty, in a globalizing world, needs an *explicit cultural dimension in relation to its policies* within economic, social and environmental policies.

The Working Group is aware of the dangers of a mismatch of objectives and available resources (financial and managerial), and therefore suggests compliance with a set of principles as follows:

- *Viability, visibility and impact:* Offering support to a smaller number of better resourced projects that at present. This requires a clear sense of priorities and the need to select projects, which should be more comprehensive and generally larger in scale and scope, but which must then foster and facilitate smaller sub-projects.
- *Proactive and positive discrimination toward certain policy priorities of the Community:*
  - Creativity and innovation
  - Enlargement of the EU
  - Cooperation with EU neighbours
  - The role of Europe in the World
  - Deepening of the integration process, community building and European Citizenship
  - Intercultural dialogue and competencies
- *Sustainability through synergies*
  - Synergies between related fields of community action (culture/education/ research..)
  - Incentives for complementarity (cooperation between member states, and member states and the EU, also in relation to third countries)
  - Synergies with the third sector and existing European partners (networks, foundations, platforms, specialized funds and institutions) and private-public partnerships
  - Synergies through the continuing promotion of inter-cultural dialogue and reflection (through conferences, workshops, publications, website) and the active promotion of these processes and relationships
  - Synergies via innovative structural instruments for cooperation, comparison, reporting, monitoring and best practice (“Observatory” functions).

## FINANCING THE NEW CULTURAL FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Working Group strongly recommends a significant increase to the culture budget and the development of mechanisms to generate new funds.

This may be achieved through innovative public-private partnerships, by joint financing between certain member states and the European Commission (through open coordination), and a direct budgetary allocation by EU, which would guarantee the effectiveness, visibility and impact of the programmes. Synergies should be achieved by making use of other EU programmes that directly or indirectly promote cultural development.

In the course of its deliberations, the Working Group was disturbed to learn that its proposals might have to be set within a context of a possible decrease of resources for the implementation of EU cultural actions. The Working Group deplores this possibility, and believes strongly that without increasing the resource allocation for cultural programmes, they will remain marginal and ineffectual, and not achieve the aims that are stated and implied in this report. Tokenism in supporting European cultural action is derisory, and must be met through continuing to put forward powerful arguments for the importance of cultural development on a pan-European basis. The Working Group was asked to be practical in its suggestions, but these need to be underpinned by a strong conceptual and policy-driven framework, and a sufficient resource base to enable the implementation of priority actions, as a fundamental minimum.

*“A future Europe requires a cultural policy that is a sensible addition to the national policies of the member states - a cultural policy of diversity and affinity, of singularity and commonality, no less deserving of our efforts and our resources than the more lauded economic and social policies” - Richard von Weizsäcker: Open letter to the Convention, 3 April 2003<sup>xxi</sup>*

## THE CRITERIA FOR EU CULTURAL ACTION PROJECTS

The Working Group believes that it is imperative to ensure that all future EU cultural action projects subscribe to several key criteria, over and above the quality and potential effectiveness of the proposed programmes and projects themselves. The following criteria are of critical importance:

1. that initiatives are multi-lateral and pan-European, with an emphasis on the involvement of cultural operators in the new members states;
2. that the focus and fundamental priority remains on key cultural objectives of each project, rather than on market and economic impact criteria;
3. that the projects do not duplicate others in the same field, unless there are overriding arguments for this;
4. that the projects make clear cases for “added value” and “impact” in European terms;
5. that the organisers of projects have appropriate professional skills and experience, and a track-record of international working;
6. that particular attention needs to be paid to the encouragement of new and emerging talented cultural operators;
7. that significant potential sources of finance for projects seeking support from the EU have been investigated, whenever possible. Diversity of funding for projects is an asset;
8. that there is an obligation to monitor and evaluate each project, to make information available, to share experience with others, and to promote the visibility of each project.

## THE SELECTION OF PROJECTS

The importance of skilled independent evaluation of project applications is stressed at many points in this report. Juries require members of the highest calibre and experience, need sufficient time to become familiar with criteria and priorities before considering individual applications, should have the right to conduct interviews with applicant bodies, and should have the responsibility for proposing a final selection of projects to the Commission. In keeping with professional consultants in other fields, the remuneration must reflect the experience required of experts, the time needed from them and the responsibility they have. The Commission should review the nomination and selection procedures for independent experts and suggest ways to improve current methods in order to attract and retain the highest calibre and most experienced experts.

