

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	761720427241834810
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU	
1.1 Please state your name (surname, first name)	European Opera Centre Trust - Baird, Kenneth
1.2 Please state your email address	bairdk@hope.ac.uk
1.3 In which country are you located?	United Kingdom
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?	Performing Arts - Music
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?	Private company in the cultural sector
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 small extent
2.6b Should cooperation with third countries be limited to certain predefined countries or would a broader approach be preferable?	Limited to certain predefined countries
2.7 To what extent should the new programme pursue the following objective: Promotion of urban and regional development through culture	To a small 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	To a small extent

<p>2.9 Would you like to comment on the objectives for a new Culture Programme?</p>	<p>Answers to question 2.1-2.5 confirm the very nature of the culture programme. Cultural diversity is a key principle of European integration; circulation and access to heritage and cultural works are essential for the creation/development of a sense of European identity; development of artists/operators in an international context - especially with an emphasis on youth/training - pursues the same goal and, in addition, echoes the widely recognized achievements of EU flagship programmes like Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci. As to the other objectives (2.6a-2.8), each of them is in itself desirable - and there may be cases where the culture programme can usefully step in. However, the budget for the culture programme will inevitably remain limited, in particular as a consequence of the economic and financial crisis. Concentration on key objectives is therefore essential. Moreover, several other Directorates general of the European Commission operate budget lines, which support directly or indirectly cultural projects. DG Relex and DG Aidco do so in third and developing countries. DG Regio does so under its regional development actions and DG EMPL uses the European Social Fund to support disadvantaged groups, including through cultural actions. Experience has shown that bringing all these cultural activities together under a single management and budget line is not a realistic option. Transparency should be created by pointing out these other sources and by explaining/justifying why certain objectives are not pursued by the new culture programme: i.e. avoid overlaps and create as much value for money for the key principles pointed out above.</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>Experience has shown the, now widely recognized, added value of European education and training programmes, like Erasmus, Leonardo Vinci and others. Exposure to other countries, cultures, habits and languages has almost invariably inspired and enriched the skills, know-how and professional/personal maturity of the participants. In addition, it has given them a personal experience of what it is to be European, increasing mutual understanding and willingness to cooperate, and thus creating and/or reinforcing a sense of European identity. Training at the European level in particular can provide a richer experience than a purely national 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>For the same reasons indicated under 3.1b</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>To a moderate extent</p>
<p>3.3b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>The cultural sector is extremely competitive. Being a gifted artist/cultural professional is not enough to be successful. Many other qualities are required, e.g. communication, networking, financial management, ..., as part of essential entrepreneurial skills. Support from the culture programme in the context described under 3.1b is therefore highly desirable.</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 moderate extent</p>

<p>3.4b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In itself this objective is desirable but probably more from the point of view of artists/creators than that of a general audience. The involvement of the latter is a consideration that cannot be ignored if the European culture programme is to have a wider resonance and acceptance than only among professionals. Taking into account also the relatively high cost of new works, one should conclude that this sort of action should not absorb sizeable amounts of scarce resources. Fitting new works in European festivals, which fully deserve the support of the culture programme (see 3.14 below), may be a cost-effective way forward.</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>For the same reasons as developed in 3.4b</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>Again, in itself an interesting and desirable objective, in particular in view of Internet and new media developments. But other EU programmes, considerably better endowed than the culture programme, in particular those run by DG Infso, have supported a lot of work in this area (virtual collections and museums, digital libraries with a wide variety of artistic content, old and new). Transparency should be created as suggested under 2.9 and to every extent possible synergies should be created with the culture programme. See also remark on European festival involvement under 3.4b.</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>To a great extent</p>

