



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 6 September 2004

**11572/04
ADD 1**

**CULT 56
CODEC 921
CADREFIN 15**

COVER NOTE

from: Secretary-General of the European Commission,
signed by Ms Patricia BUGNOT, Director

date of receipt: 15 July 2004

to: Mr Javier SOLANA, Secretary-General/High Representative

Subject: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER
New Cultural Programme (2007-2013)
Extended Impact Assessment integrating ex ante evaluation requirements

Delegations will find attached Commission document SEC(2004) 954.

Encl.: SEC(2004) 954



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 14.7.2004
SEC(2004) 954

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER
NEW CULTURAL PROGRAMME (2007-2013)

Extended Impact Assessment
integrating ex ante evaluation requirements

{COM(2004)469 final

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	4
2.	What problem is the proposal expected to tackle?	5
2.1	Principles	5
2.2	The problems in social and economic terms	6
2.3.	The target group and its needs.....	7
2.4	Options for intervention	8
3.	What are the objectives that the proposal is expected to achieve?.....	10
3.1	General objective.....	10
3.2	Specific objectives	11
3.3	Operational objectives.....	12
3.4.	Objectives and related indicators.....	14
4.	What are the main policy options and alternative delivery mechanisms?	15
4.1.	Policy instruments: Direct public sector financial interventions versus open method of co-ordination and provision of information and guidelines.....	15
4.2	The need for a new programme versus the “no action” scenario and the “no change” policy.....	16
4.3	Direct public-sector financial intervention.....	17
4.4	A broad target group versus a more specific target group	17
4.5	Options concerning the implementation of the programme.....	17
5	Risks and assumptions	18
6.	What positive and negative impacts are expected from the options selected?.....	23
6.1	Direct impacts.....	23
6.2	Indirect impacts	24
7.	Added value of Community involvement	25
7.1	Complementarity and synergies	25
7.2	Subsidiarity.....	26
7.3	Proportionality	26
8.	Stakeholder consultation and lessons learned	27
8.1	Much work has been done on analysis and forward thinking	27
8.2	The main results of this work	28
9.	Helping to achieve cost-effectiveness.....	30
9.1	Cost implications of the programme: €408 million	30
9.1.1	Total financial impact	30
9.1.2	Technical and administrative assistance	31

9.1.3	Impact on personnel and administrative expenditure	31
9.1.4	Overall financial impact of human resources.....	32
9.1.5	Other administrative expenditure deriving from the action.....	33
9.2	Could the same results be achieved at lower costs?	33
9.3	Could the same or better results be achieved with the same cost by using other instruments?.....	34
10.	Monitoring and evaluation	35
11.	Draft Commission proposal and justification.....	35
12.	Conclusion.....	37
13.	References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present the proposal for a new cultural programme of the European Community. This programme is meant to replace Culture 2000, a Community programme established for five years (2000-2004) with a total budget of 167 million euro by Decision No 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, adopted on 14 February 2000¹ and which has been extended until the end of 2006². Created to promote artistic and cultural cooperation in Europe and to move towards a common cultural area, the Culture 2000 programme supports artistic and cultural projects with a European dimension, at the level of their creation, their organisation and their implementation. The proposal for the new cultural programme is based on a series of evaluations³ of the different cultural programmes of the European Union and reflections on the future programme. Some of the elements of this reflection were, for example, the Forum on cultural cooperation, organised by the Commission in 2001⁴, the experts' report "Towards a new cultural framework programme of the European Union" of June 2003⁵ or the public consultation on our website⁶. This broad analysis has shown the pertinence of a Community action in the cultural sector but it also pointed out some failures of the current programme. The Commission therefore, decided to propose a new programme that would benefit from the experience already acquired in this field and would explore new ways of action.

This report will present the context of the proposed programme, the different elements that led to such a proposal and the expected results of this programme. It combines the requirements of an impact assessment⁷ with those for an ex ante evaluation⁸. The structure of this report will therefore be the following: the problems that the proposal is expected to tackle (2), the objectives (3), the main policy options and alternative delivery mechanisms (4), the risks and assumptions (5), the expected positive and negative impacts of the different options (6), the added value of Community involvement (7), the stakeholder consultations and lessons learned (8), helping to achieve cost-effectiveness (9), monitoring and evaluation (10) and finally the draft Commission proposal and justification.

The new programme is based upon those experiences and explores new ways of action. It will be a "third generation" programme following on from those of 1994-1999 (Kaleidoscope, Ariane, Raphaël) and those of 2000-2006 ("Culture 2000", 2000-2006, and the "Community

¹ Decision No 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 programme.

² Decision No 626/2004/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March amending Decision No 508/2000/EC of 14 February 2000 establishing the Culture 2000 programme (Official Journal L 99 of 03.04.2004, p. 3).

³ Evaluations ex post of the former cultural programmes Kaleidoscope, Ariane and Raphael; mid-term evaluation of Culture 2000 (evaluation report carried out by PLS Ramboll Management and Commission Report COM(2003) 722); evaluation of the line A 30-42, organisations promoting European culture - see page 40.

⁴ Forum on cultural cooperation, November 2001 - see page 40.

⁵ Experts' report of June 2003 « Towards a new cultural framework programme of the European Union ».

⁶ Public consultation on the website of DG EAC - see page 40. This was done under the guidance of the Communication from the Commission "Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue - General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission" COM(2002) 704 final.

⁷ Communication on Impact Assessment, COM (2002) 276.

⁸ As specified in the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation (Commission Regulation 2342/2002, Article 21).

action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture”, 2004-2006).

During the period 2004-2006, two Community actions will exist in the field of cultural cooperation: “Culture 2000” and the “Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level in the field of culture”. The proposed programme will work towards simplifying the programmes, as it provides for the integration of both elements into a single programme.

2. WHAT PROBLEM IS THE PROPOSAL EXPECTED TO TACKLE?

2.1 Principles

The competence of the European Community is relatively new, as it was introduced in 1991 in the European Community Treaty, through its Article 128 (now Article 151). This article defines the role of the EC in the cultural field and sets out four main objectives:

- Contributing to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, whilst respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore;
- Encouraging contemporary cultural creation;
- Taking the cultural dimension into account more in all Community policies;
- Encouraging cooperation between the Member States and with third countries and international organisations.

The importance of cooperation has been underlined by the European institutions on several occasions⁹. Culture and cultural cooperation are closely linked to the future objectives of the European Union.

The European Union’s action on the cultural front is entirely in keeping with the Community’s political priorities. Culture is moving further and further up the European Union’s agenda, especially in the context of enlargement, because it makes a significant contribution to long-term common prosperity and to creating a common area of freedom and constant dialogue between peoples and cultures.

Citizenship: creating a common cultural area for the people of Europe contributes directly to awareness of European citizenship. In the same way as economic and political factors, it helps to forge a sense of a shared destiny. This is all the more important in the context of enlargement, as the Commission already acknowledged in its communication on Agenda 2000, saying that culture was a sensitive area requiring particular attention¹⁰. This trend was confirmed by the adoption of a Communication on the political challenges and budgetary resources of an enlarged Union for the period between 2007 and 2013, which makes one of its priority goals the need to “give full content to European citizenship”¹¹. The intention is to “make citizenship work” by promoting European culture and diversity. In this context, a new

⁹ See, for example, the Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union, Official Journal C 032 , 05/02/2002.

¹⁰ It is worth noting that the Michalski Group (Reflection group on the spiritual and cultural dimension of Europe set up in January 2003 on the initiative of Romano Prodi) included in its remit the contribution of culture to social cohesion in an enlarged Europe (http://europa.eu.int/comm/commissioners/prodi/group/michalski_en.htm).

¹¹ Building our common future – political challenges and budgetary means of the enlarged Union – 2007 to 2013 – COM (2004) 101.

communication was adopted, specifying how far the new generation of programmes in the fields of youth, culture, the audiovisual industry and civic participation will contribute to promoting European culture and diversity and to consolidating the concept of citizenship¹². The Commission acknowledged in particular the vital contribution of cultural cooperation to forging European citizenship and declared that in an enlarged Union characterised by sustained migratory flows it was "essential that (European) citizens know and understand each other (...) [so that they] know and are able to see for themselves what they have in common".

Dialogue and peace: the importance of cultural cooperation in reinforcing solidarity is universally acknowledged¹³, because it is an ideal instrument for helping cultures and people to get to know each other. The fault lines running through our societies, and through other countries in the world, remind us every day of the importance and the urgent need for all aspects of cultural exchange: understanding, fostering creativity and learning from each other. The European Council meeting held in Brussels on 16 and 17 October 2003 once again acknowledged the importance of culture as a facilitator of dialogue between cultures and its crucial role in maintaining peace.

Prosperity: culture will henceforth be recognised as a fully-fledged sector of the economy. A study¹⁴ carried out in 2001 for the European Commission concluded that the cultural sector would see a steady increase in creative jobs prompted by a sharp rise in demand for cultural products and services from households and companies. The cultural sector thus appears to have considerable potential for creating jobs and wealth.

