

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

### Meta Informations

Creation date	
Last update date	
User name	
Case Number	
Invitation Ref.	
Status	

### SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU

1.1 Please state your name (surname, first name)	<b>Department of International Relations Ministry of Culture and National Heritage</b>
1.2 Please state your email address	<b>dwz@mkidng.gov.pl</b>
1.3 In which country are you located?	<b>POLAND</b>
1.4 Have you heard of the European Union's Culture Programme 2007-13 before?	<b>yes</b>
1.5 Have you or your organisation benefited from a grant under the Culture Programme 2007-13?	<b>no</b>
1.6 Are you or your organisation already involved in transnational co-operation in the field of culture?	<b>yes</b>
1.7 In which cultural sector do you (or your organisation) operate?	<b>All sectors</b>
Please specify	<b>All sectors</b>
1.8 In which capacity are you participating in this consultation?	<b>Public administration</b>
1.10 What kind of public authority are you?	<b>National level</b>
Please specify	<b>Ministry of Culture and National Heritage</b>

### 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?	<b>YES</b>
2.2 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Protection and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity	<b>To a great extent</b>

<p>2.3 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of the transnational circulation of cultural works and products</p>	<p><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>2.4 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Widening access to European heritage and cultural works</p>	<p><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>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</p>	<p><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>2.6a To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promote cultural cooperation with third country operators</p>	<p><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>2.6b Should cooperation with third countries be limited to certain predefined countries or would a broader approach be preferable?</p>	<p>Cooperation with third countries should be limited to certain countries which should be defined as countries included by the European Neighborhood Policy</p>
<p>2.7 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of urban and regional development through culture</p>	<p><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>2.8 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Widening access to culture and participation in culture for disadvantaged groups</p>	<p><b>To a great extent</b></p>

2.9 Would you like to comment on the objectives for a new Culture Programme?

The Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage is of the opinion that a legally and financially separate Culture programme should be maintained within the next Financial Perspective.

Poland is against merging of various programmes under current 3B budgetary section (like: Media, Europe for citizens, Youth in Action), as it would endanger the core aims of these programmes. In particular, the Culture programme has been created in order to support European cultures and promote common cultural values and heritage. This is a sole programme that supports cultural projects *sensu stricte*. While the role of culture in various UE policies is increasingly recognized, the need for a separate culture programme is even more obvious.

Moreover, in our opinion the budget of the Culture programme should grow in accordance with growing spectrum of the programme's activities (it is already decided that the programme finances various Commission's studies and events, European Capitals of Culture and the future European Heritage Label, and new activities might be added following this very consultation process).

The next Programme should be better embedded in the aims of the European Agenda for Culture and the Europe 2020 strategy. Its potential in terms of enhancing the social and economic impacts of culture and creativity should be better used.

As regards the participation of third countries, Poland is of the opinion that the future Culture programme should offer permanent possibility of participation for organizations based in the European Neighborhood Policy countries.

On the financing of the European Heritage Label, our priority is to provide a stable source of funding. This could be the Culture programme, providing that adequate sources are earmark to this aim.

**SECTION 3: ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE**

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

**To a great extent**

<p>3.1b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In the opinion of the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage promoting the availability of managerial, business and entrepreneurial training capacities specifically tailored to professionals in the cultural and creative field is an European Agenda for Culture objective which still awaits practical implementation measures and could be included inter alia in the Culture 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><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>3.2b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>3.3b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>It is of utmost importance to develop creative partnerships between institutions such as individual artists, their associations, cultural institutions, general and artistic schools, general and artistic higher education institutions, institutions preoccupied with life-long-learning and vocational training, third-age universities, research sector and cultural and creative industries. Such partnerships can play a significant role in the development of broadly understood cultural competences and understanding of social and cultural phenomena through enhanced participation in culture and cultural and artistic formal, informal as well as non-formal education, throughout the lifecycle</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.4b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a great extent</b></p>

