

# **Interim Evaluation of the Culture Programme 2007-13**

Annexes to support Final Report

ECORYS UK on behalf of the European  
Commission DG Education and Culture



# **Annex One: Terms of Reference**



# Terms of Reference for the EAC 2009 interim programme evaluations

**Title of the assignment: Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme and support  
for the impact assessment of the future programme on Culture**

1. CONTEXT .....	3
1.1. Introduction .....	3
1.2. An evolving political context.....	4
1.2.1. Pilot project on artist mobility .....	5
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME .....	5
2.1.1. General objectives.....	5
2.1.2. Specific objectives .....	6
2.1.3. Contribution to other Community objectives.....	6
3. BUDGET AND DURATION OF THE PROGRAMME .....	6
4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME .....	7
4.1. Actions under the programme.....	7
Strand 1 Support for cultural actions .....	7
Strand 1.1 Multi-annual cooperation projects.....	7
Strand 1.2 Co-operation measures .....	8
Strand 1.2.1 Cooperation projects.....	8
Strand 1.2.2 Support for literary translation projects .....	8
Strand 1.3. Special actions.....	8
Strand 1.3.1 Cultural cooperation with third countries.....	8
Strand 1.3.2 European Capitals of Culture.....	9
Strand 1.3.3 Awarding of European prizes in the cultural field .....	9

Strand 1.3.4 Support to cooperation with international organisations .....	10
Strand 2 Support for organizations active at European level in the field of culture .....	10
Strand 3 Support for analysis and dissemination activities .....	11
Strand 3.1 Support to Cultural Contact Points .....	11
Strand 3.2 Support for analyses in the field of cultural co-operation and policy development.....	11
Strand 3.3 Support for maximising the impact of projects in the field of cultural cooperation.....	11
5. ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES .....	12
6. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME.....	12
6.1. Monitoring Provisions .....	13
Monitoring data on 2008 selection rounds .....	13
7. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT .....	14
8. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION .....	15
8.1. Evaluation questions.....	15
8.1.1. Relevance.....	16
8.1.2. Effectiveness.....	16
8.1.3. Efficiency .....	17
8.1.4. Sustainability .....	17
9. OTHER TASKS UNDER THE ASSIGNMENT .....	18
9.1.1. Programme monitoring.....	18
9.1.2. Evaluation follow-up .....	18
9.1.3. Impact assessment of the future Culture programme: support for the online consultation – Work Package WP 2 .....	19
10. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES .....	19
10.1. General reporting requirements.....	19
10.1.1. Inception Report .....	19
10.1.2. Interim Report .....	19
10.1.3. Draft Final Report .....	19
10.1.4. Final Report.....	20
11. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET.....	20

11.1.	Organisation.....	20
11.2.	Meetings .....	21
11.3.	Timetable .....	21
11.4.	Budget.....	22
12.	REQUIREMENTS.....	22
12.1.	Methodology.....	22
12.2.	Resources.....	22
13.	REFERENCES.....	23
13.1.	Programme documents .....	23
13.2.	Reference documents.....	23
13.3.	Background documents.....	23
13.3.1.	Studies .....	24
13.3.2.	Evaluations .....	24

## **1. CONTEXT**

### **1.1. Introduction**

The Culture Programme Decision (No 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC) is based on Article 151 which stipulates that "

*«1. The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.*

*2. Action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas:*

- improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples,*
- conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance,*
- non-commercial cultural exchanges,*
- artistic and literary creation, including in the audiovisual sector.*

*3. The Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organisations in the sphere of culture, in particular the Council of Europe.*

*4. The Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of this Treaty, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures.*

*5. In order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article, the Council:*

- acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 251 and after consulting the Committee of the Regions, shall adopt incentive measures, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States. The Council shall act unanimously throughout the procedure referred to in Article 251,*

*- acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt recommendations.»*

The Culture Programme 2007-2013 has been preceded by a previous phase covering 2000-2006 (Culture 2000 (508/2000/EC) and by earlier programmes such as Kaleidoscope (719/96/EC), Ariane (2085/97/EC) and Raphael (2228/97/EC).

On the basis of the evaluation of these programmes, the Culture Programme 2007-2013 has been restructured to better match policy priorities and stakeholder needs. Several Resolutions of the Council and the Parliament (ref. \*11 of the Culture Programme Decision) stressed the need to adopt a more coherent approach at Community level with regard to culture, and that European added value is an essential and determining concept in the context of European cultural cooperation, and a general condition for Community measures in the field of culture.

The political context outlined in the Programme Decision takes into account the new work plan on European cooperation in the field of Culture and the Thessaloniki Agenda for the Western Balkans: moving towards European integration. It refers more specifically to

- promoting cooperation and cultural exchanges in order to respect and promote the diversity of cultures and languages in Europe, improve knowledge and raise awareness of the common European cultural heritage as part of the European citizenship and fight exclusion and racism(\*1, \*3 and \*5)
- An active cultural policy to improve the external visibility of the EU (\*2).
- Making the cultural sector to contribute to broader European political development (culture contribution to economy and cultural industries) (\*4 and \*11)

## **1.2. An evolving political context**

In 2007, the Commission adopted a Communication on a common European agenda for culture in a globalizing world. In this political document, the Commission defines a new and ambitious strategy for culture, based on three sets of objectives with a high European added value, which are intended to be shared by all stakeholders:

- promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue in Europe;
- promotion of culture as a catalyst for creativity in the framework of the Lisbon strategy for growth and jobs.
- promotion of culture as a vital element in international relations.

The objectives were endorsed by the Council in November 2007 and by the European Council in December 2007. In May 2008, the Council agreed on a three year work plan for 2008-2010. The work plan identifies 5 priority areas through which it intends to contribute to the implementation of the objectives of the agenda.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:143:0009:0016:EN:PDF>

The agenda foresees new working methods, including the setting up of an open method of coordination (OMC) with Member States, a structured dialogue with civil society stakeholders in the cultural sector, and greater mainstreaming of culture throughout the policies and programmes of the European Union. Implementation of these measures began in 2007 and 2008 and shall continue in 2009.

With regard to the structured dialogue with civil society, the Commission intends to undertake a number of activities already begun in 2008 outside the framework of the Programme. This will include convening meetings of the 3 civil society platforms on intercultural dialogue (the "Rainbow" Platform), access to culture, and the cultural and creative industries. It shall also assist with the organisation of meetings of the OMC expert groups on 4 of the issues singled out by the Council: cultural and creative industries, mobility within the cultural sector, synergies between education and culture, mobility of collections.

Within the context of the structured dialogue, the Commission intends to organise a mid-term Cultural Forum in autumn 2009, which will provide the opportunity for the platforms to present their work and recommendations to policy-makers, and to examine the progress made by Member States in the framework of the OMC.

The objectives of the Programme and the policy agenda are similar and complementary, but not entirely identical. Efforts have therefore been made to ensure that the synergies between the two are optimised. Notably the Programme contributes to the implementation of the Agenda for Culture through the support given to studies, stakeholder platforms, and expert meetings. Synergies between the Programme and policy agenda are also sought when exploiting and disseminating the results of projects.

#### *1.2.1. Pilot project on artist mobility*

In 2008 the Commission also implemented a pilot project on artist mobility voted by the European Parliament. Although this is separate to the Programme, it nevertheless provided important complementary support to the mobility of artists and cultural professionals, which is an objective of both the Programme and the policy agenda.

The aspects of the pilot project implemented in 2008 included a study examining the feasibility of setting up a European wide system of information on the regulatory, administrative obstacles to mobility (the study will be available in spring 2009), and a call for proposals to support the networking of mobility support structures with a view to improving the environment for mobility in Europe, as a result of which out of a total of 33 applications, 4 projects received grants. The results of the pilot project are feeding into the work of Member States in the open method of coordination.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME**

### *2.1.1. General objectives*

The general objective of the Programme is to enhance the cultural area shared by Europeans and based on a common cultural heritage through the development of cultural cooperation between the creators, cultural players and cultural institutions of the countries taking part in the Programme, with a view to encouraging the emergence of European citizenship (art.3.1 of the Programme Decision 1855/2006/EC, amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC).

### *2.1.2. Specific objectives*

The specific objectives of the Programme are:

- (1) to promote the transnational mobility of cultural players;
- (2) to encourage the transnational circulation of works and cultural and artistic products;
- (3) to encourage intercultural dialogue (art.3.2)

### *2.1.3. Contribution to other Community objectives*

The Programme (art.12 of the above mentioned Decision) shall contribute to the strengthening of the transversal objectives of the Community, in particular by:

- a) Promoting the fundamental principle of freedom of expression;
- b) Encouraging greater awareness of the importance of contributing to sustainable development;
- c) Seeking to promote mutual understanding and tolerance within the European Union;
- d) Contributing to the elimination of all discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

Particular attention shall be given to coherence and complementarity between the Programme and Community policies in the field of cultural cooperation with third countries.

The Programme also seeks to build links with the activities related to years that are devoted to a specific theme at European level (ref. Programme Guide and Annual Workplans). For the period covered by the current evaluation, this will concern 2008, Year of Intercultural Dialogue and 2009, Year of Creativity and Innovation. During these years particular attention is given to projects and activities pursuing the objectives of the European Years while complying with the Programme criteria.

## **3. BUDGET AND DURATION OF THE PROGRAMME**

A financial envelope of 400 M€ (EUR 27) was set aside for the seven-year duration of the programme (2007-2013). The table below provides a budget estimate of the real commitments made during the first three years of the programme and the commitments planned for 2010, broken down by strands and by percentages of the annual budget, as well as an average of the 2007-2010 period. The last column reminds the indicative percentages per strand recommended in the annex of the Decision for the whole period of the programme.



	2007 EUR 32	2008 EUR 27	2009 EUR 27	2010 EUR 27	2010%	2009%	2008%	% 2007- 2010	Decisio n %
1.1 multiannual projects	18,8	15,37 1	15,77	17,54 8	<b>30,93</b>	<b>28,35</b>	<b>31,50</b>	<b>32,21</b>	<b>32,00</b>
1.2 annual projects (including Literary translation projects)	13,3	15,79 4	17,18 9	19,44 5	<b>34,28</b>	<b>30,90</b>	<b>32,37</b>	<b>31,36</b>	<b>29,00</b>
1.3 Special actions (including third countries)	5,7	4,878	9,476	6,36	<b>11,21</b>	<b>17,03</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>12,60</b>	<b>16,00</b>
2 Organisations	5	5,991	6,63	7,303	<b>12,87</b>	<b>11,92</b>	<b>12,28</b>	<b>11,89</b>	<b>10,00</b>
3 accompanying measures	1,75	2,602	2,159	1,991	<b>3,51</b>	<b>3,88</b>	<b>5,33</b>	<b>4,06</b>	<b>5,00</b>
Operational costs	3,855	4,154	4,409	4,085	<b>7,20</b>	<b>7,93</b>	<b>8,51</b>	<b>7,88</b>	<b>8,00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48,40 5</b>	<b>55,63 3</b>	<b>56,73 2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>100,0 0</b>	<b>100,00</b>

#### 4. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME

##### 4.1. Actions under the programme

The objectives of the Programme are pursued through the implementation of three strands of activities

1. support for cultural actions
  - 1.1. multi-annual cooperation projects
  - 1.2. co-operation measures, including literary translation and third country cooperation
  - 1.3. special actions, including the European Capitals of Culture and Prizes
2. support for organizations active at European level in the field of culture
3. support for analysis and the collection and dissemination of information and for activities maximising the impact of projects in the field of European cultural cooperation and of the development of a European cultural policy development.

*Strand 1 Support for cultural actions*

*Strand 1.1 Multi-annual cooperation projects*

This strands support sustainable and structured cultural cooperation projects in order to bring together the specific quality and expertise of cultural operators throughout Europe.

Each Multi-annual cooperation project is intended to carry out a number of structured, multi-annual cultural activities which must have at least two out of the three specific objectives indicated in Article 3(2). A higher degree of attention is paid to cooperation projects intending to develop activities meeting the three specific objectives in that Article.

These projects must involve a minimum of six cultural operators from at least six eligible countries to develop joint cultural activities over a period of three to five years, for amounts of between EUR 200 000 and EUR 500 000 per year. EU support is limited to 50% of total eligible costs. Approximately 32 % of the total budget allocated to the Programme is devoted to this type of support.

#### *Strand 1.2 Co-operation measures*

Approximately 29 % of the total budget allocated to the Programme is devoted to support for cooperation projects and literary translation projects.