2.2 The problems in social and economic terms

The cultural sector is characterised by its dynamism and diversity but also by its instability. The organisations active in the field have very different statutes and financial capacities (large cultural industries in competition with even larger international companies, small and medium-sized enterprises, associations etc.). Most of them suffer from a lack of resources, or at least from a lack of stability, as the majority of grants are given only for one year. To the heterogeneity of structures we have to add the heterogeneity of the statutes of the workers, within one Member State and, even greater, between different Member States. It goes from voluntary work to independent and employed work. This situation does not encourage the emergence of cooperation projects, especially long-term cooperation projects, which require financial and human resources. We also have to add that the sector faces other specific problems related to cooperation. More than the real administrative and legal barriers, which are tending to disappear, the sector suffers from a lack of information on potential partners, on cultural infrastructures in other countries and on legal and tax issues¹⁵.

¹² Making citizenship work, fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for youth, culture, audiovisual and civic participation, COM (2004) 154.

¹³ See, *inter alia*, the action programme for the dialogue between cultures and civilisations in the Euromed Report of 13 May 2002 and the report of the high-level advisory group on dialogue between peoples and cultures in the Euro-Mediterranean area, 24 November 2003.

¹⁴ "Exploitation and development of the job potential of the cultural sector in the age of digitalisation", carried out in June 2001 on the initiative of the European Commission.

¹⁵ Study on the exploitation and development of the job potential of the cultural sector in the age of digitalisation (June 2001), study on mobility and free movement of persons and productions in the European cultural sector (April 2002), Eurobarometer studies on cultural participation in the European Union (April 2002) and in the accession countries (July 2003), feasibility study on the possible creation of a European observatory of cultural cooperation (October 2003), study on cultural cooperation in Europe in various sectors of artistic activity (August 2003) – see page 40.

The recent studies performed at the Commission's request show some aspects of cultural cooperation in Europe:

"Cultural cooperation in Europe is made up nowadays of an extensive, multilateral flow of projects and initiatives, which are launched and implemented by individual artists, non-profit organisations, local museums, theatres and companies, arts management companies, local and regional authorities, as well as by national governments and those organisations coming under their structures."¹⁶

On the one hand, cultural activities are being supported less and less by "the State" in Europe; European artistic activity is increasingly independent from State control and results from a series of independent successive projects. Cultural cooperation depends less on a process of formal exchange between institutionalised programmes but more on a favourable environment for artists and other cultural actors. On the other hand, it is clear from the research that organisations are to a large extent dependent on the availability of funding at European level for transnational cultural cooperation, as national and regional authorities are frequently reluctant to fund such projects unless they directly focus on national and regional cultural identity.¹⁷

2.3. The target group and its needs

The direct target group of the proposed programme are organisations of all kinds involved in cultural activities in a broad sense. It includes not only cultural institutions, such as museums, dance schools, theatres, universities, local authorities or publishing companies, but also associations working for the preservation of memorials dedicated to the victims of Nazism. The indirect general target group are European citizens. Organisations involved in culture, referred to in this report as "cultural operators", are necessary intermediaries in order to reach a broader audience, to give the public the opportunity to benefit from high-quality cultural activities of European dimension. This will contribute to the fostering of a shared European cultural area, bringing its diversity and richness to the front. The needs of these operators have been expressed on several occasions¹⁸. The main aspects are:

- *Financial support, especially long-term support*

The need for an increased cultural budget has been regularly expressed, as in the public consultation on the proposed programme. Community support for multilateral cooperation projects is particularly needed, as Member States tend to support mainly national or bilateral projects. The operators also underlined that long-term financial support would be necessary in order to develop sustainable cooperation projects. The support to the functioning of some networks or European associations can also have an important added value.

- *More information on issues related to cultural cooperation and increased exchange of good practices*

Different studies and the public consultation have shown that there is a real need for more up-to-date and practical information on cultural cooperation¹⁹ and that better dissemination of good practices would have a real added value. The attention was also frequently drawn to the

¹⁶ Report on the state of cultural cooperation in Europe - see page 40.

¹⁷ Feasibility study on the possible creation of a European observatory of cultural cooperation – see page 40.

¹⁸ Forum on cultural cooperation; public consultation on the website of DG EAC, mid-term evaluation of Culture 2000 - see page 40.

¹⁹ Study on mobility and free movement of persons and productions in the European cultural sector and feasibility study on the possible creation of a European observatory of cultural cooperation.

lack of research concerning cultural cooperation in Europe. Such research, as well as the gathering of statistical data, would help to foster the position of culture within European policies and would contribute indirectly to the flourishing of European cooperation.

- *A more flexible, more focused and more visible Community programme*²⁰

Operators expressed the fact that the division into different cultural sectors or activities of the Culture 2000 programme was a constraint for them, as some multidisciplinary projects do not fall into those categories. The annual priorities set by the programme seem to be a source of “frustration” for all those who are not eligible (or only in a restricted way).

Operators and various observers regretted the lack of a real global strategy for European cultural action and appealed for more coherent action. This appeal was also made by the European Parliament in its resolution on cultural cooperation in Europe²¹. The high number of objectives of Culture 2000 also appears to confuse participants and other stakeholders and is perceived as making the programme less efficient.

Greater visibility of Community action in the field of culture seems to be necessary. This could be achieved by a more focused and more coherent programme, but also by better communication around the programme and the projects supported.

2.4 Options for intervention

- *The “no action” scenario*

The “no action” scenario would not be consistent with the political discourse stressing the importance of cultural cooperation, especially in relation to the enlargement of 1 May 2004, and of the preservation of European cultural and historical heritage. It would also be inefficient, as the different cultural programmes developed since 1993 have proved that they contributed to the multiplication of cooperation projects as well as to the expansion of cultural networks. However, the cultural sector has not evolved to such a degree of maturity and financial independence that would make such a programme unnecessary.

- *The “no change” scenario*

Maintaining the current programme would not be satisfactory either, as it would imply not deriving benefit from the experience gained. The cost-efficiency would not be as high as it could be, notably because of a limited use of measures with multiplier effects. Some constraints (e.g. the division of the programme into different disciplines) pointed out by the operators, would remain, limiting the effectiveness of the programme.

If no new programme were to be launched, this would lead to considerable disappointment for the cultural sector. The consultation process has aroused great interest and a large number of persons have been involved in the reflection on the drafting of the new programme. The operators and all those having participated in this process would be disappointed not to see their recommendations taken into account. Some declarations of Commissioner Reding also raised expectations of a change in the cultural Community programme. On a general point of view, it would rather be unsatisfactory not to take advantage of all the experience already acquired and to improve the current programme. It should be underlined that the new programme should not be “revolutionary” either, as the cultural sector also seeks stability and

²⁰ Public consultation; report of the group of experts; mid-term evaluation of Culture 2000

²¹ Resolution of the European Parliament of 5 September 2001 on cultural cooperation in the European Union (OJ C 72E/2002 of 21 March 2002).

continuity. Many operators have expressed general satisfaction with this programme, which they now know well, and that only needs to be improved.

The need for a new programme

The experience gained through the former programmes and through Culture 2000 revealed that cultural cooperation is a complex phenomenon, which complexity tends to increase with the development of telecommunications and transport, and, more broadly, with the development of the cultural sector and of civil society. The analysis of the needs expressed by the sector and of the different points of view leads to the conclusion of the need for a new programme, which would be a global and coherent tool to promote of cultural cooperation and which would go beyond the direct support of cultural actions.

Community action has often appeared to be too fragmented since, alongside the framework programme “Culture 2000”, which is the main cooperation instrument, there are two other major Community activities: support for organisations of European cultural interest and the “European capitals of culture”, whose links to this programme are tenuous, if not non-existent. This fragmentation undermines the Community’s standing amongst its citizens, who do not know how much effort is put into preserving and propagating their cultures, and making culture an integral part of the European project, and, above all, it threatens the coherence of Community action. In its Resolution on a new work plan for European cooperation in the field of culture²², the Council emphasises the need “for a more coherent approach at Community level in the field of culture”.

Compared with the first two generations of cultural action, the programme proposed is intended to be a consistent, overarching and comprehensive instrument to promote multilateral cultural cooperation in Europe which is capable of doing justice to its complexity. The programme provides for three levels of intervention, each of which targets different and complementary levels of cultural cooperation and thus meets separate but interdependent needs. This is the main innovatory aspect of the programme: an overarching vision which embraces the entire cultural sector and promotes synergies.

The programme departs from the sectoral approach (by artistic and cultural disciplines) which was the hallmark of the previous programme and which attracted considerable criticism. The operators will be free to propose projects of their choice which meet their needs and aspirations, be they sectoral or cross-sectoral, as long as they contribute to the goals mentioned above.

Community cultural action is intended to be accessible to a great variety of participants ranging from administrations to enterprises in the cultural sector and networks, and enabling cooperation to take many different forms. The essential requirement is, of course, that the cooperation projects are geared to achieving the aims of the new programme. Cooperation between Member States is particularly encouraged, as required by the Treaty.

The programme is to be opened up more widely to participants from non-member countries, especially neighbouring countries, and to support projects taking place outside the borders of the European Union, thereby helping to strengthen its image throughout the world.

There is one strand for each level of intervention.

²² OJ C 162 of 6 July 2002, p. 5.

The **first strand** comprises direct financial support to projects for long-term, exploratory or “special” cooperation projects²³. This is essential in as much as it contributes to the impetus of cultural activity at European level and takes the form of activities which are visible for European citizens both inside and outside the countries taking part in the programme. This will also enable the European Union to raise its international cultural profile by promoting projects on the ground.

