

A questionnaire for the online consultation of cultural stakeholders on the future Culture Programme

Meta Informations	
Creation date	14-12-2010
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	288123259291234810
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU	
1.1 Please state your name (surname, first name)	Cultural Contact Point Finland, Centre for International Mobility CIMO
1.2 Please state your email address	ccp@cimo.fi
1.3 In which country are you located?	FI Finland
1.4 Have you heard of the European Union's Culture Programme 2007-13 before?	Yes
1.5 Have you or your organisation benefited from a grant under the Culture Programme 2007-13?	Yes
1.6 Are you or your organisation already involved in transnational co-operation in the field of culture?	Yes
1.7 In which cultural sector do you (or your organisation) operate?	Non-cultural sector - other
Please specify	Cultural Contact Point Finland / Centre for International Mobility CIMO is an organisation operating under the Finnish Ministry of Education. CIMO administers scholarship and exchange programmes and is responsible for implementing nearly all EU education, training, culture and youth programmes at national level.
1.8 In which capacity are you participating in this consultation?	An organisation
1.9a What is the size of the cultural department of your organisation?	Less than 11 employees
1.9b What type is your organisation?	Other public organisation
1.9c Are you replying on behalf of a representative organisation in the cultural field?	No
SECTION 2: OBJECTIVES OF THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE	

2.1 Do you think there is a continuing need for a specific EU programme for culture?	Yes
2.2 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Protection and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity	To a great extent
2.3 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of the transnational circulation of cultural works and products	To a great extent
2.4 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Widening access to European heritage and cultural works	To a great extent
2.5 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Professional development and capacity-building of artists or cultural operators in an international context	To a great extent
2.6a To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promote cultural cooperation with third country operators	To a great extent
2.6b Should cooperation with third countries be limited to certain predefined countries or would a broader approach be preferable?	A broader approach
2.7 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of urban and regional development through culture	Not at all
2.8 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Widening access to culture and participation in culture for disadvantaged groups	To a small extent

<p>2.9 Would you like to comment on the objectives for a new Culture Programme?</p>	<p>It would be good to give a clearer, more coherent picture about the overall philosophy of the programme. Currently the programme objectives are broad and the strands various and complex. It is not always clear to potential applicants if and why all the existing strands are relevant within the current Culture Programme. The general philosophy of the new programme should start from the need to strengthen the European cultural sector and be based on the needs and feedback of the cultural field. The policies should be connected to practice. The objectives of the programme should be precise but rather broad in nature. This would allow a broader selection of operators and projects to be involved and also leave room for creativity and experimentation. The overall focus should be on artistic process, not only on products. Regarding co-operation with third countries, the future programme should be more welcoming than the current programme for co-operation with third countries. It is important for Europe not to draw strict cultural borders but to be open for cultural co-operation beyond the European borders. This becomes even more crucial if we continue facing alarming news on attitudes hardening towards peoples of different cultural origins or even experience a rising tide of xenophobia in Europe. The current system of predetermined countries should be reconsidered and a broader approach introduced. Applying a regional focus (for example, projects with South-American countries) would allow certain focus but would better enable the cultural operators to prepare high-quality projects that would involve strong partnership in the chosen third country/ies. If successful, European projects always have positive effects on a regional or local level. Therefore we see regional and urban development more as a positive side-effect of the projects, and not an end in itself. Moreover, regional development is already supported by Structural Funds. Considering the widening of access to disadvantaged groups, we feel it important to take into account several beneficiary/target groups. One could nevertheless argue that here the objective is more national than pan-European in nature.</p>
---	--

SECTION 3: ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE

<p>3.1a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Development of the professional skills of artists or other cultural professionals in an international context</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.1b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Important theme but could also be supported more directly within the current/future LLP Programme.</p>

