

# 1 Executive Summary

---

## 1.1 General description of the programme

The Decision n°792/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 created the **community action programme** to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture, a three-fold programme:

- **Part I's** of the programme is dedicated to the support of two bodies, which have been supported by the European Commission over the past 20 years: the European bureau for Lesser-used Languages (EBLUL), and the Mercator network, consisting in three different centres, Mercator Media, Mercator Legislation, Mercator Education.

- **Part II's** of the programme is dedicated to the support of bodies pursuing an aim of general interest in the field of culture. The number of beneficiaries did not markedly evolve in number: 36 in 2004, 35 in 2005, and 34 in 2006, year when the first call for proposals was launched. 16 new beneficiaries over 34 were selected in 2006 and 17 beneficiaries of 2005 were not resumed in 2006. Totally, Part II gave support to 53 bodies active in the field of culture.

- **Part III's** of the programme is dedicated to the support of actions to preserve and commemorate the main sites and archives associated with the deportation. The number of projects is rather the same each year: 28 in 2004, 25 in 2005, and 24 in 2006. The renewal of beneficiary bodies has been very important since 24 beneficiaries out 25 were new applicants in 2005 and 20 out of 24 were also newcomers in 2006. 72 different bodies were thus received support.

The Community action programme has covered a period of **3 years**: 2004, 2005, 2006.

The programme foresees two different types of funding: **annual operating grants**, for Part I and Part II, which support the bodies' annual work programme and **action grants** for Part III

## 1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

The external evaluation of the community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of Culture has **two main objectives**: to propose possible improvements in the implementation of the components of the programme in the new programme 2007-2013 and to set forth detailed assessment reports to be provided by the Commission on the implementation of the current programme.

It aims at analyzing the **effectiveness** of the programme, and of each Part of it; the quality of the implementation of the programme and its efficiency, the sustainability of funded projects or bodies.

A new framework for the **next programming period**: the programme has definitely come to an end on December 31<sup>st</sup> 2006, and its components have been dispatched into three different programmes for the period 2007-2013<sup>1</sup>

## 1.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation focuses on the entire programme period (2004-2006). However, the insertion of the three parts of the programme into three new programmes from 2007 constitutes a specific issue, which the evaluation deals with.

---

<sup>1</sup> - Part I was integrated in the Integrated Lifelong Learning programme, in the Transversal programme, under Key activity 2: Language.

- Part II was integrated in Culture 2007-2013, under Strand 2: "Support for European Cultural Bodies".

- Part III was integrated in the programme "Citizens for Europe 2007-2013", under Action 4: "Active European Remembrance".

## 1.4 Methodology

Global methodology could be synthesised in:

- Detailed definition of **evaluation question** with **judgement criteria, indicators and descriptors, sources**, on the basis of the terms of reference.
- **Collection** of primary and secondary **data**.
- **Analysis** of collected data and **answers** to evaluation questions, identifying **limits** and borderlines in the implementation of the evaluation.
- **Recommendations**

One of the priorities of the evaluation was to focus on the **assessment of the results** of the programme and its global contribution to the cooperation in the field of culture at EU level. It has been considered therefore that it was necessary to concentrate the data collection work on the programme beneficiaries. **Direct observations** of some projects (through visits) have allowed understanding the concrete outputs of the programme, the added value of EU funds and the potential sustainability of the structures

**Choice of data collection tools** was carried out considering several factors: Steering committee guidelines, size of targets, geographical localization, data typology, data availability. Three types of data collection tools were used: **documentary reviews (regulatory documents, financial data, monitoring data), interviews and questionnaire**. Questionnaires were used for Part II and III. For Part I, interviews were performed with all the beneficiaries.

Concerning the questionnaire questions were elaborated on the basis of the evaluation question grids. A specific work has been done to define several typologies for closed questions. The questionnaires were sent through email to the beneficiaries

**Primary and secondary data collection was mainly in conformity with the data collection plan** set forth in the inception report. Concerning the questionnaire, the return rate was correct (on Part II, the return rate of the survey is 63%.and phone interviews with non selected applicants were carried out (43% ); and on Part III, the return rate of the survey is 38%., 80 % of the phone interviews with non selected applicants have been done)

The **analysis methodology** carried out during the evaluation could be set forth in three **phases**:

- Establishment of a link between the indicator/the descriptor and the type of analysis, considering the evaluation grid set forth in the inception report,
- Analysis of the indicator/descriptor, regarding the judgment criteria identified in the evaluation grid set forth in the inception report,
- Analysis of the indicator/descriptor, considering every indicators/descriptors concerned by the analysed question (analysis of interaction).

