

**REPORT
OF THE SECOND MONITORING and
ADVISORY MEETING
FOR THE EUROPEAN CAPITALS OF
CULTURE 2011**

**Issued by
The Monitoring and Advisory Panel for the European
Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2011**

May 2010

This is the report of the second monitoring and advisory meeting of the European Capital of Culture Panel. The meeting concerned the 2011 European Capitals of Culture, namely Tallinn (Estonia), and Turku (Finland); it took place on 28 April 2010.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Presentation of the context and the role of the monitoring and advisory panel in accordance with Decision 1622/2006/EC

The European Capitals of Culture (ECOC) initiative, a major European Union activity, is a way of bringing together people from the European Union and other European countries who are involved in culture. The objective is to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, as well as to promote greater mutual knowledge and understanding among Europe's citizens.

"The European City of Culture" project was launched in 1985 by the Member States meeting in the Council on the initiative of Mrs Melina Mercouri. Since then, the event has grown in popularity every year, and is now well known to European citizens.

Until 2004, the European Capitals of Culture were designated by the Council on the basis of intergovernmental cooperation. Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council established a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019. By this decision, a new nomination procedure was introduced, involving a panel in charge of assessing the proposals of cities.

For each year from 2009 to 2019, two Member States are entitled to make proposals to the EU: one from the Member States which joined the EU in 2004, another one from the others.

Following recommendations from stakeholders, the scheme of designating the European Capitals of Culture was modified in 2006, in order to introduce more effective and European designations. Consequently, Decision 1622/2006/EC is now the only applicable legal Decision.

In accordance with this Decision, the 2010 European Capitals of Culture and all those that follow are submitted to a monitoring phase between the designation and the beginning of the event.

The monitoring is carried out under the responsibility of 7 members designated by the European Institutions. This panel is called the monitoring and advisory panel. It shall be convened on two occasions between the designation and the beginning of the event to give advice on, and to take stock of the preparations for the event with a view to helping the cities develop a high-quality programme with a strong European dimension.

For the 2011 title, the first monitoring meeting took place in late 2008 and the final one on 28 April 2010.

On the basis of the report issued by the monitoring and advisory panel after its second meeting, a prize in honour of Melina Mercouri shall be awarded to the designated

cities by the Commission provided that they meet the criteria of the action and have implemented the recommendations made by the selection as well as the monitoring and advisory panels (the prize will not be awarded if the conditions mentioned above are not fulfilled). The prize shall be monetary and shall be awarded in full – if all conditions are met - three months before the start of the relevant year. It will be paid from the European Union's Culture Programme. The requirements for the award of the prize are mentioned in paragraph 5 below.

1.2. European Capitals of Culture 2011: selection and designation

Finland and Estonia were the two Member States entitled to make proposals for the 2011 title. Estonia proposed Tallinn and Finland proposed Turku. The selection panel met in June 2007 to examine the candidate cities for the 2011 title. This examination included hearings of representatives from all the candidate cities. The panel submitted its report to the Commission on 13 June 2007. At the request of the panel, the Commission forwarded it to the other Institutions.

On the basis of an overall evaluation of the applications, the panel – while suggesting some improvements (of a considerably substantial scale in the case of Tallinn) - reached a consensus to recommend to the Institutions of the European Union that Tallinn and Turku host the European Capital of Culture in 2011.

The Committee on Culture and Education of the European Parliament forwarded a letter to DG EAC on 30 September 2007 as a follow up to the panel's report which had been received, to highlight the relevant aspects of the exchange of views it had on this matter.

In conclusion, the Commission, in accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2 of Decision 1622/2006/EC submitted to the Council a recommendation for the official designation of Tallinn and Turku for the 2011 European Capital of Culture event.

1.3. The EU Council of Ministers in November 2007 designated Tallinn and Turku as the 2011 European Capitals of Culture. Remarks made by the selection panel and during the first meeting of the monitoring and advisory panel

This section summarizes remarks made by the selection panel in 2007 and during the first meeting of the monitoring and advisory panel in 2008.

1.3.1. Tallinn

Selection :

In its report of June 2007 the panel acknowledged that Estonia and Tallinn had changed a great deal in the few years since independence. They also accepted that this "youthfulness" would have an impact on the development of new cultural infrastructures as well as the formation of the 2011 programme. They noted that the Bid Book included almost 400 million Euros of capital investment in new and renovated buildings for cultural activity. As far as the 2011 programme was concerned this budget amounted to nearly 40 million Euros, although this level of expenditure was yet to be guaranteed.

