

# Ex-post evaluation of 2009 European Capitals of Culture

Annexes to the Final Report for the European Commission  
DG Education and Culture





# Contents

PAGE

---

<b>Annex One: Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annex Two: Topic Guide for interviews with co-ordinators.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex Three: Topic guide for other partners .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex Four: List of interviewees .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Annex Five: Table of effects of the European Capitals of Culture .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Annex Six: Bibliography .....</b>	<b>48</b>



## **Annex One: Terms of Reference**





EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
Directorate-General for Education and Culture

Culture, Multilingualism and Communication  
"Culture" programme and actions

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

## Ex post evaluation of 2009 European Capitals of Culture

Contracting authority: European Commission

<b>1.</b>	<b>Context</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1.	Introduction.....	4
1.2.	Objectives of the Action.....	5
1.3.	Description of the Action .....	6
1.4.	Implementation of the Action .....	7
1.5.	Monitoring Provisions .....	8
<b>2.</b>	<b>Task specification for the assignment</b> .....	<b>9</b>
2.1.	Description of Action implementation .....	9
2.2.	Evaluation questions.....	9
2.3.	Other tasks under the assignment.....	13
<b>3.</b>	<b>Reporting and deliverables</b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.1.	General reporting requirements .....	14
3.2.	Inception Report .....	14
3.3.	Draft Final Report .....	14
3.4.	Final Report.....	15
<b>4.</b>	<b>Organisation, timetable and budget</b> .....	<b>16</b>
4.1.	Organisation.....	16
4.2.	Meetings .....	16
4.3.	Timetable .....	16
4.4.	Budget .....	
<b>5.</b>	<b>References</b> .....	<b>18</b>

<b>5.1.</b>	<b>Action documents.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.2.</b>	<b>Background and reference documents .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Requirements .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6.1.</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6.2.</b>	<b>Resources .....</b>	<b>19</b>

# 1.0 Context

## 1.1 Introduction

The initial scheme of 'The European City of Culture' was launched at an intergovernmental level in 1985.<sup>1</sup> In 1992 a new event of 'European Cultural Month' was established.<sup>2</sup> In 1999 by Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and the Council the European City of Culture event was given the status of a Community Action and was renamed 'European Capital of Culture',<sup>3</sup> hereafter referred as "the Action". The Decision outlined new selection procedures and evaluation criteria for the 2005 title onward. The Decision was amended by Decision 649/2005/EC (in order to integrate the 10 Member States which joined the EU in 2004) and later replaced by the Decision 1622/2006/EC,<sup>4</sup> which has repealed the earlier decisions. Decision 1622/2006/EC specifies the objectives of the action and the designation process for the 2013 title onward. Given the time-scale of ECOCs implementation, whose preparation starts 6 years before the title year, the Decision maintains the application of 1999 Decision to European Capitals of Culture for 2007, 2008 and 2009 and foresees transitional provisions for titles 2010-2012.

The Council of Ministers of the EU is the only institution which can award the title of European Capital of Culture. The title can be awarded to a city only. The European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture recommends the designation of the cities to the Council of Ministries on the basis of a report provided by a selection panel.<sup>5</sup> The selection panel assesses applications of the cities in comparison with the criteria laid down in Art. 3<sup>6</sup> and Annex II<sup>1</sup> of the Decision 1419/1999/EC.

<sup>1</sup> The title "European Capital of Culture" was designed to help bring European citizens closer together. This was the idea underlying its launch in June 1985 by the Council of Ministers of the European Union on the initiative of Melina Mercouri. For more details see Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs regarding the annual organization of the 'European City of Culture' of 13.06.1985

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?mode=dbl&lang=en&lng1=en,en&lng2=da,de,el,en,es,fr,it,nl,&val=117538:cs&page=1&hwords=>

<sup>2</sup> Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1992 concerning the choice of European Cities of Culture after 1996 and the 'Cultural Month'

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:41992X0616:EN:HTML>

<sup>3</sup> Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019 (OJ L 166 of 1.7.1999, p. 1). Decision amended by Decision 649/2005/EC (OJ L 117 of 4.5.2005, p. 20).

[http://www.europa.eu/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/1999/l\\_166/l\\_16619990701en00010005.pdf](http://www.europa.eu/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/1999/l_166/l_16619990701en00010005.pdf)

[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l\\_117/l\\_11720050504en00200021.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_117/l_11720050504en00200021.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019 (OJ L 304 of 3.11.2006, p. 1). <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:304:SOM:EN:HTML>

<sup>5</sup> Art. 2 of Decision 1419/1999/EC.

<sup>6</sup> "The submission shall specify how the nominated city intends:

The European Capitals of Culture are expected to implement the programme of activities they put forward for the designation process during the year when they bear the title.

The 2009 European Capitals of Culture, namely Linz and Vilnius, were awarded the title by the Council of Ministers in 2005. These cities were designated following the selection process laid down by the Decision 1419/1999/EC and implemented the ECOC event.

## 1.2 Objectives of the Action

Decision 1419/1999/EC contained a list of criteria, while general and specific objectives were less clearly enunciated. For the sake of consistency and comparability, we refer here to the general and specific objectives laid down by the current Decision 1622/2006/EC, which has articulated themes and criteria already contained in former Decision 1419/1999/EC.

- to highlight artistic movements and styles shared by Europeans which it has inspired or to which it has made a significant contribution,
- to promote events involving people active in culture from other cities in Member States and leading to lasting cultural cooperation, and to foster their movement within the European Union,
- to support and develop creative work, which is an essential element in any cultural policy,
- to ensure the mobilisation and participation of large sections of the population and, as a consequence, the social impact of the action and its continuity beyond the year of the events,
- to encourage the reception of citizens of the Union and the widest possible dissemination of the various events by employing all forms of multimedia, to promote dialogue between European cultures and those from other parts of the world and, in that spirit, to optimise the opening up to, and understanding of others, which are fundamental cultural values,
- to exploit the historic heritage, urban architecture and quality of life in the city."

<sup>1</sup>"Possible elements of designated cities' programmes:

- promotion of shared artistic movements and styles in the development of which the city has played a particular role,
- organisation of artistic events (music, dance, theatre, visual arts, cinema, etc.) and improvement of the promotion and management of the arts,
- promotion of European public awareness of the figures and events which have marked the history and culture of the city,
- organisation of specific activities designed to encourage artistic innovation and to generate new forms of cultural action and dialogue,
- organisation of measures to increase access to and awareness of fixed and movable artistic assets and artistic productions specific to the city,
- organisation of specific cultural projects designed to bring young people to the arts,
- organisation of specific cultural projects designed to increase social cohesion,
- taking the planned activities to a wider public, particularly through the use of multimedia and audiovisual means and a multilingual approach,
- contribution to the development of economic activity, particularly in terms of employment and tourism,
- need to develop high-quality and innovative cultural tourism with due allowance being made for the importance in this connection of managing the cultural heritage on a sustainable basis and reconciling the wishes of visitors with those of the local population,
- organisation of projects designed to encourage the development of links between the architectural heritage and strategies for new urban development,
- joint organisation of initiatives designed to promote dialogue between the cultures of Europe and the cultures of other parts of the world."

### 1.2.1 General objectives

The overall aim of the Action is to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, as well as to promote greater mutual understanding between European citizens.

### 1.2.2 Specific objectives

In accordance with Art. 4 of the current Decision 1622/2006/EC, the cultural Action should fulfil the following criteria, subdivided into two categories, 'the European Dimension' and 'City and Citizens'.

I. As regards '*the European Dimension*', the Action shall:

- foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from the relevant Member States and other Member States in any cultural sector;
- highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe;
- bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.

II. As regards '*City and Citizens*' the Action shall:

- foster the participation of the citizens living in the city and its surroundings and raise their interest as well as the interest of citizens from abroad;
- be sustainable and be an integral part of the long-term cultural and social development of the city.

Ecotec's ECOC 2007-2008 evaluation found out that cities holding the ECOC title had adopted over the years a third broad objective, that could be defined as "*supporting social and economic development through culture*". In this context "culture" covers both cultural programmes and relevant infra-structural interventions. This objective brings to the fore elements already contained in other parts of the ECOCs decisions. It is considered highly relevant to ECOCs implementation and should be taken into account as a specific objective.