Analysis mentioned in points 2 and 3 above were carried out following three kind of reasoning:

- **Induction**: analysis performed through inference, from the outcome review to the rule/the idea,
- **Deduction**: analysis performed through definitions of axioms, coming to consequences,
- **Abduction**: analysis performed through the definition of a general rule, considered as an assumption, and strengthened by the review of outcomes

## 1.5 Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation design

The analysis and the conclusion carried out, it is now possible to point out several strengths of the evaluation design:

- Evaluation questions, judgment criteria and indicators created were operational,

- Typology of activities carried out by beneficiaries was closely related to the reality of the outputs, as it was confirmed during the data collection phase (interviews and questionnaire),
- Feedbacks from beneficiaries (interviews, open questions within the questionnaire) were crucial sources of information and analysis. They covered strategic and operational aspects. They showed a deep interest of beneficiaries, on a long term, concerning the DG EAC activities and supports.
- Indicators used during the evaluation could provide a good basis for a closer monitoring.

Several borderlines have to be noticed. Even if evaluation could, in the end, be lead, they have limited the scope of the analysis:

- Definition of quantitative indicators applicable for the Cultural sector or the memory of History is not always relevant or difficult to implement (lack of data),
- Heterogeneity of activities carried out on the programme have complicated the evaluation since it was often, in reality, several evaluations that were dealt together,
- No consolidation of various data concerning projects and bodies, especially final reports,
- The recent creation of Executive Agency implied a transition to implement an effective functioning. The evaluation had to take into account this context.
- The monitoring data were disseminated in several paper files in DG EAC and the executive Agency. The evaluation team recomposed them, so as to be able to give a complete overview on the programme outputs. It was however impossible, considering time constraints on the evaluation, to consolidate all the data. Considering the lack of consolidated data, it was not possible to carry out a full analysis about efficiency,
- The analyses were based on awarded grants amounts because the amounts effectively paid to beneficiaries were not available in a consolidated document. It was not possible for the evaluator to consolidate the amounts effectively paid, set forth in each final report.
- The accuracy of qualitative data is uneven for Part II and correct for Part III. They could back answers to the questions on results, implementation quality and sustainability. However, many projects have just finished or are still under process (Part II and Part III): impacts assessment was difficult.

Concerning the questionnaires, feedback reflected a very good understanding of the purpose of the evaluation, and a very concerned fulfilling. But some questions seem uneasy to understand:

- The issue of a voucher-pay system (“forfaitisation”),
- The question about full-time or part-time workers,
- The question asking “Which information do you reckon the final report should content, in order to give a faithful image of your activity?”

The sampling of respondents is correct but:

- For Part III, budget covered by respondents is only 24% of the total of budget for Part III beneficiaries
- Networks are highly represented for Part II with 28 respondents

## 1.6 Main conclusions of the evaluation

### 1.6.1 Conclusions on Part I

The **main operational objectives** set forth for those structures are **achieved**.

Supported bodies highly participate in **collecting and disseminating information** at European level in the education, media and legislation fields of the minority languages. This conclusion results from the connection between several outputs identified through indicators or descriptors<sup>2</sup>.

- ✓ The diversity of information disseminated. Some concrete initiatives have been set up (for instance, the increase of Mercator regional dossiers),
- ✓ The development of the internet sites, encompassing publications on website, considered as the major tool in order to improve the visibility of outputs,
- ✓ The increasing number of contacts proving material (journalists, professors...) and, related to this point, the higher geographical coverage (regarding the localization of these contacts),
- ✓ The diversity of information collected, especially thanks to the development of more structured database,

They support, especially EBLUL, **administrative procedure for applications to EU programmes**, through its Info Point, as it is confirmed by the number of services provided and the number of bodies supported.

They highly contribute to **develop adequate partnerships** in this field: the “Partnership for diversity” EBLUL yearly project aims at gathering local, regional and national authorities as well as minority languages practitioners and language planners.