<p>3.2a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: International networking for exchanging experience and practice (peer learning/peer coaching)</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.2b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Networking is the basis of European co-operation. This could be further enforced by offering support for preparatory actions such as preparatory visits and meetings. Models for this could be drawn from the current LLP Programme (eg. Grundtvig). Following the final report and recommendations on OMC group on mobility, it is also suggested that mobility schemes especially for small-scale cultural operators should be investigated and developed in the future. Here it could be worthwhile to compare the Nordic-Baltic programmes where support for small-scale projects and individual artists is provided.</p>
<p>3.3a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Interdisciplinary partnerships between arts institutions and business to foster the entrepreneurial skills of artists or cultural professionals working in an international context.</p>	<p>Not at all</p>
<p>3.3b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Only in case there will be a considerable increase in culture budget, otherwise this is more suitable an objective in business-oriented programmes and Structural Funds.</p>
<p>3.4a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Creation of new works and performances by operators from different countries working together</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.4b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>It is of high importance to provide support for the creation of joint European works and performances. Co-productions are the core outcomes of European cultural co-operation. In addition, this type of support is very rarely provided on national level whereby it would well supplement national funding schemes.</p>

<p>3.5a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Development of a space for experimentation, innovation and risk taking in the cultural sector</p>	<p>To a moderate extent</p>
<p>3.5b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>What is meant by space for the development of experimentation, innovation and risk-taking? The new programme should allow room for creative approaches and experimentation. However, it should not be made a prerequisite for small projects. By small we mean projects with fewer operators and often with “small-scaled” organisations (i.e. small in budgetary measures, short term, network-like, less red tape) involved. Smaller cooperation projects (current strand 1.2.1) that are often the most accessible type of project for “small-scaled” operators should not be restricted to laboratories and experimental actions. Support for structured sustainability should be equally open for small and large organisations.</p>
<p>3.6a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Development of innovative digital cultural content, digitisation and new digital distribution and exhibition platforms</p>	<p>To a moderate extent</p>
<p>3.6b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Digitisation of cultural content is important, and the council work plan for culture 2011-2014 outlines objectives for the exercise to be carried out. Individual cultural projects could best contribute in digital distribution and developing new exhibition platforms. Here it is also important to take into account the relevant legislation both on national and European levels.</p>
<p>3.7a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Cultural activities promoting understanding of common European heritage</p>	<p>Don't know</p>

<p>3.7b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>It is not clear what is meant by “common” European heritage. Co-operation within cultural heritage sector and the mobility of collections should have a strong place in the new programme. However, if common European heritage refers to the idea of EU (cf. the Cultural Heritage Label), the need to support projects on this topic is smaller. Themes such as the building of Europe and contributing to European citizenship are already being supported by the Europe for Citizens Programme.</p>
<p>3.8a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Incentives for artists performing or touring outside of their own country</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.8b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>The geographical imbalance between countries in the border of the EU and central Europe should somehow be taken into account when building the most suitable support system for this. As in all actions of the new programme, also here it should be possible to more easily involve operators from third countries. Following the final report and recommendations on OMC group on mobility, mobility opportunities for individual artists should also be carefully looked at.</p>
<p>3.9a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Transnational exchange of artefacts or other works</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.9b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Alongside supporting European co-productions and the mobility of cultural operators, better use and distribution of European museum collections should be in the core of the new programme. This should also involve finding solutions to overcome legislative barriers/hindrances for collections mobility both on national and EU-levels.</p>
<p>3.10a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Funding for cultural and creative companies/organisations that promote the development of artists and their works in different European countries specifically with a view to fostering cultural diversity</p>	<p>Don't know</p>

<p>3.10b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>What is meant by the question? The future programme should be open for profit-making cultural operators if they function in a non-for-profit capacity. Fostering cultural diversity is involved whenever European cooperation takes place. With this formulation it remains unclear how these two issues are meant to be combined.</p>
<p>3.11a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Support to enable artists and cultural operators to overcome barriers to transnational mobility (e.g. legal and administrative barriers)</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.11b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>It is strongly supported that Mobility Information Services are established in each Member State or country taking part in the future programme. Artists and operators are the essence of cultural projects, and therefore it is important to support mobility-related information provision as well as mobility itself. However, the financial support for this action should be in relation to the overall budget of the new programme where the emphasis should nevertheless be in supporting cultural projects and cooperation.</p>
<p>3.12a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Translation of fiction into different languages</p>	<p>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.12b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Supporting high-quality translations from one European language to another is of utmost importance also in the new programme. It is very efficient form of support and truly promotes intercultural dialogue. This action also promotes the importance of literature as an art form. The lesser used and minority languages often lack support on national level, which is why such a funding instrument is needed on EU-level. The current literary translation support (strand 1.2.2) is well functioning and the recent administrative simplifications (eg. flat-rate funding) have been welcomed by the operators.</p>
<p>3.13a To what extent should the grants for literary translation also allow other costs to be included, such as purchasing of rights, publication costs, translation of book summaries and other promotional activities</p>	<p>To a moderate extent</p>