The panel therefore invited Tallinn to step up their efforts through revisiting some core assumptions of planning, inclusive participation and contemporary excellence. A constant commitment of the State and municipal and governments up to the event was essential as well, in particular regarding financial undertakings. However, as recommended in the documents available to the applicants, a fair degree of artistic and managerial independence from political structures was advisable to make the planning viable, robust, and artistically and intellectually solid.

First monitoring :

The panel recognised that major steps forward had been made by the Foundation, however it strongly advised the delegation to be on their guard and to try to develop a programme that was not only broad and inclusive, but also cutting edge in its artistic choices. It would appreciate further information on the projects selected through the open call and on the manner in which a broad spectrum of Tallinn's multicultural population was expected to be included in the ongoing activities, particularly the large minority with an ethnic Russian background. The panel appreciated Tallinn's efforts to reinforce the leadership of the Foundation since the selection meeting.

Concerning the budget of the event, the panel stressed the importance of securing the financial participation of the state as soon as possible, since this element was essential for the successful implementation of the year. Prior to the second monitoring meeting, the panel indicated that it would welcome further detailed information on the guarantees provided for the programme's funding, a clearer presentation of the funding (clearer figures and an indication of sources), clear information on the development of the content of the programme - particularly concerning its European dimension - on the infrastructure and civic involvement in its progress.

1.3.2. Turku:

Selection :

The selection panel was impressed by Turku's presentation. The bottom up approach was vivid and it was very clear that citizens were being involved. However, the panel remarked that it was not entirely clear what the sustainable impact of the actions would be, for example on the creative industries. A figure of 2 billion Euros was mentioned with regard to the economic value of these industries. The panel asked for more detailed information on this figure to be submitted in writing.

The panel's feeling was that true artistic challenges and choices could be lost in the magnitude of ideas. The panel was not entirely convinced that the presented management construction and internal project selection criteria could guarantee contemporary and daring artistic choices to be made in order to unearth the underground art Turku wanted to bring to the foreground. The panel would advise that this be given more consideration. However it was very clear that many ideas had emerged. The great challenge now was to get the focus right and find a balance in the quality and diversity of the programme. In this respect the panel pointed towards the past Baltic Music Festival which was very successful and internationally acclaimed because of its focus on contemporary composers.

The panel was impressed by the description of the project *Bordering Memories* and by the partnership which is being forged between St Petersburg, Turku and Tallinn. The partnership in the context of this project can lead to cultural exchange, but also to next steps in development. The panel stressed as well the importance of the government's commitment to the event. Finally, the panel welcomed the fact that the programme was integrated convincingly in the long-term cultural development plan of the city.

First monitoring:

The panel complimented the delegation for the fine process which had been developed. However, it also advised the delegation to incorporate cutting edge ideas into the process in order to develop an event with the real artistic energy necessary for the Turku on Fire logo to be more than just a motto, and to avoid the year ending up as a provincial event without real European resonance. An invigorating project such as this required curiosity and a sharp artistic vision as much as clear management and a transparent selection process.

The panel expected Turku 2011 to make progress in the artistic process in the coming months and would greatly appreciate further information on the selected projects.

In the context of the second monitoring meeting, the panel would pay particular attention to the cutting edge ideas that the Foundation would incorporate in the programme as well as the European dimension of the year.

1.4. The monitoring and advisory panel

The monitoring and advisory panel was composed of the following members:

Sir Robert Scott and Mr Manfred Gaulhofer, appointed by the Commission for the 2008-2010 period.

Mr Andreas Wiesand and Ms Danuta Glondys, appointed by the European Parliament for the 2009-2011 period.

Ms Hennicot-Schoepges and Mr Constantin Chiriac, appointed by the Council for the 2010-2012 period.

Ms Elisabeth Vitouch, appointed by the Committee of the Regions for the 2010-2012 period.

Mr Wiesand was excused.

The panel was chaired by Sir Robert Scott.