However, the **dissemination** of European information in the regional or minority language communities **remains limited**. This conclusion results from several limits identified by the evaluator:

- ✓ Internet is the main tool of dissemination and, therefore, the public targeted is necessarily reduced (Internet accessibility, education, accessibility of the website),
- ✓ The cost of translations do not allow a high coverage of languages,
- ✓ Indicators available about the number of people impacted (for instance the number of web visitor), even if they reveal an increase, remain low (if they are related to other successful website for instance).

Considering the level of outputs of the four structures and despite the difficulties faced by EBLUL, the **specific objectives can be considered as achieved**: the four structures participated in promoting and safeguarding the linguistic diversity in the European Union and have a wide coverage in terms of representation. The new Member states have been immediately integrated in their scope of activities. Thus, the programme supported the further development of their expertise and contributed to the progress in the research on the minority languages. These points are confirmed by the **sustainable character of the structures**, which took the programme as an opportunity to prepare themselves to the competition in the framework of the new programmes (see evaluation question related to the sustainability analysis).

The effectiveness analysis of Part I pointed out that the level of activities of the **Mercator network** has steadily increased over the past three years, whereas the yearly grant allocated remained the same. The network **gained on efficiency**. In addition, interviews have confirmed that the network and its expertise achieved a certain level of acknowledgement that allows it to find alternative way of financing. This sustainable character of the network reinforce the efficiency of the EU grant: some results will last after the end of the programme.

For **EBLUL**, the efficiency remains difficult to assess considering the **problems faced** by the structure and the late award of the grant in 2004. The human resources dedicated to the structure have been considerably reduced over the period. However, the basic activities of EBLUL (EuroLang, PFD) remained the same and concentrated the main part of the resources, which explain the bigger amount awarded in the years 2005 and 2006.

---

<sup>2</sup> Considering indicators and descriptors identified in the inception report.

This “**transition**” programme was thus very useful for the structures to prepare themselves to the **competition** they will have to face in the framework of the next education and training UE programmes.

## 1.6.2 Conclusion on Part II

**Two third of the beneficiaries are associations or foundations.** A majority is **located in Brussels**, closed to the European institutions. Four beneficiaries of the 2006 selection are located in the new Member states.

The call for proposal splits the Part II beneficiaries into three categories: ambassadors, European networks and bodies organising cultural events. **This typology appears not very effective considering the effective types of activities** identified by the present evaluation. This typology is not fully effective because bodies, and their activities, encompassed in one category are very **heterogeneous**. The consequence is that a category of the typology does not allow effective analysis, or any extrapolation, without a risk of **unreasonable induction**. It is the case for ambassadors and bodies organising recurring cultural events. **The networks**, however, have a global homogeneity in their **activities and their objectives**

**All cultural fields are represented among the beneficiaries activities**, but especially performances (theatre, dance, music for one third of them), then audiovisual and fine arts (painting, sculptures).

**Six types of very heterogeneous activities** have been identified, each of them involved on average 10% of the beneficiaries. The network animation is the most represented:

- **Networking activities with a wide scope (from information provider to lobbying) are implemented by a wide majority of the supported structures.** The 21 networks identified by the evaluation gathered 2 581 members.
- Artistic performance (17% of the beneficiaries who answered the questionnaire) remains focused on concerts organisation (32 concerts involved on average 100 artists each). Those events are often “one shot” event.
- Support to cultural creation (38% of the beneficiaries) mainly consists in offering logistic supports to artists (travelling, accommodation, etc.). 11 beneficiaries declared supporting 1000 artists over the period.
- Half of the bodies have some representations activities of cultural private and public organisations towards the European institutions, but also, increasingly towards international organisations.
- Almost all structures considered having some training activities, through the organisation of conferences, tryouts, etc.
- Research often complements other activities.

Almost all bodies have some dissemination activities, especially on information regarding the EU. Whereas translation remains seldom, 18 beneficiaries underlined that they organised conferences and almost all of them have developed their websites over the period.

Finally, all structures produced concrete products: performance programmes, websites, databases, newsletter, website, etc, which are, in most of the cases, only available in two languages.