This action must, however, be supplemented by more structural intervention to promote cooperation beyond project level. The **second strand therefore** provides for integrating the Community action programme to promote organisations active in the field of culture at European level; operating support will be given to European organisations which are constantly engaged in promoting cultural cooperation or play the part of “ambassadors” for European culture and have acquired considerable expertise in the field²⁴. This multiannual support is intended to enable the organisations to take advantage of their experience and develop their activities. In the interests of continuity, there will also be a need to support activities to protect as historical monuments the sites of Nazi concentration camps in order to help to preserve the main sites and the deportation archives symbolised by the memorials erected in the old camps and to conserve the memory of the victims at these sites.

Finally, the **third strand** is intended to support analysis and information activities so as to create an environment which is conducive to cooperation. It comprises three complementary actions which support cultural cooperation at different levels. The first seeks to promote the production of conceptual tools by helping to carry out studies and analyses on cultural cooperation in order to obtain a clearer picture of it. The second is geared to removing certain practical obstacles to cooperation by developing an Internet tool to exchange information and good practice²⁵. The third provides for the support of “cultural contact points” to ensure targeted and effective dissemination close to the ground of practical information on the new cultural programme.

3. WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES THAT THE PROPOSAL IS EXPECTED TO ACHIEVE?

3.1 General objective

The general objective of Community cultural action is to contribute to the development of shared European cultural values on the basis of cultural cooperation between artists, cultural operators and cultural institutions. This is directly linked to the competencies of the Union, described in Article 151 of the EC Treaty. This has also been supported recently by the

²³ In its opinion of 9 October 2003, the Committee of the Regions advocated promoting high-quality local cultural activities. The mid-term assessment of the Culture 2000 programme and the assessment of previous programmes (Kaleidoscope, Raphaël and Ariane) also showed the project-based approach to be appropriate and coherent.

²⁴ In its Resolution of 14 November 1991 (OJ C 314 of 5.12.1991), the Council emphasised the important role of networks of cultural organisations in cultural cooperation in Europe.

²⁵ In its Resolution of 21 January 2002 (OJ C 032 of 5.2.2002 p.1), the Council called upon the Commission and the Member State to “promote the use of existing networks or any networks which might be set up in the future in the Member States to facilitate cooperation and to exchange information and good practice at European level” and to “promote networking of cultural information to enable all citizens to access European cultural content by the most advanced technological means, particularly by continuing to encourage the development of the European electronic portal started by the Commission and by linking this portal with the digital cultural content that exists in the Member States ». By the same token, the feasibility study on the creation of an observatory of cultural cooperation also showed the need to organise the mass of information available to cultural operators provided by the great diversity of networks and Internet sites.

Council, through its Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union²⁶, which considers « *that it is essential to encourage cooperation and cultural exchanges in order to respect and promote the diversity of cultures in Europe and to improve their knowledge of one another* » and « *invites the Member States and the Commission, guided as they are by respect for cultural diversity, the principle of subsidiarity and the willingness to place culture at the heart of European integration, to develop cultural cooperation, European artistic creativity and cultural exchanges (etc.)* ». The flourishing of European cooperation will lead to dynamism and innovation in the cultural sector and to the fostering of a European citizenship. It will raise the awareness of the diversity and richness of European cultures and open up Europeans towards other cultures.

3.2 Specific objectives

Taking account of the problem situation and the views of stakeholders, the most appropriate specific objectives are the following:

- Increase transnational mobility of persons active in the cultural sector within the EU
- Increase transnational circulation of works of art (including immaterial work, such as music)
- Increase intercultural dialogue.

The Council of the European Union stressed in a recent resolution « *that promotion of mobility of persons and circulation of works in the cultural sector are decisive factors in the dissemination of knowledge, experience, mutual inspiration, and cooperation. The issue of mobility and circulation will thus be an important tool to communicate the diversity of cultures in Europe and strengthen the cultural cooperation* »²⁷.

- Increase transnational mobility of persons active in the cultural sector

There are now relatively few legal obstacles to activities of exchange or cooperation in the cultural field outside the country of origin. The real obstacles are mainly financial. Everybody acknowledges that it is legitimate for the European Union to play a stronger instigating role in this field.

Moreover, the information made available to professionals on social, regulatory and fiscal provisions which apply during a short or long stay in another country is often still too patchy. It is therefore absolutely imperative to move towards greater coordination and to promote dissemination of knowledge and information, especially by encouraging networking. This would enhance mobility amongst cultural professionals, either to offer their services or to set up their own establishment or to exchange experiences or train with the aim of experiencing other cultures or artistic practices.

- Increase transnational circulation of works of art (including immaterial works, such as music)

Circulating works of art and artistic and cultural products beyond the national borders entails additional costs for organisers: transport, insurance and market prospecting costs, increased advertising to raise the profile of works or artists less well-known abroad, investment of time

²⁶ Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union, Official Journal C 032, 05/02/2002, p. 2.

²⁷ Council Resolution of 19 December 2002 implementing the work plan on European cooperation in the field of culture: European added value and mobility of persons and circulation of works in the cultural sector, Official Journal C 013, 18/01/2003, p. 5.

to research the target market (reception services, regulatory and administrative formalities, etc.). This objective corresponds to those set out in Articles 3q and 151 of the Treaty (contributing to the flourishing of cultures of the Member States, reinforcing cultural exchanges, improving knowledge and dissemination of culture and the history of European peoples, etc.) and is in keeping with one of the Community's basic tasks: on the one hand to complete the internal market by dismantling obstacles to free movement of goods between Member States and, on the other hand, to reinforce European integration by creating a common cultural area based on both national and regional diversity and shared European values.

– Increase intercultural dialogue

The Conference on Intercultural Dialogue of March 2002 considered that "a policy of intercultural dialogue, next to traditional economic and diplomatic relations, [ought to] play a vital role". Intercultural dialogue constitutes an exchange based on openness and equality between cultures which is designed to lead to mutual understanding and a concerted effort to seek shared values and interpretations, whilst respecting fundamental human rights and the principle of cultural diversity. Intercultural dialogue must take place both with third countries (cultural diplomacy and dialogue between world cultures) and within the borders of the European Union. The European Parliament emphasised the importance of a dialogue with the Mediterranean countries in its Resolution on implementing the "Culture 2000"²⁸ programme. The internal strand of intercultural dialogue may have a key role to play, especially in integrating the new Europeans from different cultures.

Finally, a lively and open intercultural dialogue is bound to undertake a critical examination of even the darkest periods of history. One of the programme's aims will be to preserve the Nazi concentration camps as historical monuments and keep alive the memory of the victims.

3.3 Operational objectives

The specific objectives will be realised by three sets of support measures, which constitute the operational objectives²⁹.

– Direct support to cultural activities:

The funding of multilateral cooperation projects of all kinds is essential, as it contributes to the dynamism of cultural activities of European dimension. It supports concrete actions that are visible to citizens.

– Support to European bodies active in the field of culture:

This action must, however, be supplemented by more structural intervention to promote cooperation beyond project level. The second strand therefore provides for fully integrating the Community action programme to promote organisations active in the field of culture at European level; operating support will be given to European organisations which are constantly engaged in promoting cultural cooperation or play the part of "ambassadors" for European culture and have acquired considerable expertise in the field³⁰.

²⁸ European Parliament Resolution of 28 February 2002 on implementing the "Culture 2000" programme (OJ C 293 E, p.105).

²⁹ Complementary financial interventions by Member States will be subject to the Community state aid rules outlined in Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty.

³⁰ In its Resolution of 14 November 1991 (OJ C 314 of 5.12.1991), the Council emphasised the important role of networks of cultural organisations in cultural cooperation in Europe.

This multiannual support is intended to enable the organisations to take advantage of their experience and develop their activities. In the interests of continuity, there will also be a need to support activities to protect as historical monuments the sites of Nazi concentration camps in order to help to preserve the main sites and the deportation archives symbolised by the memorials erected in the old camps and to conserve the memory of the victims at these sites.

- Support analysis and the collection and dissemination of information on cultural cooperation issues:

Beyond the direct support to activities and organisations, in which field the European Union is the most experienced, the Community action should also develop indirect support to cooperation, which would have long-term as well as multiplier effects, and would increase synergies. The idea would be to create a climate conducive to European cooperation that would flourish in and outside the context of the Community support programme.

- Support the production of research and the collecting of statistical data on culture and cultural cooperation

Cultural research is patchy and fragmented in Europe. It is, however, vital to have quantitative information and data on developments in cultural cooperation at European level, especially with regard to mobility of players, circulation of works and intercultural dialogue. This would build up a more complete picture of the phenomenon of cooperation and prepare the ground for it to develop.

- Support the dissemination of information on cultural cooperation issues through the development of a web-based tool

Accessible, up-to-date information on legal, fiscal and administrative issues related to European cooperation or on potential cooperation partners would facilitate the emergence of new cooperation projects. Such an Internet tool would assist the development of transnational cultural cooperation and enhance exchanges of experience and good practices.

- Provide information on the programme through cultural contact points:

An appropriate information policy on the programme is needed, so that the maximum benefit can be derived from it.

In order to ensure targeted and effective grass-roots dissemination of practical information on the new cultural programme, it provides for support to cultural contact points. These bodies, which operate at national level, are to be set up in cooperation with the Member States on a voluntary basis.

These contact points' tasks are to:

- promote the programme,
- facilitate access to the programme and encourage participation by the greatest possible number of cultural professionals and players through effective dissemination of information,
- provide a permanent link between the various institutions supporting the cultural sector in the Member States, thus helping the programme's action to complement national support measures,
- ensure that information is available at a suitable level and that there is contact between players participating in the programme and other Community programmes accessible to cultural projects.

