


# Ex-post Evaluation of the 2013 European Capitals of Culture

*Technical Annexes*

*Ecorys, October 2014*

Creative Europe

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union.***

**Freephone number** (*)**:**

**00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

More information on the European Union is available on the internet (http://europa.eu).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015

ISBN:978-92-79-44661-0
DOI: 10.2766/448640

© European Union, 2014
Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

## HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

**Free publications:**

- one copy:
  via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
  from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
  from the delegations in non-EU countries
  (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
  by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

  (*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

**Priced publications:**

- via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

# Annex One: Terms of Reference



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Culture and creativity

# TERMS OF REFERENCE
# Ex post evaluation of 2013 European Capitals of Culture

**Contracting authority: European Commission**


TERMS OF REFERENCE ..... 2
CONTEXT ..... 3
1.1. Description of the Action ..... 3
1.2. Objectives of the Action ..... 4
1.2.1. General objectives ..... 4
1.2.2. Specific objectives ..... 4
1.3. European Capitals of Culture 2013 ..... 5
1.3.1. Marseille-Provence ..... 5
1.3.2. Košice ..... 5
1.4. Monitoring Provisions ..... 6
1.4.1. First monitoring ..... 7
1.4.2. Final monitoring: ..... 7
1.4.3. The "Melina Mercouri "Prize ..... 7
2. TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT ..... 7
2.1. Description of Action implementation ..... 8
2.2. Evaluation questions ..... 8
2.3. Other tasks under the assignment ..... 12
2.3.1. Monitoring arrangements ..... 12
3. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES ..... 13
3.1. General reporting requirements ..... 13
3.2. Initial Bulletin ..... 13
3.3. Inception Report ..... 13
3.4. Interim Report ..... 13
3.5. Draft Final Report ..... 13
3.6. Final Report ..... 14
4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET ..... 15

4.1. Organisation ..... 15
4.2. Meetings ..... 15
4.3. Timetable ..... 15
4.4. Budget ..... 16
5. REFERENCES ..... 16
5.1. Action documents ..... 16
5.2. Background and reference documents ..... 16
6. REQUIREMENTS ..... 17
6.1. Methodology ..... 17
6.2. Resources ..... 18

## CONTEXT

### Description of the Action

The initial scheme of 'The European City of Culture' was launched at an intergovernmental level in 1985.[1] In 1992 a new event of 'European Cultural Month' was established.[2] In 1999 by Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and the Council the European City of Culture event was given the status of a Community Action and was renamed 'European Capital of Culture',[3] hereafter referred as "the Action". The Decision outlined new selection procedures and evaluation criteria for the 2005 title onward. The Decision was amended by Decision 649/2005/EC (in order to integrate the 10 Member States which joined the EU in 2004) and later replaced by the Decision 1622/2006/EC,[4] which has repealed the earlier decisions. Decision 1622/2006/EC specifies the objectives of the action and the designation process for the 2013 title onward. It set out a list of countries entitled to nominate a European Capital of Culture (ECOC) in a given year up to 2019.[5] Given the

[1] The title "European Capital of Culture" was designed to help bring European citizens closer together. This was the idea underlying its launch in June 1985 by the Council of Ministers of the European Union on the initiative of Melina Mercouri. For more details see Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs regarding the annual organization of the 'European City of Culture' of 13.06.1985
http://eur-ex.europa.eu/Notice.do?mode=dbl&lang=en&lng1=en,en&lng2=da,de,el,en,es,fr,it,nl,&val=117538:cs&page=1&hwords=

[2] Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1992 concerning the choice of European Cities of Culture after 1996 and the 'Cultural Month'
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:41992X0616:EN:HTML

[3] Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019 (OJ L 166 of 1.7.1999, p. 1). Decision amended by Decision 649/2005/EC (OJ L 117 of 4.5.2005, p. 20).
http://www.europa.eu/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/1999/l_166/l_16619990701en00010005.pdf
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_117/l_11720050504en00200021.pdf

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

[5] Annex to Decision 1622/2006/EC: 2007 Luxembourg and Romania; 2008 United Kingdom, 2009 Austria and Lithuania; 2010 Germany and Hungary; 2011 Finland and Estonia; 2012 Portugal and Slovenia; 2013 France and Slovakia; 2014 Sweden and

time-scale of ECOCs implementation, whose preparation starts 6 years before the title year, the Decision maintains the application of 1999 Decision to European Capitals of Culture for 2007, 2008 and 2009 and foresees transitional provisions for titles 2010-2012.