Considering this level of outputs, the evaluation consider that Part II of the programme **fulfilled its objective of organizing cultural events with a real European dimension and of representing stakeholders at Community level.**

However, activities around **dissemination** on community action (third operational objective) **remain lighter**, considering the analysis of indicators and descriptors available (documentation available, translation, conferences, websites), as they were described in evaluation questions. It does not appear as a priority for the beneficiaries.

Considering the development of networks in terms of members, types of members, geographical location, scope and level of activities (as demonstrated in the previous evaluation question), Part II of the programme **highly contributes to develop and strengthen the relationships among the stakeholders in the cultural fields**. It thus contributes:

- in the boosting of the cultural dialogue between the professionals of the cultural fields (mainly through the networks),
- in enhancing mutual knowledge between cultures through the organisation of events dedicated to the general public. Those events are gathering artists from all over the EU and present performances promoting national cultural patrimony.

Concerning the **mobility of arts and artists**, some contributions are indirect, or with small impact, to the mobility (for example, exclusively through meetings between artists and the creation of few joint projects).

The **call for proposals procedure** has only been implemented in 2006. It is a **positive transition from an earmarked system, to a competitive selection process**. The procedure allows selecting the projects on a **wider basis of applicants**. The text has been well understood by the applicants. However, it would be more convenient for them if the **results of the call were announced sooner** or at least before the expected starting date of the projects or programmes. It would help flatten the realisation in time, and offer more guarantees as to the achievement of the bodies' objectives. This comment has to be related to the European process for a decision in the present field of activity, implying the consultation of the European Parliament and the representatives of Member States. Nevertheless, it is such a consensual conclusion drawn by beneficiaries and by several external evaluations, and subscribed by evaluators, that it is not possible to not mention it.

Moreover, **technical assistance** provided to the applicants at the call for proposal stage needs to be more visible. This remark is based on the feeling of beneficiaries and what is pointed out by the evaluation is not a lack of quality in the technical assistance provided, but more a lack of communication.

**Selection procedure allowed an effective implementation** of the programme even if it is necessary to qualify this conclusion.

The evaluators have identified a dichotomy between two kinds of bodies selected, between **two potential strategies of selection**. Support could be whether allocated to growing bodies, with limited financial basis; or it can support risk-less bodies which have already proven their solidity and their project-management capacities. In this case, EU grant will only be a supplementary funding, for project which could have found it otherwise anyway. Of course, this dichotomy is theoretical and could be qualified, but it could be a grid of strategic analysis, in order to define the priority of the support, and the equilibrium that is suitable between the two kinds of bodies described.

Moreover, interviews and questionnaires with both selected and not selected applicants revealed that the composition of **evaluation committee** and how they are chosen, and what are exactly the **selection criteria** are **important grey areas, which need more transparency**. The evaluators follow partially this statement. It was confirmed during interviews that even beneficiaries with a long experience of the European institutions and their activities have some difficulties to understand, and enunciate which were, even broadly, selection criteria. However, it was also clear enough that beneficiaries did not use all the information available. The conclusion of the evaluators is focused on the need **to strengthen the communication of the Commission** concerning these selection criteria, in order to compensate a relative passivity of beneficiaries facing the information provided. It is necessary because it **generates a feeling that European Institutions are opaque**.

The experts form criteria are relevant regarding the objectives enunciated in the decision and in the call for proposal 38/05. They are mostly qualitative; more measurable criteria could be included, in order to give more legitimacy to the selection.

The **monitoring of agreements could be improved**. A common comment could be the **lack of reciprocity in requirements**. Beneficiaries feel that they are requested a very precise

administrative monitoring, a regular feed-back, but that in return, **their queries do not receive as much attention as they would wish**. The delays in answering are also too long. **Payment delays** were a crucial issue for part II of the Programme. The evaluation assessment on this point is based on two considerations: on this one hand, beneficiaries require quickness and easiness in the monitoring and, on the other hand, European regulations, and especially the financial regulation, require a high level of security and accuracy in the monitoring data. Regarding these two aspects, the evaluation concludes that there are some rooms of improvements in the monitoring of agreements and they could respond partially to the criticisms coming from beneficiaries: a better feed-back from the DG EAC and the Executive Agency, more transparency concerning the payment delays (foreseeable payments). Visits and **on the spot evaluation by civil servants of the Commission services were very rare**. It appears difficult to carry out an effective monitoring on projects or bodies without an in depth relation with beneficiaries. This should help the beneficiaries (but they do not request much more monitoring) but, above all, serve the Commission services, in order to readjust on a yearly basis the priorities, the selection criteria, the implementation modalities, etc.