##### *Strand 1.2.1 Cooperation projects*

This strand supports sectoral or cross-sectoral cultural cooperation actions between European operators.

This category includes projects involving at least three cultural operators, from at least three eligible countries over a maximum period of two years, for amounts of between EUR 50 000 and EUR 200 000. EU support is limited to 50% of the total eligible costs.

##### *Strand 1.2.2 Support for literary translation projects*

This category seeks to promote the largest possible spread of European literature among European citizens through support for the translation and publication of European literature into the different languages of the countries participating in the Programme. Publishing houses can be awarded grants for translations and publication of works of fiction from one European language into another, for amounts of between EUR 2000 and EUR 60 000, for projects lasting up to two years. EU support is limited to 50% of the total eligible costs.

#### *Strand 1.3. Special actions*

These actions are special in that they should be substantial in scale and scope, strike a significant chord with the peoples of Europe and help to increase their sense of belonging to the same community, make them aware of the cultural diversity of Member States, and also contribute to intercultural and international dialogue. Particular attention is paid to actions that meet at least two of the three specific objectives set out in Article 3.

These special actions shall also help to raise the visibility of Community cultural action both within and beyond the European Union. They shall also contribute to raising global awareness of the wealth and diversity of European culture. Approximately 16 % of the total budget allocated to the Programme is devoted to this type of support.

##### *Strand 1.3.1 Cultural cooperation with third countries*

This strand supports cultural cooperation projects aimed at cultural exchanges between countries taking part in the Programme and in third countries, which have concluded

association or cooperation agreements with the EU, provided that the latter contain cultural clauses. The action must generate a real European added value as well as an international cooperation dimension. Specific groups of third countries are selected each year.

The projects must involve at least three cultural operators, from at least three eligible countries as well as cultural cooperation with a minimum of one organization from the selected third country. At least 50% of the action should take place in the third country. Co-funding for amounts of between EUR 50 000 and EUR 200 000 are available for projects lasting up to two years. EU support is limited to 50% of the total eligible costs.

### *Strand 1.3.2 European Capitals of Culture*

This action is governed by the Council and European Parliament Decision n° 1622/2006/EC (henceforth referred to as "the Capitals' legal base")<sup>2</sup>. The objectives, criteria and designation process of the European Capitals of Culture action (ECOCs) are defined by the Capitals' legal base, although funding comes from the Culture programme. Each of the Capitals have received grants of EUR 1 500 000 under the Culture Programme on the basis of projects submitted by the organisations responsible for setting up the events' programmes. These projects need to show a significant European dimension.

ECOCs are submitted to an annual evaluation. Capitals of Culture in the years covered by the evaluation were: Luxembourg and Sibiu (2007), Liverpool and Stavanger (2008), Linz and Vilnius (2009).

### *Strand 1.3.3 Awarding of European prizes in the cultural field*

The programme awards cultural prizes in various fields: contemporary architecture, cultural heritage, pop music and contemporary literature. They highlight artists, works or cultural and artistic achievements, and seek to make these known beyond national borders, thereby encouraging mobility and exchanges. The organization, coordination and selection of the winners is entrusted to organizations selected through open calls for proposals. The prizes for European cultural heritage, pop music and literature are awarded on an annual basis, while the prize for contemporary architecture is awarded every two years.

The European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture aims at recognizing, promoting and developing artistic talent and excellent practices in the field of European contemporary architecture. Among the various rewards for architectural excellence, an award focusing on the specific and extraordinary role of architectural creation in Europe was missing, although this plays a leading role in the development of ideas and of architectural achievements.

The "European Border Breakers Award" aims to recognise and promote the diversity of European artistic talents as well as to highlight the main achievements in European pop music.

---

<sup>2</sup> This decision replaces Decision 1419/1999/EC amended by Decision 649/2005/EC, which governed this process until 31/12/2006

Europe has a rich and varied cultural heritage and it is therefore essential to make people more aware of the common elements of this heritage. In this context, the Culture Programme supports the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage, which aims to flagship initiatives and good practices, of local communities or of renowned organizations that contribute to protecting, to safeguarding, promoting and developing cultural heritage at European level.

The European Prize for Contemporary Literature has been developed to improve the visibility of European contemporary literary creation (fiction). This prize aims at filling this gap through the recognition and promotion of artistic talent and achievement in this field.

#### *Strand 1.3.4 Support to cooperation with international organisations*

This strand allows for cooperation with other international organizations, such as joint projects with the Council of Europe on the European Heritage Days and on the rehabilitation of cultural heritage in the Balkans continued in 2008 and conferences jointly supported with Presidencies of the European Union.

#### *Strand 2 Support for organizations active at European level in the field of culture*

The Programme provides support for bodies active in the cultural field at European level pursuing an aim of European interest. These bodies must present a real European dimension. In this regard, they must carry out their activities at European level, alone or in the form of various coordinated associations, and their structure (registered members) and activities must have a potential influence at European Union level or cover at least seven European countries. The expenditure related to the permanent work programme of such organisations can be supported through multi-annual framework agreements or annual operating grants and can be in the form of flat-rates. The maximum co-funding rate is 80%. Approximately 10 % of the total budget allocated to the Programme is devoted to this type of support.

The following categories are eligible:

- a) **Ambassadors:** organizations which, through their influence in the cultural field at European level, have a clear aptitude to be European “representatives” of European culture and, as such, can fulfill their role of European Cultural Ambassadors. The organizations must exist since at least two years and the activities must be carried out in at least seven eligible countries.
- b) **Advocacy networks:** Networks entrusted by the associated members of the network and which ensure a significant representation of specific category(ies) of cultural operators or the cultural fields at European level. The networks must exist since at least one year and have members from at least fifteen eligible countries. However if the networks are composed of organizations representing cultural operators at national level (such as national federations), the network shall reach a substantial representation in at least ten eligible countries.
- c) **Festivals:** organisations carrying out festival(s) which perform supranational activities with clear European added value and geographical outreach as well as broad European visibility covering at least seven eligible countries.

Festivals have to be renowned and recognized at European level and exist since at least five years.

- d) **Policy support** structures for the Culture agenda, further divided into two sub-categories:
- I. Structured dialogue platforms: Culture civil society platforms engaged in a structured dialogue with the Commission in the framework of the European agenda for culture, further to the call for expression of interest published by the Commission. Members of the platform must represent cultural operators in at least fifteen eligible countries.
  - II. Policy analysis groupings: Groupings of various types of private or public stakeholders which have direct and practical experience in the analysis, evaluation or impact assessment of cultural policies on one or more priorities linked to the European agenda for culture as defined by the Council. Groupings should gather members from at least three eligible countries.

*Strand 3 Support for analysis and dissemination activities*

This strand supports analysis and dissemination activities, which help to raise awareness of the Culture programme and its activities in various ways. Approximately 5 % of the total budget allocated to the Programme is devoted to this type of support.

*Strand 3.1 Support to Cultural Contact Points*

This strand co-finances cultural contact points (CCPs) in all participating countries. They are responsible for promoting the programme, facilitating the participation of as many cultural professionals as possible, ensuring an exchange of information with national cultural institutions, maintaining contact between the participants in the various Community programmes and a link with the other sources of information on the various Community programmes. The list of the current 34 CCPs is available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/doc1232\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/doc1232_en.htm). CCPs receive a global support of approximately 1.600.000 EUR per year.

*Strand 3.2 Support for analyses in the field of cultural co-operation and policy development*

This strand support studies and analysis to help improve understanding of European cultural co-operation and the conditions which help it to flourish. Subjects such as the mobility of cultural workers, the circulation of works of art and artistic and cultural products, and intercultural dialogue are of particular interest.

*Strand 3.3 Support for maximising the impact of projects in the field of cultural cooperation*

This strand supports the collection and dissemination of information on the various EU-funded cultural activities and projects, is intended to raise public awareness across the EU of this important field, and to ensure that projects have a maximum impact. In concrete terms it supports valorisation and information conferences, brochures and publications

## 5. ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES

The programme is open to:

- the 27 EU Member States;
- EFTA countries which are members of the EEA, in accordance with the provisions of the EEA Agreement (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway);
- the candidate countries benefiting from a pre-accession strategy for accession to the Union, in accordance with the general principles and with the general conditions and procedures for the participation of these countries in the Community programmes established in the framework agreements. These countries are Croatia, FYROM, Turkey and Serbia;
- the countries of the Western Balkans in accordance with the procedures defined with those countries following the framework agreements providing for their participation in Community programmes.
- other third countries which have concluded association or cooperation agreements with the Community which include cultural clauses, on the basis of supplementary appropriations .

## 6. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME

Depending on the strand concerned, the Programme is implemented by either the Commission directly or by delegation to the Executive Agency Education, Audiovisual and Culture which operates under the control of the Commission. The Executive Agency manages the multi-annual cooperation projects (strand 1.1), cooperation measures (strand 1.2), support for bodies active at European level in the field of culture (strand 2), the support for cooperation with and in third countries (under strand 1.3) and the support for Culture Contact Points. The Commission manages directly the majority of the "special actions", including the Prizes and the European Capitals of Culture and support for maximising the impact of projects in the field of cultural cooperation

The deadlines for submission of applications cover the entire period of the Programme and are scheduled as follows:

Action	Deadline for Submission	Publication selection results at latest	Starting date	Duration
Strand 1.1 Multi-annual Cooperation Projects	1 October	31 March of the following year	1 May of the following year	3 to 5 years
Strand 1.2.1 Cooperation Projects	1 October	31 March of the following year	1 May of the following year	Max. 24 months
Strand 1.2.2 Literary Translation Projects	1 February	31 July of the same year	1 September	Max. 24 months
Strand 1.3 Cultural Cooperation Projects with and in Third Countries*	1 May	30 September of the same year	1 November	Max. 24 months

*the selected third countries will be announced every year on the EACEA culture website				
Strand 2 Annual operating grant for organisations active at European level in the field of Culture: a) Ambassadors b) Advocacy Networks c) Festivals d) Policy support structures for the Culture Agenda	1 November	31 March of the following year	The budgetary year following the submission of the application	The budgetary year
Strand 2 Framework partnership (3 years) for organisations active at European level in the field of culture	1 November 2010	31 March 2011	The budgetary year 2011	The budgetary years 2011-2013

The results of these calls for proposals can be found under [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/calls-for-proposals/call1318\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/calls-for-proposals/call1318_en.htm) and [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/index\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/index_en.php)

### 6.1. Monitoring Provisions

The Commission, assisted by the Executive Agency ensures regular monitoring of the Programme against its objectives and takes its results into account in the programme implementation. The Executive Agency manages the assessment of interim and final project reports: on average and each year around 110 interim and final reports are due and processed by the Executive Agency. It also conducts monitoring visits and produces visit reports. 19 visits were conducted in 2008 and 60 are planned for 2009.

The following section shows the range of monitoring data available for 2008 selection rounds and shall enable the contractor to build its methodology. Less detailed information is currently available for first 2007 rounds, but consolidated monitoring data covering 2007-2009 will be available over the summer, once the selection 2009 is over.

#### *Monitoring data on 2008 selection rounds<sup>3</sup>*

2008 was the second year of implementation of the Programme period. The budgetary envelope for 2008 was approximately 45 Mio EUR. FYROM and Serbia joined the Programme in 2008, thereby becoming the 33<sup>rd</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> participating countries.

Out of a total of 819 applications received by the Executive Agency further to the calls for proposals launched in 2007, a total of 264 projects were selected for funding<sup>4</sup>, for an amount of around 42 Mio EUR. The average success rate across all strands of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Calls and application procedures already started in 2007

<sup>4</sup> For the statistical purposes of this section, the words "project" and "application" solely refer to activities under strands 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3 (third country cooperation only) and 2 of the Programme. The other strands concerning activities being carried out by a designated or pre-determined beneficiary or by beneficiaries selected on a multiannual basis.

Programme was 32%.<sup>5</sup> While one single country (Italy) accounts for 23% of all applications, the provenance of the remaining 77% is relatively evenly spread in geographical terms. After Italy, the highest number of applications came from Germany and France. Other countries such as Greece or Austria applied in proportionately high numbers relative to their size, which may reflect strong traditions in the field of cultural heritage and music respectively. Belgium also had a high level of applications due to the many European organisations supported under strand 2, which are based there. Conversely, it can be noted that fewer applications were submitted from some countries than one might expect on the basis of their size or cultural infrastructure, for example the UK and Ireland. Broadly speaking, the applications coming from those countries which joined the EU since 2004, although increasing, were still relatively low in number, with the exception of Slovenia, the Czech Republic and Bulgaria. This probably reflects the relatively weaker capacity of the cultural sector in some of the new member countries.