2. MEETING OF THE MONITORING AND ADVISORY PANEL IN BRUSSELS, 28 APRIL 2010

The 2011 European Capitals of Culture had been invited by the panel to answer some questions listed in a monitoring form and to return it to the Commission. The Commission then forwarded the completed forms to the panel.

The panel members were invited to a meeting on 28 April 2010 in Brussels, coordinated by the European Commission. The cities were expected to present the progress achieved so far in the preparation of the event and to answer questions from the panel members.

The following were present from the European Commission as observers: Ann Branch (Head of Unit - Culture Programme and Actions), Jacqueline Pacaud, Patrizia Baralli and Denis Mahon (Culture Programme and Actions Unit).

The meeting was structured around the following sessions:

- Opening by the Commission, internal debate of the panel (restricted to panel members and the Commission).
- Presentation by representatives from Tallinn and question/answer session
- Presentation by representatives from Turku and question/answer session
- Panel discussion, outlines of the report and conclusions (restricted to panel members and the Commission).

3. SUMMARY OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE 2011 ECOCs AND QUESTION/ANSWER SESSIONS

At the beginning of each session Sir Robert Scott welcomed each delegation and recalled that the meeting came towards the end of the preparation phase and that it was on the basis of the panel's report that the Commission would decide whether or not to award the Melina Mercouri Prize. Sir Robert Scott also introduced the three new panel members who were not at the first monitoring meeting, namely Ms Erna Hennicot-Schoepges (Council designation), Ms Elisabeth Vitouch (Committee of the Regions nomination), and Mr Constantin Chiriac (Council designation).

A) Tallinn 2011

The Tallinn delegation, consisting of Mr. Mikko Fritze and Jaanus Mutli, members of the managing board of the Foundation Tallinn2011, was led by the vice mayor, Mrs Kaia Jäppinen. Mr Siim Sukles, secretary general of the Ministry of Culture attended the meeting as national observer.

Vice mayor, Mrs Kaia Jäppinen, introduced the members of her delegation and referred immediately to 'Stories of the Seashore', the main theme of Tallinn 2011, citing its importance as both the sea and storytelling were to play a major role in many of the planned events.

Mr. Mikko Fritze then began the presentation for Tallinn 2011. Tallinn assured the panel that it was very much aware of the importance of the title European Capital of Culture and referred to it as 'the only brand in the European Union for culture'. The advantages for a city of the title were seen both in the additions to the cultural life of the city through additional media exposure and through changes to the physical infrastructure of the city.

The Foundation undertook an open call for applications, receiving around 1,000 project ideas. It was stressed that there was huge public involvement at this stage with every citizen invited to take part and this was reflected in the campaign 'Capital Culture has Your Face' employed at the time. Tallinn stated its intention to use social media so that both the poetic and the pragmatic sides of the slogan 'Stories from the Seashore' could come to full fruition.

In terms of infrastructure, 2011 had been a focus for many years in the city with the waterfront promenade designed to be opened in time for the event, and the renovation of the new 'Freedom Square', and the rebuilding of a children's museum also planned with ECOC in mind. Other infrastructural work included the redevelopment of such sites as the tunnels under the city, the prison, the Maritime Museum, and the Culture Cauldron. It stated especially the hope that the Culture Cauldron would be a space for long-term cultural events in the future.

The panel was informed that at the city council meeting on 9 April 2010, 251 projects had been selected. 75% of the Programme was now in place with performing arts, visual art, and music among the most popular genres. Eight to ten large scale events were planned (including the opening ceremony, the Song and Dance festival, and the Tallinn Marathon), with approximately five featured events planned each month. Some projects were highlighted as they targeted specific groups, for instance the MIM, flower festival, and cycling events all pointed to the environmental and "green" side of Tallinn, while other projects focused on young people, urban space, contemporary Tallinn culture, and ethnic minorities.

The European dimension of the project was remarked upon throughout and was highlighted by examples of cooperation and networking with many countries in Europe. Remarks were also made on co-ordination with Turku 2011. Examples of shared marketing and common projects were put forward to show the contact between the two cities.

The Volunteer Programme offered by the event was also mentioned with participation figures in excess of 500 and training supplied to volunteers for over 40 events. People aged 16 to 77 have been involved as volunteers.

As for the budget, it had unfortunately shrunk due to the financial crisis and was now estimated to be 7.4 million EUR (with the city and the state each providing 3.2 million EUR and a further 1 million EUR coming from the roll-over of the 2010 budget and other sources). All projects in the programme were expected to go ahead under the current budget figures.