Considering the **effectiveness analyses**, the resources allocated to Part II of the programme (which represent 4% of the budgetary costs) led to the intended effects. The setting up of an open selection process (year 2006) and the creation of the executive Agency (January 2006) both participated in the deterioration of the costs dedicated to the management of Part II over the past two years. But, the budgetary costs have been decreased (- 35%) over the period, from 5,3 M€ to 3,4 M€

However, the evaluation shows that there is room for improvement to guarantee the highest level of efficiency:

- On the implementation site, the creation of the Agency gives for instance the opportunity to develop some services in terms of monitoring and to set up appropriate framework to facilitate the reporting of the structures.
- On a more strategic point of view, the right balance between the award of bigger budget to highly visible and recognised structures having a real European level activities and thus impacts closed to the European institutions and the support of smaller structures, which participate in reinforcing the cultural cooperation between the European Citizens.

The effectiveness analyses shows that EU grant should have long term effects on the future of the structures:

- A great majority of the organisms assert that they created stable relationships, especially among their members for the network
- Even if very rare projects are implemented in addition to the usual one, 90% of the bodies pointed out that the results of their activities are used by other organisations
- EU grant participated to increase their visibility and credibility towards other financing bodies

However, the evaluation shows a high level of dependence towards EU funds for most of the supported structures. This level has strongly decreased over the period but did not have negative impacts on the structures activities. The financial instability had some impacts on the human resources, which are consequently instable and thus highly linked to the renewal and level of grants, all the more that the structures assert that they have difficulties to find other resources.

### 1.6.3 Conclusion on Part III

Projects are located in 16 different EU countries, even if Germany appears as the main providers of projects. Projects are, for a majority of them, dedicated to specific target groups: general public, young people, researchers and academics, etc.

The projects are covering a **wide range of outputs**:

- The highest number of projects is dealing with archives research, storing and exploiting (8 projects identified). They are systematically integrated in a wider research project and products are used in other frameworks: conferences, exhibitions, library, etc.
- Collection of testimonies (8 projects identified), particularly on digital support, led to several urgent projects, as witnesses and victims are progressively disappearing
- Commemorations or events organisation (7 projects identified) are often one shot event. They mainly have a local coverage.
- Art work and didactic or educational material have been realised: films, books, documentaries, mainly in English. They are not so often dedicated to young people.
- Some restorations have been undertaken on highly symbolic sites:

All projects conduct to **concrete results** (films, books, leaflets, etc.). **Dissemination** activities are quite numerous. Projects leaders use Press, Internet and public interventions to widespread those results.

Following the visits in situ, all projects have been implemented with **respect to their initial objectives**. They are rather **small projects**, limited in time and lead to concrete results.

The structures, through their projects, are connected with indirect target groups: lots of people ask them for information in the framework of their projects (victims, general public, pupils and academics). Specific partnerships have been developed, but this remains seldom. According to project holders, there is no need to set up partnerships to implement those kinds of projects. The evaluation supports partially this conclusion. Outputs carried out, and analysed during the evaluation are mainly specific and do not need partnership to be implemented. But this comment is not relevant if you take into account the operational objective related to dissemination. And it is precisely one of the main stakes on the Part III.

Thus, operational objectives of preserving and commemorating the main sites, preserving the archives associated with deportations and using the site to reinforce Holocaust education are fulfilled.

However, additional efforts should put on the objective of keeping alive the memory of victims. This opinion is shared by a vast majority of beneficiaries interviewed and the evaluation, based on a simple fact: victims are disappearing; the urgency is to collect their testimonies.

Projects dedicated to art work and didactic material remains rare.

Considering the subject, some projects seem to be quite urgent and appear as a priority in comparison to others. Thus, the specific objective of preserving and commemorating the memory of victims of incarceration in the camps is partially achieved. It should have bearded some additional means to cover the needs.