The same trend can be observed for selected projects. Although Italy was still the leading country with 12% of granted projects, the difference is less marked compared with the statistics on applications and overall the picture is rather encouraging in terms of spread across countries. Organisations from Germany, France, Belgium and most northern countries – countries with longer experience of the Programme - recorded a high success rate. Among the newer countries, Slovenia and Hungary had a higher than average level of success. There were no projects retained from Ireland, Malta and Serbia. The aggregate figures including both project leaders and co-organisers show that 1.333 organisations were involved in total in the Programme. The breakdown per country is rather encouraging as it demonstrates a reasonably balanced picture and that the Programme had a concrete impact on all participating countries, with only one exception, Liechtenstein.

Regarding the objectives addressed by the projects, of all selected applications 226 (47%) focused mainly on intercultural dialogue, 147 (30%) on the mobility of cultural professionals and 116 (24%) on the circulation of cultural works. Projects were selected from a broad array of sub-sectors and themes. In particular, 116 (27%) were concerned with literature, 100 (23%) with the performing arts, 63 (14%) had an interdisciplinary approach, 52 (12%) focused on cultural heritage, 46 (11%) on visual arts, 18 (4%) respectively on multimedia/new technologies and on design/applied arts, 16 (4%) concerned architecture and 6 (1%) had a particularly strong innovative and creative dimension. With regard to target groups, one third of selected projects were aimed at the general public. An analysis of the specific target groups reached indicates that, in addition to cultural specialists and artists, who are naturally the first two target groups with respectively 126 (19%) and 112 (17%) projects, there were also other key target groups.

## **7. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

The assignment is composed of two related work packages, based on requirements of art.13 of the Culture Programme Decision:

- WP1: Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme, covering the period 2007-2009.

---

<sup>5</sup> In comparison, in 2007 out of 816 applications, 188 projects were selected for a total budget of 39 Mio EUR. The average success rate was 23%.



- WP2: assistance on the Impact Assessment of the future Culture Programme (drafting of the online consultation and analysis of its answers).

The external evaluation conducted in WP1 will be used as basis for the Commission interim evaluation report on the results obtained and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the Programme. The Commission report shall be submitted to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions not later than 31 December 2010.

By the first semester 2011 the Commission shall submit to the other European institutions a draft proposal for the continuation of the Programme. The draft proposal will be accompanied by an Impact Assessment Report. An online consultation of stakeholders is foreseen in the second semester 2010 to support the Impact Assessment. External support is sought to prepare the consultation and analyse its results (WP2).

The evaluation shall include a forward-looking aspect and anticipate the information needs of decision makers and address also the high-level political objectives of the activity. Evaluation results shall have an appropriate scope and timeliness, in order to make a useful contribution to the related impact assessment and the proposal for the new programme.

This is a general evaluation that should cover all actions and geographic areas of the programme during the period 2007-2009 with an exemption of the European Capitals of Culture (ECOCs). The ECOCs are submitted to a separate annual evaluation. The contractor should make use of the available ECOCs evaluation covering 2007-2008 and should concentrate on complementarity between ECOCs and the rest of the Culture programme and effectiveness/efficiency of the budget allocated to ECOCs.

The contractor must make use of recent material relating to the Culture Programme. List of available studies and evaluations is provided in section 13.3.

## **8. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

The contractor must provide a synthetic description of the implementation of the programme, including a statistical analysis and general conclusions. The description should provide the necessary background and reference points for responding to the evaluation questions in the next sub-section. It should also provide concise individual descriptions of all actions under the programme according to an agreed common format, covering their organisation, implementation, and any other relevant aspects.

### **8.1. Evaluation questions**

The contractor must provide answers to the evaluation questions listed below. The contractor will be called upon to use their knowledge and experience to refine and elaborate these questions and, where appropriate, propose others to the Commission with the aim of improving the focus of this ex-post evaluation. The contractor should note that the sub-questions proposed under some of the evaluation questions do not necessarily cover the entire aspect of the questions concerned. In fact, the sub-questions normally cover only very specific aspects of a given question. They deal with issues the Commission is particularly interested in and which the contractor therefore should address, in addition to any other issues which the evaluator may see as requiring attention in the case of each evaluation question.

With respect to each of the evaluation questions, the evaluation is expected to provide concrete recommendations on how a new Culture programme (after 2013) can address deficiencies and gaps in terms of geographical and sectoral coverage represented in the programme, maximise its relevance and impact and successfully exploit examples of good practice.

#### *8.1.1. Relevance*

- (1) To what extent have the programme's general, specific and operational objectives proved relevant?
- (2) To what extent can the programme be said to be relevant to the objectives of the Agenda for Culture (which was adopted after the entry into force of the Programme)?
- (3) To what extent have the different programme strands been complementary to each other and matched users need?
- (4) To what extent has the programme proved complementary to other Community initiatives in the field of culture – such as ECOCs (which are regulated by a separate Decision) and mobility pilot projects -, as well as to Community initiatives in the field of education, media, citizenship and youth?
- (5) What is the Community added value of the programme?
- (6) To what extent has the programme proved relevant to promoting the diversity of cultures and languages in Europe?

#### *8.1.2. Effectiveness*

- (7) To what extent can the programme be said to have contributed to the achievement of the objectives of the Agenda for Culture (which was adopted after the entry into force of the Programme)?
- (8) To what extent can the programme be said to have contributed to the achievement of the policy objectives of the Annual Management Plan of DGEAC for cultural activities?<sup>6</sup> Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the programme?
- (9) To what extent can the programme be said to have contributed to the objectives of the European Year for Intercultural Dialogue (2008) and for

---

<sup>6</sup> The AMP objectives are: 1. Create a supportive environment for artistic creation and cultural works/operators with a view to promoting cultural diversity, and creating jobs and economic growth; 2. Support European cultural cooperation by promoting intercultural artistic creation, new professional pathways for artists, increasing the circulation of cultural works throughout Europe as well as the audiences for non-national European works, with a view to promoting cultural diversity enhancing intercultural dialogue, and promoting a sense of European citizenship. 3. Promote the systematic integration of the cultural dimension in all external and development policies and programmes, and develop political dialogue and cultural exchanges with 3rd countries, with a view to integrating the cultural dimension as a vital element in the EU's international relations.

Creativity and Innovation (2009)? Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the programme?

- (10) To what extent has the programme contributed to the mobility of artists and cultural workers? Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the programme?
- (11) To what extent has the programme contributed to the circulation of cultural works? Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the programme?
- (12) To what extent has the programme supported intercultural dialogue? Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the programme?
- (13) Does participation in the programme appear satisfactory in giving equal opportunities to men and women, to disabled people and to those at disadvantage from a socio-economic point of view? Could any particular points of improvement be identified?
- (14) Does participation in the programme appear satisfactory in terms of representation of different cultural sectors and categories of actors?
- (15) Does participation in the programme appear satisfactory in terms of geographical coverage, within the EU and with third countries?
- (16) To what extent does the programme seem to be influencing national legislation or policy on issues relevant for cultural policies and international co-operation, etc.?
- (17) To what extent has the programme contributed to promoting the diversity of cultures and languages in Europe?

#### *8.1.3. Efficiency*

- (18) Is the size of budget for the programme appropriate and proportional to what the programme is set out to achieve? Is it sufficient for reaching a critical mass of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided better cost-effectiveness?

#### *8.1.4. Sustainability*

- (19) Which of the current activities or elements of the programme would be likely to continue and in which form if Community support was withdrawn or substantially decreased?
- (20) To what extent have the results of the actions been properly disseminated to stakeholders and the public? What is their exploitable potential, and to what extent can one say that this potential has been fully exploited?

## 9. OTHER TASKS UNDER THE ASSIGNMENT

### 9.1.1. Programme monitoring

On the basis of the experience gained from the implementation of the programme, the Contractor should propose a practical approach for the monitoring of the future Culture Programme 2013-2017. Consideration should also be given to the information needs of the Commission and the Agency to support the execution of their main tasks. Furthermore, the existing monitoring arrangements and the needs of future evaluations should be taken into account.

The proposed approach must include, as a minimum:

- An analysis of the need for monitoring information.
- Indicators (and their relationship to relevant objectives and targets). The criteria used for selecting the indicators should be specified.
- Data sources.
- Procedures for data gathering (including frequency).
- Structuring and analysis of data, including reporting.
- Relevant IT support tools.
- Organisation, and workload of Commission and Agency staff (overall + per indicator).

The proposed approach must be realistic, e.g. it could basically not require additional human resources in the Commission and the Agency, and it should be possible to implement in a period of 6-9 months. It is expected that a trade-off will have to be made between perfection and feasibility. If the proposed approach would have to leave any open issues, concrete advice must be provided to the Commission on how to deal with these issues.

### 9.1.2. Evaluation follow-up

The Contractor should:

- Provide a one-page statement about the validity of the evaluation results, i.e. to what extent it has been possible to provide reliable statements on all essential aspects of the Community intervention examined. Issues to be referred to may include scoping of the evaluation exercise, availability of data, unexpected problems encountered in the evaluation process, proportionality between budget and objectives of the assignment, etc.
- Make a proposal for the dissemination of the evaluation results, on the basis of the draft Dissemination Plan annexed to these Terms of Reference.

Upon request by the Commission, the contractor will be required to make two presentations of the results of WP1 and two presentations of the results of WP2 to the representatives of Member States and/or to other stakeholders.

### *9.1.3. Impact assessment of the future Culture programme: support for the online consultation – Work Package WP 2*

In the second semester of 2010 the Commission will launch an online consultation to support the impact assessment of the future Culture programme. The contractor is expected to:

- Assist the Commission in drafting questions for the online consultation
- Analyse the contributions submitted through the online consultation and draft the final consultation report.

## **10. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES**

### **10.1. General reporting requirements**

Provisions laid down in this chapter apply to inception, interim and final reports of each work package (WP1 and WP2).

Each report (except the final version of the Final Report) should have an **introductory page** providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document, on the one hand, have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and on the other hand, represent progress of the evaluation work with reference to the work plan.

All reports must be drafted in English and submitted according to the timetable below to the responsible body. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format. Additionally, the Final Reports of work packages 1 and 2 must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format and in 5 hard copies.

#### *10.1.1. Inception Report*

The report should detail how the methodology proposed by the Contractor is going to be implemented in the light of an examination of the quality and appropriateness of existing data.

For Work Package WP2 the inception report shall also include draft questions for the online consultation of stakeholders on the new Culture programme.

#### *10.1.2. Interim Report*

The report is to be produced after the desk and field research has been completed, and shall, to the extent possible, include preliminary conclusions. It shall not exceed 30 pages, annexes excluded.

For Work Package WP2, the interim report shall include the methodology to assess the responses to the online consultation and an overview of first consultation findings.

#### *10.1.3. Draft Final Report*

This document should deliver the results of all tasks covered by these Terms of Reference, and must be clear enough to understand for any potential reader.

The structure of the report should follow a broad classification into three parts:

- **Executive summary:** It sets out, in no more than 7 pages, a summary of the evaluation's main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them. It should include a ½ page summary statement on the main evaluation issues covered by the evaluation (i.e. one or two sentences per evaluation issue).
- **Main report:** The main report must be limited to a maximum of **75** pages, and present in full the results of the analyses, the conclusions, and the recommendations arising from the evaluation. It must also contain a description of the subject evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (with an analysis of the latter's strengths and weaknesses).
- **Annexes:** These must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include the Terms of Reference, questionnaire templates, interview guides, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

For Work Package WP2 the final report shall include a full report and an executive summary of the analysis of the online consultation.

#### *10.1.4. Final Report*

The Final Report follows in principle the same format as the draft Final Report. Furthermore, the Executive Summary should be translated into French and German by a professional translation agency, once it has been approved by the responsible body.

The document must take into account the results of the quality assessment of the draft Final Report, and the relevant discussions with the Steering Group insofar as these do not interfere with the independence of the Contractor in respect of the conclusions they have reached and the recommendations made.

The contracting authority will publish the Final Report, the Executive Summary and the annexes on the World-Wide Web.

## **11. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET**

### **11.1. Organisation**

The contract will be managed by Unit C2 of the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture.

A Steering Group will be involved in the management of the evaluation. The responsibilities of the Steering Group will include:

- providing the Contractor with access to information;
- supporting and monitoring the work of the Contractor;
- assessing the quality of the reports submitted by the Contractor;
- ensuring that the monitoring and supervision of the evaluation work does not compromise the Contractor's independence.