Under the Decision 1622/2006/EC France and Slovakia are each entitled to host a European Capital of Culture in 2013. The 2013 ECOC title is the first to be subject to the new selection arrangements established in 2006, under which there are two selection phases: a pre-selection phase, at the end of which a shortlist of applicant cities is drawn up, and then a final selection nine months later. In both countries, bids from candidate cities are examined by an international jury of thirteen members, six of whom are appointed by the Member State concerned and the other seven are appointed by the European Institutions. The jury examines the bids on the basis of the criteria laid down in the above-mentioned Decision.

The four pre-selected cities in France were Bordeaux, Lyon, Marseille-Provence and Toulouse. The jury recommended that the ECOC title be given to Marseille-Provence. Of the four pre-selected Slovakian cities; Košice, Presov, Martin and Nitra, the jury decided to recommend Košice for the ECOC title. In May 2009, the Council of Ministers of the European Union formally designated Marseille-Provence and Košice as the 2013 European Capitals of Culture.

**Objectives of the Action**

These are the general and specific objectives laid down by the current Decision 1622/2006/EC, which has articulated themes and criteria already contained in former Decision 1419/1999/EC.

*General objectives*

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

*Specific objectives*

In accordance with Art. 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC, the cultural Action should fulfil the following criteria.

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

- foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from the relevant Member States and other Member States in any cultural sector;
- highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe;

Latvia; 2015 Belgium and Czech Republic; 2016 Spain and Poland; 2017 Denmark and Cyprus; 2018 Netherlands and Malta; 2019 Italy and Bulgaria

- bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.

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

- foster the participation of the citizens living in the city and its surroundings and raise their interest as well as the interest of citizens from abroad;

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

ECOC 2007-2008 evaluation[6] found out that cities holding the ECOC title had adopted over the years a third broad objective, that could be defined as "*supporting social and economic development through culture"*. It is generally considered highly relevant to ECOCs implementation.

**European Capitals of Culture 2013**

*Marseille-Provence*

The programme as presented by Marseille-Provence 2013 [7] offered a regional vision for the ECOC year. The programme is not only about the city of Marseille; the territories around the city; Camargue, Alpilles, Aix and the Provence coast are essential partners in, and parts of, the project.

A main message of the programme is that Marseille-Provence 2013 is a "laboratory for the dialogue of cultures in the Mediterranean", exploring and exploiting the city's long history of openness to the world. Large-scale urban renewal projects, development of the city-port interface, construction of the MUCEM (*Musée des Civilisations euro-méditerranéennes*), public transport improvements and economic revitalization, e.g. in the culture and tourism industries, are essential and visible elements of Marseille-Provence 2013.

*Košice*

Košice 2013 [8] presented its cultural programme for the ECOC year as a new vision for a city known both for its rich history and developed heavy industry. A main message was to make the city a centre of creativity for a new future for young, creative people. The programme was outlined along five main thematic lines:

- "Forward to traditions - forward to roots" - a presentation of authentic and traditional culture connecting traditional elements to modern life.

[6] "Ex-post Evaluation of 2007 & 2008 European Capitals of Culture. Final Report", Ecotec 2009 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/ecoc/ex_post_evaluation_final_report2007_08.pdf

[7] http://www.mp2013.fr/?lang=en

[8] http://www.kosice2013.sk/en/

- "Open public space" - the creation of a new media space and space in streets and squares using events outside of brick-and-mortar institutions.

- "Košice's forces - light, water and sound" - events working with the phenomena of light, water and sound.

- "Living Culture Lab" – a presentation and promotion of all forms of modern culture including innovative, alternative and experimental locations.

- Wandering City" - to increase the visibility of Košice and eastern Slovakia and to export art to the local, national and international level.