3.4. Objectives and related indicators

Objectives	Indicators
<i>General</i>	
Contribute to the development of shared European cultural values on the basis of cultural cooperation between artists, cultural operators and cultural institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudes of programme beneficiaries
<i>Specific</i>	
Increase transnational mobility of artists and cultural operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of launched/completed projects that specifically seek/sought to enhance the movement of artists and cultural operators • Number of artists taking part, via the medium of the programme, in exchanges and collaborations • Number of cultural operators taking part, via the medium of the programme, in exchanges and collaborations • Proportion of relevant completed projects that, if not funded by the programme, would probably not have been undertaken (based on survey of participants)
Encourage the transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of launched/completed projects that specifically seek/sought to encourage the circulation of artistic and cultural works and products • Number of artistic and cultural works and products made to circulate via the medium of the programme • Proportion of relevant projects that, if not funded by the programme, would probably not have been implemented (based on survey of participants)
Facilitate intercultural dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of launched/completed projects that specifically seek/sought to facilitate intercultural dialogue and foster cultural diversity • Proportion of relevant projects that, if not funded by the programme, would probably not have been implemented (based on survey of participants)

<i>Operational</i>	
Support cultural activities via: — cultural cooperation focal points — cooperation actions — special actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of focal points launched • Proportion of total programme budget used to support focal points (indicative target 36%). • Number of cooperation actions launched • Proportion of total programme budget used to support cooperation actions (indicative target 24%) • Number of special actions launched • Proportion of total programme budget used to support special actions (indicative target 17%)
Support European organisations active in the field of culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of European organisations active in the field of culture supported • Proportion of total programme budget used to support such organisations (indicative target 10%)
Support analysis and the collection and dissemination of information on cultural cooperation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of studies and surveys funded • Number of conferences supported • Level of use of information portal • Level of requests received and answered by the Cultural Contact Points • Proportion of total programme budget used to support this operational objective (indicative target 5%).

4. WHAT ARE THE MAIN POLICY OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY MECHANISMS?

4.1. Policy instruments: Direct public sector financial interventions versus open method of co-ordination and provision of information and guidelines

The Treaty imposes restrictions on the Community's capacity to legislate on culture matters (article 151§5).

According to Article 151§2 of the EC Treaty, “action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas (...)”. The open method of co-ordination could be envisaged, as it implies “encouraging cooperation, the exchange of best practice and

agreeing common targets and guidelines for Member States”³¹. The main need expressed by the sector is for financial support to multilateral projects, as national funding mainly focuses on national or bilateral projects. This option would be rather unsatisfactory for the cultural sector and would have less European added value. Without direct Community support to multilateral projects, cultural cooperation in Europe would still take place, probably at a lower level and with less coherence and visibility. This would have a negative impact on the fostering of a shared European area. However, Community action definitely has to encourage complementary activities taking place outside the programme and foster cooperation between Member States.

The other option is to provide information and guidelines. This policy “ensures that citizens and producers are better informed, thereby reinforcing market mechanisms”. This mechanism is “generally most useful in areas where sociological and psychological factors have a greater impact on behaviour than (*Translator’s note: word missing here*) factors or strict rules”. The need for better dissemination of information has been expressed, and some psychological barriers probably hinder the emergence of cooperation projects. However, this aspect is marginal and the need for information has to be understood as a complementary measure to a financial support. This policy would therefore be very ineffective and inappropriate.

Direct public-sector financial intervention should be therefore foreseen, as a complement to other forms of intervention (from the states and regions, from the private and non-profit sectors, etc.) This public expenditure programme would contribute to the production of cultural goods and works as well as to the preservation of memorials to the victims of Nazism. This instrument would be highly effective, as direct support to cultural actions always takes place in the context of co-financing and as indirect support to cooperation is expected to have important multiplier effects. It would also be of great effectiveness, as it helps to achieve the different objectives and would be a global answer to the needs expressed by the sector. It is consistent with the global objective of bringing the European Union closer to citizens and with other Community actions involving citizens (education, youth, civil society, etc.).

4.2 The need for a new programme versus the “no action” scenario and the “no change” policy

The “no action” scenario would not be consistent with the political discourse stressing the importance of cultural cooperation, especially in relation to the enlargement of the 1 May 2004, and of the preservation of European cultural and historical heritage. It would also be inefficient, as the different cultural programmes developed since 1993 have proved that they contributed to the multiplication of cooperation projects as well as to the expansion of cultural networks. However, the cultural sector has not evolved to such a degree of maturity and financial independence that would make such a programme inappropriate.

Maintaining the current programme would not be satisfactory either, as it would imply not deriving benefit from the experience gained. The cost-efficiency would not be as high as it could be, notably because of a limited use of measures with multiplier effects. Some constraints (e.g. the division of the programme into different disciplines) pointed out by the operators, would remain, limiting the effectiveness of the programme.

The instrument of direct public-sector financial intervention is therefore proposed, which can take alternative forms.

³¹ IA annexes Annex 3.

4.3 Direct public-sector financial intervention

The intervention strategy proposed is the allocation of direct financial assistance to projects. Those projects could be cultural cooperation projects, but could also be projects indirectly fostering European cooperation, for example projects providing information to cultural operators (see point 3). It is also intended to support European bodies active in the field of culture. Direct intervention by the Commission, such as the creation of an agency for cultural cooperation has been envisaged and evaluated by independent experts, who did not recommend it because of the relatively low cost-effectiveness³².

As to the choice of financial instrument, the use of reimbursable instruments (such as subsidised loans or equity investments) would not be appropriate because of the general economic fragility of the cultural sector. The programme therefore provides for the use of non-reimbursable instruments such as grants. Grants can be allocated both for financing actions “intended to help achieve an objective forming part of a European Union policy” and for financing the “functioning of a body which pursues an aim of general European interest or has an objective forming part of a European Union policy”³³. This instrument covers the different aspects of the envisaged actions described in point 3. The selection of beneficiaries and the payment of grants will be managed by the Commission in a centralised way.

4.4 A broad target group versus a more specific target group

In order to adapt to the complexity and richness of the cultural sector, the approach proposed for this programme is that of a broad target group. The programme should be open to all kinds of participants engaged into cultural activities in a broad sense (industries, administrations, networks, etc.). A more specific target group, for example on creative disciplines or on intermediary structures such as galleries or theatres, could not be justified with regard to the broad general objectives of European cultural action, which is to contribute to the development of shared European cultural values on the basis of cultural cooperation between artists, cultural operators and cultural institutions of all kinds involving directly or indirectly large numbers of citizens.

4.5 Options concerning the implementation of the programme

During the Forum on cultural cooperation of November 2001, the participants “hinted that the creation of decentralised intermediary platforms with a capacity to redistribute resources should be considered as a new tool that could be developed for the implementation of future cultural programmes”³⁴. As this was already a recommendation of the group of experts³⁵, this option has been carefully examined, taking into account the positive experience acquired by highly autonomous foundations (“Stichtings”) in the Netherlands.

This option had to be rejected because the delegation of the competence of the European Commission to such a platform (e.g. for the selection of projects benefiting from a Community subsidy) is not compatible with the Financial Regulation. Such large-scale actions involving a large number of cultural operators would also have been too ambitious for many operators of this sector, which have limited financial resources. The option was therefore taken not to create large autonomous platforms but to encourage structured durable cooperation via the “cultural cooperation focal points”, which are more ambitious than the “multiannual cooperation agreements” of Culture 2000.

³² See feasibility study on the creation of a European Observatory of cultural cooperation.

³³ Article 108 of the new Financial Regulation.

³⁴ Forum 2001 Overview, « Cultural cooperation in Europe », Brussels, 21-22 November 2001.

³⁵ Group of experts, « Towards a new cultural programme », June 2003.

In order to rationalise the management of the programme, it has been decided to create an executive agency, in accordance with different guidelines, that would be in charge of the management of certain aspects of the programme.

Following the adoption of the Communication “Building our Common Future – Policy challenges and Budgetary means of the Enlarged Union”³⁶, which underlined the necessity of simplifying the design and management of the Community programmes, a second Communication³⁷ was adopted, which specified to what extent the new programmes in the fields of youth, culture, audiovisual and civic participation would be simpler and more user-friendly.

5 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The cultural sector is relatively fragile, especially because of the lack of stability of financial resources. This factor increases the risks related to the implementation of new measures. Those risks have been carefully analysed and it appears that there is no risk that would undermine the fundamental basis of the programme.

36 COM (2004) 101.

37 “Making citizenship work: fostering European culture and diversity through the programmes for Youth, Culture and civic participation”, COM (204) 154.