## 1.3 Description of the Action

### 1.3.1 Actions under the initiative

Under the legal basis valid for the designation of the 2009 European Capitals of Culture (i.e. Decision 1419/1999/EC), the MS concerned by a given year proposed one or several cities for the title to the Commission, the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions. The applications of candidate cities were assessed by a panel of 7 independent experts in comparison with the criteria laid down for the Action.

### 1.3.2 Budget and duration of the Action

The Decision 1419/1999/EC did not have any financial aspects. However, the European Capital of Culture Action is one of the 'special actions' included under Strand 1.3 of the Culture Programme (2007-13). The latter is established by the Decision 1855/2006/EC. Each year, 1.5

million euro per European Capital of Culture is made available in the budget of the Culture programme for each European Capital of Culture.<sup>1</sup> For the year in question the grant was awarded on the basis of a 'project' which represents part of the programme for the European Capital of Culture and must be submitted by the structure responsible for running the event.

### 1.3.3 Eligible countries

The 27 eligible MS are ranked in a chronological order of entitlement to host the event. The chronological order is annexed to the Decision 1419/1999/EC and was decided by common agreement with the Member States. Each year, two of the 27 Member States may host the event. Article 4 of Decision 1419/1999/EC made it possible for European non-EU member countries to host the event as well. There is no pre-defined chronological order for the non-EU member countries.

## 1.4 Implementation of the Action

According to Decision 1419/1999/EC, Member States entitled to host the European Capital of Culture in 2009 were Austria and Lithuania. Late in 2004 Austria proposed for the title the city of Linz, Lithuania proposed Vilnius.

### 1.4.1 European Capitals of Culture 2009

The applications for the 2009 title, putting forward a programme for the year in question, were received in March 2005 and were assessed by a panel of independent experts designated by the Institutions in April 2005. A delegation of each of the candidate cities was invited to present their bid and to answer questions from the panel members.

Linz' application was rooted in the reconversion of the city from an industrial to a high-tech cultural city. The proposed programme was build around the themes of social and economic justice; and natural resources and ecology. From a European perspective, the city would emphasise urban development based on equality, migrants enriching cities and regions and European integration including peace, solidarity and diversity. Linz wanted to create an environment of openness for artists to develop their works. Linz wanted to create a laboratory for the future, involving creative, inspiring spaces for people working together to create a vision for the future. It wanted to equip the city with large public screens broadcasting cultural programmes from all over the world. Linz also wanted to convert industrial areas into new living areas.

The Danube was to be used as a metaphor for a trans-national challenge, a drama on the river as an example for artists. Other themes which were highlighted in the application included the Power of Knowledge, the Culture of Media, Connections and Exchange Programmes. The theme "Culture for All and Culture by All" would brand the programme until 2009.

<sup>1</sup> Decision 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 the Culture Programme (2007-2013) (OJ L 372 of 27.12.2006, p. 1).

Relativity and Vitality were the core themes proposed by the Vilnius programme. They would be developed by projects across the four historic capital cities of Lithuania based on four core seasonal themes. This would enable the organisers to re-launch the programme at the beginning of each season. The four seasonal themes were: Open History Season, with an emphasis on restoration; Open Space Season, which aimed to celebrate the Lithuania's 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of accession to the EU with street parties with a southern European flavour; Open Community Season concentrating on young people and site specific works; and Open Future season highlighting cinema and theatre.

In its report, the panel recommended Linz and Vilnius for the 2009 title, and made a few recommendations regarding the progress to be achieved until the ECOC event.

## **1.5 Monitoring Provisions**

Up until the 2010 title, the European Capitals of Culture are not subject to a formal monitoring process by the legal basis. Nevertheless, the managers of current and future Capitals benefit from the exchange of experience for the preparation of the event. Some of them are part of an informal network which provides an opportunity to meet and to debate about the design and the management of the event. The Commission seeks to foster the sharing of best practices since it is one of the keys to success. The Culture Programme has supported a policy grouping on the sharing of evaluation methodologies and practices among past, present and future European Capitals of Culture.<sup>1</sup> No monitoring material is directly available at this stage in the Commission.

The new legal basis (1622/2006/EC) devotes more attention to monitoring and lays down a monitoring process, but it does not concern the 2009 title year, as it applies from 2010 title onwards. This monitoring phase aims at ensuring that the cities concerned fulfil the commitments undertaken at selection stage, in particular concerning the criteria of the action, and to provide them with guidance on the implementation of the event. For this purpose, representatives from the cities are convened to meet the monitoring and advisory panel twice between the designation and the start of the event.

<sup>1</sup> IMPACTS 08 - European Capital of Culture Research Programme <http://www.liverpool.ac.uk/impacts08/>

## **2.0 Task specification for the assignment**

This evaluation is launched according to Article 12 of the current Decision 1622/2006/EC: Each year the Commission shall ensure the external and independent evaluation of the results of the European Capital of Culture event of the previous year in accordance with the objectives and criteria of the Action.

The results of the evaluation will be used to draw lessons for the future development of the initiative. It will also help to improve understanding of the impact of the initiative with a view to feeding into the policy-making process at European level in the field of culture.

The evaluation should cover the European Capital of Culture Action, the events in Linz and Vilnius that took place in 2009.

### **2.1 Description of Action implementation**

The contractor must provide in its report:

- a brief description of the conception of the ECOC Action,
- the conceptual framework that guided the study,
- the evaluation questions that the research aimed to answer and the methodology followed;
- reports for Linz and Vilnius,
- lessons in delivery from across the two ECOC;
- overall conclusions and recommendations for the ECOC Action.

The description should provide the necessary background and reference points for responding to the evaluation questions in the next sub-section. It is strongly recommended to follow as much as possible the methodology and reporting structure used by Ecotec in the Ex-post evaluation report of ECOCs 2007-2008, in order to ensure comparability of data.

### **2.2 Evaluation questions**

The contractor must provide answers to the evaluation questions listed below. These questions were addressed by ECOCs evaluation 2007-08 and should remain as far as possible stable. In order to allow comparability of evaluation results of individual ECOC evaluations over the years, the contractor should use also the same intervention logic and indicators as ECOCs 2007-2008 evaluation. The contractor will nonetheless 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 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. The sub-questions 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 particularly on how future European Capitals of Culture can address any deficiencies and/or gaps identified by the evaluator. As far as the conclusions for the two evaluated cities allows recommendations should also be made – if appropriate –for the future design of the Action.

Evaluation Question	
<b>Relevance</b>	
<b>EQ1</b>	What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture?
<b>EQ2</b>	What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives?
<b>EQ3</b>	What were the objectives of the city in being an ECOC? (refer to list in intervention logic) What was the relative importance of each objective?
<b>EQ4</b>	Have any specific objectives of the ECOC event been related to social impacts?
<b>EQ5</b>	In this connection, did the objectives of the ECOC event include reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled people and minorities?
<b>EQ6</b>	To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined?
<b>EQ7</b>	To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECOC's own application? (special focus on the <b>European</b> dimension)
<b>EQ8</b>	To what extent were the activities consistent with the ECOC's own objectives, with the ECOC's application and with the Decision? (special focus on the <b>European</b> dimension)
<b>EQ9</b>	How was the European dimension reflected by the themes put forward by the ECOC event and in terms of cooperation at European level? How did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible?
<b>EQ10</b>	As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow it, to what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the Action been proved relevant to Article 151 of the EC Treaty?
<b>EQ11</b>	To what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the 2009 ECOC events proved relevant to the Action?
<b>EQ12</b>	As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allows it, to what extent has the Action proved to be complementary to other Community initiatives in the field of culture?
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<b>EQ13</b>	How have the organisational models of the formal governing Board and operational structures played a role in the European Capital of Culture? What role have the Board and operational structures played in the ECOC event's implementation? At what stage were these structures established?
<b>EQ14</b>	Who chaired the Board and what was his/her experience? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the Board and operational structure used and personnel involved?