The Working Group considered different methods concerning the formation of selection juries, taking into account current procedures, and the need to develop a consistent, independent and expert approach to selecting projects. The Working Group strongly advises the Commission to create a single jury for the entire cultural framework programme. Such a jury should be established for a period of 3 successive years. This jury of independent experts should have the ability to call on other specialist experts to offer opinions on specific projects or sectors as required, but would accept collective responsibility for making proposals. Members of such a jury would be chosen on the basis of their professional experience, geographical knowledge of the cultural sector in Europe, and proven track record in relation to the selection of cultural projects. A single jury system would simplify the management of selection, help build trust between the cultural sector and the Commission, promote on-going learning based on experience, and offer the new framework programme a more consistent approach to decision-making.

## PROPOSALS FOR ACTION LINES FOR EU CULTURAL PROGRAMMES

The Working Group discussed several alternative models for EU cultural programmes, and was encouraged to be pragmatic when making proposals. The Working Group suggests that future EU programmes should be based on several key operational principles: *the selection of fewer projects than at present, projects that are sufficiently resourced, the need for strong management of delivery, and the need to encourage innovative approaches*. The Group discussed the growing importance of different cultural “platforms” in Europe, a platform being an organisation that possesses professional expertise in one or more elements of the cultural sector, that fosters collectivity and connectivity between cultural operators, that advocates common principles that reflect the importance of transversal and inter-cultural working on a pan-European basis, and that can demonstrate its competence in both leadership and management. Platforms can cater for thematic cohesion, achieve quality within each of the projects they manage, and facilitate and promote coherent sub-projects of various smaller partners.

The Working Group proposes *three main pillars* as the basis of actions for future EU cultural programmes. These are summarised briefly as follows:

- A. Community support for a limited number of substantial and comprehensive arms-length-projects, whereby “platforms” cater for thematic cohesion, quality, professional management, and facilitate coherent sub-projects of various smaller partners.
- B. European incentives to innovative cooperation by member states/regions/ municipalities, and the independent sector, generating added European value.
- C. Pro-active cultural cooperation policy development (including new tools for cooperation).

Each pillar is described in more detail below.

## First Pillar

<b>A. Community support for a limited number of substantial and comprehensive arms-length-projects.</b>
A.1. Comprehensive cooperation projects based on existing and new content and management platforms, in partnership with networks and foundations. These comprehensive projects would promote and encompass a substantial number of sub-projects
A.2. Cooperation projects based on platforms, promoting projects possibly smaller in scale than those above .
A.3. An open call for projects in order to respond to specific and significant issues that are topical, timely and flexible, complementing A1.and A.2.
The projects above should also encompass transversal priorities: mobility, training and dissemination of knowledge and information.
<b>60% of budget</b>

### Comments

#### Addressing European Challenges

Projects selected within this pillar should address specified major challenges that Europe is facing. Key issues are defined as follows:

- Creativity
- Enlargement and beyond
- Europe in the world
- European Citizenship (representing all peoples of Europe) and Community building
- Intercultural dialogue

#### Dimensions of the Cultural Sector

Organisations that are eligible for support within these actions should be involved in one or more of the following dimensions of the cultural sector in the EU:

- Creation
- Production
- Diffusion
- Training
- Documentation

- Mobility
- Training
- Technology

**Actions A1 and A2 would be based on the concept of "platforms".**

The operational criteria for platforms are described below, but platforms can be defined as:

- Consortia of European dimension, with an obligation to work across Europe
- Quality oriented (expertise in content)
- Having managerial and efficiency skills as well as experience
- Created to deal with sub-projects (clustering)

Necessary characteristics of platforms:

- They have to be pan-European operational bodies, or operational bodies with strong partners from at least 3 (possibly 4) European countries (artistic, cultural, cultural research, training). These might include networks, a consortium of networks, international organisations and foundations. Each major platform should also cater for a broader range of sub-project partners.
- They have to be able to demonstrate managerial experience and reliability, and have a strong track record for implementing successful cultural projects.
- They have to be able to demonstrate professional expertise, the ability to structure and guide a project, and exploit its innovative and dissemination potential.
- They have to be able to connect partners from several regions of Europe, preferably with an emphasis on partners from new member states and candidate countries.
- They have to be able to act as mediators and umbrellas for sub-projects affiliated to the project focus.
- In general, such platforms should be from the third sector, non-governmental at all levels and independent, although there may be certain exceptions that will have to be considered.