**Monitoring Provisions**

The current legal basis (1622/2006/EC) lays down a monitoring process, applying from 2010 title onwards. This monitoring phase aims at ensuring that the cities concerned fulfil the commitments undertaken at selection stage, in particular concerning the criteria of the action, and to provide them with guidance on the implementation of the event.

During this phase, the progress in the city's preparations is monitored and guided by a monitoring and advisory panel, composed of seven independent experts appointed by the Commission, the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the Committee of the Regions.

The involvement of this committee of experts makes it possible to:

- assess the progress made in the preparations;

- give guidance;

- check compliance with the programme and the commitments on the basis of which the cities were selected (particularly as regards meeting the "European Dimension" and "City and Citizens" criteria).

For this purpose, representatives from the cities are convened to meet the monitoring and advisory panel twice between the designation and the start of the event.

The managers of current and future Capitals benefit from the exchange of experience for the preparation of the event. Some of them are part of an informal network which provides an opportunity to meet and to debate about the design and the management of the event. The Commission seeks to foster the sharing of best practices since it is one of the keys to success. The Culture Programme has supported a policy grouping on the sharing of evaluation methodologies and practices among past, present and future European Capitals of Culture.[9]

[9] European Capital of Culture Policy Group http://ecocpolicygroup.wordpress.com/

*First monitoring*

Two years before the event, the monitoring and advisory panel meets the structures responsible for implementing the programmes and the authorities of the two designated European Capitals of Culture, on the initiative of the Commission.

At the latest three months before this meeting, the structures responsible for implementing the programmes of the two Capitals of Culture present a progress report to the Commission relating to the progress achieved so far in the preparation of the event on the basis of the programmes presented at selection stage and the commitments made at that time. The monitoring panel shall draw up a first monitoring report on the preparations for the event and on the arrangements which still need to be made.[10]

*Final monitoring:*

At the latest eight months before the event, the monitoring panel again meets the structures responsible for implementing the programmes and the authorities of the two designated European Capitals of Culture in order to evaluate the preparatory work so far and the arrangements which still need to be made.

At the latest three months before this meeting, the structures responsible for implementing the programmes submit a progress report to the Commission, drafted according to the same principles as those outlined above. This report deals also with the progress achieved in relation to the recommendations made by the panel during the first monitoring phase.[11] The report recommends to the Commission whether to award the Melina Mercouri prize.

*The "Melina Mercouri "Prize*

On the basis of the Panel's report, the Commission awards a prize "in honour of Melina Mercouri" to the designated cities, provided that they have honoured the commitments made in the selection phase and acted on the recommendations of the panels during the selection and monitoring phases. This prize, to be awarded no later than three months before the event, rewards the quality preparation of the event. It consists of 1,5 million EUR and has a great symbolic value often triggering complementary sponsoring. Both of the 2013 European Capitals of Culture were awarded the Melina Mercouri Prize in 2012.

**TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT**

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

[10] http://ec.europa.eu/culture/documents/report_1monitoring_meeting_2013.pdf
[11] http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/ecoc/2013-monitoring-report.pdf

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

The evaluation should cover the European Capital of Culture Action, the events in Marseille-Provence and Košice that took place in 2013.

**Description of Action implementation**

The contractor must provide in its report:

- a brief description of the conception of the ECOC Action,
- the conceptual framework that guided the study,
- the evaluation questions that the research aimed to answer and the methodology followed;
- core indicators to assess the two ECOC event on the basis of existing data made available by the cities. Core indicators have been developed in the ex post evaluation of ECOC 2010.
- reports for Marseille-Provence and Košice , including the matching of core indicators,
- lessons in delivery from across the two ECOC;
- overall conclusions and recommendations for the ECOC Action.

The description should provide the necessary background and reference points for responding to the evaluation questions in the next sub-section. It is strongly recommended to follow as much as possible the methodology and reporting structure used in the ex-post evaluation reports of ECOCs 2007-2008-2009-2010-2011-2012, in order to ensure comparability of data.

**Evaluation questions**

The contractor must provide answers to the evaluation questions listed below. These questions were addressed by ECOCs evaluations 2007-2012 and should remain as far as possible stable. In order to allow comparability of evaluation results of individual ECOC evaluations over the years, the contractor should use also the same intervention logic and indicators as for ECOCs 2007-2012 evaluation.