In addition, Part III of the programme lightly facilitates the dissemination of the European populations' history:

- few projects aimed at developing didactical support,
- still few translations are planned in the framework of the projects,
- projects have for most of them a local coverage.

Thus, the programme does not highly contribute to the improvement of the knowledge of the present and future generations on that period, but, according to the people interviewed, contribute, at least, to avoid a decrease in this knowledge. At this stage, by allocating financial support to specialised organisms, it contributes to the development of the research and archives in this field. The next step will be to disseminate the results of the research and archives restoration.

**The conclusions on the selection procedure and the monitoring for Part III are almost the same as the one drafted for the Part II of the programme.**

However, the **effectiveness analyses** show that the budget led to the expected outputs and results:

- At the project level, with relatively small amounts of grant, effective products are created

- At the Part III level, the addition of the supported projects contributed to the objectives' achievement. The European added value is particularly high for those kinds of projects.

The creation of Agency gives some opportunity to improve the implementation of the programme: monitoring of the agreements, creation of monitoring data and regular update, etc. This should improve the efficiency on the management side.

However, the **projects themselves would not have been implemented without the EU funds**. They often come in addition to the current running of the structures and have been developed on the basis of the DG EAC terms of reference: the EU added value is really very strong on those kinds of projects. The products created do not need any update and can be used in the next years. They thus participate indirectly in the future development of the beneficiaries.

The project however still suffer of a **lack of visibility**: the poor means dedicated to translation do not participate in creating long term effects.

#### 1.6.4 Conclusion on the Programme

As anticipated by the methodology setting up, it is impossible to draw a global conclusion on the impacts of the programme. By construction, it gathers projects which have almost nothing in common.

However, at a transversal level, all stakeholders, structures and project leaders, officials interviewed at EU level, express a **positive opinion on the programme contribution to its main global objectives**. This positive opinion is shared by the evaluation. The analysis of outputs and results for each Parts of the Programme show a global respect of operational and specific objectives.

It thus have contributed to the **promotion of bodies active at European level in the field of culture** and to their networking, especially through the structures supported under Part I and thanks to the networks supported under Part II. The evaluation shows the improvement in the organization of the cultural actors, the enlargement of the scope of activities of the structures and the increasing professionalism towards EU projects and partnerships. Beneficiaries identified as ambassadors (first type of beneficiaries, if it is referred to the grants allocated) contribute to the promotion, but much more on a symbolic point of view (for example, youth orchestra from all the Member states). This approach combining several tools and objectives of promotion is sound if the equilibrium between the tools and objectives is managed.

However, its contribution to the **development and implementation of Community cooperation policy and actions in the field of culture is not perceived as very effective** by the stakeholders. The evaluation has not been able to provide a conclusion on this point on the basis of its data collection and the following analysis. Indeed, this conclusion is related to a type of analysis closed from an impact analysis (on a long term) and this type of analysis has to be carried out with high caution. However, during some of the interviews, evaluation noticed that the opinion of **some of the stakeholders interrogated was negatively influenced by other factors** (for example a budget considered as inadequate). Consequently, the **evaluation has a qualified approach of their perception**.

It must be highlight that the present programme is not the main instrument of the Community action in the field of culture. Its impacts must be considered at least together with the Culture 2000 programme.

Finally, the stakeholders are a little bit **less convinced by the contribution of the programme to the objectives of disseminating information** of Community action and representing stakeholders at Community level:

- Only Part I structures have some limited information activities on the Community action towards minority languages;

- Part II structures, i.e. the networks, have some rare information activities and are developing their representation activities.
- Part I and Part II activities of structures and Part III projects are, for most of them, as shown by the present evaluation, dedicated to stakeholders with a specific expertise or field of interest, either in the minority languages field, in the cultural field or the memory. Only performance events and a few Part III projects are really dedicated to the general public.

**The evaluation confirms this perception from stakeholders. Globally, the objective of dissemination is rarely a priority for beneficiaries**, even if some clear improvement were noticed for some of them (for the Part I for example). As a consequence, the programme lacks of visibility. This will be partially resolved in the framework of the next programmes

## 1.7 Recommendations

The following synthetic presentation of the recommendations of the evaluation is organized around the three main themes of the evaluation of the programme: its effectiveness and its efficiency, its visibility and its sustainability. This presentation is a selection of the major recommendations. All the recommendations are set forth at the end of the final report.

