

SECTION 2: OBJECTIVES OF THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE

Response from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport –DCMS

2-4 Cockspur Street

London SW1Y 5DH

We would like to know your views of the objectives of a new Culture Programme. The current programme places a strong emphasis on promoting transnational mobility, circulation and intercultural dialogue through transnational cultural cooperation. The objectives need to be reviewed in the light of changing global circumstances. The new programme is likely to focus on three or four key objectives. We offer a list here of the types of things that might be included. Please bear in mind that not all objectives listed here will be prioritised – please think carefully about those objectives that are most important to you or your organisation.

2.1 Do you think there is a continuing need for a specific EU programme for culture? **(compulsory)**

- Yes
- No – it is best to mainstream cultural considerations into other EU programmes
- No – it is best to take a policy approach to culture rather than operate a specific programme
- Don't know

2.2 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Protection and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a small extent
- Not at all
- Don't know

2.3 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of the transnational circulation of cultural works and products **(compulsory)**

- 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 **(compulsory)**

- 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 **(compulsory)**

- To a moderate extent

2.6a To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promote cultural cooperation with third country operators **(compulsory)**

- To a moderate extent

2.6b Should cooperation with third countries be limited to certain predefined countries or would a broader approach be preferable? **(compulsory)**

- Limited to certain predefined countries
- A broader approach
- Don't know

2.7 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of urban and regional development through culture **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent

2.8 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Widening access to culture and participation in culture for disadvantaged groups **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent

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

The UK Government would prefer not to answer Q2.1 – *the continuing need for a specific EU Programme for culture*. Any decision on continuation of funding should be taken as part of a broader exercise to consider the priorities for EU funding in the future, as part of the negotiations on the next Financial Perspective (2014-2020). The UK Government wants to see a smaller EU budget and will be looking at all aspects of expenditure.

We would also stress that, whatever the future objectives, any future Programme needs to be clearly focussed and targeted to be able to achieve them. Value for money should be the guiding principle and robust evaluation should be in place to reflect that – it should be possible to have measurable outcomes.

In our view, ‘promotion of the transnational circulation of cultural works’ should be a priority for any future Culture Programme. Efficient sharing of collections, for example through standardised procedures, has value for sharing the European cultural heritage and in particular bringing recently accessioned Member States “into the club”.

We believe that widening access to European heritage and culture (we place equal importance on 2.4 and 2.8) is an admirable ideal, capable of resolution through practical means. We would stress that any future Culture Programme needs to be focussed to be able to achieve this important objective, and that European Programmes should insist on evidence of engagement, including with those who are economically and educationally disadvantaged. We see a growing role for digital technology in widening access (see responses to 3.5b, 3.6a and b).

‘Professional development and capacity-building of artists or cultural operators in an international Context’ is important – in the sense of building up networks to increase co-operation and, in the case of smaller institutions, capacity-building is important.

European Capital of Culture status provided Liverpool in 2008 with a significant opportunity to bring about ‘urban and regional development through culture’ and the resulting step-change is testament to the role that the Culture Programme can have in transforming cities and regions. The EU funding for Capital of Culture was modest in comparison to the private and public (UK) investment which the status and ‘badge’ of European Capital of Culture was able to lever into the city.

While we think that the ‘Protection and promotion of cultural and linguistic diversity’ is of some importance to any future programme, we recognise that other Member States may place a greater prominence on this objective.

Promotion of cultural education would be an objective worthy of consideration here, given that education is one of the main objectives of EU 2020 policy.

SECTION 3: ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE

We would like to know your views about the types of activities that should be supported. Please bear in mind that not all activities listed here will necessarily be supported – please think carefully about those activities that are most important to you or your organisation.

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 (compulsory)

- To a moderate extent

3.1b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

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) (compulsory)

- To a moderate extent

3.2b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

Building up networks makes practical programmes work on the ground but as always principles need to be well focussed, defined projects that offer value for money – and can be evaluated after completion against these principles.

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. (compulsory)

- To a great extent

3.3b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

Entrepreneurial skills, and effective partnerships between arts organisations and business, are increasingly important in this economic climate and meaningful activities to support this would be a wise investment *if* the activities are well-focused and defined.

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 (compulsory)

- To a moderate extent

3.4b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

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 (compulsory)

- To a moderate extent /

3.5b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

Small awards for experimentation, innovation and risk-taking could reap rewards – particularly in terms of digital experimentation, as it is best to fail fast and fail cheaply in this area. As noted in 3.6b, EU-funded digital projects should avoid providing solutions that the market might otherwise provide.

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 (compulsory)

- To a great extent

3.6b Would you like to explain your response? (optional)

If one of the main objectives of any future Programme is to widen access to Europe's culture, digital is an effective, and in some cases inexpensive, means to achieve that. EU-funding should only be awarded where digital projects have unique value, and are not simply duplicating what already exists. Also, EU-funded projects must avoid providing solutions that the market could easily/ would otherwise provide.

We stress that the needs and demands of the user *must* be the starting point for any investment in digital content/digitisation/new platforms etc. Culture programme funding could

be awarded to organisations/projects which approach access in an innovative and user-friendly way, and projects need not be immense undertakings (like Europeana) but awards could benefit small projects to enable experimentation and risk-taking in digital technology.

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 **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent

3.7b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

We would be supportive of activities to promote understanding of common European heritage – but note that as always principles need to be well focussed, defined projects that offer value for money and are evaluated fully after completion.

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 **(compulsory)**

- To a moderate extent

3.8b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

3.9a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Transnational exchange of artefacts or other works **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent

3.9b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

Most countries recognise this as a valuable aim and offer such incentives as state indemnities to facilitate such exchanges. The EU can play a valuable role in promoting this through practical ways or removing the barriers to such exchanges (through promoting common, standardised procedures).