## Evaluation Question

<b>EQ15</b>	Has an artistic director been included into the operational structure and how was he/she appointed? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the artistic director and personnel involved?
<b>EQ16</b>	What was the process of designing the programme?
<b>EQ17</b>	How were activities selected and implemented?
<b>EQ18</b>	How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?
<b>EQ19</b>	To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy been successful in/contributed to the promotion of city image/profile, promotion of the ECOC event, awareness raising of the European dimension, promotion of all events and attractions in the city?
<b>EQ20</b>	To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels?
<b>EQ21</b>	What was the process of securing the financial inputs?
<b>EQ22</b>	What was the total amount of resources used for each ECOC event? What was the final financial out-turn of the year?
<b>EQ23</b>	What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total?
<b>EQ24</b>	To what extent were the inputs consistent with the Action and with the application? (special focus on the <b>European</b> dimension)
<b>EQ25</b>	What was the total expenditure strictly for the ECOC event?
<b>EQ26</b>	What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation
<b>EQ27</b>	Was the total size of the budget sufficient for reaching a critical mass in terms of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the same results have been achieved if the structure of resources and their respective importance was different?
<b>EQ28</b>	To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the ECOC event been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes?
<b>EQ29</b>	Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided greater cost-effectiveness? As a result, could the total budget for the ECOC event be considered appropriate and proportional to what the action set out to achieve?
<b>EQ30</b>	To what extent have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the ECOC event?
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
<b>EQ31</b>	Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.)
<b>EQ32</b>	How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the ECOC event? (explore role of Board, Chair, Artistic Director, decision-making, political challenges, etc.)
<b>EQ33</b>	What quantitative indicators (number of visitors, overnight stays, cultural participation of people, etc.) of the social, tourist and broader economic impacts of the event have been gathered by the ECOC?
<b>EQ34</b>	To what extent did the ECOC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city and as set

## Evaluation Question

	out in the application (refer to list in the intervention logic)?
<b>EQ35</b>	To what extent has the ECOC event been successful in attaining the objectives set (general, specific and operational) and in achieving the intended results as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)?
<b>EQ36</b>	To what extent have the ECOC been successful in achieving the intended impacts as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)?
<b>EQ37</b>	To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met?
<b>EQ38</b>	To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met?
<b>EQ39</b>	What were the most significant economic outcomes of the Capital of Culture experience?
<b>EQ40</b>	What have been the impacts of the ECOC event on regional development?
<b>EQ41</b>	Can impacts on tourism be identified? What was the total number of visitors (from abroad and from the country) to the ECOC event: before the title year, during the title year, after the title year?
<b>EQ42</b>	Are there any instances where the ECOC event has exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had?
<b>EQ43</b>	Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the action?
<b>EQ44</b>	To what extent has the implementation of the action contributed to the achievement of the objectives of Article 151 of the EC Treaty?
<b>EQ45</b>	As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow, what is the Community added value of the European Capital of Culture?
<b>EQ46</b>	What lessons can be learnt in terms of how to deliver ECOC effectively which might have wider applicability to future ECOC events?
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>EQ47</b>	Which of the current activities or elements of the ECOC event are likely to continue and in which form after the Community support is withdrawn?
<b>EQ48</b>	Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the ECOC event after the closure?
<b>EQ49</b>	How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the ECOC event?
<b>EQ50</b>	What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the ECOC event and how will the organisational structure change?
<b>EQ51</b>	What has been the contribution of the ECOC event to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)
<b>EQ52</b>	What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term cultural development of the city?
<b>EQ53</b>	What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term social development of the city?
<b>EQ54</b>	What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term urban and broader economic development of the city?
<b>EQ55</b>	What lessons have been learnt from the 2009 ECOC in terms of achieving sustainable effects that might be of general applicability to future ECOC events?

## **2.3 Other tasks under the assignment**

### **2.3.1 Monitoring arrangements**

On the basis of the experience gained from the implementation of the action, the Contractor should propose a practical approach for reinforcing the monitoring of the European Capitals of Culture as well as the external evaluation undertaken by the cities and for building a database on best practice identified. Consideration should be given to the information needs of the Commission to support the execution of their main tasks. The existing and foreseen monitoring arrangements and the needs of future evaluations should be built on. The fact that each European Capital of Culture bears the title for only one year should be also reflected by the proposal.

The proposed approach must be realistic, e.g. it could basically not require additional human resources in the Commission, and it should bear in mind the short duration of the action. 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.

### **2.3.2 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 Action 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.

## 3.0 Reporting and deliverables

### 3.1 General reporting requirements

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. The Executive Summary should be translated into French and German. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format and in 5 hard copies.

### 3.2 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.

### 3.3 Interim report

The interim report must provide information about the initial analyses of data collected in the field (primary data) and secondary data. The Contractor may be in a position to provide preliminary answers on some of the evaluation questions.

This report will provide the basis for a dialogue between the Contractor and the Steering Group about the adequacy of analyses, the factual accuracy of observations and the realism of assertions and interpretations.

### 3.4 Draft Final Report

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

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

- **Main report:** The main report must be limited to a maximum of **75** pages and present, in full, the results of the analyses, conclusions and 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, full transcript of case studies, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

### 3.5 Final Report

The Final Report follows the same format as the draft Final Report. On top of that, it will be accompanied by an executive summary. .

- **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. These last two sections – conclusions and recommendations – must be written in a maximum of 4000 characters, including spaces. 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 discussions with the Steering Group about the draft Final Report insofar as these do not interfere with the autonomy 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.

# 4.0 Organisation, timetable and budget

## 4.1 Organisation

The contract will be managed by Unit C.2 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:

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

## 4.2 Meetings

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

## 4.3 Timetable

The indicative starting date is **16 November 2009**. The contract will start after both parties have signed it. The period of execution of the contract is **6 months**.

The following outline work plan and indicative timetable are envisaged:

<b>Deadline</b> (from starting date)	<b>Task</b>
<i>Within a week</i>	A <b>kick-off meeting</b> may be held after the signature of the contract.
<i>After 1 month</i>	Contractor submits the <b>inception report</b> to Steering Group. At least one <b>Steering Group meeting</b> will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
<i>After 3 months</i>	Desk and field research: at least 60% completion. Contractor submits the <b>interim report</b> to Steering Group.

	At least one <b>Steering Group meeting</b> will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
<i>After 4.5 months</i>	Desk and field research completed. Analysis and drafting completed. Contractor submits the <b>draft final report</b> , to Steering Group. At least one <b>Steering Group meeting</b> will be held in Brussels within <b>two weeks</b> after the submission.
<i>After 5.5 months + 2 weeks for eventual finalisation of the FR</i>	Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits the <b>final report and executive summary</b> to Steering Group.

#### **4.4 Budget**

The estimated maximum budget for the evaluation of the action, covering all the results to be achieved by the contractor as listed in sections 2 and 3 above, is **EUR 75 000**.

# 5.0 References

## 5.1 Action documents

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

- The bids of the 2009 candidate cities.

## 5.2 Background and reference documents

Knowledge of the following documents is required for the tender. Unless differently specified, they are available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc413\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc413_en.htm) :

- Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;
- Decision 649/2005/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 April 2005 amending Decision 1419/1999/EC establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;
- Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019;
- Decision 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 the Culture Programme (2007-2013)
- Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1992 concerning the choice of European Cities of Culture after 1996 and the 'Cultural Month'
- Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs regarding the annual organization of the 'European City of Culture';
- Study about the European Cities and Capitals of Culture, and the European cultural months (1995-2004) achieved by palmer/RAE Associates;
- Ex-post Evaluation of 2007 & 2008 European Capitals of Culture, Ecotec, 2009 [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm)
- IMPACTS 08 - European Capital of Culture Research Programme <http://www.liverpool.ac.uk/impacts08/>
- The panel's report concerning the 2009 titles [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/pdf/doc672\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/pdf/doc672_en.pdf)

# 6.0 Requirements

## 6.1 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.
- Comparability of results with evaluation of ECOC 2007 and 2008 should be assured.
- 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. (In order to assure comparability of data for different ECOCs, use of the same indicators as for the ex-post evaluation of ECOC 2007 and 2008 is strongly recommended.) 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 action will 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.

## 6.2 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.

Contact:

Patrizia BARALLI, Telephone:94633, patrizia.baralli@ec.europa.eu

Annex: Dissemination Plan

## **Annex Two: Topic Guide for interviews with co-ordinators**



## Annex Two: Topic guide for interviews with co-ordinators

All questions need to be considered in the specific *context* of each city. At each stage, key success factors and good practice also need to be identified. The questions need to be asked with reference to the table of outputs, results and impacts (and associated indicators).