Assumption	Risk	Assessment
The programme is based on the assumption that the other sources of funding for culture would remain relatively stable.	A substantial increase or decrease of the funding for culture (at regional or national level, from the private sector, etc.) would threaten the effectiveness of the programme.	Although cultural expenditure tends to vary according to the general economic context, the experience of the previous years is that the fluctuations are not important enough to be a real threat for the programme.
The programme assumes that the cultural sector would stay dynamic and that the interest in cooperation would remain high or even increase.	A lack of interest in multilateral cooperation (e.g. because of its increased complexity linked to the enlargement; because of a new focus on bilateral projects or projects with third countries) would deeply affect the programme.	Although cultural expenditure tends to vary according to the general economic context, the experience of the previous years is that the fluctuations are not important enough to be a real threat for the programme.
This proposal is based on the assumption that the cultural sector will react positively to this new programme and will continue submitting projects.	There is a risk of a negative reception of the programme.	The new programme is based on the remarks expressed by the cultural sector at several occasions, so that it should be generally welcomed.
<i>Risks in implementing the programme</i>		
The programme can manage the volume of applications.	Because of the increase in participating countries (e.g. to the “wider neighbourhood”), the absence of sector “barriers” or the opening to new kinds of operators, there is a risk that a too large number of applications would overwhelm the programme.	The observations from the past reveal that there is potential for an increase in applications, but that this potential is not unlimited. The number of cultural operators meeting the criteria of the programme is limited.
The programme will be able to maintain a balance between large, established	There is a risk that “large”, “established” cultural organisations or networks	The programme is meant to encourage the emergence of structured,

organisations and emerging ones.	would attract all the subsidies, preventing smaller organisations from participating.	durable co-ordination. Through the “actions of cooperation”, the programme will support such developments, which are not prerequisites but rather objectives. Smaller organisations with less ambitious but structured projects will therefore not be excluded.
All dynamic cultural sectors will spontaneously participate in the programme. No sector will be dominant.	Because of the absence of predetermined specifications on the number of projects that should be funded in the different sectors, there is a risk that not all sectors would be represented in the selected project.	The choice made by this programme is to give greater freedom to the cultural sector, without predetermining sector categories, which necessarily exclude some “unclassifiable” projects. ³⁸ The choice is also to focus on the quality and European added value of the projects. Therefore, not all “sectors” will probably be equally represented each year, but the dynamism of the sectors will certainly be reflected in the projects proposed and selected and an overall balance will be achieved.
<i>Risks linked to the different actions</i>		
There is an existing basis for the development of structured long-term cooperation.	The constitution of “cooperation focal points” could be difficult because of the high level of expectations (number of partners, length of the cooperation, etc.). The quality of the cooperation could be threatened by the failure of one of the	The cooperation projects launched under the Culture 2000 programme as “structured and multiannual cooperation agreements” could be a basis for the development of cultural cooperation focal points. The long-term support should help the structuring and

³⁸ The research shows that the cultural sector is becoming increasingly interdisciplinary and it is no longer as meaningful to make absolute distinctions between different categories of cultural activity.

	partners.	stabilisation of the cultural operators, even though it will never cover the total budget of an action.
The European cultural sector has achieved a level of maturity and development that allows real cooperation between a relatively large number of operators to take place in the context of “actions of cooperation”.	As the number of organisers involved is increased to four (compared to the annual actions of “Culture 2000”, which required three organisers), there is a risk that some of the partners are not effectively involved in the project.	The experience based on “Culture 2000” should help to “detect” at an early stage those “fake” cooperations. In an enlarged Europe, there is a potential for real cooperation between four partners.
It is possible to have emblematic “special actions” of both high quality and “visibility”.	There is a risk that the cultural sector would not welcome the “special actions”, regarding them as publicity-oriented, as political events rather than cultural events.	The programme will place great emphasis on the quality of the actions supported and will involve the cultural sector in their preparation. A large number of respondents to the “public consultation” supported the idea of increasing the visibility of Community action via “emblematic” actions.
The competition between the organisations in order to receive support from the EU programme will enhance the quality of their programmes and activities and strengthen the dynamism and attractiveness of the sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support to some cultural organisations of European cultural interest could strengthen the discrepancy between “large”, well-established organisations and smaller, emerging entities. • There is also a risk of progressive withdrawal of other sources of funding, from those organisations benefiting from Community support. • The quality of the actions undertaken by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection of the associations will be made via an open call for proposals that will ensure transparency. <p>The grants will not cover the total operating budget, ensuring the involvement of other funding sources.</p> <p>The selection of the organisations will focus on the expected quality of the actions undertaken. The quality will be evaluated at different stages.</p>

	the association could be poor and the use of the funding could seem unsatisfactory.	
There is a need for data on cultural cooperation through studies and analyses.	There is the risk that the studies and analyses on cultural issues would be too theoretical, or that they would not address issues of European dimension and related to cooperation.	The object of the studies will be clearly described.
An information tool is needed and the Community has a unique role to play in this regard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Internet tool for information and communication is intended to be very broad. It could appear difficult to maintain an up-dated site, addressing, with a high level of specialisation, the needs of the professionals. • The site is liable not to be appreciated by the professional, especially if it is challenged by another website or simply because of changing needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These issues will be discussed with the company or institution in charge of the projects, which will have to prove its technical capability as well as its flexibility. The Commission will ensure the maximum level of control. • It seems very unlikely to have such a broad instrument developed by another organisation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an interest for CCPs on the part of the operators. • National authorities will agree to cofinance them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the risk that the operators which have gained experience with the programme do not need the services of the CCPs or have other sources of information (Internet, consultants, etc.). • The consequence would probably be the withdrawal of the Member States from financing the CCPs. 	The CCPs are well-known in their countries as reliable information sources and their activity did not decline during the last years of the Culture 2000 programme. It seems very unlikely that the demand from the operators would decrease in the near future. The risk that the national authorities withdraw their support to the CCPs is therefore very limited.

6. WHAT POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS ARE EXPECTED FROM THE OPTIONS SELECTED?

6.1 Direct impacts

Direct impacts are those directly related to the objectives of the new programme or to the article of the Treaty defining the objectives of European cultural action.

Social impact

- On social cohesion

The programme aims at creating a shared European cultural area. It therefore encourages dialogue and exchanges between Europeans. It also aims at fostering the dialogue with non-European cultures, especially through increased exchanges with minorities living in EU countries. The programme is expected to have long-term effects on the building of a sense of common cultural belonging, and thus cohesion.

The cultural activities are also very important for their contribution to the regeneration of cities or rural areas, as was shown in the recent Working Paper on culture and the Structural Funds³⁹.

Participation in cultural activities is a key way in which people and communities can define and develop their own identities and communicate and represent themselves to others and engage in symbolic exchange. Thus, promoting access to and participation in cultural activity is as intrinsically important and valid an aspect of building an inclusive society as promoting participation in the economic, employment or social domains⁴⁰. Access to culture is very crucial for preventing poverty and facilitating social integration.

- On new Member States

The programme will facilitate the integration of organisations from new Member States into European networks and the participation of the citizens in an enriched cultural life, as well as their sense of belonging to a common cultural area.

- On third countries

The programme will have an impact on the cultural life of third countries, through both the presentation of European culture made in third countries and the involvement into intercultural cooperation projects.

- On security and terrorism

The increased intercultural dialogue will contribute to the strengthening of mutual understanding and solidarity.

The first group to benefit from the programme will be the organisations involved in cultural cooperation in Europe. It will thus also contribute to the dynamism of the whole cultural sector in the participating countries and also the whole public.

Economic impact

Cultural activities are one of the most dynamic economic activities in Europe. Continued employment growth in the creative occupations of the cultural sector is to be expected in the

³⁹ see Commission Staff Working Paper on the Structural Funds and culture.

⁴⁰ Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion, March 2004. http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/soc-prot/soc-incl/final_joint_inclusion_report_2003_en.pdf

future, since the demand for cultural products and services is strongly increasing, according to a study commissioned by DG Employment⁴¹.

The programme will have an impact on the growth of prosperity and on the creation of new job opportunities. The programme is expected to have a positive economic impact in enhancing the sustainable development of the cultural sector; it is also expected to consolidate the single market with positive economic effects for the sector. In overcoming obstacles to mobility, the programme will contribute to the creation of a transparent European labour market in the cultural sector, as underlined by the previously mentioned study and by the study about the mobility and free movement of people working in the cultural sector commissioned by DG Education and Culture⁴².

The impact of the programme also relies on the positive effects in terms of development of human capital. The means for achieving these positive effects are mainly by promoting mobility and exchanges at European level. The programme will enable the professionals in the sector to benefit more from the single market.

6.2 Indirect impacts

Social impact

- On geographical social cohesion

The programme will foster geographical cohesion through cultural cooperation between neighbouring countries or within a region.

- On employment quality

The programme will contribute to the creation of new jobs (especially "content producing" oriented jobs) and to the stabilisation of former precarious jobs.

- On social, health and tax administrations

The forecast increased mobility of professional involved in the cultural sector could affect those services in the country of origin as well as in the country of destination.

Economic impacts

- On human capital formation

Professional training in other EU countries is one of the purposes of the programme.

- On economic cohesion

It will have an impact on economic integration, especially of new Member States.

- On specific sectors

The increase in mobility of professionals and circulation of cultural works will have a (small) impact on companies dealing with entertaining, publicity, public relations, etc. It will also have a positive impact on tourism, while encouraging projects that will provide wider access to cultural events and goods.

- On developing countries

⁴¹ "Exploitation and development of the job potential in the cultural sector in the age of digitalisation", study commissioned by the European Commission, presented by MKW Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH in 2001.

⁴² Study on the mobility and free movement of people and products in the cultural sector, CEJEC - Université PARIS X-EAEA, April 2002.

Cultural cooperation will have some direct but limited economic impact. The strengthening of cultural ties could also create a positive climate that will stimulate economic activity in general.

– On innovation

The programme will foster artistic creativity that might find an application in the economic sphere (see particularly part 1 of the programme for innovative actions).

Environmental impact

The programme will have positive impacts on the natural and built cultural heritage; it will thus contribute to the environmental quality of the European area.