Categories of Platforms:

There are different types of platforms that function in the cultural sector. The following are the most frequent categories:

- Existing European non-governmental bodies, such as networks with operational capacities, consortia of specialized institutions, consortia of culturally active associations or cultural foundations, with a European scope and proven track record
- Professional organizations working within the not-for-profit cultural sector in Europe
- Newly composed European bodies from the third sector; such platforms can be formed for a specific project purpose, as long as they meet the criteria.

Eligibility of platforms can be considered on a case-by-case basis, and it is anticipated that there will be certain acceptable bodies that do not conform to all the criteria outlined above. In particular, it will be important to remain sensitive to initiatives from new member states and candidate countries, where for historical and financial reasons, few platforms of the types outlined above exist

**A1. Comprehensive cooperation projects based on existing and new content and management platforms, in partnership with networks and foundations. These comprehensive projects would promote and encompass a substantial number of sub-projects.**

- ☐ The *main share of the budget* should go to arms-length projects that encourage and facilitate artists and professional cultural operators to work together, to exchange and to build on European projects of major visibility.
- ☐ The *number of directly supported projects* must be limited, with the size and scope of most projects being significant. Limiting the number of directly supported projects will mean making difficult choices. Experienced professionals of the cultural sector, who have the skills to understand, question and assess projects, must lead the process of making such choices. Experience will be more important than geo-political affiliations, and it should be the responsibility of the Commission to ensure that the right expertise is utilized when making judgments about one project against another. This matter was dealt in an earlier section of this report, but because of its importance is emphasized again here.
- ☐ Projects may be *one-off or multi-annual*, for a maximum period of 3 years, which could then be renewed for a further period. Sustaining key projects over time would be an essential principle for the majority of such projects.

**A.2. Cooperation Projects Promoting Projects Smaller in Scale Than Those Above**

- ☐ A *proportion of the budget* should be allocated to a small number of new or emerging platforms, in particular to ensure a continuing process of developing new cooperation projects between EU countries that are under-represented in existing platforms or traditional channels, between marginalized groups and minorities, and within sectors where appropriate platforms do not already exist.
- ☐ The *number of such projects* must be limited (5 to 8)
- ☐ Projects may be *one-off or multi-annual*, for a maximum period of 3 years, which could then be renewed for a further period.

**Operational Criteria**

General key operational criteria for selection and the principle of independent juries have been outlined previously. Certain other fundamental issues should also be addressed:

- ☐ Projects that include artists and organisations from the enlargement states, projects that promote active cooperation between existing member states and accession and new candidate countries,

should be given priority. Although no quotas should be set, positive discrimination for such projects will be essential.

- Given the specific rules of the EU administration, and the specificities of the artistic and cultural sector, most of these major projects should be the responsibility of independent intermediary bodies. New terms of reference for these partnerships would have to be developed.

#### **Ability to manage sub-projects and mobility programmes**

- As stated, the platform will be expected to develop and promote projects that correspond to one or more major European challenges that need to be embedded in the vision and objectives of their projects. Platforms cannot just act as distribution agencies for funds, and must demonstrate their capacity to understand European issues and have a clearly worked-out approach and methodology for achieving their aims.
- Smaller initiatives and individuals such as independent artists could, if their projects are related to the main project focus, approach platforms for funding of their projects or mobility needs. The responsibility (content, management and finance) would be born by the platforms.
- The scope and nature of sub-projects and mobility opportunities, which platforms can decide upon, would have to be approved by the Commission as part of the overall contract.
- The Commission's role would remain to develop and supervise cultural policy and strategy, delegating all operational functions to the platforms. The Commission would have a major role in evaluating projects and disseminating their results to a wider public.

#### **A.3. Open calls for projects in order to respond to specific and significant issues that are topical, timely and flexible, complementing A1 and A2.**

- In addition to platform and network projects, *the Commission, in response to topical issues, should be empowered to launch open calls for projects*, with an ability to react flexibly and quickly to new challenges (cross-sectoral, multilateral, innovative). The Working Group gave consideration to a number of such topics.<sup>xxii</sup> Topical issues would be defined as themes, and not as sectors (performing arts, visual arts etc). Intersectoral and interdisciplinary approaches should be encouraged.
- This category of projects should remain entirely open and flexible, with applicants judged on their own merits and experience in relation to the topic. The levels of financial contribution to projects must also be flexible, with positive discrimination given to projects from new member states and minority groups.
- The minimum number of countries to be involved in such projects should be 3. However, the impact of the project should be pan-European and/or involve third countries.
- As for other projects, experienced independent experts must undertake the assessment of applications. The criteria would remain fundamentally the same as other projects (multilateral, added European value etc), but would be applied more flexibly to encourage truly innovative and experimental approaches, possibly including partners new to the EU application process. One



legally constituted organisation in one of the EU members states would act as the coordinator for each project.

