

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

Meta Informations	
Creation date	15-12-2010
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	179267256521534910
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N
SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU	
1.1 Please state your name (surname, first name)	Cultural Contact Point of Romania (hosted by the Centre for Research and Consultancy in the Field of Culture)
1.2 Please state your email address	info_c2k@eurocult.ro
1.3 In which country are you located?	RO Romania
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?	No
1.7 In which cultural sector do you (or your organisation) operate?	Other cultural sector
Please specify	information and consultancy for the Culture 2007-2013 programme (national CCP for the Culture Programme)
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?	Public cultural organisation
1.9c Are you replying on behalf of a representative organisation in the cultural field?	Yes
1.9d Does your organisation represent individuals or organisations?	Not applicable
1.9e How many members does your organisation represent?	Not applicable
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 moderate 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	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	To a great extent

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

The Romanian Cultural Contact Point (hosted by the Centre for Research and Consultancy in the Field of Culture) strongly supports the continuation and development of the EU Culture Programme. The programme should fully reflect Article 167, be aligned with the overall strategy of the European Agenda for Culture and be embedded in Europe 2020's overall vision of sustainable and inclusive growth. The next programme's vision should start from the need to strengthen the cultural sector and meet its current needs. The objectives of the next Programme have to be refocused, its design and management improved, and its budget increased. The broad aim of the Programme should be to foster European integration, cooperation and exchange. We join the CCP network and propose the following general objective: to develop and consolidate the European cultural space, which is based on a common cultural heritage, through cooperation activities between cultural operators, support to creative processes and their development, sharing risk and experimentation. Cultural operators should be encouraged to see cooperation as a process of co-thinking, co-creation and the emergence of new ideas. The first two specific objectives of the current 2007-2013 framework, i.e. transnational mobility and transnational circulation, should shift from being objectives in themselves to becoming a tool for the achievement of other objectives, and the ones put forward by this questionnaire are all a very good start. The intercultural dimension should be considered a transversal prerequisite of all initiatives supported by the Programme, an intrinsic part of the entire cooperation process, from working methodology to activities and their results. Regarding the objectives proposed in this questionnaire, we have a few additional remarks: - for points 2.2, 2.3, 2.6a and 2.7: replace "promotion" with "support" if we want the new Programme to convey an in-depth meaning of what it aims at. "Promotion" is a very empty word and in some languages (in Romanian included) it is certainly associated with marketing or publicity issues, which is absolutely not the core intention of a substantial funding programme, aimed to assist the real development of the sector - For point 2.6a: co-operation with third countries should not be limited to an annual list of eligible countries: all third country partners should be eligible in all action strands, when relevant. We recommend that cultural cooperation with third countries also be more strongly introduced and correlated with EU's foreign policy instruments, if sustainable relationships are to be created with operators from outside the EU. - Point 2.8 should not be a separate objective in itself, but should be integrated into point 2.7 as it is an organic part of what we understand through Support to urban and regional development through culture.

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
3.1b Would you like to explain your response?	The Programme should definitely support the professional development of the arts and culture sector, through training, capacity building and peer co-learning. This would be a coherent direction considering the future Programme's intention to "help achieve the objectives of the new "Europe 2020" Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth", as mentioned in the introductory part of this consultation. The education and skills framework is an important priority of this strategy and the arts and culture sector's professional development needs should be taken into account in the funding offered by the next Culture Programme.
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)	To a great extent
3.2b Would you like to explain your response?	Peer learning and coaching inside a project's partnership is very important both during the project and after it. Opportunities to meet, network, exchange and develop common ideas should be supported. The focus on processes, experience and practice exchange is essential to the future orientation of the Programme. Having said this, we suggest that more careful consideration is given to ways of encouraging relevant and sustainable networking, where the qualitative and not the quantitative dimension of the partnership is essential. Peer learning and peer coaching should also be much more encouraged along borders.

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.	To a great extent
3.3b Would you like to explain your response?	Partnerships between arts and businesses are indeed an important tool to foster entrepreneurial skills of artists or cultural professionals. In addition, they can help develop the economic potential of the arts and culture sector, while also acknowledging the potential of the arts and culture sector to participate in the development of alternative economic models that most commercial organisations could learn from. Together, arts and businesses can innovate, experiment, develop new experiences and products, and extend audience and consumer reach.
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	To a great extent
3.4b Would you like to explain your response?	Support to co-thinking, co-creation and co-production should be an essential part of the Programme, leading to new creative processes and artistic expressions, to the creation of new European cultural spaces. The joint effort of partners to co-create something new should be seen as a natural part of the entire cooperation process (from working methodology to activities and results). In particular, support to co-productions / co-production projects should be seen as having a significant impact on the professionalization and development of the sector, as genuine artistic exchanges and experimentations and a confrontation of practices and traditions which help achieve a genuine intercultural dialogue. However, for this type of coproduced initiatives to really work in practice, there is a crucial need to concretely tackle the harmonization of legal, financial and mobility-related differences between countries. What sounds like a wonderful project idea of creation of new works and performances by operators from different countries working together can result in total failure in practice due to these above mentioned differences and, therefore, real obstacles. One strong recommendation when designing the next Culture Programme is to also try to communicate these problems not only to Ministries of Culture but also to national Ministries of