	Questions	Some of the issues to explore	Note
<b>Objectives</b>	<p>What was their overall motivation? (motivation of the partner organisation and of the city as a whole)</p> <p>What was the process of determining objectives?</p> <p>(How far) did they adopt each of the objectives listed in the intervention logic?</p> <p>In particular, how was the European dimension taken into account? To what extent was the European dimension a bolt- on or integral?</p> <p>What was the relative importance of each objective?</p> <p>To what extent did objectives change in the 4 years between the application and the start of the title year? What were the most important changes?</p>	<p>Background of the city – existing strengths/weaknesses of cultural sector, economic and social context, etc.</p> <p>Main driver behind the decision to bid and the nature of the bid – key individuals and organisations</p> <p>Specific target groups identified</p> <p>Background research undertaken, e.g. to identify needs of cultural sector – and the extent to which this research influenced the choice of objectives</p> <p>Reasons for / impact of changes in objectives. Probe on clarity of objectives</p> <p>How did the municipality engage with cultural operators? (partnerships, consultation mechanisms etc) What problems encountered?</p> <p>Was a new delivery agency / mechanism put in place to develop and deliver the ECOC? What problems did it encounter?</p> <p>Is there a tension between the long-term administrative modus operandi of municipalities and the short-term, results-oriented approach needed for an ECOC?</p>	<p>If they broadly adopted the objectives in the intervention logic, then each ECOC was relevant to the 1999 Decision and thus also Article 167 of the Treaty.</p> <p>Second fundamental question – European dimension – can be answered in part here.</p> <p>Third fundamental question – broad participation – can be answered in part here.</p>

	Questions	Some of the issues to explore	Note
<b>Application and planning/development phases</b>	<p>How did the City apply to its Member States for the nomination?</p> <p>How effective was the selection process at Member State level?</p> <p>In what ways did the ECOC take into account the recommendations of the EU selection panel?</p> <p>In what ways have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the action?</p> <p>What were the main milestones in the planning/development phase?</p> <p>What difficulties were encountered during the planning/development phase and how were these overcome?</p>	<p>Steps taken in the preparation of the bid</p> <p>Role of municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic Director, etc. (cultural differences between municipality, culture sector and business community?)</p> <p>Evidence that the ECOC took into account the recommendations of the panel</p> <p>Reflections on effectiveness of the processes followed by Member States and by the European Commission.</p>	<p>We already have a description of the UK process</p> <p>If possible, identify a contact name at the national level.</p> <p>We know what the EU-level designation process was (key steps set out in the 1999 Decision). But we need to identify the efficiency and impact of the EU's processes.</p> <p>There was no formal monitoring / reporting required by the Commission following the award of the title (4 years before the title year). So there was no way of ensuring that the recommendations of the Selection Panel were followed.</p> <p>See notes of Selection Panel for relevant year.</p>
<b>Inputs</b>	<p>What was the process of securing the necessary financial resources?</p> <p>What were the inputs in terms of EU, other public and private funding?</p> <p>How effective were attempts to raise funds through sponsorship? How helpful (or not) was the ECOC brand in this?</p> <p>What was the balance of expenditure on infrastructure, events, management, communications, etc.? (NB We need the split between revenue and capital spend)</p> <p>To what extent did the actual financial inputs reflect those promised in the application?</p>	<p>Political and other challenges to securing funding</p> <p>Role of municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic Director, etc.</p> <p>Fund-raising strategy, sponsorship arrangements, etc.</p> <p>Probe on any issues around administration of the €1.5m EU funding</p> <p>It has been claimed that ECOC is not a clear brand and therefore it is hard to attract sponsors (e.g. compared to the Olympics which has clearly known and understood content and image). It may also be hard to sell 'culture' because of inherent problems in defining</p>	<p>This section helps answer the basic questions of accountability, i.e. did they do what they promised to do?</p> <p>The EU funding was limited to €1.5m and allocated to run specific cultural projects, not as a block grant to manage the ECOC.</p>

	Questions	Some of the issues to explore	Note
	To what extent were the financial inputs sufficient to achieve the desired outputs, results and impacts?	<p>it. We need to test these theories.</p> <p>Connection between infrastructure expenditure (often taking place anyway) and expenditure on cultural activities</p> <p>Reasons for / impact of changes in funding</p>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p>What was the process of agreeing artistic themes and designing the programme?</p> <p>What were the artistic themes?</p> <p>What activities did they undertake?</p> <p>How did the European dimension feature in the themes and the activities? Again, how integral was it - or was it a bolt-on?</p> <p>How were activities selected, implemented and monitored?</p> <p>How/how effectively was the cultural programme publicised (through a communications strategy)? What difficulties were encountered and how were they overcome?</p> <p>To what extent did the themes and activities change between the application date and the title year? (Which were achieved most/least?)</p>	<p>Role of municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic Director, etc.</p> <p>Relevance of the themes to i) Europe; ii) the host city</p> <p>Reasons for / impact of changes in themes and activities</p> <p>Selection of activities, events, projects – by open calls, closed calls, direct commissioning, etc.</p> <p>Balance between high art and popular culture</p> <p>Balance between paying events and free/subsidised</p> <p>Phasing over events over year</p> <p>Role/extent/dissemination of research, monitoring and evaluation</p>	<p>This section helps answer the basic questions of accountability, i.e. did they do what they promised to do?</p> <p>To a certain extent, activities and outputs may, in fact, overlap.</p>
<b>Outputs</b>	<p>How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?</p> <p>What outputs did they produce from the set in the intervention logic? (special focus on the <b>European</b> dimension)</p> <p>Any other significant outputs (not in the intervention logic)?</p> <p>To what extent did the</p>	<p>Role of municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic Director, etc.</p> <p>Decision-making</p> <p>Political challenges</p> <p>Outputs listed in the intervention logic</p>	<p>Consider each of the outputs in the intervention logic.</p> <p>If they broadly produced the outputs in the intervention logic, then relevant to the 1999 Decision and thus also Article 167 of the Treaty.</p> <p>First fundamental evaluation question – extensive, exciting,</p>

	Questions	Some of the issues to explore	Note
	ECOC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?)		innovative cultural programme - can be answered here.  Second fundamental question – European dimension – can be answered in part here.  Third fundamental question – broad participation – can be answered in part here.
<b>Results</b>	<p>How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the title year?</p> <p>What is the evidence that the results listed in the intervention logic were achieved? (special focus on the <b>European dimension</b>)</p> <p>Any other significant results (not in the intervention logic)?</p> <p>To what extent did the ECOC achieve the results hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?)</p>	<p>Role of municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic Director, etc.</p> <p>Decision-making</p> <p>Political challenges</p> <p>Results listed in the intervention logic</p> <p>Expected and unexpected results</p>	<p>Consider each of the results in the intervention logic.</p> <p>Second fundamental question – European dimension – can be answered in part here.</p> <p>Third fundamental question – broad participation – can be answered in part here.</p> <p>Fourth fundamental evaluation question (legacy) answered here.</p>
<b>Impacts</b>	<p>What is the evidence that the impacts listed in the intervention logic were or will be achieved? (special focus on the <b>European dimension</b>)</p> <p>Any other significant impacts (not in the intervention logic)?</p> <p>To what extent did the ECOC achieve the impacts hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?)</p> <p>What elements of the delivery structure (will)</p>	<p>Impacts listed in the intervention logic</p> <p>Expected and unexpected impacts</p> <p>"Hard legacies" e.g. buildings, new organisations, ongoing projects</p> <p>"Soft legacies" e.g. city image, personal skills, new ideas, etc.</p> <p>"Negative legacies" e.g. debts, political tensions</p> <p>Role of delivery agency, municipality, other partners, Board, Chair, Artistic</p>	<p>Consider each of the impacts in the intervention logic.</p> <p>Fourth fundamental evaluation question (legacy) answered here.</p>

	Questions	Some of the issues to explore	Note
	<p>continue to operate?</p> <p>How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the title year?</p> <p>What has been the contribution of the ECOC to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)</p> <p>Has there been a long term impact on levels of funding for culture in the city? Are bids to other EU sources in train or planned?</p>	<p>Director, etc.</p>	



## **Annex Three: Topic guide for other partners**



# Draft topic guide for interviews with ECOC stakeholders

All questions need to be considered in the specific *context* of each city. At each stage, key success factors and good practice also need to be identified. The questions need to be asked with reference to the table of outputs, results and impacts (and associated indicators).