B) Turku 2011

The Turku delegation consisted of Ms. Cay Sevon, Chief Executive Officer, Ms. Suvi Innilä, Programme Director, and Mr Mikko Lohikoski, Director, City Hall of Turku.

Turku began its presentation by remarking that its financial situation was better than they had expected last year. It stated that on 9 June 2010 the outlines of the programme would be published with 90% of the projects included. The entire programme would be published in November 2010.

In terms of governance the city informed the panel that Foundation Turku 2011 was an independent organisation under private law, led by one elected politician, the

Mayor of Turku and the Deputy Mayor for Services. However, there was no political influence on artistic choices or implementation of cultural events. The Board consisted of 15 members: the Chair, city appointees, ministries, Art Council, etc and delegates to the Statuary Advisory Board which was composed of 52 members (representatives of Universities, institutions etc). The Board of the Foundation met 8 times in 2008, 11 times in 2009, and had scheduled about 12 meetings in 2010. A substantial majority had been met at these meetings.

In terms of infrastructure the city informed the panel that the Foundation did not finance infrastructure projects. The main venue for the event would be LOGOMO, an old industrial hall regenerated for cultural events, which it was hoped would be used as a cultural space beyond the year. Its capacity of 1,200 people meant that the city expected 150,000 visitors. The redevelopment of the city park by the river was another project that the Foundation hoped would add to the cultural infrastructure of the city in the years to come.

The city's communication strategy was adopted in August 2009. Its focus was on the Baltic rim and thus the city's target audience included most especially Northern Germany, Stockholm, and Saint Petersburg. The city has planned two communication campaigns: the first from June to November 2010; the second in the first semester of 2011. These campaigns will involve partnership with television, radio and print media. The city pointed most especially to the publication of a magazine that would appear as a supplement to a national newspaper and thus gain a wide readership.

In terms of the Budget for Turku 2011, the city pointed to an incoming figure of €50 million (Finnish government €18m, City of Turku €18m, 'Other' €4m).

Turku intends to have five themes for its programme, namely 2011 Transformations (projects about culture and everyday life), 2011 Takes Off (projects intended to bring marginalized cultural activities to the fore), 2011 Explores the Archipelago (projects focused on water, the Baltic sea and environmental issues), 2011 Personally (projects focused on the identity of individuals), and 2011 Memories and Truth (projects focused on the identity of society with a strong emphasis on history). The opening would take place on 15-16 January 2011.

Regarding the planned programme of events, Turku insisted that the projects had already begun and cited the example of the Accordion Wrestling project. Some 130-150 projects would be part of the programme. This number had fallen from the Bidding Document figure of 300 largely because of a merging of smaller projects into bigger ones. 75% of projects selected were from the open call that took place in 2008. 20 of the 30 projects put forward in 2006 will take place as part of the programme.

The slogan 'Turku on Fire' had been chosen for the year. A balance between large and small scale projects was intended throughout the programme. Large scale projects included the Night of the Ancient Bonfires on 27 August 2010 (including the Tall Ships Race, a series of high quality concerts, and multiple exhibitions) while smaller scale projects included community based events that would take place in schools and suburban areas. There was also an effort to have events that continued throughout the year as opposed to most events which would be one-off occasions; '876 Shades of Darkness' was an example cited as an event that would continue and evolve throughout the year.

In terms of evaluating the programme, the city insisted that the European and International dimension of the event had improved in the run up to the event itself.

4. THE PANEL'S ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with article 10 of Decision 1622/2006/EC the role of the monitoring and advisory panel consists in monitoring the implementation of the objectives and criteria of the action and provide European Capitals of Culture with support and guidance.

In this context, the assessments and recommendations of the panel are as follows:

1) Tallinn 2011 :

The panel appreciated the efforts achieved by the Foundation Tallinn 2011 to prepare various big scale cultural events for the year. It encouraged the city to go ahead with its plans to develop its urban projects. The volunteer programme was also welcomed, as an element fostering the participation of people in the event. Furthermore the panel welcomed the improved involvement of the city's minorities in the programme and urged it to do still more. The panel also complimented the confidence of the national ministry in the team running the programme.