## 11.2. Meetings

It is expected that the contractor participate in 6 meetings in Brussels with the evaluation Steering Group. For these meetings, minutes should be drafted and provided by the Contractor within 5 working days, to be agreed among the participants and approved and signed by the chair person, who will be appointed from Unit EAC/R2.

## 11.3. Timetable

The indicative starting date is **1 June 2009**. The contract will start after both parties have signed it. The period of execution of the contract is **19 months**.

The following indicative timetable is envisaged:

Deadline (from starting date)	Task
After 30 days	Contractor submits <b>WP1 inception report</b> to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
Middle of month 6	Desk and field research: at least 60% completion. Contractor submits <b>WP1 interim report</b> on the Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
Middle of month 11	Desk and field research completed. Analysis and drafting completed. Contractor submits <b>WP1 draft final report</b> , to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
End of month 12	Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits <b>WP1 final report and executive summary</b> to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
End of month 12	Contractor submits <b>WP2 inception report</b> to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
Middle of month 15	Contractor submits <b>WP2 interim report</b> to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.

Middle of month 17	<p>Analysis of the online consultation within the impact assessment of the new Culture Programme completed.</p> <p>Contractor submits <b>WP2 draft final report</b>, to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.</p>
End of month 18	<p>Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits <b>WP2 final report and executive summary</b> to Steering Group. At least one Steering Group meeting will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.</p>

#### 11.4. Budget

The estimated maximum budget for the two work packages, covering all the results to be achieved by the contractor as listed in sections 2 and 3 above, is **EUR 220 000**.

## 12. REQUIREMENTS

### 12.1. Methodology

The contractor will have a free choice as to the methods used to gather and analyse information and for making the assessment, but must take account of the following:

- The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques.
- The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions can be further elaborated, e.g. by providing operational sub-questions under each question.
- Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis phase of the evaluation. In addressing the evaluation questions, quantitative indicators should be sought and used as far as possible. The contractor must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be given.
- It is not expected that all individual projects financed by the programme be assessed, but the sample of projects examined should be drawn up in a manner suitable for each evaluation question addressed, and should be such as to enable the evaluators to draw general conclusions on the actions.

### 12.2. Resources

The Contractor shall ensure that experts are adequately supported and equipped. In particular, sufficient administrative, secretarial, and interpreting resources as well as



junior experts must be available to enable senior experts to concentrate on their core evaluation tasks.

### **13. REFERENCES**

#### **13.1. Programme documents**

The following information will be made available to the contractor in the inception phase.

- Culture Programme activity report 2008<sup>7</sup>
- Implementation of the Culture Programme. Annual Workplan 2007, 2008 and 2009
- DGEAC Annual Management Plan 2007, 2008 and 2009
- List of selected projects 2007-2009
- List of all organisations involved in selected projects
- Contact details of co-ordinators of projects
- Selected proposals
- Expert assessment manuals
- Expert assessments of selected proposals
- Progress and final reports submitted by projects
- Mission reports to projects

#### **13.2. Reference documents**

Knowledge of the following documents is required for the tender.

- Culture Programme Guide (2007-2013)
- The policy documents referred to under section 1

All information can be found on the following websites:

[http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index_en.htm)

#### **13.3. Background documents**

The contractor should be acquainted with the results of the following studies and evaluations:

---

<sup>7</sup> §The Culture Programme Activity Report 2009 will be available in September 2009.

### *13.3.1. Studies*

- Feasibility study for a European wide system of information on the different legal, regulatory, procedural and financial aspects to mobility in the cultural sector
- "Mobility Matters": Programmes and Schemes to Support the Mobility of Artists and Cultural Professionals in Europe
- "Sharing diversity": National approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe
- The economy of culture in Europe
- Culture and education. Study concerning an inventory of the best practices linking culture with education
- Mobility and free movement
- Eurobarometer survey. Quantitative Eurobarometer study on the Europeans, culture and cultural values
- Study on the contribution of culture to creativity
- Study on the entrepreneurial dimension of cultural and creative industries
- Study on the contribution of culture to local and regional economic development as part of European regional policy”

These studies are available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc537\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc537_en.htm)

### *13.3.2. Evaluations*

- ECOCs 2007-2008 external evaluation (on-going, by Ecotec)
- Interim external evaluation of the Cultural Contact Points (CCPs) (2008)
- Final external evaluation of the Culture 2000 Programme (2008)
- Report from the Commission on the implementation of the Culture 2000 programme (2008)
- Final external evaluation of the Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture (2008)
- Report from the Commission on the implementation of the Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of Culture (2008)
- Second external evaluation of the Culture 2000 Programme (2006)
- Report of the Commission on the second external evaluation of the Culture 2000 Programme (2006)
- Mid-term evaluation of the Culture 2000 Programme (2003)

These evaluations are available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc539\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc539_en.htm)

Contact:

Patrizia BARALLI, Telephone:94633, [patrizia.baralli@ec.europa.eu](mailto:patrizia.baralli@ec.europa.eu)

## DG EAC

### Dissemination plan for evaluation results

Evaluation: Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme (Work Package –WP 1) and support for the impact assessment of the future programme on Culture (Work Package –WP 2)

Responsible Unit: C.2

1. Document/ Contents	2. Target group	3. Requirement	4. Dissemination channel	5. Translations	6. Budgetary implication	7. Dissemination tasks of the evaluator	8. Deadline	9. Comments/ specifications
Complete final report on the Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme, covering the period 2007-2009 (WPI)	DG EAC	Decision 1855/2006/EC amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC	E mail	EN	N/A	N/A	30/06/2010	N/A
Complete final report on the Interim evaluation of the Culture Programme, covering the period 2007-2009 (WPI)	National authorities	EAC Evaluation and IA charter	E mail, presentation in committee meetings	EN	N/A	N/A	30/06/2010	
Executive summary of the report (WPI)	Public EAC management National authorities	EAC evaluation policy	Internet email	EN,FR,DE	budget included in the evaluation as such	N/A	30/06/2010	
Complete final evaluation report (WPI)	Public	EAC Evaluation and IA charter	Internet	EN	N/A	N/A	30/06/2010	
Action plan	DG EAC management	EAC Evaluation and IA charter	According to procedure	N/A	N/A	N/A	31/08/2010	
Commission Report on the	European Parliament,	Decision 1855/2006/EC	According to procedure	EU Official languages	N/A	N/A	31/12/2010	

## DG EAC

interim evaluation of the Culture Programme 2007-2009	Council, Committee of the Regions	amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC								
Complete final report on the online consultation for the future Culture programme, in the framework of the Impact Assessment (WP2)	DG EAC	Decision 1855/2006/EC amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC	E mail	EN	N/A	N/A	N/A	31/01/2011	N/A	
Executive summary of the report (WP2)	Public EAC management	EAC evaluation policy	Internet	EN,FR,DE	budget included in the evaluation as such	N/A	N/A	31/01/2011		
Complete final evaluation report	Public	EAC Evaluation and IA charter	Internet	EN	N/A	N/A	N/A	31/01/2011		
Complete final report on the online consultation for the future Culture programme, in the framework of the Impact Assessment (WP2)	National authorities	EAC Evaluation and IA charter	E mail, presentation in committee meetings	EN	N/A	N/A	N/A	31/03/2010		
Commission Staff Working Paper on the results of the online consultation for the future Culture programme	European Parliament, Council, Committee of the Regions	Decision 1855/2006/EC amended by Decision 1352/2008/EC	According to procedure	EN	N/A	N/A	N/A	30/07/2011		It will be an annex to the IA report accompanying the Commission Proposal for the future Culture Programme

## **Annex Two: Interviews undertaken**

## Annex Two Interviews undertaken

**Table A.2.1: Direct beneficiaries of the programme**

Name	Organisation
<b>Cultural operators involved in multi-annual co-operation projects (Strand 1.1)</b>	
Marie-Christine Baratta	Danceweb - Verein Zur Forderung Des Internationalen Kulturaustausches Im Bereich Der Darstellenden Kunste
Alexandra Büchler	Literature Across Frontiers Mercator Institute for Media, Languages and Culture Aberystwyth University
Lamberto Caccioli	Integra - Fusing music and technology Birmingham Conservatoire, Birmingham City University
Gerhard Eckhel	University of Graz, Austria (Partner to Integra II)
Silvia Gstrein	Universität Innsbruck
Alenka Kavčič-Čolić	National and University Library
Krista Kiisa	National Library of Estonia
Manuel París	Cofradia De Pescadores De Lira
Daniela Pařízková	The Arts Institute-Theatre Institute Prague
Sorrel Hershberg	Frieze Foundation
Filipa Oliveira	Arte Contempo
Simon Rees	CAC Vilnius
Kamma Siegumfeldt	Dance Info Denmark
Ine Therese Berg	Dance Information Norway
<b>Cultural operators involved in co-operation projects (Strand 1.2.1)</b>	
Sophia Antoniadou	Pierides Foundation
Miranda Bird	Erocco
Jelka Ciglencečki	Studentska Zalozba
Joachim Declerck	Centre for Architectural Research & Development (CARD), Berlage Institute
Heidi Giebel	European Theatre Convention
Gemma Jelier	Stichting Moderne Dans En Beweging
Péter Jónás	Gardonyi Geza Szinhaz

Name	Organisation
Veronika Leiner	Eurozine - Gesellschaft Zur Vernetzung Von Kulturmedien Mbh
Cosetta Nicolini	Societas Raffaello Sanzio
Raisa Niemi	Lasispalatsi Media Centre Ltd
Heleni Porfyriou	Institute for the Conservation and Valorization of Cultural Heritage (ICVBC)
Paul Russ	DANCE4
Martin Solotruk	Studentska Zalozba
Katerina Tlachova	Moravian Gallery In Brno
Donatella Tomadini	Regione Veneto
David Woollcombe	Peace Child International
Caroline Marcilhac	Avignon Festival
Catalina Nagy	Fundación Albeniz
Álvaro Guibert	Fundación Albeniz
Anna Krohn	Sibelius Academy
Dr. Alison Rooke	Centre for Urban and Community Research Goldsmiths, University of London
Rudolf Netzelmann	Urban Dialogues
Milkana Lazarova	Atelier for free Association
Claudia Cootrer	Fondazione RomaEuropa
Virgninija Vitkiene	Kaunas Artists Support Fund
Paola Re	Arte&Arte
<b>Publishing houses (Strand 1.2.2)</b>	
Cameron Allen	Vagabond Voices
Emilia Lodigiani	Iperborea
Jonathan Landgrebe	Suhrkamp



Name	Organisation
Lidia Pitek	Didakta
Peter Varadip	Hermattan
Raymond Wagenstein	Colibri
<b>Cultural operators involved in co-operation with third countries (Strand 1.3.1)</b>	
Filip Aiello	(Partner of) Border Crossing
Afif Riahi	Association Echos Electriques
Spomenka Stimec	Kroata Esperanto-Ligo
Michael Walling	Border Crossing
Zhao Daying	National Library of China
Alastair Morrison	The British Library
Thierry Delcourt	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Bertram Müller	Tanzhaus nrw
Isabell Kümpel	Tanzhaus nrw
Karene Lyngholm	Dansens Hus Oslo
Francesc Casadesus	Mercat de les Flors
<b>Bodies active at European level (Strand 2)</b>	
Justine Bryer / Kim Sargeant	European Youth Orchestra (Ambassador)
Jan Connix	European Music Festival for Young People (Festival)
Mathis Huber	Steirische Kulturveranstaltungen Gmbh (Festival)
Ilona Kish	European Forum For the Arts and Heritage (Advocacy network)
Birgitta Persson	Trans Europe Halles Coordination Office / Mejeriet Stora Södergatan 64 (Advocacy Network)
Martin Prchal	Association of European Conservatoires (Advocacy Network)
Linda Stenholt Jensen	Swinging Europe – The European Jazz Orchestra (Ambassador)

Name	Organisation
Ilona Kish	Cultural Action Europe (CAE)
Philippe Le Moine	Avignon Festival

**Table A.2.2: Programme implementation bodies**

Name	Organisation
<b>Awarding organisations</b>	
Sneska Quadedvlieg Milhailovic	Europa Nostra
<b>DG EAC officials</b>	
Ann Branch	DG EAC, Head of Unit, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Sylvain Pasqua	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture policy and intercultural dialogue (Unit C1)
Sheamus Cassidy	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Cecilie Cave	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Antonio Farrauto	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Jean-Philippe Gammel	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Alessandro Senesi	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
Diego Marani	European Commission DG Education and Culture, Multilingualism policy (Unit C5)
Sheamus Cassidy	DG EAC, Culture programme and actions (Unit C2)
<b>Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) officials</b>	
Naomie Fabregue	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
Katharina Riediger	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
Marie-Luce Vissol	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
<b>Cultural Contact Points</b>	
Elisabeth Pacher	Ministry for Education, Arts and Culture (Austria)
Gudrun Heymans	Flemish Ministry of Culture, Youth, Sport and Media (Belgium (FL))
Eleftherios Loizou	Larnaca District Development Agency (Cyprus)