<p>3.7b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>For much the same reasons as developed under 3.1b (sense of European identity). But also here, links with other EU activities should be exploited wherever possible. Educational programmes (DG EAC) reach all citizens, not only artists and cultural professionals. Informatics programmes (DG Infso) help the development of, and access to, cultural content (see 3.6b) available anywhere in Europe and even worldwide.</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>For the same reasons as developed under 3.1b. In addition: this type of action fits in with 3.7a as performances by non-national artists offer a concrete illustration of - and hopefully a taste maker for - cultural diversity for the general public.</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 moderate extent</p>
<p>3.9b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>There is already a lot of activity in this area. More and more museums and other culture operators have discovered the lucrative side of organizing important exhibitions and events, which draw large crowds. The situation is not yet optimal, mainly as a consequence of varying practices with regard to state guarantees. Some countries do not give such guarantees, confronting borrowing museums with considerable, sometimes prohibitive, insurance fees. Scarce resources from the culture programme should not be spent on this problem. But the European Commission should continue to support member states in their efforts towards convergence with analyses, expertise, conferences, etc.</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>To a great extent</p>
<p>3.10b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>For the reasons developed under 3.1b and in conformity with the key objective of diversity. This promotion activity greatly benefits from specialized organisations and may even be largely dependent on them.</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 moderate extent</p>
<p>3.11b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In itself this is an important objective. However, earlier Commission reports have shown that these barriers are largely the consequence of insufficient coordination among member states. The Commission should continue to offer its expertise, analysis, conferences, etc. in order to promote better coordination - mainly through DG Internal Market, which is responsible, and has the instruments, for monitoring and enforcing the right of unhindered circulation.</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 moderate extent</p>
<p>3.12b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>The availability of literature in all EU languages fits well with declared EU objectives like multilingualism and diversity. But going beyond the present EU support would require a clear confirmation of a market failure, i.e. that publishing companies are not doing enough. A related question that would require a clear answer: who sets which quality criteria for the selection of the texts to be translated?</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>If the analysis suggested under 3.12b concludes that important texts cannot be translated as a consequence of market failure, the logical conclusion would be that other costs should be included.</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 moderate extent</p>
<p>3.14b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Such festivals are indispensable platforms giving artists, creators and cultural operators the possibility to showcase before large audiences the benefits of Europe's cultural diversity, including new and more "risky" productions (see earlier questions). In addition, the association of the EU with such festivals can enhance the EU's own positive visibility.</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>To a moderate extent</p>
<p>3.15b In which cultural sector(s) should new European prizes be supported?</p>	<p>See 3.15c</p>
<p>3.15c Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>In itself an attractive objective. But its successful implementation depends to a large extent on the existence of representative, credible organisations and criteria for the selection of award winners. This seems to be the case for existing prizes, especially those for architecture and cultural heritage. Can this be emulated in other sectors?</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>To a small extent</p>

3.16b Would you like to explain your response?	The cultural work supported should prove sufficiently interesting to attract media attention organised by organisations promoting the work without further initiatives being required. There is a danger that resources move away from culture per se.
3.17 Would you like to comment on the activities within the new Culture 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
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?	To a great extent
4.4 What problems does your organisation face as a result of degressivity?	The principle assumes that organisations only need a launching pad and that they can/should progressively find other sources of revenue. This is not the case for a great number of these organisations truly established at the European level. Even if they manage to find other sources of support, these remain very uncertain and discontinuous, especially in times of economic and financial crisis. Other sources of finance are largely likely to be purely national; receipt therefore skews the work of truly European organisations. The EU should not consider these organisations as receivers of welfare but as providers of services in support of European integration - services that could not possibly be provided by the European institutions themselves. The latter should therefore ensure financial stability, which is a condition sine qua non for the continuity of these services. Obviously, financial support should be subject to continuous checks on the operational and financial suitability of the beneficiaries.

<p>4.5 Could you suggest any further specific ways to simplify the application process and the management of the new programme?</p>	<p>Multi-year funding has proved a great benefit. It would assist planning and delivery if there was more flexibility within the multi-year programme to meet targets and objectives. Often benefits fall within subsequent years from a project established in an earlier year.</p>
<p>4.6 How could the dissemination of the results of activities funded under the new programme be supported?</p>	<p>The Commission may be able to establish a media partner to report aspects of the work supported.</p>
<p>4.7 Would you like to add anything else on the types of support within the new Culture Programme?</p>	