<p>3.13b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Support for publication costs is important for small publishers who publish high-quality literature. However, it cannot be automatic but should be considered case by case. It could also be restricted to certain genres such as children's literature or other genres with many illustrations. Support for marketing is not necessarily a very good incentive: the publisher needs to be committed enough to properly market the translated work.</p>
<p>3.14a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Festivals with a strong European dimension and visibility and featuring works and artists of European significance</p>	<p>To a small extent</p>
<p>3.14b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Festival support is definitely needed but should perhaps be targeted to other than large European festivals that are able to attract both funding and audiences without public support. There should also be a possibility for smaller, emerging and innovative festivals to receive support in order to bring their activities to a more professional and international level. The large number of applications received for the current festival strand (call in Nov 2010) well justifies the need for this type of support on a European level, and particularly for smaller festivals. Regarding the current festival strand, there are some urgent improvements to be made: the "European dimension" of the festival should be further clarified and workshops for professionals removed as this is not a typical working method in festivals outside the audiovisual sector.</p>
<p>3.15a The EU already supports European prizes in the fields of contemporary architecture, cultural heritage, literature and pop music. To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: New European prizes in the field of culture</p>	<p>Not at all</p>
<p>3.15b In which cultural sector(s) should new European prizes be supported?</p>	

3.15c Would you like to explain your response?	It is questioned whether the current European prizes have real impacts or visibility. Have any studies been made on this? At the moment only the European Literature Prize has a real and concrete link to the funding programme, which encourages the translation of work from winning authors. Based on the feedback from cultural operators, it feels that receiving support for activities would be a better reward than any prize. One idea is to combine several prizes into one European Culture Prize that could have real significance and potential for larger visibility even worldwide.
3.16a To what extent is it important for the Programme to support: media initiatives giving visibility to European cultural themes and projects	Not at all
3.16b Would you like to explain your response?	High-quality projects are a far more effective channel for promoting the Culture Programme than any media initiatives. The current Culture in Motion conferences could also be better harnessed in promotional and media activities.
3.17 Would you like to comment on the activities within the new Culture Programme?	The network of Cultural Contact Points should be supported also within the new Culture Programme. Having information and guidance on application procedures in applicant's own language and in ways that best fit the way operators work in a particular country is essential also in the future. This also guarantees visibility to the programme and its activities in each country participating in the future programme.
SECTION 4: TYPES OF SUPPORT WITHIN THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE	
4.1 The Culture Programme currently supports co-operation partnerships between cultural operators (at a rate of 50%): Is 50% the most appropriate rate for EU co-financing of co-operation projects?	Yes
4.2 EU operating grants currently meet 80% of the running costs of selected European-level organisations (Ambassadors, Advocacy Networks, Structured dialogue platforms). Is 80% the most appropriate level for EU co-financing of European-level organisations?	Yes

<p>4.3 EU operating grants currently provided to organisations in support of their running costs are subject to the principle of “degressivity”, i.e. they are reduced each year. To what extent does degressivity present a problem for cultural operators?</p>	<p>Don't know</p>
<p>4.4 What problems does your organisation face as a result of degressivity?</p>	
<p>4.5 Could you suggest any further specific ways to simplify the application process and the management of the new programme?</p>	<p>Electronic applications should be further developed and applied in all strands of the future programme. In multiannual projects it is challenging to outline a very detailed budget for 5 years: flexibility within main budget headings could be increased.</p>
<p>4.6 How could the dissemination of the results of activities funded under the new programme be supported?</p>	<p>The technical implementation reports could include elements that will look in the future and take forward the project actions themselves. At the moment the reporting is more technical and backward-looking in nature.</p>
<p>4.7 Would you like to add anything else on the types of support within the new Culture Programme?</p>	