	Questions
<b>Background</b>	<p>Explore background of interviewee and his/her organisation</p> <p>Explore role of interviewee and his/her organisation in the ECOC</p> <p>Explore views of interviewee on the background context of the city (e.g. state of cultural sector, socio-economic context, etc.)</p>
<b>Objectives</b>	<p>What was their overall motivation for participating in the ECOC? (motivation of the partner organisation and their view of the motivation of the city as a whole)</p> <p>What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of consultation / partnership building to define aims and objectives?</p> <p>How relevant were the objectives chosen to the needs/potential of the city and the interests of the partner organisation?</p> <p>In their view, how/how far was the European dimension taken into account? To what extent was the European dimension a bolt-on or integral to the ECOC?</p>
<b>Application and planning/development phases</b>	<p>What difficulties were encountered during the application and planning/development phases and how were these overcome?</p> <p>If there was a new delivery agency / mechanism put in place to develop and deliver the ECOC, what were the key success factors and failure elements related to it?</p>
<b>Inputs</b>	<p>What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of raising the necessary financial resources (EU, public, private, sponsorship etc)?</p> <p>How helpful (or not) was the ECOC brand in attracting funding and sponsorship?</p> <p>In their view, to what extent were the financial inputs sufficient to achieve the desired outputs, results and impacts?</p>
<b>Activities</b>	<p>What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of agreeing artistic themes and designing the programme?</p> <p>What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of selecting, implementing and monitoring activities, events and projects?</p> <p>In their view, how/how far did the European dimension feature in the themes and the activities? Again, to what extent was the European dimension a bolt-on or integral to the cultural programme?</p>

	Questions
	<p>Explore key success factors and failure elements related to specific activities involving the interviewee's organisation</p> <p>What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the communication and publicity of the cultural programme?</p>
<b>Outputs</b>	<p>How did the delivery mechanism contribute the achievement of outputs?</p> <p>Explore key success factors and failure elements related to specific outputs involving the interviewee's organisation</p> <p>To what extent did the ECOC achieve the outputs they hoped for?</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>In what ways did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the title year?</p> <p>Explore interviewee's views relating to achievement of results i) involving the interviewee's organisation; ii) results in general</p> <p>To what extent did the ECOC achieve the results they hoped for?</p>
<b>Impacts</b>	<p>In what ways has the ECOC improved the management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)</p> <p>Explore interviewee's views relating to achievement of impacts i) involving the interviewee's organisation; ii) impacts in general</p> <p>To what extent did the ECOC achieve the impacts they hoped for?</p>

## **Annex Four: List of interviewees**



# Annex Four: List of interviewees

## Interviews undertaken in Linz

Key: F = Face-to-face; T = Telephone

Name	Type of interview	Organisation & Position
<b>Governance and management bodies</b>		
Martin Heller	F X 2	Artistic Director (Intendant), Linz 09
Ulrich Fuchs	F X 2	Deputy Artistic Director, Linz09
Walter Putschögl	F	Managing Director, Linz09
Peter Androsch	F	Music Director, Linz09
Nora Wolloch	F	Performing Arts Manager, Linz09
Sigrid Wilhelm	F	Communications Manager, Linz09
Simon Lachner	F	Hospitality Manager, Linz09
Erich Watzl	F	Deputy Mayor, City of Linz
Gerda Forstner	F	Head of Culture, Culture department of the city of Linz
Reinhard Mattes	F	Head of Culture, Culture department of the Land Upper Austria
Georg Steiner	F	Director, Tourismusverband Linz
Rudolf Trauner	F	Chamber of commerce Upper Austria
Regina Patsch	TEL	ORF Oberösterreich
Dr Thomas Denk		Leader, Wirtschaftskammer Oberösterreich
Prof. Dr. Friedrich Schneider		Professor of Economics, Johannes Kepler University of Linz Department of Economics
<b>Cultural operators</b>		
Gerfried Stocker	TEL	Director, Ars Elektronica
Stella Rollig	TEL	Director, Lentos Museum
Martin Sturm	F	Director, Offenes Kulturhaus OK
Günter Mayer	F	Director, Medienkulturhaus Wels in the Region of Linz
Holger Jagersberger	F	Director, Salzamt Atelier

## Interviews undertaken in Vilnius

Name	Type of interview	Organisation & Position
<b>Governance and management bodies</b>		
Daiva Dapšienė	F	Ministry of Culture, Head of International Relations and European Affairs Department
Gintautas Babravičius	F	Vilnius City Municipality, Deputy Mayor
Nijolė Beliukevičienė	F	Vilnius City Municipality, Head of Tourism Division
Rolandas Kvietkauskas	F x3	Delivery Agency, Director
Daina Urbanavičienė	T	Delivery Agency, Programme Director
Ieva Skaržinskaitė	T	Delivery Agency, Project Manager for "European School of Arts"
Laura Grudzinevičiūtė	F	Delivery Agency, Head of Marketing and Communications
Dalia Bankauskaitė	F	Delivery Agency, former Deputy Director
Gražina Soltonienė	F	EC delegation
<b>Cultural operators</b>		
Rūta Prusevičienė	F	Lithuanian National Philharmonic Society, Director General
Lolita Jablonskienė	F	National Art Gallery, Director
Agnė Vasiliauskaitė	F	Cultural & Media Consulting, project coordinator "maProject" (European School of Arts)
Inga Nostytė	F	Project coordinator "Vilnius Academy of Literature: Acquaintances and Connections" (European School of Arts)
Nida Rutkienė	F	Director of Gallery Vartai, Artscape project promoter
Arūnas Matelis	F	Film Director
Gražina Arlickaitė	F	Festival Scanorama, Director
Judita Akromienė	F	House of Europe, Director
Mykolas Vildžiūnas	F	"Kaukių akademija", Project promoter

## **Annex Five: Table of effects of the European Capitals of Culture**



# Annex Five: Table of effects of the European Capitals of Culture

## Outputs, results and impacts of the Linz ECOC (EQ33, EQ34, EQ38, EQ39, EQ40, EQ41)

The table below presents the generic expected/intended effects of the ECOC Action (see the conceptual framework in Table 2.2 of the report). In bold italics we highlight the actual outcomes of Linz, for which evidence is available. Below the table we also present the findings of an independent study into the economic impact of the Linz ECOC.

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
Support the development of local artists and cultural organisations	Individuals/organisations receiving support <b>Great number of co-operations with the local cultural scene</b>	Larger/stronger/more skilled sector <b>Stakeholders report enhanced capacity for project development and an improved level of qualification both on the part of institutions and independent artists</b>	International/national profile and importance of city's cultural sector
Commission new artworks and encourage new forms of cultural expression	New artworks / new forms of cultural expression <b>3 cultural prizes for projects</b> <b>New commissions/new works</b> <b>Innovative use of venues and public space</b>	Ongoing process/trend for stimulating new artworks / forms of cultural expression <b>Some innovative activities continuing, e.g. elements of Hörstadt</b>	Recognised & ongoing contribution to artistic innovation
Organise cultural events, activities and projects	Cultural events, activities and projects <b>220 projects</b> <b>7,700 events</b> Individuals accessing events, activities and projects <b>2,895,000 visitors in 2009</b> <b>600,000 visitors in 2006-2008</b>	Positive effects on participants <b>88% of Linzers rated the ECOC proposal as "good" or "very good"</b>	More cultural activity taking place on on-going basis / Step change in vibrancy of cultural scene <b>Many activities continuing including Hörstadt (Acoustic City), Kepler Salon, Turmeremit (The Hermit Of The Tower), Festival Next Comic and Pixel Hotel</b>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
Implement activities with a specific European theme (diversity and commonalities)	Events with European themes <b>Numerous events, including Extra Europa, Crossing Europe film festival, Linzfest09, Europa – Die Demokratische Herausforderung (Europe – The Challenge Of Democracy)</b>	Effects on participants – more aware of European diversity and common cultural heritage <b>Stakeholders and media report greater awareness of European issue</b>	More cultural activities taking place with a European theme / More European outlook of city residents <b>Stakeholders report a broadening of international horizons amongst residents and cultural operators</b>
Facilitate international exchanges and create international networking structures	Individuals and organisations on exchanges <b>100 delegations received from 30 countries</b> Transnational activities <b>220 projects featuring 5000 artists from 66 nations</b> <b>17 co-productions with Vilnius09</b>	Effects on participants – more likely to participate in exchanges in future	Sustainable platform for international cooperation established <b>Ongoing collaborations with cultural operators in other countries</b>
Improve access to culture	Events, activities and projects to widen participation and improve access to culture <b>Range of events, notably Bellevue, Kulturhauptstadtteil Des Monats (Culture Capital Neighbourhood of the Month) And Brauhaus (The Brewery)</b> Individuals from target groups accessing activities, events and projects <b>18,000 visitors to KINDERPUNKT09</b> <b>2,000 school pupils and 700 teachers involved in “I like to move it, move it”</b> <b>33,000 local residents visited</b>	Positive effects on participants More people from target groups accessing culture <b>50% of Linzers visited an event (by August 2009)</b> <b>30% of residents of Upper Austria visited an event (by August 2009)</b> <b>7.5% of Austrians visited an event (by August 2009)</b>	Step change in cultural participation