The contractor will nonetheless be called upon to use their knowledge and experience to refine and elaborate these questions and, where appropriate, propose others to the Commission with the aim of improving the focus of this evaluation. The contractor should note that the sub-questions proposed under some of the evaluation questions do not necessarily cover the entire aspect of the questions concerned. The sub-questions deal with issues the Commission is particularly interested in and which the contractor therefore should address, in addition to any other issues which the evaluator may see as requiring attention in the case of each evaluation question.

With respect to each of the evaluation questions, the evaluation is expected to provide concrete recommendations particularly on how future European Capitals of Culture can address any deficiencies and/or gaps identified by the evaluator. As far as the conclusions for the two evaluated cities allows recommendations should also be made – if appropriate – for the future design of the Action.

| | Evaluation Question |
|---|---|
| | |
| **Relevance** | |
| **EQ1** | What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture? |
| **EQ2** | What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives? |
| **EQ3** | What were the objectives of the city in being an ECOC? (refer to list in intervention logic) What was the relative importance of each objective? |
| **EQ4** | Have any specific objectives of the ECOC event been related to social impacts? |
| **EQ5** | In this connection, did the objectives of the ECOC event include reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled people and minorities? |
| **EQ6** | To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined? |
| **EQ7** | To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECOC's own application? (special focus on the **European** dimension) |
| **EQ8** | To what extent were the activities consistent with the ECOC's own objectives, with the ECOC's application and with the Decision? (special focus on the **European** dimension) |
| **EQ9** | How was the European dimension reflected by the themes put forward by the ECOC event and in terms of cooperation at European level? How did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible? To what extent did the 2 cities cooperate? |
| **EQ10** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow it, to what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the Action been proved relevant to Article 151 of the EC Treaty? |
| **EQ11** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allows it, to what extent has the Action proved to be complementary to other EU initiatives in the field of culture? |
| **EQ11a** | To what extent has each ECoC been reinforced by and added impetus to investments by the EU Structural Funds? |
| **EQ11b** | To what extent have ECoC complemented other EU initiatives, e.g. European Youth Capital, European Green Capital? |
| **Efficiency** | |
| **EQ12** | How have the organisational models of the formal governing Board and operational structures played a role in the European Capital of Culture? What role have the Board and operational structures played in the ECOC event's implementation? At what stage were these structures established? |
| **EQ13** | Who chaired the Board and what was his/her experience? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the Board and operational structure used and personnel involved? |

| | Evaluation Question |
|---|---|
| | |
| **EQ14** | Has an artistic director been included into the operational structure and how was he/she appointed? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the artistic director and personnel involved? |
| **EQ15** | What was the process of designing the programme? |
| **EQ16** | How were activities selected and implemented? |
| **EQ17** | How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs? |
| **EQ18** | To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy been successful in/contributed to the promotion of city image/profile, promotion of the ECOC event, awareness raising of the European dimension, promotion of all events and attractions in the city? |
| **EQ19** | To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels? |
| **EQ20** | What was the process of securing the financial inputs? |
| **EQ21** | What was the total amount of resources used for each ECOC event? What was the final financial out-turn of the year? |
| **EQ22** | What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total? |
| **EQ22a** | How was the Melina Mercouri Prize used? |
| **EQ22b** | To what extent did the award of the Melina Mercouri Prize create symbolic value for the cities holding the ECoC title? |
| **EQ22c** | To what extent did the ECoC title trigger complementary sponsorship? |
| **EQ23** | To what extent were the inputs consistent with the Action and with the application? (special focus on the **European** dimension) |
| **EQ24** | What was the total expenditure strictly for the implementation of the cultural programme of the year (operational expenditure)? What is the proportion of the operational expenditure in the total expenditure for the ECOC event? |
| **EQ25** | What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation) |
| **EQ26** | What were the sources of funding for the ECOC event? How much came from the European Commission structural funds (e.g. ERDF - European Regional Development Fund, ESF – European Social Fund)? |
| **EQ27** | Was the total size of the budget sufficient for reaching a critical mass in terms of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the same results have been achieved if the structure of resources and their respective importance was different? |
| **EQ28** | To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the ECOC event been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes? |
| **EQ29** | Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided greater cost-effectiveness? As a result, could the total budget for the ECOC event be considered appropriate and proportional to what the action set out to achieve? |
| **EQ30** | To what extent have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring |

| | Evaluation Question |
|---|---|
| | |
| | mechanisms influenced the results of the ECOC event? |
| **EQ30a** | To what extent has the informal meeting following the designation as well as other advice offered by the panel and by the Commission influenced the results of the ECoC event? |
| **Effectiveness** | |
| **EQ31** | Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.) |
| **EQ32** | How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the ECOC event? (explore role of Board, Chair, Artistic Director, decision-making, political challenges, etc.) |
| **EQ33** | What quantitative indicators (number of visitors, overnight stays, cultural participation of people, etc.) of the social, tourist and broader economic impacts of the event have been gathered by the ECOC? |
| **EQ34** | To what extent did the ECOC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city and as set out in the application (refer to list in the intervention logic)? |
| **EQ35** | To what extent has the ECOC event been successful in attaining the objectives set (general, specific and operational) and in achieving the intended results as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)? |
| **EQ35a** | Was the cultural programme perceived as being of high artistic quality? To what extent did the ECoC prove successful in bringing their chosen artistic themes/orientations to the fore? |
| **EQ35b** | To what extent did the ECoC title contribute to an increased cultural offer in the cities holding the title (e.g. in terms of scope and scale)? |
| **EQ36** | To what extent have the ECOC been successful in achieving the intended impacts as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)? |
| **EQ37** | To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met? |
| **EQ38** | To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met? |
| **EQ39** | What were the most significant economic outcomes of the Capital of Culture experience? |
| **EQ40** | What have been the impacts of the ECOC event on regional development? |
| **EQ41** | Can impacts on tourism be identified? What was the total number of visitors (from abroad and from the country) to the ECOC event: before the title year, during the title year, after the title year? |
| **EQ42** | Are there any instances where the ECOC event has exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had? |
| **EQ43** | Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the action? |
| **EQ44** | To what extent has the implementation of the action contributed to the achievement of the objectives of Article 151 of the EC Treaty? |
| **EQ45** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow, what is the added value of the European Capital of Culture being an EU intiative? |

| | Evaluation Question |
|---|---|
| | |
| **EQ46** | What lessons can be learnt in terms of how to deliver ECOC effectively which might have wider applicability to future ECOC events? |
| **Sustainability** | |
| **EQ47** | Which of the current activities or elements of the ECOC event are likely to continue and in which form after the EU support is withdrawn? |
| **EQ48** | Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the ECOC event after the closure? |
| **EQ49** | How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the ECOC event? |
| **EQ50** | What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the ECOC event and how will the organisational structure change? |
| **EQ51** | What has been the contribution of the ECOC event to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term) |
| **EQ52** | What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term cultural development of the city? |
| **EQ53** | What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term social development of the city? |
| **EQ54** | What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term urban and broader economic development of the city? |
| **EQ55** | What lessons have been learnt from the 2012 ECOC in terms of achieving sustainable effects that might be of general applicability to future ECOC events? |

## Other tasks under the assignment

*Monitoring arrangements*

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

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

## REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES

### General reporting requirements

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

All reports must be drafted in English and submitted according to the timetable below to the responsible body. The Executive Summary should be translated into French and German. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format and in 3 hard copies. Authorized pictures of ECOC events 2013 will be welcome in the cover page and in the report.

### Initial Bulletin

1. The initial bulletin to be delivered early in 2014 should provide some first messages on the two 2013 European Capitals of Culture; e.g. main attendance figures, number and scale of cultural events and key features and qualities as observed at the end of the ECOC year. The information may be used as a basis for press releases and news reports by the European Commission on the 2013 ECOC of interest to the press and the general public.

### Inception Report

The report should detail how the methodology proposed by the Contractor is going to be implemented in the light of an examination of the quality and appropriateness of existing data. It shall not exceed **30** pages, annexes excluded

### Interim Report

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

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

### Draft Final Report

This document should deliver the results of all tasks covered by these Terms of Reference, and must be clear enough for any potential reader to understand. Upon authorisation of the Steering Group, the contractor shall submit this document for factual check to key stakeholders in the cities concerned.