On a short-term basis as well as in the long term, there seem to be no potential conflicts between social, economic and environmental impacts for this programme. In accordance with the Lisbon strategy, the positive economic and social effects combined are likely to have a positive effect on growth and employment, as well as on social cohesion.

7. ADDED VALUE OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

7.1 Complementarity and synergies

Culture is being addressed at different administrative and geographical levels, because of its broad definition and its many applications in society. Community action should be complementary to the actions undertaken at other levels⁴³.

Governments are of course involved in the fostering of creativity and cultural exchange. A recent study⁴⁴ has shown that one of the focuses for governmental foreign cultural policy is still bilateral cooperation. Mobility in itself does not seem to be a priority either. “Only a handful of the current Member States make cultural mobility a priority, or provide incentives to foster genuine cross-cultural dialogue outside the fairly formal confines of bilateral or multilateral cultural cooperation agreements”⁴⁵.

Other Directorates-General of the European Commission are also involved in culture, thus with different objectives than the proposed programme, as the following examples illustrate.

The regional policy supports projects with a cultural dimension via its structural funds; the objective is thus regional development rather than culture in itself. The co-operative dimension is absent from most of those projects⁴⁶.

EC cultural intervention also occurs in the context of development policy. The implemented actions seek mainly at fostering cultural infrastructures and capacities in developing countries (especially the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries -ACP- and the South-Mediterranean

43 A resolution adopted by the Council in December 2002 proposes in this regard a standard profile for European intervention: it should tend to encourage cooperation between the Member States and have a clearly multilateral character; the aims of this intervention should be better achieved and should have more effect at Community level than at Member State level; their target, audience and main beneficiaries should be European citizens; these measures should be sustainable and contribute to the long-term development of cooperation, integration and cultures in Europe, help to improve knowledge of other cultures and have a high profile and easy accessibility.

44 Report on the state of cultural cooperation in Europe, see page 40.

45 *Idem*, p. 53.

46 See COM (96) 160, 1st report taking stock of the cultural aspects of the European Community's action, and the recent Commission working document on the use of the Structural Funds in the field of culture, SEC (2004) 237.

countries) and encouraging access of the public of the developing countries to their own culture and the others ones. Intercultural dialogue is also encouraged through several actions, including mobility of students and professionals, support to networks, research activities and dissemination of results.

In the context of its research activities, and more particularly of its key action "the city of tomorrow and cultural heritage" (Fifth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development), the Commission currently finances and manages about 40 projects the aim of which is to design common diagnosis research methodologies and innovative preservation methods as well as to better integrate cultural heritage into the urban environment. For some 20 years, the Commission has invested around 100 Million Euros in the research in this area. Moreover, the thematic network «EUROCULT21», which gathers 31 partners from all over Europe, develops tools helping local bodies to improve and strengthen their urban cultural policies.

A Community action focused on the enhancement of cultural co-operation between operators would be complementary to the other interventions mentioned above. The different levels of action mentioned are coherent and complementary: they all contribute to creating a "climate" in favour of culture, but with different focuses and levels of intervention.

7.2 Subsidiarity

The actions envisaged by the programme could be achieved by the different Member States, but with less cost-effectiveness, efficiency and synergies. Each Member State could indeed support programmes for cultural cooperation, but this would imply that each country would have to develop a service responsible for this issue. For the applicants, the system would be very confusing, with different sources of funding and different procedures. This scenario being rejected, we can state that the proposed programme fully complies with the subsidiarity principle. The European added value of this programme is twofold. The programme will bring financial added value, because it will cost less than interventions at Member States' level. Because of its centrality and visibility, the programme will also be able to attract other funding sources available for culture and steer them towards multilateral European cooperation projects. The second dimension is the social added value. The programme will contribute to bringing the EU closer to citizens and to creating a shared European cultural area.

7.3 Proportionality

The proposed programme is focused on the objectives of the Treaty. Article 151 defines the role of the EU in the cultural field and sets out different objectives:

- Contributing to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, whilst respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore;
- Improving the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples;
- Safeguarding cultural heritage of European significance;
- Encouraging contemporary artistic and literary creation;
- Encouraging non commercial cultural exchanges;
- Taking the cultural dimension into account more in all Community policies;

- Encouraging cooperation between the Member States and with third countries and international organisations.

Through the support to cultural actions, to European organisations active in the field of culture and to information and knowledge in the cultural field, the proposed programme will focus on the objectives of the Treaty: it will bring the common heritage to the fore, while respecting national and regional diversity. It will encourage contemporary cultural creation as well as cooperation between Member States and with third countries. The actions envisaged in this programme do not go further than what is necessary to achieve these objectives, in keeping with the principle of proportionality.

8. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND LESSONS LEARNED

8.1 Much work has been done on analysis and forward thinking

To prepare the new programme and to take stock of the activities conducted in the field of cultural cooperation, external consultants evaluated Community cultural actions and programmes⁴⁷ on behalf of the European Commission. These evaluations were supplemented by a large number of contributions from the cultural sector and the experience gained by the Commission in exercising its competence for culture.

Moreover, and in order for the new programme to be in tune with the major changes occurring both in the field of culture and in the European Union itself, the Commission conducted a large-scale exercise in forward thinking. It organised a Forum on cultural cooperation⁴⁸, commissioned a group of experts to discuss the future cultural programme⁴⁹ and organised a public round of consultation⁵⁰.

The public consultation conducted by Internet (Europa) between April and July 2003 yielded more than 250 replies from individuals, but mainly from organisations from all over the European Union: European networks, local associations, museums, cultural contact points, foundations, ministries, regional bodies, professional bodies, trade unions.

The Commission also organised and attended seminars on horizontal or sectoral subjects and commissioned various studies on subjects with a bearing on cultural cooperation, as already mentioned on several occasions (see also page 40).

Finally, when it was drawing up its proposal, the Commission also took account of the deliberations of the Council, the European Parliament and the Committee of the Regions⁵¹.

⁴⁷ Ex-post evaluation of the former cultural programmes Kaleidoscope, Ariane and Raphaël, mid-term evaluation of Culture 2000 and evaluation of organisations of European cultural interest.

⁴⁸ Forum of 21-22 November 2001 on cultural cooperation in Europe.

⁴⁹ "Towards a new cultural framework programme of the European Union".

⁵⁰ Public consultation on the future European cultural programme conducted between April and July 2003 by Internet: http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/archive/consult_pub_fr.html.

⁵¹ See in particular the Council Resolution of 25 June 2002 on a new plan of work for European cooperation in the field of culture and of 19 December 2002 implementing the plan of work on European cooperation in the field of culture, the Resolutions of the European Parliament of 5 September 2001 on cultural cooperation in the European Union of 21 March 2002, of 28 February 2002 on implementation of the Culture 2000 programme and of 21 October 2002, and the opinion of the Committee of the Regions of 9 October 2003 on extension of the Culture 2000 programme.

8.2 The main results of this work

This very extensive evaluation, discussion and consultation exercise showed first of all that there was a sound basis and a need for cultural action by the European Union. But it also pinpointed several shortcomings which need to be remedied. This is why the Commission drew up a new – third-generation – programme, drawing on the lessons of past experience and exploring new avenues of action.

Many opinions were voiced during this exercise, giving rise to a profusion of ideas and proposals to give fresh impetus to cultural cooperation on our continent. The many avenues of action advocated, which were sometimes contradictory, were all studied carefully by the Commission, but not all of them could be implemented, given the legal and financial constraints to which Community action is subject.

European cultural action

It emerged from the discussion that Community action was too fragmented, as explained in point 2.4. Given the restricted budget available, the requirements of efficiency and visibility suggest that a more coherent approach is needed.

The public consultation showed that Community intervention in the field of culture was hampered by a lack of visibility. This could no doubt be remedied by better communication on the projects supported but also, as explained previously, by greater coherence of Community cultural activity as a whole⁵².

Finally, the mid-term evaluation of the “Culture 2000” programme emphasised, as have some experts in the sector, the lack of an overall strategy for Community action. A programme of support for cultural activity makes most sense if it is integrated in a wider political framework which enables complementary action to be taken⁵³ in various fields. This was the tenor of the European Parliament’s Resolution of 5 September 2001 on cultural cooperation in Europe, which called for much more global action by the European Union on this front.

The “Culture 2000” programme

Attention has repeatedly been drawn to the fact that the “Culture 2000” programme pursued too many aims⁵⁴ for the limited financial resources available. This makes it appear less effective and coherent, since the projects supported, which are many and varied, may give the impression of a lack of focus. In the interests of effectiveness and greater conceptual simplicity, the goals ought to be limited to those geared directly to cultural cooperation, since they generate genuine European added value. This is in fact one of the main lessons to be learned from the Forum on cultural cooperation, the discussions of the group of experts, the evaluation of the Culture 2000 programme and the public consultation. Reducing the number of goals obviously involves making choices. It was decided to give priority to three specific aims enabling the general objective, namely developing cultural cooperation in Europe in order to make an active contribution to the emergence of European citizenship, to be attained. These specific aims, on which there was a broad consensus amongst the interested parties are: transnational mobility of persons working in the cultural sector, transnational circulation of works of art (including intangible works such as music) and intercultural dialogue.

⁵² See the results of the public consultation and of the evaluation of the previous cultural programmes.

⁵³ Report from the Commission to the Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – mid-term report on « Culture 2000 ».