- The Commission should consider different options for developing and managing projects based on topical issues. These might include open calls through tenders and by forming panels of experts and cultural operators to generate ideas.
- The Working Group believes that there must always be room to support exceptional projects of high quality, and which foster innovative creative collaborations and exchange across Europe. This category of “open calls” must be managed in order to protect the need for a flexible response to such projects.

### **Transversal priorities: mobility, training and dissemination**

Transversal aims should be achieved through consistent umbrella projects (most often managed by platforms). These may include issues such as mobility, training and information dissemination, which should form integrated elements of comprehensive thematic projects and sub-projects.

The Working Group supports the idea of a mobility programme, as a key instrument for European cultural cooperation, but believes, as stated above, that it should take place primarily alongside and in association with independent platforms, and in relation to specific cultural projects. Such a scheme should not be centralised or based only around existing major cultural institutions, and must be very flexible, bearing in mind the decentralised and often fragile nature of many cultural organisations across Europe. The “university” model, as used in the existing Erasmus programme, is not appropriate or workable in the cultural sector. The impact of such a scheme would be much larger if the involvement of the Member States could be reinforced.

*Further consultation with the cultural sector should now be undertaken relating to the priorities and management of such a mobility programme.*

## Second Pillar

<b>B. Incentives to innovative cooperation by EU member states/regions/municipalities/cultural institutions and the independent sector, generating added European value.</b>
--

<b>20 % of the budget</b>
---------------------------

### Comments

- ☐ It will be essential in the future to stimulate additional *commitment of the EU member states* at all levels for multilateral, European cooperation, both in terms of additional funding to be made available on European level as well as in terms of creating the common European space. Article 151, and whatever replaces it in the new constitution, should be used to reinforce the principle of subsidiarity, and act as a firm basis to encourage member states to engage in and support pan-European cultural projects. One pillar of EU cultural action should focus on the importance of such support.
- ☐ Existing bi- and multilateral experiences of cities, regions and member states can be *catalysts for a new quality of European projects*, and so financial incentives to develop such projects between local, regional and national state authorities should be offered within this action programme.
- ☐ Throughout Europe, cultural institutions and organisations on national and sub-national levels have certain *needs and interests in common* (such as the training of cultural managers and administrators, cultural planning and research), and can profit from cross-border multilateral cooperation
- ☐ Certain member states have extensive experience in cultural diplomacy and intercultural cooperation. The development of pilot projects, which are multi-lateral and innovative, and which act as a form of a future European common cultural diplomacy should be encouraged. In addition, European *intercultural partnership components of foreign policy*, in particular cultural cooperation with third countries, might be developed from cooperative efforts between institutions. It is very important that governmental or quasi-governmental bodies be encouraged to form partnerships with independent cultural operators for such projects.
- ☐ *Internal/domestic challenges* related to multicultural issues, migration and minorities are increasingly *becoming comparable and demand cross-border solutions*. Joint multilateral innovative projects on intercultural challenges may help to search for European solutions
- ☐ *Cooperation*, as suggested above, *would be stimulated both by EU financing and symbolic recognition of such projects*.
- ☐ *Clear criteria for EC support would have to be developed*. Similar to other European programmes, assessment of projects must be undertaken by a jury of independent experts, as suggested previously.

## Third Pillar

<b>C. Pro-active Cultural Cooperation Policy Development (including new tools for cooperation)</b>
<b>20% of budget</b>