Name	Organisation
Anja Jelavić	Ministry of Culture, Directorate for the International Cultural Cooperation (Croatia)
Eva Zákova	Arts Institute - Theatre Institute (Czech Republic)
Marie Husted Dam	The Danish Arts Agency (Denmark)
Marion Ründal	Estonian Theatre Agency (Estonia)
Silja Hakulinen	Centre for International Mobility CIMO (Finland)
Barbara Lázár	KultúrPont Iroda (Hungary)
Rosa B. Thorsteinsdottir	Cultural Contact Point Iceland (Iceland)
Katie Lowry	The Arts Council (Ireland)
Laura Turlaja	Ministry of Culture (Latvia)
Milda Laužikaitė	International Culture Programmes Centre (Lithuania)
Marie-Ange Schimmer	Agence luxembourgeoise d'action culturelle (Luxembourg)
Astrid Bjerke	Arts Council (Norway)
Nuno de Faria	GPEARl - Ministério da Cultura (Portugal)
Bianca Floarea	The Consultancy Centre for European Cultural Programmes (Romania)
Zorana Dojić	Center for Study in Cultural Development (Serbia)
Natalia Cehlariková	Theatre Institute (Slovakia)
Mateja Lazar	SCCA, Centre for Contemporary Arts (Slovenia, Ljubljana)
Augusto Paramio Nieto	Ministerio de Cultura (Spain)
Monica Lindqvist	Cultural activities and literature, Swedish Art Council (Sweden)
Hale Ural	Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Turkey)
Geoffrey Brown	EUCLID (UK)

**Table A.2.3: Other Stakeholders**

Name	Organisation
<b>Member State experts involved on the various OMC working groups</b>	
Risto Kivela	Chair of the OMC working group for mobility of artists and other professionals in the cultural field
<b>Sector stakeholders</b>	
Céline D'Ambrosio	Federation of European Publishers
Martin De Haan	European Council of Literary Translators Associations (CEATL)
Sabine Frank	Rainbow Platform
Mercedes Giovinazzo	President of the Platform "Access to Culture"
Jean-Marc Leclerc	European Music Office
Jean-Francois Michel	European Music Office
Yvette Masson Zanussi	President of the Platform "Potential of Cultural Creative Industries."
Dulce Maria Cardoso	Writer, EU literature prize winner
Diane Grey	Fundacio Mies van der Rohe, organiser of the architecture award
Peter Smidt	Buma Cultur, organiser of the EBBA awards

## **Annex Three: On-line survey questionnaires**

# Annex Three On-line survey questionnaires

Two surveys were undertaken:

- Survey of co-operation projects and organisations active at European level (Strands 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1 and 2)
- Survey of publishers and publishing houses receiving support for literary translations (Strand 1.2.2)

A number of questions were common to both surveys, including those relating to the application process, the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, project reporting, and programme publicity & dissemination (Q42-65). These followed questions specific to each survey: Q1-41 in the first survey and Q1-24 in the second survey. (There were no questions numbered 25-41 for the second survey.)

**Table A.3.1: Survey of co-operation projects and organisations active at European level (Strands 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1 and 2)**

Question Numbers	Section 1: Respondent Details	Question
1	Under which strand of the Culture Programme was your project funded?	Strand 1.1: Multi-annual co-operation agreement projects; Strand 1.2.1 Co-operation projects; Strand 1.2.2. Literary Translation Projects; Strand 1.3.1 Cultural Co-operation Projects with Third Countries; Strand 2 – Ambassadors; Strand 2 – Advocacy Networks; Strand 2 – Festivals; Strand 2 – Policy Support Structures; Don't know.
2	The name of your organisation	
3	The type of your organisation	Public cultural organisation; non-profit-making cultural association; private company in the cultural sector; other private company; other.
4	The size of your organisation	<11 employees; 11-50 employees; 51-250 employees; 251-500 employees; more than 500 employees; don't know.
5	Cultural Sector of your organisation	Cultural Heritage; Performing Arts; Visual arts; Audio-visual; Literature, Books and Reading; Architecture; Design, Applied Arts; Interdisciplinary; Other (please specify)

Question Numbers	Section 1: Respondent Details	Question
6	Country of your organisation (or your location if the organisation is based in more than one country)	AT Austria; BE Belgium; BG Bulgaria; CY Cyprus; CZ Czech Republic; DE Germany; DK Denmark; EE Estonia; ES Spain; FI Finland; FR France; GR Greece; HR Croatia; HU Hungary; IE Ireland; IS Iceland; IT Italy; LI Liechtenstein; LT Lithuania; LU Luxembourg; LV Latvia; ME Montenegro; MK Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; MT Malta; NL the Netherlands; NO Norway; PL Poland; PT Portugal; RO Romania; RS Serbia; SE Sweden; SI Slovenia; SK Slovakia; TR Turkey; United Kingdom; Other (please state)
7	Was your organisation involved in projects/activities funded under the previous programme (Culture 2000) or the Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture?	Yes – as Project Co-ordinator; Yes – as Project Co-organiser; Yes – as an Associated Partner; Yes – other role; No; Don't know.
8	What roles has your organisation played in your current project/activity funded by the Culture Programme (2007-13)?	Project Co-ordinator; Project Co-organiser; Associated Partner; other role; Don't know.
<b>Section 2: Objectives and activities of your project/activity</b>		
9	To what extent did your project/activity pursue the following objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the transnational mobility of cultural players</li> </ul>	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
10	To what extent did your project/activity pursue the following objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the transnational circulation of works and cultural and artistic products</li> </ul>	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
11	To what extent did your project/activity pursue the following objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage intercultural dialogue</li> </ul>	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.

	Section 2: Objectives and activities of your project/activity	
12	What activities has your project undertaken in support of the mobility of cultural operators?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for artists / cultural operators in residence or touring</li> <li>• Information, advice and practical support in respect of mobility (e.g. on regulatory issues, visas, funding opportunities)</li> <li>• Education, training and research supporting the mobility of cultural operators</li> <li>1 Other – please specify</li> </ul>
13	What activities has your project undertaken to encourage the transnational circulation of works and cultural and artistic products?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information and advice in respect of circulation of cultural works (e.g. on regulatory issues, funding opportunities)</li> <li>• Transnational exchange of artefacts</li> <li>• Co-production of works of art, exhibitions, performances, touring, etc.</li> <li>• Transnational promotion of cultural and artistic works and products</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>
14	What activities has your project undertaken to encourage intercultural dialogue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational and research activities related to intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Creating concrete opportunities for people of different cultures to interact (events, meeting places, etc.)</li> <li>• Creating virtual spaces for people of different cultures to interact (e.g. on-line forums)</li> <li>• Improving access to cultural activities for all sections of the community</li> <li>• Development of policies and strategies related to intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Promotional, communication and media activities in support of intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>



	Section 2: Objectives and activities of your project/activity	
15	What activities has your project undertaken in support of cultural and linguistic diversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Production of cultural works and literature in different languages</li> <li>• Translation of art and literature into other languages</li> <li>• Production of materials in different languages</li> <li>• Promotional, communication and media activities in support of linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Educational and research activities related to cultural and linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>
16	Has your project specifically promoted equal opportunities for men and women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - specific activities to promote equal opportunities</li> <li>• Yes - guidance on equal opportunities</li> <li>• No specific activity</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>
17	Has your project specifically promoted opportunities for disadvantaged people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - People with a disability</li> <li>• Yes - People suffering socio-economic disadvantage</li> <li>• Yes - Ethnic minorities</li> <li>• Yes – Other (please specify)</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>
18	Has your project/activity contributed to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project/activities obtained the logo of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008</li> <li>• Activities were relevant to the objectives of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008</li> <li>• No specific contribution</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>
19	Has your project contributed to the European Year of Creativity and Innovation 2009?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project/activities obtained the logo of the European Year of Creativity and Innovation 2009</li> <li>• Activities were relevant to the objectives of the European Year of Creativity and Innovation 2009</li> <li>• No specific contribution</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>

	Section 3: Opinion of impact	
20	To what extent has your project/activity been effective in promoting the transnational mobility of cultural operators?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know; Mobility was not an objective of the project
21	Within your project, what has proved most effective in promoting the mobility of cultural operators?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for artists / cultural operators in residence or touring</li> <li>• Information, advice and practical support in respect of mobility (e.g. on regulatory issues, visas, funding opportunities)</li> <li>• Education, training and research supporting the mobility of cultural operators</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>
22	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in promoting the mobility of cultural operators?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Legal/fiscal barriers (e.g. visas)</li> <li>• Lack of information</li> <li>• Language barriers</li> <li>• Lack of co-operation / trust between partners</li> <li>• Difficulties in identifying appropriate partners</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>
23	To what extent has your project/activity been successful in encouraging the transnational circulation of cultural and artistic products?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know; Transnational circulation of cultural and artistic products was not an objective of the project
24	Within your project, what has proved most effective in promoting the transnational circulation of cultural and artistic products?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information and advice in respect of circulation of cultural works (e.g. on regulatory issues, funding opportunities)</li> <li>• Transnational exchange of artefacts</li> <li>• Co-production of works of art, exhibitions, performances, touring, etc.</li> <li>• Transnational promotion of cultural and artistic works and products</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>

	Section 3: Opinion of impact	
25	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in promoting the transnational circulation of cultural and artistic products?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Legal/fiscal barriers</li> <li>• Lack of information</li> <li>• Language barriers</li> <li>• Lack of co-operation / trust between partners</li> <li>• Difficulties in identifying appropriate partners</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>
26	To what extent has your project/activity encouraged intercultural dialogue?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know; Intercultural dialogue was not an objective of the project
27	Within your project, what has proved most effective in promoting intercultural dialogue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational and research activities related to intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Creating concrete opportunities for people of different cultures to interact (events, meeting places, etc.)</li> <li>• Creating virtual spaces for people of different cultures to interact (e.g. on-line forums)</li> <li>• Improving access to cultural activities for all sections of the community</li> <li>• Development of policies and strategies related to intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Promotional, communication and media activities in support of intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>
28	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in promoting intercultural dialogue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulties in defining or understanding Intercultural dialogue</li> <li>• Difficulties in identifying appropriate partners</li> <li>• Lack of co-operation / trust between partners</li> <li>• Difficulties in involving citizens and in reaching a wide audience</li> <li>• Language and cultural barriers</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>

	Section 3: Opinion of impact	
29	To what extent has your project/activity promoted cultural and linguistic diversity?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know; Cultural and linguistic diversity was not an objective of the project
30	Within your project, what has proved most effective in promoting cultural and linguistic diversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Production of cultural works and literature in different languages</li> <li>• Translation of art and literature into other languages</li> <li>• Production of materials in different languages</li> <li>• Promotional, communication and media activities in support of linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Educational and research activities related to cultural and linguistic diversity</li> <li>• Other – please specify</li> </ul>
31	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in promoting cultural and linguistic diversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language barriers</li> <li>• Lack of co-operation / trust between partners</li> <li>• Difficulties in identifying appropriate partners</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>
32	To what extent has your project/activity been successful in promoting equal opportunities?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know; Equal opportunities was not an objective of the project.
33	Within your project, what has proved most effective in promoting equal opportunities?	
34	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in promoting equal opportunities?	
35	To what extent has your project/activity improved the capacity for cultural operators to engage in transnational co-operation projects?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
36	To what extent has your project/activity produced new artistic or cultural works or events of a very high quality?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.

<b>Section 3: Opinion of impact</b>		
37	To what extent has your project/activity produced a strong and enduring partnership between co-ordinator and co-organisers?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
38	To what extent has your project/activity increased the European outlook of your organisation?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
39	To what extent has your project/activity increased the European outlook of cultural operators, artists and audiences?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
40	To what extent has your project/activity successfully disseminated its results and achievements?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
41	To what extent will the activities continue beyond the life of EU funding?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
<b>Section 4: Project Application Process</b>		
42	What was the quality of the information about the Culture Programme provided on the Europa website?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
43	What was the quality of the information contained in the programme guide?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
44	Was the application process clear?	Very clear; quite clear; unclear; Don't know.
45	What was the quality of the feedback on your application?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Not provided; Don't know.
46	Do you have any other comments about the project application process?	
47	Did you know that there is a national Cultural Contact Point in your country?	Yes; No
48	What was the quality of the information about the Culture Programme provided on the website of your national Cultural Contact Point?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
49	Did you seek any advice or guidance from your Cultural Contact Point while completing your application?	Yes - for information about the programme; Yes - for partner search; Yes – for help in completing the application form; Yes – other help; No; Don't know.