	<p>Finances and advance the process together in a more organic and substantial way. Otherwise, we will again end up with wonderful cooperations on paper, but with tremendous implementation hardships in reality. A genuine coordination between stakeholders of the Programme and other relevant actors for the entire process has to take place.</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 great extent</p>
<p>3.5b Would you like to explain your response?</p>	<p>Experimentations in arts and culture should be highly encouraged and supported to develop with the right evaluation tools. Particular attention should be given to such experimentation through enlarging the current 1.2.1 strand so as to also offer support for experimental innovative cooperation projects, or 'laboratories' . This would facilitate the participation of new comers of the Programme, especially is this is also correlated with more flexible participation and financial rules. The focus of 'laboratories' would be on new innovative initiatives, open to smaller scale organisations. This is important because there is a need to explore new ways of expression and cooperation in arts and culture, to experiment new models of governance within the partnership, to develop personal and inter-cultural skills, to create bridges between the cultural sector and other professional sectors (e.g. education, research, etc.).</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	To a great extent
3.6b Would you like to explain your response?	The sector does need financial means to develop in the direction of digital content and platforms and this should be taken into account by the next Culture Programme to a great extent. The only remark here is to be careful to offer distinct support for what is not already covered by the CIP ICT - PSP Programme (Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme - Information Communication Technologies Policy Support Programme).
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	To a great extent
3.7b Would you like to explain your response?	The Culture Programme should continue to promote the understanding and valorization of common heritage in Europe as to raise awareness of the European common cultural heritage is one of the two main pillars at the core of Article 167.
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	To a moderate extent
3.8b Would you like to explain your response?	Individual mobility should not be a an end in itself, but rather become a tool for the achievement of other specific objectives of the Programme.
3.9a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Transnational exchange of artefacts or other works	To a moderate extent

3.9b Would you like to explain your response?	Individual mobility should not be an end in itself, but rather become a tool for the achievement of other specific objectives of the Programme. Furthermore, for this transnational exchange to function properly, it is crucial to also tackle the national differences related to financial, administrative, regulatory barriers throughout Europe. In particular, insurance-related aspects should be tackled and correlated with European and international regulations if the circulation of cultural goods is to be supported.
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	To a moderate extent
3.10b Would you like to explain your response?	-
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)	To a great extent
3.11b Would you like to explain your response?	The new Culture Programme support to overcoming barriers to transnational mobility is key to the development of European cultural co-operations.
3.12a To what extent is it important for the new programme to support the following activities: Translation of fiction into different languages	To a great extent
3.12b Would you like to explain your response?	Support to translation, because of its importance in terms of access to culture, cultural and linguistic diversity should remain under the umbrella of the Culture Programme. Translation of fiction significantly encourages the transnational circulation of cultural works and products throughout Europe and thus underlines the common European values and heritage. If the budget of the Programme is increased, digital format works should be eligible for translation under this strand.

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	To a moderate extent
3.13b Would you like to explain your response?	Publication costs would not make sense since the publishing houses are profit-making entities, which might result in them receiving 100% EU funds to then sell those books they proposed.
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	To a moderate extent
3.14b Would you like to explain your response?	We join our CCP colleagues from the European network and support the clear distinction between emerging festivals and big established festivals. Smaller, emerging and innovative festivals should be supported via the current 1.3.6 strand in the future. These festivals, which would often not be supported by regional/national bodies, have a unique opportunity to present new, innovative and cutting edge work, and support the diversity of artistic creation. On the other hand, support to big established festivals should go into a distinct strand for wide visibility, 'emblematic' actions (where EU Prizes and the Culture Capitals of Europe would also be included). The rule of subsidiarity should be carefully observed in the case of these festivals, i.e. the action could not take place only with national funding.
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	To a moderate extent

3.15b In which cultural sector(s) should new European prizes be supported?	Cultural Management Prize (best practice models of organisations and individuals); Cultural Education Prize (best practice models of organisations and individuals) - in all arts and culture fields, not just in heritage, as the current Europa Nostra Prize very well includes.
3.15c Would you like to explain your response?	There is a need to strengthen the management capacity of the arts and culture fields and providing good practice models can only help in this direction. Highlighting outstanding successes in cultural education initiatives will equally have a great benefic impact on the sector.
3.16a To what extent is it important for the Programme to support: media initiatives giving visibility to European cultural themes and projects	To a great extent
3.16b Would you like to explain your response?	It is important to give visibility to the projects funded by the Culture Programme.
3.17 Would you like to comment on the activities within the new Culture Programme?	The Romanian CCP joins most of the proposals of the CCP network and argues that the next Culture Programme support: Ø preparatory visits for prospective cooperation projects - connected or not to projects funded by the Programme It is important for potential project partners to meet before submitting a proposal in order to better outline the project idea, the agreed activities and the results and to actually 'test' the partnership compatibility at a very early stage. Currently, the Culture Programme emphasizes to a great extent the quality of a project's partnership as an essential award criterion, therefore allowing partners to meet face-to-face prior to applying would be a coherent measure to introduce, so cooperation is enhanced and there is a greater guarantee that the project is implemented successfully later on. The impact of this action would mean an increase in a project's chances of success in terms of partnership and a better negotiated and developed project idea and structure, a better collaborative project management scheme between operators. The Culture Programme could take the model of the Life Long Learning Programme in this sense, as the latter has a strand that supports preparatory meetings for prospective projects. If this is a desirable direction, CCPs could be involved in this task of selecting proposals for preparatory visits, as is the case of national agencies for the LLL Programme. Ø operational grants for cultural networks The current operational grants for European networks needs to continue to strengthen the capacity of these umbrella organisations. The impact of supporting networks would translate in enhanced cooperation