⁵⁴ Forum on cultural cooperation, mid-term evaluation of « Culture 2000 ». The ex post evaluation of the previous programmes already pointed out the problems in coordinating properly cultural and economic aims.

The compartmentalisation of the various cultural disciplines in the “Culture 2000” programme was also mentioned as a constraint on the operators. And it is true that this fails to properly reflect the way the sector is changing and is liable to exclude certain forms of cultural expression. What is more, people failed to see why there were differences in the way the funds were allocated to the sectors. In order to simplify matters for future beneficiaries, the new programme will therefore seek to eschew this compartmentalised or normative approach with regard to eligible or ineligible forms of art⁵⁵ and to be open to all types of artistic or cultural projects, particularly by encouraging integrated projects which combine various forms of cooperation. The need to develop cooperation through exchanges of information, discussion between professionals, training, technical assistance and development of professional expertise of cultural players was therefore stated⁵⁶.

The Culture 2000 programme was intended to encourage permanent cooperation between operators, many of whom took the view that new methods should be used to continue and intensify efforts in this direction in the future programme. Support should be granted for a longer period, which would enable operators to bring their projects properly to fruition and create solid links between them. The idea of cooperation platforms was also mooted⁵⁷, but as these would be involved in the management, including the financial management, of the programme, there are insurmountable legal obstacles to their being set up, because it would be incompatible with the Financial Regulation governing European Union action, which does not permit execution of the Community budget to be delegated to institutions other than executive agencies created under the said Regulation. Nevertheless, the need to structure cooperation and to place it on a permanent footing was expressed on many occasions and will be met by setting up cooperation centres. Attention was drawn on several occasions to the fact that support to more ephemeral but innovatory and dynamic projects, from which interesting permanent cooperation projects could stem in the future, should not be neglected either⁵⁸.

Types of action supported

It was also emphasised that some activities which could be very useful were not covered by the Community cultural programme. At present, there is a lack of real support for activities examining the challenges of and resources for cultural cooperation in Europe. It is vital to finance studies and analyses on cultural cooperation at European level and on the obstacles it comes up against. The group of experts convened by the Commission in 2003 also advocated developing a more proactive approach to European cultural action and its strand of studies and reflection.

Exchange of experience and good practice on cooperation and facilitating access to quality information on the possibilities for cooperation in Europe should also be encouraged. The Council recently emphasised its desire to “examine the methods through which the exchange of good practices in relation to the economic and social dimension of culture could be developed”⁵⁹. In 2001, it was already keen to encourage “exchange of information and

⁵⁵ See also the opinion of the Committee of the Regions of 9 October 2003.

⁵⁶ See in particular the report on the state of cultural cooperation in Europe, October 2003.

⁵⁷ See the results of the public consultation, the discussions of the Forum on cultural cooperation and the report from the group of experts.

⁵⁸ See, inter alia, the results of the public consultation and the opinion of the Committee of the Regions of 9 October 2003.

⁵⁹ Council Resolution of 26 May 2003 on the horizontal aspects of culture, OJ C 136 of 11.06.2003, p. 1.

experience regarding conditions for professional artists between the Member States as well as between the Member States and the candidate countries”⁶⁰.

9. HELPING TO ACHIEVE COST-EFFECTIVENESS

9.1 Cost implications of the programme: €408 million

9.1.1 Total financial impact

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Mio €	45	47	51	57	62	69	77	408

(Financial and human resources costs)

The cost implications of the proposal result from the assumptions. These assumptions take into account the experience of support to the sector of the previous Community action as well as the emergence of new needs. They draw on the conclusions of the consultation of the stakeholders carried out in the preparation of the draft decision. The overall budget is informed by the need for credibility. It takes account of parameters justifying an increase in the budget (extension of the fields of activity and the geographical scope of the programme and the increase in the number of measures, as explained above). It also takes account of the need to keep a certain number of activities at national, regional or local level which the principle of subsidiarity requires to be conducted at these levels and which would not gain by being handled at European level. The budget also takes account of the capacity of the project management structures.

In carrying out the programme the Commission will have recourse to an executive agency. The agency will be operational as from January 2005. In establishing the agency a feasibility study has been carried out by an independent external consultant. The study demonstrated that a centralised management guarantees the European dimension of the programme and the subsidiarity principle.

⁶⁰ Council Resolution of 23 July 2001 on exchange of information and experience on the situation of professional artists in the context of enlargement of the European Union, OJ C 213 of 31.07. 2001, p. 9.

Commitment appropriations in € million (to three decimal places)

Breakdown	Type of actions/outputs	Number of actions/ outputs	Average unit cost	Total cost
<u>Strand 1 - Support to projects</u>				314,160
Cooperation centres	-> <u>Grants to projects</u>	80	1,836	146,880
Cooperation activities	-> <u>Grants to projects</u>	870	0,113	97,920
Special activities	-> <u>Grants to projects</u>	400	0,173	69,360
<u>Strand 2 – Support to organisations active at European level in the field of culture</u>	-> <u>Operating grants</u>	305	0,132	40,358

<u>Strand 3 – Analysis and information</u>	-> <u>Grants to projects</u>	60	0,143	8,570
	-> <u>Calls for tenders:</u>			
	- Studies			
	- Portal	17	0,200	3,430
	-> <u>CCP</u>	182	0,046	8,400
Programme management	<u>Technical and administrative assistance (ATA) and support expenditure (DDA)</u>			33,082
TOTAL COST				408,0

9.1.2 *Technical and administrative assistance*

9.1.3 *Impact on personnel and administrative expenditure*

The estimation of expenses is based on an average for 2007-2013. It is envisaged to expand the human resources currently deployed on the management of the Culture 2000 programme in order to take account of the evolution of the operational credit allocated to the programme. The human resources would increase from 16 to 20 people/year in 2013.

Type of posts		Resources to be assigned to managing the action by using existing and/or supplementary resources		Total	Description of the tasks involved in the action
		Number of permanent posts	Number of temporary posts		
Officials or Temporary staff	A	4 (5)		4 (5)	Implementation of the programme
	B	3 (5)		3 (5)	
	C	6 (7)		6 (7)	
Other human resources				1	<i>Support staff</i>
				2	<i>National experts</i>
Total			13 (17)	16 (20)	

9.1.4 Overall financial impact of human resources

Type of human resources	Sums in euros	Calculation method *
Officials	1 404 000	13*108 000 €
Temporary staff	(1 836 000)	(17* 108 000)
Other human resources (indicate the budget heading)	108 000	1*108 000 € support staff
	90 000	2*45 000 € national experts
Total	1 602 000 (2 034 000)	

The sums constitute total expenditure for 12 months.

9.1.5 Other administrative expenditure deriving from the action

Budget heading (No and title)	Sums in euros	Method of calculation
Overall allocation (Title A7)		
A0701 – Missions	41 250	5 people * 10 missions * 825 € (average)
A07030 – Meetings	116 000	2meet.*50 people* (860€+2*(150€))
A07031 – Obligatory committees ⁽¹⁾	64 500	3meet.*25 people*860€
A07032 – Non-obligatory committees ⁽¹⁾		
A07040 – Conferences	200 000	
A0705 – Studies and consultations		
Other expenditure (please indicate)		
Information systems (A-5001/A-4300)		
Other expenditure – Part A (please indicate)		
Total	421 750	

9.2 Could the same results be achieved at lower costs?

Table 1 shows the target outputs (excluding technical assistance) and Table 2 below makes an assessment of the major assumptions on the basis of which the cost of the programme has been calculated.

Table 1

Target Outputs	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Strand 1								
Cooperation centres	9	9	10	11	12	14	15	80
Cooperation activities	97	100	109	121	132	147	164	870
Special actions	42	45	49	55	61	69	79	400
Strand 2	33	35	38	42	47	52	58	305
Strand 3	32	33	34	36	39	41	44	259

Table 2

Assumption	Assessment
Cooperation centres would receive support of a maximum of €500 000 per annum over a period of five years.	These figures were discussed with experts in the sector and represent the duration and amount necessary to ensure that a cooperation activity which is intended to last can be properly consolidated.
Cooperation activities would receive support of between €60 000 and 200 000 for a maximum period of one year.	This support would be provided for a maximum of 12 months. This assumption is based on the expressed needs of the sector
The programme would finance some 60 special actions per year.	Special actions would have to resonate strongly with the peoples of Europe and contribute to greater awareness of belonging to the same community and to awareness of cultural diversity. They will also contribute to raising the profile of Community cultural activities both inside and outside the European Union.
Under strand 2, the programme would support around 50 European cultural organisations per year. This strand would account for approximately 10% of the programme.	This is an assumption based on the nature of the activities and on the current allocations for the special budget heading.
Under strand 3, some 10 studies and analyses would be conducted each year. Each year, approximately 30 contracts would be signed with the CCPs. This strand would account for approximately 5% of the programme.	This is an assumption based on the nature of activities and the expressed needs of the sector.

In conclusion, the cost of the programme is the lowest possible. The only way in which the cost of the programme could be significantly reduced would be by cutting down the number of projects supported. This would endanger the viability of the programme. The programme's multiplier effect would be seriously at risk and so would be its expected results and impacts.

9.3 Could the same or better results be achieved with the same cost by using other instruments?

Under heading 4 (4.1.), this report discusses the recourse to a Community action programme versus non-intervention and other approaches (such as open method of coordination or the provision of information and guidelines). It concludes that an action programme is needed, given the restrictions on the Community's capacity to legislate on cultural matters imposed by

the Treaty, and given that the lack of Community intervention would prolong the persistence of present needs and possibly lead to increased needs over time.