<b>Section 4: Project Application Process</b>		
50	If yes, what was the quality of the advice and guidance you received?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
51	Do you have any other comments about your national Cultural Contact Point?	
<b>Section 5: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency</b>		
52	During the selection process, did you have a contact at the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency you could contact for support, advice and guidance?	Yes; No; Don't know.
53	How would you rate the quality of the support, advice and guidance you received?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
54	Do you have any comments and suggestions to improve communications between the Executive Agency and applicants / projects?	
<b>Section 6: Project Reporting</b>		
55	Have you produced an interim or final project report for the European Executive Agency?	Yes; No; Don't know.
56	How would you rate the quality of the report templates?	Easy; acceptable; Not easy; Don't know.
57	Was any guidance provided on how to complete the interim or final report?	Yes; No; Don't know.
58	If yes, how useful was the guidance?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
59	Do you have any comments and suggestions to improve the guidance for interim and final reports?	

<b>Section 7: Programme Publicity &amp; Dissemination</b>		
60	How did you first find out about the Culture Programme?	Directorate General for Education and Culture website; Cultural Contact Point website; Education Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) website; From colleague ; From other organisation / partner; From information event; From Directorate General Education and Culture newsletter; From other publication; Other
61	How would you rate the activities of the Executive Agency to disseminate the achievements of the Culture Programme?	Good; acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
62	Please explain your response. For example, what dissemination activities are you aware of and how would you rate them?	
63	How would you rate the visibility of the Culture Programme in your country	Good; acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
64	Overall, what is your feeling about the opinions of cultural operators in your country about the Culture Programme?	Positive; Neutral; Negative; Don't know
65	Please explain your response.	
<b>Thank-you for participating</b>		

**Table A.2.1: Survey of publishers and publishing houses receiving support for literary translations (Strand 1.2.2)**

On-line Numbers	Section 1: Respondent Details	Question
1	Under which strand of the Culture Programme was your project funded?	Strand 1.1: Multi-annual co-operation agreement projects; Strand 1.2.1 Co-operation projects; Strand 1.2.2. Literary Translation Projects; Strand 1.3.1 Cultural Co-operation Projects with Third Countries; Strand 2 – Ambassadors; Strand 2 – Advocacy Networks; Strand 2 – Festivals; Strand 2 – Policy Support Structures; Don't know.
2	The name of your organisation	
3	The size of your organisation	<11 employees; 11-50 employees; 51-250 employees; 251-500 employees; more than 500 employees; don't know.
3a	What is the annual turnover / revenue of your organisation?	
4	Country of your organisation (or your location if the organisation is based in more than one country)	AT Austria; BE Belgium; BG Bulgaria; CY Cyprus; CZ Czech Republic; DE Germany; DK Denmark; EE Estonia; ES Spain; FI Finland; FR France; GR Greece; HR Croatia; HU Hungary; IE Ireland; IS Iceland; IT Italy; LI Liechtenstein; LT Lithuania; LU Luxembourg; LV Latvia; ME Montenegro; MK Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; MT Malta; NL the Netherlands; NO Norway; PL Poland; PT Portugal; RO Romania; RS Serbia; SE Sweden; SI Slovenia; SK Slovakia; TR Turkey; United Kingdom; Other (please state)
5	Was your organisation involved in projects/activities funded under the previous programme (Culture 2000) or the Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture?	Yes – as Project Co-ordinator; Yes – as Project Co-organiser; Yes – as an Associated Partner; Yes – other role; No; Don't know.



On-line Numbers	Section 1: Respondent Details	Question
6	<p>In general, what barriers do you face concerning the publication of translated works?</p> <p>1(=not at all) to 5(=very much):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial risk associated with publishing a foreign author</li> <li>• Costs of translation</li> <li>• Lack of translators meeting the requirement (translating into their mother tongue)</li> <li>• Limited number of readers in the target language</li> <li>• Legal/fiscal barriers</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>
7	<p>Was this the first time your organisation had translated a work for publication?</p>	<p>Yes; No; Don't know</p>
<p><b>Section 2: Objectives and activities of your project</b></p>		
8	<p>How many works did you have translated with aid from the Culture Programme? (When?)</p>	<p>(don't know)</p>
9	<p>Number of works by source language</p>	<p>Bulgarian (BG); Czech (CS); Danish (DA); German (DE); Greek (EL); English (EN); Spanish (ES); Estonian (ET); Finnish (FI); French (FR); Gaelic (GA); Croatian (HR); Hungarian (HU); Icelandic (IS); Italian (IT); Lithuanian (LT); Latvian (LV); Maltese (MT); Macedonian (MK) Dutch (NL); Norwegian (NO); Polish (PL); Portuguese (PT); Romanian (RO); Swedish (SE); Slovak (SK); Slovene (SL); Serbian (SR); Turkish (TR); Welsh (WL) Other (please specify); Don't know.</p>
10	<p>Did these include new source languages for you?</p>	<p>Yes – all; Yes – some; No; Don't know</p>

Section 2: Objectives and activities of your project		
11	Number of works by target language	Bulgarian (BG); Czech (CS); Danish (DA); German (DE); Greek (EL); English (EN); Spanish (ES); Estonian (ET); Finnish (FI); French (FR); Gaelic (GA); Croatian (HR); Hungarian (HU); Icelandic (IS); Italian (IT); Lithuanian (LT); Latvian (LV); Maltese (MT); Macedonian (MK) Dutch (NL); Norwegian (NO); Polish (PL); Portuguese (PT); Romanian (RO); Slovak (SK); Slovene (SL); Serbian (SR); Swedish (SE); Turkish (TR); Welsh (WL) Other (please specify); Don't know.
12	Did these include new target languages for you?	Yes – all; Yes – some; No; Don't know
13	Did these include a new combination of source and target languages?	Yes – all; Yes – some; No; Don't know
14	Have all the works been printed and distributed?	Yes – all; Yes – some; No; Don't know
15	If not, why not?	
16	How many copies of each work (on average) were printed?	(state number) (don't know)
17	How many copies of each work (on average) were sold?	(state number) (don't know)
18	In your opinion, are the translations a commercially viable activity for your organisation?	Yes – all books; Yes – some books; No; Too early to say; Don't know
Section 3: Opinion of impact		
19	Have works of newly published authors been translated with support of the strand?	Yes – (state number) No; Don't know
20	To what extent have your projects/activities been successful in encouraging the transnational circulation of translated literature?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.

<b>Section 3: Opinion of impact</b>		
21	What success factors have you experienced in translating and publishing the books translated with support from the Culture Programme?	
22	What barriers/obstacles have you experienced in translating and publishing the books translated with support from the Culture Programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial risk associated with publishing a foreign author</li> <li>• EU grant insufficient to cover cost of translation</li> <li>• Lack of translators translating into their mother tongue</li> <li>• Limited number of readers in the target language</li> <li>• Legal/fiscal barriers</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> </ul>
23	To what extent have your projects/activities increased the European outlook of your organisation?	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
24	The Culture Programme has increased the European outlook of publishing houses in general.	To a great extent; To a moderate extent; To a small extent; Not at all; Don't know.
<b>Section 4: Project Application Process</b>		
42	What was the quality of the information about the Culture Programme provided on the Europa website?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
43	What was the quality of the information contained in the programme guide?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
44	Was the application process clear?	Very clear; quite clear; unclear; Don't know.
45	What was the quality of the feedback on your application?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Not provided; Don't know.
46	Do you have any other comments about the project application process?	
47	Did you know that there is a national Cultural Contact Point in your country?	Yes; No
48	What was the quality of the information about the Culture Programme provided on the website of your national Cultural Contact Point?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.

<b>Section 4: Project Application Process</b>		
49	Did you seek any advice or guidance from your Cultural Contact Point while completing your application?	Yes - for information about the programme; Yes - for partner search; Yes – for help in completing the application form; Yes – other help; No; Don't know.
50	If yes, what was the quality of the advice and guidance you received?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
51	Do you have any other comments about your national Cultural Contact Point?	
<b>Section 5: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency</b>		
52	During the selection process, did you have a contact at the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency you could contact for support, advice and guidance?	Yes; No; Don't know.
53	How would you rate the quality of the support, advice and guidance you received?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
54	Do you have any comments and suggestions to improve communications between the Executive Agency and applicants / projects?	
<b>Section 6: Project Reporting</b>		
55	Have you produced an interim or final project report for the European Executive Agency?	Yes; No; Don't know.
56	How would you rate the quality of the report templates?	Easy; acceptable; Not easy; Don't know.
57	Was any guidance provided on how to complete the interim or final report?	Yes; No; Don't know.
58	If yes, how useful was the guidance?	Good; Acceptable; Poor; Don't know.
59	Do you have any comments and suggestions to improve the guidance for interim and final reports?	

	<b>Section 7: Programme Publicity &amp; Dissemination</b>	
60	How did you first find out about the Culture Programme?	Directorate General for Education and Culture website; Cultural Contact Point website; Education Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) website; From colleague ; From other organisation / partner; From information event; From Directorate General Education and Culture newsletter; From other publication; Other
61	How would you rate the activities of the Executive Agency to disseminate the achievements of the Culture Programme?	Good; acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
62	Please explain your response. For example, what dissemination activities are you aware of and how would you rate them?	
63	How would you rate the visibility of the Culture Programme in your country	Good; acceptable; Poor; Don't Know.
64	Overall, what is your feeling about the opinions of cultural operators in your country about the Culture Programme?	Positive; Neutral; Negative; Don't know
65	Please explain your response.	
	<b>Thank-you for participating</b>	

## **Annex Four: Statistical data**

## Annex 4 Statistical Annex

This annex presents in detail the programme data relative to applications and selected projects. The tables here presented have provided the basis for the development of evidence-based insights concerning participation to the programme (section 5.4) and, more generally, informed several stages of the evaluation process.

All data on projects have been collated by ECOTEC from the records kept at DG Education and Culture and EACEA, from the Culture Programme Activity Report 2008 and from the statistics available on line in the europa website<sup>1</sup>. All data on population are taken from Eurostat and are relative to 2007.

For each strand presented, the first table shows the number of applications and selected projects disaggregated by country, role in the project (leader or partner) and financial year.

Starting from the data on applications, the following tables present a 'set of indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009' constructed to analyse whether or not any Country specific trend in terms of participation to the programme can be identified. This set of indicators includes:

- 1) *Total number of organisations applying*: this indicator shows the number of applications in absolute terms. This is a useful indicator to start with, however it must be emphasized that we can reasonably expect the size of the country (in terms of population) to determine how well a specific country will perform on this indicator. That is also why we need to look at a set of indicators, rather than only at one.
- 2) *Country shares of total applications*: gives an indication of the 'weight' in terms of share of wins over the total for each country. Again, while providing a useful synthetic picture, it is reasonable to expect that size of the country will determine how well a specific country performs according to this indicator alone.
- 3) *Index of applications per capita* (EU27+ applications per capita equals 100): this indicator weights (divides) the number of applications by the population of each country, and it then compares the value obtained with that for the EU27, whose value is indexed at 100 to enable a cross-country comparison. It follows that if this indicator for Country X is bigger than 100, an operator in Country X applies more than one would expect considering its European share of population. This indicator is particularly useful because it allows us to control for the differences in any revealed trends that is driven by the diversity in the sizes of the countries participating to the Culture Programme.

Following a similar approach, but making use of data on both selected projects and applications, an additional 'set of indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009' is constructed. This time the objective is to analyse whether or not any Country specific trend in terms of 'success rate' can be identified. This set of indicators includes:

- 1) *Total number of selected organisations*: this indicator shows the number of selected organisations in absolute terms. As seen before, it is reasonable to expect that the total number of applications, which arguably heavily depends on the size of the country (population) and/or cultural sector, can determine how well a specific country will perform according to this basic indicator. That is why we need to look at a set of indicators, relative to applications, selected projects and indexes of both, rather than at only one or two.
- 2) *The share of total selected projects by country on total applications by country*: this indicator tells us, for instance, how many applications for Country X out of ten applications from Country X were successful and how many were not. If a country performs particularly well on this indicator, it might

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc2011\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc2011_en.htm) last accessed on 28 May 2010

be the case that the applications from Country X were particularly successful, regardless of their total number. However, if the number of applications is very low (like one or two), even a 100% success rate on this indicator might not be of statistical significance. Again, considerations like this show us why it is important to look at a full set of indicators of both participation (applications) and success (selected projects) before drawing inferences and conclusions.