### Comments

- ☐ The Working Group supports the idea of a new role for the Commission in the development of a pro-active approach to European cultural policy and research.
- ☐ If the cultural sector were to become an integral part of European policy, and if a future Europe required a cultural policy that is a sensible addition to the national policies of the member states – “a cultural policy of diversity and affinity, of singularity and commonality”<sup>xxiii</sup>, the *EU would have to become a pro-active cultural policy agent*. The Commission itself would have an important new responsibility for cultural policy development and reflection. The Commission should have the ability to appoint independent experts, organise workshops and conferences, and directly or indirectly commission and support research that would make an important contribution to the debate and formulation of cultural policy on a pan-European basis.
- ☐ This might be partly achieved in practical terms by delegating operative and administrative tasks to platforms and networks. (see A.), partly by adopting a new policy responsibility of the Commission and partly by budget provisions within the cultural framework programme for such activity.
- ☐ This would not mean a carte blanche for the Commission, but a system of checks and balances should be introduced in collaboration with experts ( including criteria, discussion, reporting and evaluation), to be monitored by member states and the European Parliament. An independent committee of experts should be created to advise on this areas of policy development and research, and to help develop of a coherent programme of actions over a 3-year period.
- ☐ The Commission would stimulate discussion in relation to *standard-setting, encouraging partners to embark on investigation and research, promoting pilot projects, stimulating reflection, and through pro-active communication and publication programmes*.
- ☐ *Thought leadership*, in close cooperation with the Parliament, the European third sector and European independent expertise, will be required to fulfil the expectations of a public which identifies increasing difficulties to match cohesive needs, and with disintegrative forces in Europe. This must be a continuing programme, with linked initiatives, and coordinated at one point. The Commission should have the ability to appoint experts or ask specialist networks, university departments, research institutes, artists and cultural operators to assist with this task.
- ☐ *Strategic leadership* is required to implement Article 151/4, to create synergies between community action fields, and between structural and social funds, and other EU programmes (and what follows these in the future), to coordinate research developments on the EU level, and to shape the developments at the crossroads between the commercial (such as the cultural, creative

and media industries) and the non commercial cultural sector. Policy development concerning culture must involve a number of EU departments and services, and work closely with the independent cultural operators and organisations.

- *Policy leadership* together with the Council and the Parliament is needed to shape a cultural policy, which meets the challenges of Europe (intercultural dialogue, enlarging and deepening the EU, cultural cooperation with third countries, creating a public European debate and space). This must also include regulatory aspects of the cultural sector, which must be applied with considerable sensitivity to the special nature and needs of the sector, and in recognition of its differences to other economic sectors.
- *Innovative new instruments for stimulating cultural cooperation* are urgently needed to give a boost to the fairly underdeveloped field of European cultural cooperation. Education may serve as a model for what can be achieved, by creating a reporting system on cultural policy developments in the member states, on best practice and on developments in cultural diplomacy. Statistics are required; also needed are a database on mobility tools, a database on bi- and multilateral cooperation, information on synergies between cultural industries and the non-for-profit sector, and analyses of mechanisms to stimulate creativity and creative competitiveness. Member states may (in an open method of coordination) agree on comparative research in specific sectors on a voluntary basis; benchmarking may be useful in specific cases; pilot projects may be required to test certain assumptions; cultural research may be needed for stimulating European cooperation; reflection may lead to the creation of a sounding board for the management of creativity. Good practice needs to be disseminated in a targeted way. Public private European partnerships need to be engineered. The feasibility of developing Cultural Observatory (Laboratory) on European Cultural Cooperation is under investigation, and could assist the Commission in its task.
- *Visibility and actions with a high degree of symbolic cohesiveness* must be developed without being trapped in enigmatic “favourites” of certain lobbies, or actions of the past. The year 2005 should be the last for any existing emblematic actions, with new actions determined by 2004/5, to be operational by 2006/7. All operators of existing emblematic actions should be warned of this timetable. Bearing in mind changing priorities in the cultural sector, the impact and needs of an enlarged Europe, and the importance of visibility for EU actions, the Working Group believes that support for all existing European emblematic actions (European Capital of Culture, European Youth Orchestra, prizes etc) should be terminated in their present forms or should undergo a major review, and new, more innovative forms should be developed.
- A review of the current programme of European Capitals of Culture (Decision 1418/1999/EC) is both urgent and timely. Such a review may conclude with options for a replacement programme that would have greater European impact and relevance in an enlarged Europe. Any new programme must fully integrate the new members states and involve a wide European cultural area that includes the not as yet accession countries. It might take into account the developing roles of cities as “metropolitan corridors” and “regional hubs”, as well as the role of “peripheries”, that are central to rural and regional cultural development. The process of rotational nomination of cities by one state after another needs reconsideration, as well as the “competitive” aspects within and between nominating countries, and the resourcing of any new programme. Bearing in mind the timescale for the development of a programme for European Capitals of Culture, the review should be undertaken in 2003, decisions taken for any future programme in 2004, and the new scheme for Cultural Capitals determined in 2005, with the first Cultural Capital designated for 2009. The Cultural Capitals selected for the years 2006, 2007 and 2008 should mark the end of the existing programme. *The Working Group supports the proposal by the Commission to begin procedure for a reviews of the European Capitals of Culture programme, as a priority.*

- The concept and practice of *European International Cultural Relations and Cooperation* must be re-considered, and this should form part of the Commission's review of objectives of cultural actions and other policies relating to the EU's role in international cultural relations. Consideration of this matter should go beyond the specific responsibilities of the DG responsible for cultural action.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

In its discussions, the Working Group gave consideration to many issues that are related to the implementation of EU cultural actions. In particular, the group wishes to highlight the following:

### **Cultural Contact Points**

The Working Group recommends that *a major review of the Cultural Contact Points be undertaken*.