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
	<p><b>Bellevue</b>  <b>15,250 visitors to Capital of Culture Neighbourhoods of the Month</b>            New approaches to participation  <b>1,000 participants in the “Flood”</b>            Volunteering activities  <b>220 volunteers</b></p>		
<p>Improve the capacity for governance in the culture sector</p>	<p>Effective delivery mechanisms  <b>Dedicated delivery agency in operation 2005-10</b></p>	<p>Greater engagement with the cultural sector  <b>Jointly marketing plan of Tourist Board Linz and Linz09</b>  <b>Collaboration between Linz09 and Oberösterreich Tourismus and Österreich Werbung</b></p>	<p>Sustainable platform for cultural activities established  <b>Better long-term collaboration between tourism and cultural sectors</b>  <b>“hotspots” (association focussed on improving the quality offered by catering businesses and hotels</b></p>
<p>Promote the city as a cultural destination nationally and internationally (especially in the EU)</p>	<p>Marketing campaigns to promote the city and its cultural programme to visitors and tourists (including those specifically stressing the European dimension) and activities to improve the visitor experience  <b>19% of budget allocated to communication and marketing</b>  <b>More than 25,000 media reports mentioning Linz 09 – in 2,600 national and international media channels</b>  <b>12 communication or marketing prizes</b></p>	<p>Increase in visitors and tourism (from within country, EU and outside EU)  <b>738,555 overnight stays (10% increase)</b>  <b>2m day visitors</b>  <b>167,601 visitors and callers to Linz 09 Infocenter in 2009</b>  <b>5, 100 participants in guided tours in 2009</b>  <b>2009 saw increases in visits from Austria (19.9%), and neighbouring countries Germany(15.6%), Switzerland (28%), Czech Republic</b></p>	<p>City recognised internationally (and especially in the EU) as a cultural destination  <b>2,600 national and international media items</b></p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
Improve image of the city	<p>855,650 web site users and 3.9m page impressions in 2009</p> <p>Information/promotion activities focussed on improving image (including branding)</p> <p><b>Specific Linz09 branding</b></p> <p><b>New image based on "Industry, Nature, Culture"</b></p>	<p>(28%), Italy (4.7%)</p> <p>Residents' perceptions and media coverage more positive</p> <p><b>97% of Linzers, 90% of Upper Austrians and 60% of Austrians aware of ECOC (Spectra)</b></p> <p><b>97% of Linzers felt "well informed" or "very well informed" about ECOC (August 2009)</b></p>	<p>Improved civic pride and image (internally and externally)</p> <p><b>"Overwhelmingly positive" media coverage, especially in international media</b></p> <p><b>Improvement in public image (Spectra)</b></p>
Undertake capital improvements to cultural infrastructure	<p>New and refurbished facilities</p> <p><b>4 architecture prizes</b></p> <p><b>Complementary programme of capital investments, e.g. expansion of Ars Electronica Center, South Wing of Schlossmuseum Linz, International Atelierhaus Salzamt, Kepler Salon</b></p>	<p>Increased physical capacity for cultural events</p> <p><b>New venues provide increased capacity, e.g. Ars Electronica</b></p>	<p>Improved cultural and tourist offering</p> <p><b>Cultural and infrastructure investments estimated to have increase regional GDP by €426m and created or safeguarded 4,625 jobs</b></p>
Provide training and business support in the cultural field	<p>Individuals and businesses trained, supported</p> <p><b>Hospitality programme, including training and support for local businesses</b></p>	<p>Stronger businesses, higher skills levels</p> <p><b>Identified improvements in capacity of tourism and cultural sectors</b></p>	<p>Greater economic success of cultural sector</p> <p><b>Cultural projects estimated to have increase regional GDP by €8.4m and created or safeguarded 93 jobs</b></p>

Sources: Final Report Linz 09 European Capital of Culture; Spectra Marktforschungsinstitut August 2009; interviews with stakeholders in Linz; Wirtschaftsfaktor Städtetourismus - Eine empirische Untersuchung für Linz, Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider.

## Economic impact of Linz 2009

The economics department of Johannes Kepler University in Linz conducted an economic study on the impact (specifically direct and indirect return on investment) of ECOC on the regional economy of Upper Austria.<sup>1</sup> This uses an established econometric modelling system, constructed on a sector-by-sector basis and with inputs provided by the city council, regional government from external sources. The entry parameters are

- Levels of investment in new infrastructure (17 cultural and urban projects with combined total €323m)
- Details of (6) high profile cultural events and when they took place
- Ticket revenue
- Numbers of visitors

The model both has been used to calculate direct and indirect benefits to the region, in terms of income and employment over the period from 2005 to 2001. It calculates

- Additional regional GDP of €426m
- Additional regional income of €302.5m (N.B. forms part of GDP figure)
- 4,625 jobs created or secured

The vast majority of these effects stem from physical infrastructure projects, many funded by the city and region over and above the €61.5m allocated to Linz 2009 GmbH. The researchers suggest that if the taxes payable to national Government are also taken into account, Linz 09 and its associated infrastructure developments approach break-even.

The analysis also calculates the impact of purely cultural projects taking place in 2009, calculating that these led to:

- Additional regional GDP of €8.4m
- Additional regional income of €5.9m
- 93 jobs created or secured

<sup>1</sup> Wirtschaftsfaktor Städtetourismus - Eine empirische Untersuchung für Linz (Full report - Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider; see [www.linz.at/images/ko-staedtetourismus.pdf](http://www.linz.at/images/ko-staedtetourismus.pdf))

## Economic impact of urban tourism

The University also carried out a study on the economic impacts associated with the increased numbers of tourists and visitors visiting Linz during 2009 as well as of the improvements to the hotel infrastructure (taking place between 2006 and 2008). The study estimates tourist spend per night at between €150 and €250, with between 70% and 85% of the additional investment remaining in the region.

While the study explores the total contribution of the tourist economy to Linz, it also compares the data for 2008 and 2009. The study calculates year on year increases of

- Between €3.5m and €4.3m in additional regional GDP (€150 average spend)
- Between €5.9m and €7.2m in additional regional GDP (€250 average spend)
- Between €2.5m and €3.1m in additional regional income (€150 average spend)
- Between €4.2m and €5.1m in additional regional income (€250 average spend)
- Between 39 and 47 created or secured (€150 average spend)
- Between 65 and 78 additional jobs (€250 average spend)

The study utilises visitor data for 2009 provided by the Tourism directorate in Linz. This shows;

- 9% increase in overnight stays compared to 2008, including
  - ▶ 24% increase in May
  - ▶ 20% in June
  - ▶ 8% in July
- Significant increases from neighbouring countries
  - ▶ Switzerland up 23%
  - ▶ Czech Republic up 23%
  - ▶ Germany up 18%
- Domestic visitors up 18%
- Large reductions in tourists from further afield – linked to economic crisis<sup>1</sup>
  - ▶ Russia down 53%
  - ▶ USA down 45.5%

<sup>1</sup> Linz airport saw 15% fall in overall passenger numbers between 2008 and 2009  
<http://www.linz-airport.at/www/cm/system/galleries/download/documents/statistik.pdf>

For the €67m spent on new hotel projects and €6.5m on improving or extending existing hotels, the study calculates;

- Additional regional GDP of between €64m and €78m
- Additional regional income of between €45m and 55m
- Between 664 and 806 jobs created or secured

## Outputs, results and impacts of Vilnius ECOC (EQ33, EQ34, EQ38, EQ39, EQ40, EQ41)

The table below presents the generic expected/intended effects of the ECOC Action (see the conceptual framework in Table 2.2 of the report). In bold italics we highlight the actual outcomes of Vilnius, for which evidence is available.