- 3) *Country share of total selected projects*: this indicator is different from the one above in that it shows the ratio of selected projects by country over total selected projects, giving an indication of the 'weight' in terms of win for each country. Again, while providing a useful synthetic picture, it is reasonable to expect that size of the country will determine how well a specific country performs according to this indicator, i.e. it should not come as a surprise if – for instance - a 50.000.000 inhabitant country has an higher share of wins (according to this indicator) than a 500.000 inhabitant Country.
- 4) *Index of selected projects per capita* (EU27+ selected projects per capita equals 100): this indicator weights (divides) the number of selected projects by the population of each country, and it then compares the value obtained with that for the EU27, whose value is indexed at 100 to ease a cross-country comparison. It follows that if this indicator is bigger than 100 it means that an operator in Country X wins more than one would expect considering its European share of population. This indicator is particularly useful because it allows us to control for the differences in any revealed trends that might be simply driven by the diversity in the sizes of the countries participating to the Culture Programme.

The data presented below have informed the programme analysis throughout the evaluation and the insights obtained have been used to draw conclusions and charts on participation in the programme, particularly as reported in section 5.4 of the main report.



**Table A.4.1 – Strand 1.1 - Culture Programme 2007-2013: Number of applications and selected projects by Country in 2007, 2008 and 2009**

STRAND 1.1		2007			2008			2009					
Country	Country Label	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Austria	AT	5	11		n.a.	4	19	1	4	4	8	1	4
Belgium	BE			1	n.a.	6	13	2	5	7	7	2	4
Bulgaria	BG	1	7		n.a.	1	9	0	2	0	5	0	1
Cyprus	CY				n.a.	0	8	0	2	0	3	0	
Czech Republic	CZ		12		n.a.	2	14	0	7	3	10	1	3
Germany	DE	5	30	1	n.a.	3	32	0	6	5	22	0	7
Denmark	DK	2	7	1	n.a.	1	7	0	1	0	5	0	2
Estonia	EE		3		n.a.	0	5	0	3	0	8	0	2
Spain	ES	7	26		n.a.	6	48	1	11	4	25	0	4
Finland	FI		12		n.a.	1	14	0	4	0	10	0	3
France	FR	8	21	2	n.a.	7	34	2	6	6	25	1	7
Greece	GR		8		n.a.	5	25			2	12	0	
Croatia	HR		6		n.a.	0	6	0	1	1	3	0	
Hungary	HU	2	12		n.a.	4	19	0	3	0	15	1	6
Ireland	IE		6		n.a.	0	5	0	1	0	3	0	2
Island	IS		5		n.a.	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	
Italy	IT	17	26	1	n.a.	14	48	1	5	11	16	2	6
Lithuania	LT		4		n.a.	0	5	0	1	0	4	0	1
Luxembourg	LU				n.a.	0	3			0	3	0	1
Latvia	LV		1		n.a.	1	9	0	1	0	7	0	
Macedonia	MK				n.a.	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	
Malta	MT		1		n.a.	0	10	0	2	0	3	0	
Netherlands	NL	3	13		n.a.	3	14	0	1	0	14	0	4

STRAND 1.1		2007			2008			2009					
Country	Country Label	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Norway	NO	1	7	1	n.a.	3	9	0	3	3	3	1	1
Poland	PL		17		n.a.	3	28	0	5	0	11	0	2
Portugal	PT	2	18		n.a.	3	19	1	6	2	11	0	4
Romania	RO	2	19		n.a.	0	15	0	3	0	14	0	2
Serbia	RS		1		n.a.	0	8	0	1	1	5	0	1
Sweden	SE	2	10	1	n.a.	1	14	0	4	0	6	0	
Slovenia	SI	1	9		n.a.	1	17	1	4	1	9	0	2
Slovakia	SK		5		n.a.	0	10	0	1	0	9	0	3
Turkey	TR		2		n.a.	0	15	0	6	0	8	0	1
United Kingdom	UK	5	22	2	n.a.	3	24	2	8	1	22	0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>77</b>

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.1 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009						
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ selected projects per capita=100)	
Belgium	BE	14	42%	6%	207	
Estonia	EE	5	31%	2%	907	
Turkey	TR	7	28%	3%	24	
Czech Republic	CZ	11	27%	5%	237	
Macedonia	MK	1	25%	0%	119	
Norway	NO	6	23%	3%	208	
Ireland	IE	3	21%	1%	169	
United Kingdom	UK	16	21%	7%	48	
Portugal	PT	11	20%	5%	230	
Austria	AT	10	20%	5%	235	
Hungary	HU	10	19%	5%	218	
Finland	FI	7	19%	3%	323	
Slovenia	SI	7	18%	3%	727	
Cyprus	CY	2	18%	1%	626	
Denmark	DK	4	18%	2%	134	
France	FR	18	18%	8%	50	
Luxembourg	LU	1	17%	0%	512	
Slovakia	SK	4	17%	2%	181	
EU27+ Average	Total	216	16%	100%	100	
Lithuania	LT	2	15%	1%	144	
Sweden	SE	5	15%	2%	107	
Germany	DE	14	14%	6%	38	
Malta	MT	2	14%	1%	1195	
Spain	ES	16	14%	7%	82	

Strand 1.1 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009					
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ capita=100)
Serbia	RS	2	13%	1%	66
Bulgaria	BG	3	13%	1%	95
Island	IS	1	13%	0%	792
Poland	PL	7	12%	3%	45
Italy	IT	15	11%	7%	45
Netherlands	NL	5	11%	2%	74
Romania	RO	5	10%	2%	56
Croatia	HR	1	6%	0%	55
Latvia	LV	1	6%	0%	107
Greece	GR	0	0%	0%	0
		top eight countries			
		bottom eight countries			

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.1 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009				
Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)
Malta	MT	14	1%	1173
Island	IS	8	1%	889
Slovenia	SI	38	3%	646
Cyprus	CY	11	1%	483
Luxembourg	LU	6	0%	431
Estonia	EE	16	1%	407
Latvia	LV	18	1%	270
Finland	FI	37	3%	240
Austria	AT	51	4%	210
Norway	NO	26	2%	190
Portugal	PT	55	4%	177
Hungary	HU	52	4%	177
Greece	GR	52	4%	159
Slovakia	SK	24	2%	152
Denmark	DK	22	2%	138
Czech Republic	CZ	41	3%	136
Lithuania	LT	13	1%	131
Sweden	SE	33	2%	124
Croatia	HR	16	1%	123
Ireland	IE	14	1%	111
Belgium	BE	33	2%	107
Bulgaria	BG	23	2%	102
EU27+ Average	EU27+	40	3%	100
Netherlands	NL	47	4%	98
Spain	ES	116	9%	89
Romania	RO	50	4%	79

Strand 1.1 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009

Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)
Italy	IT	132	10%	76
Serbia	RS	15	1%	69
Macedonia	MK	4	0%	67
France	FR	101	8%	54
Poland	PL	59	4%	53
United Kingdom	UK	77	6%	43
Germany	DE	97	7%	40
Turkey	TR	25	2%	12
		top eight countries		
		bottom eight countries		

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Table A.4.2 – Strand 1.2.1.1 – Culture Programme 2007-2013: Number of applications and selected projects by Country in 2007, 2008 and 2009

Country	Country Label	2007				2008				2009			
		Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Austria	AT	27	43	7	11	23	62	4	16	20	28	10	12
Belgium	BE	15	40	4	6	19	40	3	8	8	34	4	17
Bulgaria	BG	6	51	2	6	1	42	0	8	4	33	3	7
Cyprus	CY	2	10		2	2	14	1	1	2	10	1	0
Czech Republic	CZ	5	26	2	8	17	48	3	13	10	18	4	7
Germany	DE	31	82	8	15	42	97	14	22	15	72	9	24
Denmark	DK	4	11	1	6	5	12	1	5	6	16	0	8
Estonia	EE		13		6	0	20	0	4	2	14	2	3
Spain	ES	22	108	4	14	22	108	0	24	15	62	3	21
Finland	FI	1	18	1	8	4	17	1	5	11	14	2	7
France	FR	54	87	10	17	36	104	9	22	34	55	14	16
Greece	GR	14	49	5	9	18	60	2	6	10	43	1	11
Croatia	HR		11		4	2	26	1	5	2	18	1	6
Hungary	HU	10	45	1	9	10	48	4	15	5	39	3	15
Ireland	IE	4	10	1	2	3	10	0	3	0	3	0	0
Island	IS	2	3		0	3	3	1	0	1	6	0	1
Italy	IT	126	205	12	26	114	210	15	23	66	51	10	17
Lithuania	LT	1	11	1	0	4	22	0	4	4	12	0	5
Luxembourg	LU	2	2		0	0	6	0	2	1	3	0	0
Latvia	LV	5	12	1	1	4	11	1	1	2	10	0	3
Macedonia	MK		4		2	0	3			2	9	1	1
Malta	MT	3	15		2	5	6			1	14	0	1
Netherlands	NL	8	29	2	5	10	32	5	10	10	27	4	16
Norway	NO	2	7	1	4	5	7	1	2	3	2	0	0
Poland	PL	11	60	1	16	22	87	3	10	10	37	3	16
Portugal	PT	12	49	2	8	6	49	1	10	5	32	1	10

STRAND 1.2.1		2007				2008				2009			
		Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Country	Country Label												
Romania	RO	9	67	1	8	5	66	2	12	2	33	0	14
Serbia	RS				0	0	18	0	3	3	12	0	3
Sweden	SE	2	18		7	6	22	1	8	3	6	2	0
Slovenia	SI	10	37		6	12	39	5	9	11	32	1	12
Slovakia	SK	6	27	1	6	1	41	0	13	2	18	0	5
Turkey	TR	7	14		2	5	31	1	5	4	22	0	7
United Kingdom	UK	21	49	8	9	14	76	4	20	21	42	8	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>1213</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>1437</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>827</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>282</b>

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting



Strand 1.2.1 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009

Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country/total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ selected projects per capita=100)
Denmark	DK	21	39%	2%	216
Finland	FI	24	37%	2%	255
Netherlands	NL	42	36%	4%	144
Sweden	SE	18	32%	2%	111
Norway	NO	8	31%	1%	96
Estonia	EE	15	31%	1%	626
Hungary	HU	47	30%	5%	262
Czech Republic	CZ	37	30%	4%	201
United Kingdom	UK	66	30%	6%	61
Austria	AT	60	30%	6%	405
Croatia	HR	17	29%	2%	214
Germany	DE	92	27%	9%	63
Belgium	BE	42	27%	4%	222
Slovakia	SK	25	26%	2%	260
France	FR	88	24%	8%	78
Slovenia	SI	33	23%	3%	919
EU27+	Total	1042	23%	3%	100
Macedonia	MK	4	22%	0%	110
Poland	PL	49	22%	5%	72
Portugal	PT	32	21%	3%	169
Romania	RO	37	20%	4%	96
Ireland	IE	6	20%	1%	78

Strand 1.2.1 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009					
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ selected projects per capita=100)
<b>Spain</b>	ES	66	20%	6%	83
<b>Bulgaria</b>	BG	26	19%	2%	190
<b>Lithuania</b>	LT	10	19%	1%	165
<b>Serbia</b>	RS	6	18%	1%	45
<b>Turkey</b>	TR	15	18%	1%	12
<b>Greece</b>	GR	34	18%	3%	170
<b>Latvia</b>	LV	7	16%	1%	172
<b>Luxembourg</b>	LU	2	14%	0%	235
<b>Italy</b>	IT	103	13%	10%	98
<b>Cyprus</b>	CY	5	13%	0%	360
<b>Island</b>	IS	2	11%	0%	364
<b>Malta</b>	MT	3	7%	0%	412
	top eight countries				
	bottom eight countries				