Although the programme looked promising, the panel was, however, extremely concerned by the financial aspects of Tallinn 2011: the level of the budget suggested now was far lower than planned at selection stage and would be one of the most modest budgets ever of the Capitals. Although the panel understood the challenges posed by the financial crisis, the information provided concerning the budget was nevertheless too vague, and precise amounts had not yet been officially confirmed by the city or State, in spite of the request in the first monitoring report. The panel noted that such late budgetary decisions could jeopardize the successful implementation of the event.

However the Panel praised the continuity of the team in place, which should help to ensure a proper delivery in the current difficult situation. It would recommend planning for the legacy of the event, not only in terms of newly developed infrastructure but also to concentrate on retaining key people to work for the city in the cultural domain beyond 2011. The Panel also suggested involving local universities in evaluating and ensuring the legacy of Tallinn 2011.

2) Turku 2011 :

The panel appreciated the strong and well balanced governance scheme of Turku 2011, including representatives of various institutions of the city. It stressed the importance of ensuring the legacy of the event beyond 2011. Indeed, the long term effects may have very positive and important impacts on the development of the city, provided that they are fostered in advance.

The panel noted that, additionally to the Ministry of Culture, several Ministries were expected to contribute to the budget of the event and that these contributions should

be confirmed by the end June. It recalled that their financial contribution would be important to the implementation of the event.

The panel was concerned by the lack of visibility of the European dimension in the event as planned. The discussion clarified that the European dimension was in fact present in the cultural programme, so the panel recommended bringing out these elements much more clearly and explicitly in order to do justice to this fundamental aspect of the event.

5. THE REQUIREMENTS FOR AWARDING THE MELINA MERCOURI PRIZE

On the basis of the report issued by the monitoring and advisory panel after its second meeting, a prize in honour of Melina Mercouri shall be awarded to the designated cities by the Commission, on the condition that they meet the criteria laid down in article 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC (see below), have fulfilled their commitments and have implemented the recommendations made by the selection as well as the monitoring and advisory panels. The prize consists of a one-off payment of 1.5 million Euros and shall be awarded in full three months before the start of the relevant year if the necessary conditions are met. It is paid from the European Union's Culture Programme.

Article 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC specifies the criteria that the cultural programme shall fulfil. They are subdivided into 2 categories (the "European dimension" and the "City and citizens").

As regards the "European Dimension", the programme shall:

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

As regards the "City and citizens", the programme shall:

- a) 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;
- b) be sustainable and be an integral part of the long-term cultural and social development of the city.

6. THE PANEL'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE MELINA MERCOURI PRIZE

The Panel, in the light of the criteria specified by article 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC and on the basis of the information contained in the city monitoring reports, of the exchange of views with the city delegations during the meeting held on 28 April recommends awarding the Melina Mercouri Prize to Turku 2011.

Concerning Tallinn, the Panel was not yet in a position to recommend awarding the Melina Mercouri Prize. Although the programme looks promising, the financial information provided was too vague and uncertain and did not respond to the request in the first monitoring report. The panel's recommendation would therefore be conditional upon the provisional budget indicated in Tallinn's report to the monitoring

panel being better detailed, and the Commission receiving written guarantees from the state and city on this. The required information should be provided to the Commission before the end June. Should the city and state authorities be unable to respond within this time frame, the decision on the award of the Melina Mercouri Prize would be postponed until the necessary guarantees had been received by the Commission. This was essential as the Commission has a responsibility – in compliance with the financial rules by which it is bound – to ensure the sound financial management of public funds.

In the light of the difficulties in obtaining these funding guarantees, and upon hearing about the imminent departure of one of the current Members of managing board Tallinn2011 after the meeting, the panel also mandated its chair, Sir Robert Scott, to visit Tallinn in June in order to seek to clarify that the organisation of the event would not be jeopardised by this personnel change.

In order to further improve the quality and the success of the Capital event, the Panel invites Turku and Tallinn to make use of the assessments and recommendations contained in chapter 4 of this report.

Sir Robert Scott (Commission designation)	signed
Manfred Gaulhofer (Commission designation)	signed
Erna Hennicot-Schoepges (Council designation)	signed
Constantin Chiriac (Council designation)	signed
Danuta Glondys (Parliament nomination)	signed
Elisabeth Vitouch (Committee of the Regions nomination)	signed