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

- **Main report:** The main report must be limited to a maximum of **100** pages and present, in full, the results of the analyses, conclusions and recommendations arising from the evaluation. It must also contain a description of the subject evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (with an analysis of the latter's strengths and weaknesses). Its cover page shall bear a disclaimer such as: "The conclusions, recommendations and opinions in this report are those of the authors and they do not necessarily represent the views of the European Commission."

- **Annexes:** These must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include**:**

- the Terms of Reference,
- questionnaire templates, interview guides, full transcript of case studies, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.
- draft minutes of the meetings with the steering group
- a one-page statement about the validity of the evaluation results, i.e. to what extent it has been possible to provide reliable statements on all essential aspects of the Action examined. Issues to be referred to may include scoping of the evaluation exercise, availability of data, unexpected problems encountered in the evaluation process, proportionality between budget and objectives of the assignment, etc.
- a proposal for the dissemination of the evaluation results, on the basis of the draft Dissemination Plan annexed to these Terms of Reference.
- In case, a glossary of terms used

**Final Report**

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

- **Executive summary:** It sets out, in no more than 10 pages, a summary of the evaluation's main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them. It should include a ½ page summary statement on the main evaluation issues covered by the evaluation (i.e. one or two sentences per evaluation issue). These last two sections – conclusions and recommendations – must be written in a maximum of 4000 characters, including spaces. Furthermore, the Executive Summary should be translated into French and German by a professional translation agency, once it has been approved by the responsible body.

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

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

## ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET

### Organisation

The contract will be managed by Unit E.2 of the European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture.

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

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

### Meetings

It is expected that the contractor participate in **four meetings** in Brussels with the evaluation Steering Group.

For these meetings, minutes should be drafted by the contractor within 5 working days after the SG meeting, to be agreed among the participants and approved and signed by the chair person, who will be appointed from Unit EAC/R2.

### Timetable

The indicative starting date is **15 October 2013**. The contract will start after both parties have signed it. The period of execution of the contract is **10 months**.

| Deadline | Task |
|---|---|
| *15 October 2013* | A **kick-off meeting** may be held after the signature of the contract. |
| *15 November 2013* | Contractor submits the **inception report** to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission. |
| 15 January2014 | Contractor submits the **initial bulletin** to Steering Group. |
| *14 March 2014* | Desk and field research: at least 60% completion. Contractor submits the **interim report** to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission. |
| *21 May 2014* | Desk and field research completed. Analysis and drafting completed. Contractor submits the **draft final report**, to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission. |
| *17 June 2014* | Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits the **final report and executive summary** to Steering Group. |
| *15 August 2014* | Taking account the Commission' comments, contractor submits the very last versions (hard copies included) of the Final report and the Executive Summary including the translated versions into French and German. |

**Budget**

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

**REFERENCES**

**Action documents**

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

- The bids and progress reports of ECOCs 2013

**Background and reference documents**

Knowledge of the following documents is required for the tender. Unless differently specified, they are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/capitals/european-capitals-of-culture_en.htm:

- Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;

- Decision 649/2005/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 April 2005 amending Decision 1419/1999/EC establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;

- Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019;

- Decision 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 the Culture Programme (2007-2013)

- Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1992 concerning the choice of European Cities of Culture after 1996 and the 'Cultural Month'

- Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs regarding the annual organization of the 'European City of Culture';

- Study about the European Cities and Capitals of Culture, and the European cultural months (1995-2004) achieved by palmer/RAE Associates;

- Ex-post Evaluation of European Capitals of Culture from 2007-2011[12]

- Ex-post Evaluation of 2012 European Capitals of Culture (as soon as available)[13]

- The panel's report concerning the 2013 titles http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/capitals/current-capitals_en.htm

- Interim evaluation of selection and monitoring procedures of ECOC 2010-2016, Ecorys, 2011[14]

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

- European Capital of Culture Policy Group http://ecocpolicygroup.wordpress.com/

**REQUIREMENTS**

**Methodology**

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

- The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques.