As outlined in the final report of the OMC working group on the mobility of museum collections (“Final Report and recommendations to the Cultural Affairs Committee on improving the means of increasing the Mobility of Collections”, July 2010) continuous attention on the following topics is needed in the future to achieve common standards and to make progress in this field:

- (1) Government indemnity; insurance
- (2) Immunity from seizure
- (3) Professional contacts;
- (4) Long-term loans
- (5) Prevention of illicit trafficking

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 **(compulsory)**

- To a small extent

3.10b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

Fostering cultural diversity is an admirable aim, and if well-defined, focussed, and fully evaluated, grants to organisations specifically to support the promotion of the development of artists and their works in different European countries could be of value, but should be funded from reprioritisation from lower value for money areas.

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) **(compulsory)**

- To a great extent

3.11b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

Creating free mobility of goods and services in a European market is fundamental, and can foster mutual understanding and intercultural dialogue.

3.12a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Translation of fiction into different languages **(compulsory)**

- To a small extent

3.12b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

While we would not place great importance on support for translation, we recognise that other Member States may place greater significance on such activity.

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 **(compulsory)**

- Don't know

3.13b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

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 **(compulsory)**

- To a moderate extent

3.14b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

In terms of funding for European Capital of Culture, there are clear and significant benefits for some cities (for example, Liverpool). The UK will also respond to the on-going Consultation on the future of the Capitals of Culture, to outline our views on that programme and to address issues such as the frequency of the awards.

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 **(compulsory)**

- Not at all

3.15b In which cultural sector(s) should new European prizes be supported? **(optional)**

None.

3.15c Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

We do not see the creation of new prizes as a priority. While there may be some value in some of the existing prizes (in particular, the Europa Nostra prize), the majority of these awards do not seem to be well publicised and overall we do not believe that there is great value or a need for such prizes.

3.16a To what extent is it important for the Programme to support: media initiatives giving visibility to European cultural themes and projects **(compulsory)**

- To a small extent

3.16b Would you like to explain your response? **(optional)**

Given that we have stressed the importance of obtaining value for money, we feel that any funding from any future Culture Programme should be targeted towards cultural operators and supporting cultural activities rather than funding media initiatives.

3.17 Would you like to comment on the activities within the new Culture Programme? **(optional)**

While we have identified what we see as priorities at present, we think any future Programme should be more flexible to enable it to respond to changing and unanticipated priorities.

If there is to be a continued specific EU culture programme, another activity worthy of funding would be informal and formal non-government (voluntary or minimally-staffed) networks (European Registrars group would be an example of the type of network in the context of increasing mobility of collections) – the aim of this investment would be a more informed Commission. Such networks devise common practices and standards etc, and benchmark best practice to help smooth out difficulties “on the ground”. Small investment into such networks would lead to better communication within institutions in the MSs, and more focussed projects co-ordinated by the collective view. Funding for this should be found from reprioritisation from lower value for money areas.

SECTION 4: TYPES OF SUPPORT WITHIN THE NEW PROGRAMME FOR CULTURE

We would like to know your views about the types of support that should be offered. Here, we refer to types of support already offered by the Culture Programme but you can also indicate other elements you would like to suggest.

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? **(compulsory)**

- 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? **(compulsory)**

- No – the EU should fund more organisations at a lower level

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? **(compulsory)**

- To a moderate extent

4.4 What problems does your organisation face as a result of degressivity? **(optional)**

In the UK degressivity can be a problem for small organisations who may be discouraged from applying for funding for fear of getting into financial difficulties at the end of the project.

4.5 Could you suggest any further specific ways to simplify the application process and the management of the new programme? **(optional)**

- The UK is highly appreciative of all the work the Executive Agency has undertaken in its efforts to improve the application process and the guidance offered to applicants.

- The UK also appreciates that at times the application process for operators can appear somewhat bureaucratic– this can deter cultural operators especially perhaps smaller organisations who may not be able to invest resources into the application process. Perhaps the criteria and structure of any future programme could be less rigid (relates to our response to 4.7). Or perhaps there could be a small pot of seed funding grants with a shorter and easier application process for perhaps small amounts of funds?
- We would also recommend consideration of an ‘expression of interest’ round – with the intention of saving time for both the EC *and* bidding organisations. Linked to this could be assistance in/direction through the bidding process for those whose first round applications are worthy of development. The Cultural Contact Points (CCPs) could also play an increased role

4.6 How could the dissemination of the results of activities funded under the new programme be supported? **(optional)**

The UK would support any dissemination activity being carried out by inexpensive electronic means (newsletters, websites), rather than by conferences. It would also be helpful to show honest results of evaluations of the projects funded – this would help show the variety and range of cultural activities funded, and might also present an opportunity for sharing best practice and lessons learnt. .

4.7 Would you like to add anything else on the types of support within the new Culture Programme? **(optional)**

- A more accurate response to Q4.1 would be that, generally, we believe that match-funding around 50% is appropriate, however, the most appropriate level of support will vary and we would welcome more flexibility. Consideration could be given to the introduction of a small pot for seed-funding, as match-funding can be a barrier for certain types of projects/organisations.
- A more accurate response to Q4.2 would be that 80% support is too high a rate and that organisations should be challenged to raise more than 20% of the required funding – but that the EU should *not necessarily fund more organisations* at a lower rate.
- We would welcome increased flexibility of criteria – including the partnership criteria, i.e. the need for 3 partners from at least 3 different eligible countries. We believe that projects could still deliver on the Culture Programme objectives if this criteria were to be relaxed.