<p>3.5b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>There is a need to support more innovative projects which run across disciplines, promote new solutions or modalities of cooperation, social innovations, involve or promote experimentation and risk taking.</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><b>To a small extent</b></p>
<p>3.6b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage strongly believes that the new CULTURE programme may only to a limited extent support development of innovative digital cultural content, digitization and new digital distribution and exhibition platforms, however it could only be a supplementary platform of financing of such activities. Culture programme suffers from limited funding, while digitalization is expensive. Moreover, we need to bear in mind that there are other existing schemes of support such as the FP7 R&amp;D and the CIP ICT-PSP programme which support ICT for access to cultural resources, digital preservation as well as promoting access to knowledge, cultural diversity and creative content and facilitating the digitisation and dissemination of cultural works in Europe. In addition, the Competitiveness and Innovation programme offers co-funding for the aggregation of material (including audiovisual material) with the aim to make it available through Europeana. Although the basic funding of digitisation should be taken care of by the Member States, the programme also funds some digitisation of masterpieces with a clear European added value and scope.</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><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>3.7b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In the opinion of the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage understanding of the common European heritage is a very important component of cultural competences the Europeans need. Thus it should be supported by the Culture programme. One of initiatives that potentially can have a significant impact in that regard is the European Heritage Label. The general priority of providing a stable source of funding of the European Heritage Label could be done through the Culture programme, providing that adequate sources are earmarked to this aim.</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.8b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a small extent</b></p>
<p>3.9b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.10b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>This question is not clear.</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><b>To a great extent</b></p>
<p>3.11b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.12b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.13b Would you like to explain your response?</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><b>To a moderate extent</b></p>
<p>3.14b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In the opinion of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage the festivals should not be supported by the Culture programme. They are usually not in conformity with the non-profit rule and, as a very popular form of cultural event, usually do not need financial support of that kind. However, a scheme for aiding new, small-scale, innovative, alternative festivals could be taken into account.</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><b>To a small extent</b></p>
<p>3.15b In which cultural sector(s) should new European prizes be supported?</p>	
<p>3.15c Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In the opinion of Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage before new prizes are launched, large scale promotion (ensuring better visibility and wider communication on the laureates) of the existing ones is needed. The prizes could potentially be a very good tool for communication of the EU and European cultures. However, nowadays the news on the applications, award ceremonies and laureates is not well available to the broader public. Use of the EU Communication funding for that purpose should also be a point for reflection.</p>
<p>3.16a To what extent is it important for the Programme to support: media initiatives giving visibility to European cultural themes and projects</p>	<p><b>Not at all</b></p>
<p>3.16b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>These initiatives should be supported by the new edition of Media programme.</p>
<p>3.17 Would you like to comment on the activities within the new Culture Programme?</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>YES</b></p>

<p>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?</p>	<p><b>more at a lower level</b></p>
<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><b>Don't know</b></p>
<p>4.4 What problems does your organisation face as a result of degressivity?</p>	<p>This issue is a very complex one and requires close examination taking account of the not-for-profit requirement and rules of eligibility.</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>SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF A MEETING WITH POLISH BENEFICIARIES OF THE CULTURE PROGRAMME 2007-2013 held in THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND NATIONAL HERITAGE, 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2010</p> <p>- PRACTICAL PROPOSALS:</p> <p>COMMUNICATION WITH THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION – The beneficiaries pointed out the issues concerning the communication with the European Commission, in particular problems with obtaining a fast, reliable and solid answer. This concerns particularly European Commission contact persons indicated by in the agreements. In addition, the information provided by them is very often contrary to the one obtained at Cultural Contact Point.</p> <p>COMMISSION’S WEBSITE /INFORMATION BANK / MEETINGS / TRAININGS – The beneficiaries considered the Commission’s Culture Programme website to be unclear and the partner search engine to be of a little use. According to the beneficiaries it is necessary to create an information bank including information on partners or potential partners as well as to organise more meetings and trainings e.g. for people developing applications. Finding the right partners is one of the major problems for beneficiaries especially for the novice participants of the Programme.</p> <p>CHANGES MADE DURING THE PROJECT – The beneficiaries indicated problems arising when changes need to be made to the applications in the course of the project (change of partners, address, headquarters etc). This involves a considerable logistical effort, duplication of the whole application and it is both cost- and time-consuming.</p>

PROJECT EVALUATION – The beneficiaries pointed out that the project evaluation should be conducted at shorter intervals than the current ones – every quarter, every six months, every year. It of particular importance in cases of multi-annual projects and is also relevant in terms of financial settlement and the risk of exchange rate changes.

ACTIVITY OF THE CCP – The beneficiaries took into consideration the activity of the Cultural Contact Point and emphasised that the Programme somehow “surpasses” the CCP. The attention has been drawn to the frequent discrepancy between the guidelines presented by the CCP and by the European Commission. The problems concerning the information flow and the need for creation of a data bank have been pointed to.