between network members (synergies, common initiatives), in the professionalisation of their members and of the sector (capacity building, setting standards for the sector if needed and wished), in a thorough representation of the sector towards decision-makers and other stakeholders. The award criteria for this strand should focus on working methods (how they foster cooperation between members, how they want to steer the process, get away from usual network management which does not allow for a real exchange between members and raises some questions on internal governance and/or democracy). For networks to develop coherently, we recommend that the duration per grant is of 3 years in all cases. We also propose to stop funding Ambassadors. Their visibility and exchange qualities are rather weak. The current Ambassador strand is mostly rather restricted to music-based organisations, its focus on sustainability is not convincing enough and its concept of 'Ambassadors of European culture' targeting Europe and not other regions of the world does not make enough sense. Support to civil society platforms should become a separate funding line, outside the Culture Programme.

Ø Opening up the current 1.2.1 strand also to experimental innovative projects ('laboratories') As already mentioned, there is a need to explore new ways of cooperation in arts and culture, to experiment new models of governance within the partnership, to develop personal and inter-cultural skills, to create bridges between the cultural sector and other professional sectors. They would not be a separate strand, but would be integrated into the current 1.2.1 strand, which would thus become opened up to a broader remit and to more diversified types of cooperation projects.

Ø structuring cooperation projects (ex-1.1 multi-annual cooperation projects) In the spirit of the Programme's vision, these larger co-operation projects would call on the partners to develop a longer-term impact on the European cultural/arts sector by:

- developing structured governance models for the running of the project
- professionalisation of cultural sector workers
- exchange of skills and working methods, especially between more experienced and less experienced partners
- mobility of artists
- innovation of artistic practice, in particular trans-disciplinary initiatives
- involvement of (mostly local) audience in the artistic/conception process

The focus of these projects would be on structured sustainability, on the cooperation process, on the medium and longer term professionalisation of the cultural sector.

Ø translations (see point 3.12 b) Ø 'emblematic' / wide visibility actions / „celebrations“ (see point 3.1 b) There is a need to group together all big actions which focus on wide visibility impact and are not accessible to most operators. This would include: Cultural Capitals of Europe, EU Awards and established festivals. Ø

	<p>emerging innovative festivals “ (see point 3.1 b)</p> <p>These festivals, which would often not be supported by regional/national bodies have a unique opportunity to present new and innovative work and cutting edge, + support diversity of artistic creation.</p>
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?	Don't know
4.4 What problems does your organisation face as a result of degressivity?	-

<p>4.5 Could you suggest any further specific ways to simplify the application process and the management of the new programme?</p>	<p>The new programme should have a more simplified access to funding for a wider range of actors. In terms of the evaluation of applications: • the selection process and training of experts should be reconsidered • national authorities, in some cases with the help of CCPs, should be able to propose national experts since they have a better grasp of the best evaluation specialists in their own countries. • experts should be thoroughly trained by the EC & EACEA before starting to evaluate proposals. • more than 2 experts should be involved in the assessment of each proposal. Also different experts to evaluate different areas - artistic / management / communications • internal co-operation agreements (free documents) should be mandatory in application packages for all cooperation projects, even if they would not be checked by the EACEA (feedback of co-organisers, who feel totally 'unprotected' in relation to their partners but also to EACEA).</p>
<p>4.6 How could the dissemination of the results of activities funded under the new programme be supported?</p>	<p>The Culture in Motion conferences are a first good step, but the presented projects and organizations should better display the character of the programme. CCPs make suggestions about cultural actors to be presented. This should be taken more into account.</p>
<p>4.7 Would you like to add anything else on the types of support within the new Culture Programme?</p>	<p>European cooperation initiatives should be about European governance. More importance should be given to projects in which cooperation is genuinely taken a step further, i.e. project partners actually work on new activities and products together, beyond the separate presentation of the each other's culture, experiences, know-how, etc. (there needs to be more focus on sharing of working methods amongst applicants). Working together to create something new should become a natural part of a project and a natural way of thinking among partners. It should be reflected in the process, methods, activities and results of a project. The award criteria should underline this characteristic. Regarding the co-financing levels, higher co-financing rates should also be made available for the 'laboratories' proposed above in order to facilitate the participation of smaller operators and newcomers in the Programme - up to 70-80% even, but without having less projects funded at a higher rate in this way - unfortunately point 4.1 above did not give the possibility to select this option...increase the co-funding rate without decreasing the number of funded projects.</p>