### **Support For Other Networks**

Certain *European cultural networks*, acting in their function as bodies that promote information and skills exchange, advocacy, etc *should continue to be supported* ( by means of structural and operational funding), under a different programme (such as those currently defined as "A" line). Such decisions should be based on the following principles:

- A multi-annual funding basis, linked to the submission of 3 year plans
- An assessment of the membership (especially from a geographical perspective)
- Negotiated targets and objectives, corresponding to EU priorities
- Openness for collaborating with others and ability to attract new members
- Potential for managing projects (based on experience and track record)

Clear criteria for the support of such networks must be developed.

## **PILOT PERIOD 2004-2006**

The Working Group recognises the time-scale involved in gaining final approval to changing the EU programme of cultural action. Whenever possible, the Commission should instigate pilot projects in the period 2004-2006, which correspond to the proposals outlined in this report, to test out and gain experience from new approaches and priorities. For this reason, the process of reflection in respect of future programmes must continue, in the light of experience gained through the monitoring of pilot projects. A special Working Group composed mainly of independent experts with wide experience of the European cultural sector should be retained for this purpose over this period.

## CONCLUSION

The Working Group has had very limited time to evaluate existing programmes and develop proposals for a new cultural framework programme. Nevertheless, the group attempted to address the main objectives and features of such a programme, and has made proposals concerning main actions and support methods. The group's approach has not been to propose radical changes, but equally the Working Group believes strongly that a continuation of the status quo is neither tenable nor desirable. The current programme and procedures must be changed. The group urges the Commission to develop new programmes and procedures that are more clearly focused and efficient than at present, that adhere to clearly stated priorities, that involve and capture the experience of the cultural sector, that take into account the important cultural challenges of an enlarged Europe, and that offer leadership and inspiration.

In view of its efforts, the Working Group wishes to make this report available publicly, and asks the Commission to include it within the report on the consultation process, and to keep members of the group informed about progress in relation to the development of the new cultural framework programme.

The Working Group wishes to thank Commission officials who assisted the discussions by providing documentation and sharing experience, and to members of the cultural sector who were consulted as part of this process.

Finally, the Working Group does not consider this report as a final document. The proposals included within it must be amplified and developed.

## ENDNOTES: REFERENCES IN REPORT

---

<sup>i</sup> European University Institute, report of Wim Kok to the European Commission, Enlarging the European Union, page 3

<sup>ii</sup> Contribution of the NL delegation to the informal seminar of Ministers of Culture in the EU, Salamanca 2002

<sup>iii</sup> *ibid.* page 9

<sup>iv</sup> Council resolution of 25 June 2002 (2002/C 165/03), 11

<sup>v</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 3

<sup>vi</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 4

<sup>vii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 5

<sup>viii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 5

<sup>ix</sup> 2002/C 162/03, annex iv

<sup>x</sup> 2002/C 162/03, annex vi

<sup>xi</sup> 2002/C 162/03, annex vi

<sup>xii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 1

<sup>xiii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 3

<sup>xiv</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 9

<sup>xv</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 9

<sup>xvi</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 9

<sup>xvii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 9

<sup>xviii</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 10

<sup>xix</sup> 2002/C 162/03, 10

<sup>xx</sup> for example, EFAH and IETM documents

<sup>xxi</sup> written for the EPC-ECF-EFAH policy dialogue on culture and education

<sup>xxii</sup> Examples of topical themes are as follows: cultural projects that promote new thinking and innovative approaches to a special topic; the importance of new innovative multi-cultural celebrations promoting linkages between EU states; cultural collaboration between artists and cultural operators from Western and Islamic countries or within countries; connections between artists of minority groups within and between EU member states and third countries; projects linking children and artists from different EU states and third countries

<sup>xxiii</sup> Richard von Weizsaecker: Open letter to the Convention, 3 April 2003