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.2.1 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009				
Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)
Italy	IT	772	17%	165
France	FR	370	8%	74
Germany	DE	339	7%	52
Spain	ES	337	7%	96
Poland	PL	227	5%	75
United Kingdom	UK	223	5%	46
Austria	AT	203	4%	309
Greece	GR	194	4%	220
Romania	RO	182	4%	107
Hungary	HU	157	3%	197
Belgium	BE	156	3%	186
Portugal	PT	153	3%	183
Slovenia	SI	141	3%	887
Bulgaria	BG	137	3%	226
Czech Republic	CZ	124	3%	152
Netherlands	NL	116	3%	90
Slovakia	SK	95	2%	223
Turkey	TR	83	2%	15
Finland	FI	65	1%	156
Croatia	HR	59	1%	168
Sweden	SE	57	1%	79
Lithuania	LT	54	1%	202
Denmark	DK	54	1%	125
Estonia	EE	49	1%	462

Strand 1.2.1 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009				
Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)
Malta	MT	44	1%	1365
Latvia	LV	44	1%	244
Cyprus	CY	40	1%	650
Serbia	RS	33	1%	56
Ireland	IE	30	1%	88
Norway	NO	26	1%	70
Island	IS	18	0%	740
Macedonia	MK	18	0%	112
Luxembourg	LU	14	0%	372
EU27+	EU27+	4614	100%	100
	top eight countries			
	bottom eight countries			

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Table A.4.3 – Strand 1.3.1 - Culture Programme 2007-2013: Number of applications and selected projects by Country in 2007, 2008 and 2009

STRAND 1.3.1		2007			2008			2009					
Country	Country Label	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Austria	AT	1	n.a.	1	2	n.a.	n.a.	1	3	1	10	1	2
Belgium	BE		n.a.		5	n.a.	n.a.	1	5		8		3
Bulgaria	BG		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0		4		1
Cyprus	CY		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0		3		1
Czech Republic	CZ		n.a.		1	n.a.	n.a.		0		2		2
Germany	DE	1	n.a.	1	0	n.a.	n.a.	1	2	2	8	1	5
Denmark	DK		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Estonia	EE		n.a.		1	n.a.	n.a.		1		1		1
Spain	ES	3	n.a.		3	n.a.	n.a.		3	1			1
Finland	FI	1	n.a.	1	2	n.a.	n.a.		1				
France	FR	2	n.a.	2	6	n.a.	n.a.	2	3	9	4	6	6
Greece	GR	2	n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	2		1	3
Croatia	HR	1	n.a.	1	0	n.a.	n.a.		0				1
Hungary	HU		n.a.		2	n.a.	n.a.		2	1			
Ireland	IE		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	1			
Island	IS		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Italy	IT	4	n.a.	1	0	n.a.	n.a.		0	6	24	1	6
Lithuania	LT	1	n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	1	1		
Luxembourg	LU	1	n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Latvia	LV		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	3	2	1	1
Macedonia	MK		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	1	1		1
Malta	MT		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Netherlands	NL		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		3	1	3		1
Norway	NO		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		1	1	6		1
Poland	PL		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	1	7	1	2
Portugal	PT		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.	1	5		3		

STRAND 1.3.1		2007				2008				2009			
		Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Partners' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Partners' selected projects
Country	Country Label												
Romania	RO		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0	1	4		
Serbia	RS	1	n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Sweden	SE		n.a.		3	n.a.	n.a.		0	2	1	1	
Slovenia	SI	2	n.a.	1	1	n.a.	n.a.		0	1	1	1	
Slovakia	SK		n.a.		0	n.a.	n.a.		0				
Turkey	TR		n.a.		1	n.a.	n.a.		0		3		3
United Kingdom	UK	5	n.a.	5	2	n.a.	n.a.	1	0	4	8	1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>44</b>

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.3.1 - Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009					
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	
Estonia	EE	3	2%	761	
Slovenia	SI	3	2%	508	
Belgium	BE	14	11%	451	
Cyprus	CY	1	1%	438	
Austria	AT	8	6%	328	
Latvia	LV	2	2%	299	
Finland	FI	4	3%	258	
Portugal	PT	6	5%	193	
Macedonia	MK	1	1%	167	
Croatia	HR	2	2%	153	
Sweden	SE	4	3%	150	
Norway	NO	2	2%	146	
Hungary	HU	4	3%	135	
France	FR	23	17%	124	
Greece	GR	4	3%	122	
EU27+ Average	EU27+ Avg	4	3	100	
Czech Republic	CZ	3	2%	99	
Netherlands	NL	4	3%	83	
United Kingdom	UK	12	9%	67	
Spain	ES	7	5%	54	
Italy	IT	8	6%	46	
Bulgaria	BG	1	1%	44	
Germany	DE	10	8%	41	
Poland	PL	3	2%	27	
Turkey	TR	4	3%	20	
Denmark	DK	0	0%	0	
Ireland	IE	0	0%	0	
Island	IS	0	0%	0	
Lithuania	LT	0	0%	0	

Strand 1.3.1 - Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009				
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)
Luxembourg	LU	0	0%	0
Malta	MT	0	0%	0
Romania	RO	0	0%	0
Serbia	RS	0	0%	0
Slovakia	SK	0	0%	0
	top eight countries			
	bottom eight countries			

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting



Table A.4.4 – Strand 1.2.2 - Culture Programme 2007-2013: Number of applicant and selected publishing houses by Country in 2007, 2008 and 2009

STRAND 1.2.2. - DATA BY PUBLISHING HOUSES		2007		2008		2009		Total	
Country	Country Label	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects
Austria	AT	3		4	3	1		8	3
Belgium	BE							0	0
Bulgaria	BG	12	6	19	9	13	9	44	24
Cyprus	CY							0	0
Czech Republic	CZ	6	1	8	2	3	1	17	4
Germany	DE	1		6	1	4	3	11	4
Denmark	DK	3	1	4	2	4	2	11	5
Estonia	EE	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3
Spain	ES	9		11	6	6	1	26	7
Finland	FI	5	3	12	8	7	6	24	17
France	FR	2		2				4	0
Greece	GR	10	4	13	9	12	4	35	17
Croatia	HR	1		5	1	4	2	10	3
Hungary	HU	7	3	9	6	15	11	31	20
Ireland	IE							0	0
Island	IS	3	1	2	2			5	3
Italy	IT	34	5	32	10	22	7	88	22
Lithuania	LT	7	1	7	4	8	7	22	12
Luxembourg	LU							0	0
Latvia	LV	4	1	2	1	3	1	9	3
Macedonia	MK	1		5	2	7	3	13	5
Malta	MT	2						2	0
Netherlands	NL	1		3	2	1	1	5	3
Norway	NO	6	2	9	6	9	7	24	15
Poland	PL	4	1	5	3	3	2	12	6
Portugal	PT	3	1	2	1			5	2
Romania	RO	4	2	3	1	6	4	13	7
Serbia	RS	1		1		8	4	10	4
Sweden	SE			3	1	1	1	4	2
Slovenia	SI	7	4	18	12	9	4	34	20

STRAND 1.2.2. - DATA BY PUBLISHING HOUSES		2007		2008		2009		Total	
Country	Country Label	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects	Leaders' applications	Leaders' selected projects
Slovakia	SK	2	1	4	2	2	1	8	4
Turkey	TR	7	2			1		8	2
United Kingdom	UK	3	2	1		6	3	10	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>224</b>

Note: Data on the second round of applications in 2007 and 2008 were not available and therefore not included in their respective columns above

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Table A.4.5 – Strand 1.2.2 - Culture Programme 2007-2013: Number of books translated by source and target language in 2008 and 2009

	2008		2009		TOTAL	
	Total Source Selected	Target Language	Source Language	Target Language	Source Language	Target Language
Italian	171	68	27	27	198	95
Hungarian	93	23	67	13	160	36
Slovene	126	43	28	4	154	47
Bulgarian	85	24	50	9	135	33
Greek	100	51	24	8	124	59
Lithuanian	57	0	26	1	83	1
Norwegian	60	24	20	12	80	36
Finnish	51	9	18	7	69	16
Spanish	56	17	5	18	61	35
Macedonian	41	3	19	3	60	6
Dutch	42	16	10	3	52	19
Polish	39	32	6	13	45	45
Romanian	19	10	25	5	44	15
Czech	38	40	2	11	40	51
Croatian	31	32	8	10	39	42
Danish	26	19	12	6	38	25
German	19	124	16	53	35	177
English	20	282	10	88	30	370
Serbian	0	26	24	6	24	32
Slovak	20	1	2	6	22	7
Icelandic	16	1	0	3	16	4
French	15	217	0	72	15	289
Latvian	10	1	4	1	14	2
Estonian	10	1	3	0	13	1
Swedish	6	45	7	7	13	52
Portuguese	10	15	0	5	10	20
Latin	0	0	0	5	0	5
Russian	0	0	0	1	0	1
Turkish	0	20	0	10	0	30

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.2.2 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009						
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ selected projects per capita=100)	
Estonia	EE	3	100%	1%	582	
Finland	FI	17	71%	8%	839	
Hungary	HU	20	65%	9%	518	
Norway	NO	15	63%	7%	835	
Island	IS	3	60%	1%	2541	
Netherlands	NL	3	60%	1%	48	
Slovenia	SI	20	59%	9%	2592	
Lithuania	LT	12	55%	5%	924	
Bulgaria	BG	24	55%	11%	814	
Romania	RO	7	54%	3%	85	
Slovakia	SK	4	50%	2%	193	
Sweden	SE	2	50%	1%	57	
Poland	PL	6	50%	3%	41	
United Kingdom	UK	5	50%	2%	21	
Greece	GR	17	49%	8%	396	
Denmark	DK	5	45%	2%	239	
Serbia	RS	4	40%	2%	141	
Portugal	PT	2	40%	1%	49	
Macedonia	MK	5	38%	2%	638	
Austria	AT	3	38%	1%	94	
Germany	DE	4	36%	2%	13	
Latvia	LV	3	33%	1%	343	
Croatia	HR	3	30%	1%	176	
Spain	ES	7	27%	3%	41	
Italy	IT	22	25%	10%	97	
Turkey	TR	2	25%	1%	7	
Czech Republic	CZ	4	24%	2%	101	

Strand 1.2.2 - Set of Indicators of successful participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009					
Country	Country Label	Total number of selected organisations	First indicator of successful participation (total selected projects by country /total applications by country)	Second indicator of successful participation (country share of total selected projects)	Third Indicator of Success Rate (Index of selected projects per capita; EU27+ selected projects per capita=100)
Belgium	BE	0	0%	0%	0
Cyprus	CY	0	0%	0%	0
France	FR	0	0%	0%	0
Ireland	IE	0	0%	0%	0
Luxembourg	LU	0	0%	0%	0
Malta	MT	0	0%	0%	0
<b>EU27+</b>	Total/Avg	224	45%	100%	100
		top eight countries			
		bottom eight countries			

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting

Strand 1.2.2 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009					
Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)	
Slovenia	SI	34	7%	1982	
Island	IS	5	1%	1905	
Lithuania	LT	22	4%	762	
Macedonia	MK	13	3%	746	
Bulgaria	BG	44	9%	672	
Norway	NO	24	5%	601	
Malta	MT	2	0%	575	
Finland	FI	24	5%	533	
Latvia	LV	9	2%	462	
Greece	GR	35	7%	367	
Hungary	HU	31	6%	361	
Croatia	HR	10	2%	264	
Estonia	EE	3	1%	262	
Denmark	DK	11	2%	237	
Czech Republic	CZ	17	3%	194	
Italy	IT	88	18%	174	
Slovakia	SK	8	2%	174	
Serbia	RS	10	2%	158	
Austria	AT	8	2%	113	
EU27+ Avg	Total	15	3%	100	
Romania	RO	13	3%	71	
Spain	ES	26	5%	69	
Portugal	PT	5	1%	55	
Sweden	SE	4	1%	51	
Poland	PL	12	2%	37	
Netherlands	NL	5	1%	36	
United Kingdom	UK	10	2%	19	
Germany	DE	11	2%	16	
Turkey	TR	8	2%	13	

Strand 1.2.2 - Set of Indicators of participation to the Programme during the period 2007-2009				
Country	Country Label	Total number of organisations applying	First Indicator of Participation (country shares of total applications)	Second Indicator of Participation (Index of per capita applications; EU27+ applications per capita=100)
France	FR	4	1%	7
Belgium	BE	0	0%	0
Cyprus	CY	0	0%	0
Ireland	IE	0	0%	0
Luxembourg	LU	0	0%	0
	top eight countries			
	bottom eight countries			

Source: Ecotec Research and Consulting



Ecorys UK Ltd  
Vincent House,  
Quay Place,  
92-93 Edward Street,  
Birmingham,  
B1 2RA

Tel +44 (0) 0845 313 7455  
Fax: +44 (0) 0845 313 7454

[www.uk.ecorys.com](http://www.uk.ecorys.com)