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
Support the development of local artists and cultural organisations	Individuals/organisations receiving support <b>More local operators received support than in previous years.</b>	Larger/stronger/more skilled sector <b>The cultural operators have gained significant experience during the title year. They had the opportunity to receive more funding for their projects and realise their ideas and larger scale projects.</b> <b>A new association uniting cultural operators has been established to represent cultural organisations within the wider policy context.</b>	International/national profile and importance of city's cultural sector <b>Cooperation with international partners improved the international profile of local/national cultural operators.</b>
Commission new artworks and encourage new forms of cultural expression	New artworks <b>Leading Russian conductor Valery Gergiev, performed "Lithuanian Saga" created by Rodion Shchedrin specifically for Vilnius</b> <b>New sculptures within public spaces humanisation programme</b> <b>Georges Rousse, a world-famous French artist, installation in old building</b> <b>More than 200 art objects created and installed in Children Hospital</b> <b>Prototypes of new furniture in public spaces</b> <b>Kadish (Requiem) for Holocaust</b>	Ongoing process/trend for stimulating new artworks / forms of cultural expression <b>Major cultural operators have gained significant experience in running larger and more ambitious projects.</b>	Recognised & ongoing contribution to artistic innovation <b>Some of the projects initiated in Vilnius are further being developed in other countries, e.g. the film by Carl Theodor Dreyer "The Passion of Joan of Arc" together with the music written by B.Kutavicius will be performed in "FEBIO Fest" in Prague; the festival Neu Now Vilnius09 is being organised in other cities; the cooperation with the art galleries developing the cold war theme is taking place as the follow up on the exhibition Cold War Modern: Design 1945-1970.</b>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
	<p><i>victims by A. Senderov (Lithuania)</i>  <i>Music by Lithuanian composer B. Kutavicius for silent film "La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc"</i>  <i>F. Dostoyevsky. The Idiot, dir. E. Nekrosius (Lithuania)</i>  <i>Mental Finland, dir. K. Smeds (Finland)</i>  <i>Cherry Orchard, dir. K. Smeds (Finland)</i>  <i>W. Shakespeare. Hamlet, dir. O. Korsunovas (Lithuania)</i>            New forms of cultural expression  <b>The project "European School of Arts" presented creative workshops for higher education institutions and art students.</b></p>		
Organise cultural events, activities and projects	<p>Cultural events, activities and projects  <b>100 projects and 1,500 events</b>            Individuals accessing events, activities and projects  <b>Around 1.5 million visitors</b>  <b>Audience/visitor numbers for the 5 or 10 largest events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Opening events – about 200.000</b></li> <li>• <b>Street Music Day – about 100.000</b></li> <li>• <b>Culture Night – about 100.000</b></li> <li>• <b>Exhibition of Georgian artist Pirosmeni – 30.000</b></li> </ul>	<p>Positive effects on participants  <b>10.7% of residents participated in ECOC events; 8.6 % participated in more than one event; 2.1% mentioned that they often participate in ECOC events.</b></p>	<p>More cultural activity taking place on on-going basis / Step change in vibrancy of cultural scene  <b>Some events will continue e.g. Street Music Day, Let There be Night.</b></p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Icy Baroque</i> – 30.000</li> <li>• <i>Exhibition “Cold War Modern. Design 1945-1970”</i> – 25.000</li> <li>• <i>Children’s creativity festival</i> – 20.000</li> <li>• <i>Exhibition “Colour and Sound Dialogues”. Works by Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis and His Contemporaries</i> – 25.000</li> <li>• <i>Art fair “Art Vilnius’09”</i> – 17.000</li> </ul>		
<p>Implement activities with a specific European theme (diversity and commonalities)</p>	<p>Events with European themes</p> <p><b>European dimension was prioritised in the selection criteria.</b></p> <p><b>Projects within the European Arts Programme, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Cold War Modern and Design 1945-1970</i> exhibition;</li> <li>• <i>Performance of the silent film by C.T.Dreyer “The Passion of Joan of Arc” with the music created by Lithuanian composer B.Kutavicius;</i></li> <li>• <b>ARTscape project</b></li> <li>• <b>13 sub-projects with participants and workshop leaders from other European countries</b></li> </ul>	<p>Effects on participants – more aware of European diversity and common cultural heritage</p> <p><b>Two exhibitions at the National Art Gallery received over 25,000 visitors each. The exhibitions were:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Cold War Modern and Design 1945-1970</i> exhibition;</li> <li>• <i>Dialogue of Colour and Sound, Works by Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis and his Contemporaries</i></li> </ul>	<p>More cultural activities taking place with a European theme</p> <p>More European outlook of city residents</p> <p><b>Co-operation with international partners was of key importance for the cultural operators who have been able to develop significant partnerships and large scale projects.</b></p>
<p>Facilitate international exchanges and create international networking structures</p>	<p>Individuals and organisations on exchanges</p> <p><b>European School of Arts facilitated 800 student or teacher exchanges across 38 countries and 340 events</b></p>	<p>Effects on participants – more likely to participate in exchanges in future</p> <p><b>Cooperation with existing international partners as well as with new ones has increased.</b></p>	<p>Sustainable platform for international cooperation established</p> <p><b>Some cultural operators are planning new exchanges with international partners.</b></p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
	<p>Transnational activities</p> <p><b>European Arts Programme facilitated cooperation with international partners, the most important events including European partners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Concert by the Philharmonic Orchestra of Duisburg and the Lithuanian State Symphony Orchestra;</b></li> <li>• <b>Capital to Capital (project of Stavanger Brass Band and the Vilnius choir “Jauna muzika”);</b></li> <li>• <b>Water Music of Capital City (music project of Vilnius and Linz music academies);</b></li> <li>• <b>Meeting at Crossroads (cooperation project of Vilnius and Linz music schools);</b></li> <li>• <b>Theatre performance “Cherry Orchard” (dir. Kristian Smeds (Finland) and Lithuanian artists);</b></li> <li>• <b>The international art exhibition “Longing for nature. European landscapes” (organizers – Upper Austrian State Museum and Lithuanian National Art Museum)</b></li> <li>• <b>Exhibition “Cold War Modern. Design 1945-1970” (exhibition in National Art Gallery organized by Victoria and Albert Museum, London)</b></li> </ul>		<p><b>Co-operations with major international institutions have been enabled i.e. cooperation with Victoria and Albert museum, London Symphony Orchestra, exhibition of Hans Op De Beeck “Vartai”, tour by Comédie Française.</b></p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
<p>Improve access to culture</p>	<p><i>Conferences and meetings included those organised by international organisations and networks i.e. European Festival Association (EFA), meeting of European network of cultural journals "Eurozine"</i></p> <p><i>International volunteers programme was expected to receive 48 volunteers from abroad in 2008.</i></p> <p>Events, activities and projects to widen participation and improve access to culture</p> <p>Individuals from target groups accessing activities, events and projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Terno Vilna (for Roma community);</i></li> <li>• <i>Day of the Sun (project for disabled people);</i></li> <li>• <i>Children's creativity festival.</i></li> </ul> <p>New approaches to participation</p> <p>Volunteering activities</p> <p><i>Art Territory project looked at the role of art in health care. Over 300 art works created for the Vilnius University Children Hospital. First conference addressing the issue of art in the health care system.</i></p> <p><i>Volunteers programme was one of the largest and most extensive volunteers programme in Vilnius</i></p>		
		<p>Positive effects on participants</p> <p>More people from target groups accessing culture</p>	<p>Step change in cultural participation</p> <p><b>Stakeholders reported a step-change in volunteering in the cultural sector of Vilnius.</b></p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
<p>Improve the capacity for governance in the culture sector</p>	<p><i>involving around 500 volunteers.</i></p> <p>Effective delivery mechanisms  <b><i>New delivery agency established.</i></b></p>	<p>Greater engagement with the cultural sector  <b><i>Some smaller cultural operators started to cooperate and are establishing an association representing their interests within the wider policy context.</i></b></p>	<p>Sustainable platform for cultural activities established</p>
<p>Promote the city as a cultural destination nationally and internationally (especially in the EU)</p>	<p>Marketing campaigns to promote the city and its cultural programme to visitors and tourists (including those specifically stressing the European dimension) and activities to improve the visitor experience</p> <p><b><i>Programme identity and communications strategy.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Presentations to tourism fairs and in tourism publications from 2005. Extensive international marketing campaign in 2008:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Presentations of the ECOC in cooperation with tourism information centres and Lithuanian Embassies.</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>Communication campaign "Hello, We Discovered You – You Discover Us" in 8 countries, with 900 billboards</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>Coordinated communication campaign in 10 countries: 577 TV commercials; 1950 billboards.</i></b></li> </ul>	<p>Increase in visitors and tourism (from within country, EU and outside EU)  <b><i>Vilnius implemented its largest ever communications campaign presenting the city and the country abroad.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Over 700 participants came to presentations in 2008.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Some 153 media representatives from 22 countries visited Vilnius. ECOC was also presented to the foreign media representatives in Vilnius. Some 500 journalists from 16 countries witnessed the presentations.</i></b></p>	<p>City recognised internationally (and especially in the EU) as a cultural destination</p>