ON-LINE APLPLICATIONS – It has been suggested to set up an on-line application system (or at least a system that would enable online submission of some of the documents).

- OTHER PROPOSALS:

PROGRAMME BUDGET – The beneficiaries reported the need for increasing the Programme budget even by 100% in relation to current 400 million EURO.

EURO EXCHANGE RATE – The beneficiaries addressed the issues related to EUR/PLN exchange rates. The issue mainly concerns multi-annual projects which are settled under different exchange rate than the one assumed while signing the agreement. The unfavourable differences often negatively affect the stability of the project and the institution’s activity.

OWN CONTRIBUTION – VOLOUNTEERS/ CONTRIBUTION IN-KIND – The beneficiaries pointed out the problem of providing and documenting own contribution. This concerns especially small organisations as well as the partners from the Third Countries. The lack of own contribution at a sufficient level very often prevents them from acting as project leaders. Beneficiaries proposed to create the possibility for including contribution in-kind as a part of own contribution as well as to acknowledge the work of volunteers as one of the costs – just as it is in educational Programmes.

BILLS – The beneficiaries proposed the possibility for providing the Commission with copies of bills. As in the case of the European Funds copies of bills should be enough for settlements (original bills should not be required).

	<p>DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE DEADLINES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND POLAND – The beneficiaries pointed out the discrepancy between the EU and Polish dates set for budget settlement and submission of applications (for example for Promesa programme). Also the financial year is closed in the EU at a different time than in Poland which makes it difficult to plan and settle the budgets of the projects.</p> <p>ANNUAL PLANS AND PRORITIES – The beneficiaries pointed out that it is necessary for the Commission to determine its plans and thematic priorities more in advance as it would enable the beneficiaries to prepare specific projects.</p> <p>One more idea that the Ministry would like to suggest is the introduction of concept notes, which would serve as a tool for preliminary evaluation of applications.</p>
<p>4.6 How could the dissemination of the results of activities funded under the new programme be supported?</p>	<p>The Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage believes that the website of the Programme should become more functional and serve as a database of projects and a ‘meeting point’ for projects as well as a tool for sharing best practices. It would be useful if the projects’ leaders included in the reports evaluation of the real impact of the project and its tangible results. The best projects could be given visibility within the EU COM communication strategy.</p>
<p>4.7 Would you like to add anything else on the types of support within the new Culture Programme?</p>	<p>SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF A MEETING WITH POLISH BENEFICIARIES OF THE CULTURE PROGRAMME 2007-2013 held in THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND NATIONAL HERITAGE, 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2010</p> <p>- SUBSTANTIAL PROPOSALS</p> <p>THE OPENING OF THE PROGRAMME TO THIRD COUNTRIES PARTICIPATION – The beneficiaries proposed the opening of the Programme to Third Countries of both the Eastern Partnership and the Union of Mediterranean (the opening of the Programme for the European Neighbourhood Policy countries). The Third Countries should be given the possibility to participate in the Programme on equal footing, in particular when it comes to financing, e.g. receiving of advance payments. Within the framework of the cooperation with Third Countries, the possibility of financing of small projects is said to be of particular importance.</p> <p>INNOVATION – The beneficiaries proposed the opening of the Programme to innovative, nonstandard projects representing a new approach, e.g. non-technological</p>

innovations. It is necessary to overcome Programme's conservatism by going beyond standard or outdated definitions of innovation, mobility, intercultural dialogue and appreciating combination of strands within some of the projects during the added value assessment. Beneficiaries have also pointed out to the conservatism of the Commission and persons checking the applications.

THE POSSIBILITY FOR ALLOCATING A SPECIFIC PART OF RESOURCES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECTS FOR EXPENSES RELATED TO SOFT INFRASTRUCTURE, including audio-visual equipment, multimedia kiosks, renovation works or sanitary facilities.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONSTANT POOL OF RESOURCES FOR SMALL PROJECTS – To enable financing of small-scale projects and increase the availability of participation in the Programme for small organisations with limited budgetary resources.

CHANGE OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NUMBER OF PARTNERS – It was proposed to make 4 partners (instead of 6) enough for submitting applications within the framework of multi-annual projects. For application for annual projects – 2 partners (instead of 3) should be deemed sufficient.

PROCEDURES – According to the beneficiaries, the procedures require changes concerning a shortening of the time between the submission of applications and the Grant Decision. At present the Commission may need even 1.5 years to reach the Grant Decision.