The report also discusses the need for a new action programme versus the use of the existing one (4.2). It concludes that maintaining the current programme would not be satisfactory either, as it would imply not taking advantage of the experience acquired. The cost-efficiency would not be as high as it could be, notably because of a limited use of measures with multiplier effects.

In light of the above, it can be concluded that no other instrument would allow for the same or better results to be achieved at the same cost.

10. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Mid-term report: the first report will be drawn up three years after the start of the programme (31 December 2010 at the latest). The object of this report is to provide an initial assessment of the results obtained at the halfway stage so that any changes or adjustments that are deemed necessary may be made for the second half of the programme (31 December 2011 at the latest). To this end, the Commission will draw on the assistance of outside experts, who will be selected on the basis of their expertise following a call for tenders. The Commission report will be submitted to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.

Ex-post evaluation: the ex-post report on the impact of the action in question will be drawn up at the end of the seven-year programme (31 December 2015 at the latest). The object of this report is to assess the comparative results of support systems in the light of the programme objectives. As with the mid-term report, the Commission will call on outside consultants for assistance. The final report will be submitted to the European Parliament, the Council the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.

The specific objectives of the programme and the actions will be subject to monitoring. Information providing a measure of the performance, results and impact of the programme will be also taken from audit reports on a sample of programme beneficiaries (30 per year).

The studies on cultural issues carried out in the context of this programme (third strand on information and communication) could be one of the sources for measuring the impact of this policy.

11. DRAFT COMMISSION PROPOSAL AND JUSTIFICATION

Whilst abiding by the Commission guidelines intended to provide for better lawmaking at European level, the proposal for the legal basis is based on broad prior consultation. It is also based on the current impact study, which factors in all the elements of an *ex ante* evaluation. Finally, it is simple and comprehensible, is structured in terms of objectives, activities and measures and is flexible by virtue of having a clear framework which can be developed.

To recap, the new legal basis has three overall objectives which are related to the European Union's broad political aims and specific priorities defined in the course of the discussions conducted by the European institutions, and to the needs of the European cultural sector.

It was decided to concentrate on a very few specific goals in order to make Community action more effective. A broad consensus emerged on the following three areas of support:

transnational mobility of all cultural players

transnational circulation of artistic and cultural works and products

intercultural dialogue.

The programme is made up of three strands.

First strand: support for cultural activities

The programme provides for direct support to three categories of European cooperation projects of varying duration and scale.

– Cooperation centres

Cooperation centres bring together operators from one or several sectors from the Member States or other countries participating in the programme. They are geared to conducting structured multiannual cultural activities of either a sectoral or cross-sectoral nature.

– Cooperation activities

The programme supports cultural cooperation projects of a maximum duration of one year bringing together various European operators to work on sectoral or cross-sectoral activities. There is considerable room for creativity and innovation. Projects geared to exploring avenues of cooperation for development over a longer term will be particularly encouraged.

– Special actions

Special actions, which would be on a large scale, would have to resonate strongly with the peoples of Europe and contribute to greater awareness of belonging to the same community and to awareness of cultural diversity. They should also make a contribution to raising the profile of Community cultural activities both within and outside the European Union.

Second strand: support to organisations active at European level in the field of culture

In addition to direct support for cooperation projects, the programme provides operating aid to organisations which are engaged in promoting cultural cooperation or play the part of ambassadors of European culture and which have a genuine European dimension.

This strand will integrate in the new programme action to promote organisations active at European level in the field of culture, which were previously covered by a separate programme (Community action programme for promoting organisations active at European level in the field of culture, 2004-2006).

Third strand: support for analyses and collection and dissemination of information on cultural cooperation

This strand is intended to support analysis and information activities to pave the way for cooperation. It is made up of three complementary activities which support cultural cooperation at different levels:

– Support for analysis in the field of cultural cooperation

This seeks to promote the production of conceptual tools by supporting studies and analyses on cultural cooperation to build up a better picture of it.

– Support for the collection and dissemination of information on cultural cooperation

This is intended to remove some practical obstacles to cooperation by developing an Internet tool for the exchange of information and good practice.

– Support for cultural contact points

In order to ensure targeted and effective grass-roots dissemination of practical information on the new cultural programme, it provides for support to cultural contact points. These bodies, which operate at national level, are to be set up in cooperation with the Member States on a voluntary basis and their main task will be to promote the programme.

Community intervention supporting cultural cooperation is definitely needed in order to achieve the objectives of the Treaty, as European multilateral cooperation would be very limited without EU funding. This support is complementary to other regional, national and Community interventions in the field of culture, which are not focused on cooperation.

Through the extended consultation and reflection on the cultural programme, it appeared clearly that a new programme had to be launched, building on the experience gained within the last few years and adapting to the changing reality of the sector. Cultural cooperation being a complex sector, it appeared necessary to develop a global instrument dedicated to different aspects of cooperation. Alongside direct support to cooperation projects, indirect support to cooperation as a whole through the gathering and disseminating of information is envisaged.

The practical difficulty that had to be faced while drafting the proposal was the need to encourage structured, sustainable cooperation without excluding less established, emerging organisations from being involved in cooperation projects. A balance should be achieved thanks to the distinction made between the different actions supported.

12. CONCLUSION

The content of the new legal basis is intended to establish a third-generation programme on the basis of the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the "Culture 2000" programme, the positions adopted by the European institutions, the various stages of consultation and the studies conducted recently on behalf of the Commission on cultural cooperation.

The present legal basis provides continuity with the "Culture 2000" programme, which will last until 2006, and with the programme of Community action to promote organisations active at European level in the field of culture (2004-2006), by developing them in keeping with the new political priorities and also ensuring a certain degree of flexibility so the programme can adapt to future political aims and new challenges in the field of culture.

13. REFERENCES

Resolutions of the European Parliament

- European Parliament Resolution of 22 October 2002 on the importance and dynamics of the theatre and the performing arts in an enlarged Europe (Official Journal C300E/156, 11/12/2003)
- European Parliament Resolution of 28 February 2002 on the implementation of the 'Culture 2000' programme (Official Journal C284E/2002, 21/11/2002)
- European Parliament Resolution of 5 September 2001 on European cultural cooperation in the European Union (Official Journal C72E/2002, 21/03/2002)

Resolutions of the Council

- Council Resolution of 26 May 2003 on the horizontal aspects of culture: increasing synergies with other sectors and Community actions and exchanging good practices in relation to the social and economic dimensions of culture, Official Journal C 136, 11/06/2003.
- Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union, Official Journal C 032, 05/02/2002
- Council Resolution of 21 January 2002 on culture and the knowledge society, Official Journal C 032, 05/02/2002
- Council Resolution of 19 December 2002 implementing the work plan on European cooperation in the field of culture: European added value and mobility of persons and circulation of works in the cultural sector, Official Journal C 013, 18/01/2003
- Council Resolution of 25 June 2002 on a new work plan on European cooperation in the field of culture, Official Journal C 162, 06/07/2002
- Council Resolution of 23 July 2001 on exchange of information and experience concerning conditions for professional artists in the context of EU enlargement, Official Journal C 213, 31/07/2001

Studies and evaluations

- Evaluations ex post of the former cultural programmes Kaleidoscope, Ariane and Raphael: - evaluation report carried out by GMV Conseil
- Commission Report COM (2004) 33
http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/studies_evaluation/studies_en.html#studies3
- Mid-term evaluation of Culture 2000:
 - evaluation report carried out by PLS Ramboll Management,
 - Commission Report COM (2003) 722
http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/studies_evaluation/studies_en.html
- Evaluation of the line A 30-42 about organisations promoting European culture:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/pdf-word/report_17_org.pdf.
- Report on the state of cultural cooperation in Europe, EFAH/Interarts, October 2003:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/studies_evaluation/studies_en.html

- Feasibility study on the possible creation of a European observatory of cultural cooperation, August 2003:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/pdf-word/final_report_aout_2003.pdf

- Study on the mobility and free movement of people and products in the cultural sector, CEJEC - Université PARIS X-EAEA, April 2002:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/pdf-word/mobility_en.pdf

- Exploitation and development of the job potential in the cultural sector in the age of digitalisation, study commissioned by the European Commission, presented by MKW Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH in 2001:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2001/jul/summary.pdf

- Eurobarometer Surveys "Europeans' participation in cultural activities" in the Member States (April 2002) and in the candidate countries (July 2003):

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/studies_evaluation/studies_en.html#studies3

Public and experts consultations

- Public consultation on the website of DG EAC « Designing the future programme of cultural cooperation for the European Union after 2006 », April to July 2003

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/archive/consult_pub_en.html

- Forum on cultural cooperation, November 2001:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/other_actions/reflexion/forum_en.html

- Report of the high-level advisory group on dialogue between peoples and cultures in the Euro-Mediterranean area, 24 November 2003:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/commissioners/prodi/group/spirit_en.htm

Other

- Communication from the Commission - Building our common Future: Policy challenges and Budgetary means of the Enlarged Union 2007-2013 COM (2004) 101 of 10.2.2004.

- Communication from the Commission - Making citizenship work: fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for Youth, Culture, Audiovisual and Civic Participation - COM (2004) 154 of 9.03.2004.- Commission Staff Working Document on the Structural Funds and culture - SEC (2004) 237.

http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/sources_en.html