### 1.7.1 Effectiveness and efficiency

1. To strengthen links between cultural sector and other political issues, in order to fully benefit from the potential added value of cultural activities, in terms of citizenship. Structured cooperation with other DG could be implemented for the monitoring of specific projects, with high symbolic value.
  - Example: Cooperation with the DG Regional Policy for an artistic project carrying out in area eligible to the Convergence Objective.
  - Example: Cooperation with the DG Environment for a cultural event promoting environment protection.
2. To ensure the **publication** applicants selection **earlier** because a lot of bodies follow the calendar year. It would therefore relevant to align EU grants remittance and bodies activities realisations at the end of the calendar year. This recommendation is set forth by the evaluators even if they are aware of the European process for a decision in the present field of activity, implying the consultation of the European Parliament and the representatives of Member States. However, it is such a consensual conclusion drawn by beneficiaries and by several external evaluations, and subscribed by evaluators, that it is not possible to not mention it.
3. To improve the assistance for beneficiaries through **guidelines for technical assistance** in order to provide an homogeneous answer, whoever is the civil servant in charge, and a better reactivity for the answers provided to the beneficiaries (several tools available: answering machines, FAQ...)
4. To respect delays indicated in provisional calendars for the selection procedure. Even if these delays are long, they have to be foreseeable in order to allow, for each applicant, to anticipate the time of relevant response.
5. To develop data base for a closer monitoring and to consolidate and follow monitoring data resulting from final reports
  - The data base could be created in cooperation with long term beneficiaries.
  - The data base could be created taking advantage of beneficiaries data collected on different actions and.
  - The indicators used during the evaluation could be used as a basis to develop the data base.

6. To distinguish levels of monitoring depending on the amounts of grants allocated. A lightened monitoring could be implemented, for instance, for grants inferior to the average of grants distributed
7. To strengthen qualitative monitoring during the implementation of the project through synthetic evaluation grids for civil servants in charge of the monitoring, or spontaneous phone interview or on the sport visits.
8. For the support to projects, to offer certain flexibility in the starting and ending dates of the projects and their length, just as in other European Union programmes (ERDF for example).
9. To improve the resources dedicated to the knowledge of the cultural sector and its stakeholders within the DG EAC and the Executive Agency (data base, newsletters, phones, meetings, studies...)
10. To conceive cultural networks as an implementation of the subsidiarity principle. Networks could be responsible for supra national activities and coordination in the cultural sector. In the same order of idea, to conceive **networks** as an emanation of **civil society**, by assessing their representativeness, through the selection process, or through the monitoring.
11. To set forth a hierarchy on urgent projects. The data collection concerning witnesses of the Second World War needs to concentrate supports, on a short term, since a lot of these witnesses are dying progressively. For example, what is urgent is to collect testimonies then it is less crying to organise events, to organise dissemination (even if it is a necessity on a mid term).

#### 1.7.2 Visibility of outputs and results

12. To provide a booklet for each beneficiary setting forth beneficiaries' good practices identified related to the improvement of the visibility of outputs and results. This booklet could be based on the experience acquired during the former programmes.
13. To introduce specific criteria related to the visibility in the selection process. For instance, the implementation of a website, a minimum number of public interventions (conferences, seminars, etc...) or a minimum number of concrete products dedicated to the dissemination (publications, books, articles in newspapers, etc...)

#### 1.7.3 Sustainability

14. To offer **multi-annual grants**. A **combining of annual and multi-annual grants** could be proposed, depending on the nature of the project. Applicants could choose between annual or multi annual grants. Criteria of selection would be different. For example, a stricter appraisal of sustainability will be required for multi annual grants.
15. To maintain the requirement of a low **external financing** (20% for part II and 25% for part III) that is fitted to particularities of cultural sector.
16. Even if **amounts concerned by the principle of gradual reduction of grants are low** (2,5% of the co-financing rate), its implementation has a **symbolic value**, and it is perceived by beneficiaries as a constraint. The evaluation considers that the **relation between the benefit and the cost of the implementation of this principle is negative** for the objective targeted
17. Allow the grant to pay for the "application preparation", i.e. pay for the staff that took time in preparing the application, if selected.