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
Improve image of Vilnius	<p><i>Audience of 65m reached. Press articles in 13 languages.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Visits of journalists from abroad.</i></li> <li>• <i>Presentations to 15 international tourism fairs in 2008.</i></li> </ul> <p>Information/promotion activities focussed on improving image of Vilnius (including branding)</p> <p><b>Dedicated logo / programme identity</b></p> <p><b>Ambassadors' programme aimed to build the network of Vilnius residents who would spread good news about Vilnius to their friends and colleagues.</b></p>	Residents' perceptions and media coverage more positive	Improved civic pride and image (internally and externally)
Undertake capital improvements to cultural infrastructure	<p>New and refurbished facilities</p> <p><b>Associated programme of infrastructure improvements</b></p> <p><b>Most important infrastructure improvement projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>National Art Gallery;</b></li> <li>• <b>Vilnius Art Academy Design Innovation Centre;</b></li> <li>• <b>Arts Printing House</b></li> </ul>	<p>Increased physical capacity for cultural events</p> <p><b>Refurbishment of Arts Printing House and National Art Gallery.</b></p>	Improved cultural and tourist offering
Provide training and business support in the cultural field	<p>Individuals and businesses trained, supported</p> <p><b>Hospitality programme 2008 provided training and information for restaurants, hotels, galleries, tourism agencies, guides, taxi</b></p>	Stronger businesses, higher skills levels	Greater economic success of cultural sector

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	RESULTS	IMPACTS
	<i>companies, coach and train station employees and working directly with visitors (67 heads of organisations and 300 employees).</i>		

Sources



## **Annex Six: Bibliography**



# Annex Six: Bibliography

---

## EU-level literature

- Binns, L. (2005), *Capitalising on culture: an evaluation of culture-led urban regeneration policy*. Articles, Paper 5, Futures Academy Dublin Institute of Technology, <http://arrow.dit.ie/futuresacart/5>.
- European Commission (1985), *Resolution of the Ministers Responsible for Cultural Affairs Concerning the Annual Event European City of Culture (7081/84)*.
- European Commission (2004), *Evaluating EU Activities. A practical guide for the Commission services*, p.71.
- European Commission (2007), *Employment in Europe 2007*, ISSN: 1016-5444.
- European Parliament and European Council (1999), *Decision No 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019*.
- European Parliament and European Council (2000), *Decision No 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 programme*.
- European Parliament and European Council (2006), *Decision No 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019*.
- European Parliament and European Council (2006), *Decision No 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013)*.
- European Union (2006), *Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and of the Treaty Establishing the European Community*, C 321 E/1, 29.12.2006.
- Griffiths, R. (2006), *City/Culture Discourses: Evidence from the Competition to Select the European Capital of Culture 2008*; European Planning Studies, Volume 14, No.4, May 2006.
- Palmer-Rae Associates (2004), *European Cities and Capitals of Culture*; Study Prepared for the European Commission.
- Selection Panel for the European Capital of Culture 2009 (2005), *Report on the Nominations from Austria and Lithuania for the European Capital of Culture 2009*.
- Stevenson, D. (2004) *Civic gold rush: Cultural planning and the politics of the Third Way*, International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10(1), pp. 119–131.

## Websites

- CIA World Factbook, [www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook](http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook)
- Europa: European Capital of Culture; [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc413\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc413_en.htm)

## Linz

- 1979-2004 Ars Electronica: the first 25 years
- Auszeichnungen/Preise/Nominierungen in folgenden Bereichen: 1. Kommunikation und Marketing; 2. Projekte; 3. Architektur
- Culture meets Economy - Wirtschaftskrise = Kulturkrise. Georg Steiner, Tourismusdirektor von Linz
- Draft of Final Summary Report by Linz 09 GmbH
- Erhebliche Umwegrentabilität durch das Kulturhauptstadt-Jahr 2009 (Powerpoint presentation by Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider )
- Europäische Kulturmonat Linz – Pressespiegel
- Europäische Kulturmonatsstadt 1998 - Eine Dokumentation
- Facts & Figures (Communication and Tourism) - Tourismusverband Linz
- Facts & Figures 30.11.2009
- Facts & Figures 31.1.2010
- Höhenrausch - Presseinformation Mai 2009, OK Offenes Kulturhaus
- Höhenrausch project book by OK Offenes Kulturhaus
- In Situ (map)
- Kooperation Linz09 Member
- Kooperation Linz09 Premium Club
- Kooperation Linz09 TOP Club
- Kulturhauptstadt des Führers - Oberösterreichische Landesmuseen
- Kulturhauptstadtteil des Monats (booklet)
- Linz 2009 Application for European Capital of Culture
- Linz 2009 European Capital of Culture: A Stocktaking. Press release - Linz 09 GmbH

- Linz09 - was bleibt? Georg Steiner, Tourismusdirektor von Linz
- Linz09 Dialogue: application for EU funding
- linz09: Culture as a source of fascination for everyone. Martin Heller
- Linz09: The statements, Linz09 GmbH
- LinzBuch
- Neuner
- Press release 1.12.2009
- Programme 1/3
- Programme 2/3
- Programme 3/3
- Report on the nominations from Austria and Lithuania for the European Capital of Culture 2009 - ECOC selection panel
- Schaurausch exhibition guide - OK Offenes Kulturhaus
- The Programme - Linz 2009 European Capital of Culture
- Volkswirtschaftliche Analyse der Umwegrentabilität ausgewählter Kulturprojekte und Investitionen in Kulturbauten „Kulturhauptstadt Linz 2009“ (Full report - Dr.h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider )
- Volkswirtschaftliche Analyse der Umwegrentabilität ausgewählter Kulturprojekte und Investitionen in Kulturbauten „Kulturhauptstadt Linz 2009“ (Powerpoint presentation by Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider )
- Wirtschaftsfaktor Städtetourismus - Eine empirische Untersuchung für Linz (Full report - Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c.mult. Friedrich Schneider; see [www.linz.at/images/ko-staedtetourismus.pdf](http://www.linz.at/images/ko-staedtetourismus.pdf))
- [www.linz09.info](http://www.linz09.info)

## Vilnius

- Vilnius 2009 Application for European Capital of Culture
- Vilnius CV: Creativity and Vitality (part of the original application)
- Application for European School of Arts project
- Delivery Agency report for 2007
- Delivery Agency report for 2008
- European School of Art final report
- Government Resolution No.150 dated 6 February 2008
- Government Resolution No.119 dated 6 February 2008
- Government Resolution No. 1231 dated 24 November 2008
- The statute / terms of reference of the Delivery Agency dated 29 December 2008
- Events of the European Capital of Culture extended the cultural landscape of Vilnius, 29 December 2009 (Press release)
- Culture Programme
- [www.vilnius2009.lt](http://www.vilnius2009.lt)



**Published by**  
ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd

Vincent House  
Quay Place  
92-93 Edward Street  
Birmingham  
B1 2RA

**T** +44 (0) 845 313 7455

**F** +44 (0) 121 212 8899

**W** [www.ecotec.com](http://www.ecotec.com)