- The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions can be further elaborated, e.g. by providing operational sub-questions under each question.

- Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis phase of the evaluation. In addressing the evaluation questions, quantitative indicators should be sought and used as far as possible. The contractor must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be given.

[12] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm
[13] idem
[14] idem

- Comparability of results with evaluation of ECOC 2007-2010 should be assured.

- A set of core and preferably quantitative indicators should be proposed in the inception report. They should build on indicators developed for the ex-post evaluation of ECOC 2010

- It is not expected that all individual projects financed during the ECOC event will be assessed, but the sample of projects examined should be drawn up in a manner suitable for each evaluation question addressed, and should be such as to enable the evaluators to draw general conclusions on the actions.

**Resources**

The Contractor shall ensure that experts are adequately supported and equipped. In particular, sufficient administrative, secretarial and interpreting resources, as well as junior experts, must be available to enable senior experts to concentrate on their core evaluation tasks.

Contact:

Ingveig ASTAD, Telephone: 64808, ingveig.astad@ec.europa.eu
Antonio FARRAUTO, Telephone: 87736, antonio.farrauto@ec.europa.eu

Annex: Dissemination Plan ex-post evaluation ECOC 2013

# Annex Two: Proposal for Dissemination

# Ex post evaluation of 2013 European Capitals of Culture - Proposal for the dissemination of evaluation results

As required by the Terms of Reference for this study, we provide here a proposal of the dissemination of the results of the evaluation.

## General public

- Host the full evaluation report, executive summary and technical annex on the ECoC and Evaluation sections of the European Commission Creative Europe web site.
- Announce availability of the report via relevant social media feeds and/or (email) newsletters

## Policymakers

- Email alert to Cabinet of the Commissioner and other Commission decision makers notifying them of the availability of the report, utilising dissemination summary / information bulletins and web links to evaluation documents.
- Email alert to Member State culture ministries notifying them of the availability of the report, utilising dissemination summary / information bulletins and web links to evaluation documents, and requesting further assistance with dissemination of evaluation results.
- Present Commission Report to European Parliament, Council and Committee of the Regions in line with appropriate procedures.
- Present Action Plan to DG Education and Culture management in line with appropriate procedures.

## ECoC stakeholders

- Email alert to past, current, future and candidate ECoC cities notifying them of the availability of the report, utilising dissemination summary/ information bulletins and web links to evaluation documents.
- Presentation by unit R2 at first meeting of ECoC selection and monitoring panel.

## Cultural stakeholders

- Email alert to cultural sector stakeholders (i.e. members of OMC working groups, forums and thematic platforms) notifying them of the availability of the report utilising dissemination summary / information bulletins and web links to evaluation documents, and requesting further assistance with dissemination of evaluation results.
- Presentation by unit R2 at meetings of relevant cultural forums or platforms, requesting assistance with further dissemination of evaluation results.

# Annex three: Evaluation Questions

## Evaluation Questions

| | Relevance | Report Section |
|---|---|---|
| **EQ1** | What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture? | 3.2.1<br>4.2.1 |
| **EQ2** | What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives? | 3.2.1<br>4.2.1 |
| **EQ3** | What were the objectives of the city in being an ECoC? (refer to list in intervention logic) What was the relative importance of each objective? | 3.2.1<br>4.2.1 |
| **EQ4** | Have any specific objectives of the ECoC event been related to social impacts? | 3.2.1<br>3.3.3<br>4.2.1.<br>4.3.3 |
| **EQ5** | In this connection, did the objectives of the ECoC event include reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled people and minorities? | 3.3.3<br>4.3.3 |
| **EQ6** | To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined? | 3.3.1<br>4.3.1 |
| **EQ7** | To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECoC's own application? (special focus on the **European** dimension) | 5.1 |
| **EQ8** | To what extent were the activities consistent with the ECoC's own objectives, with the ECoC's application and with the Decision? (special focus on the **European** dimension) | 5.1 |
| **EQ9** | How was the European dimension reflected by the themes put forward by the ECoC event and in terms of cooperation at European level? How did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible? To what extent did the 2 cities co-operate? | 3.3.2<br>4.3.2 |
| **EQ10** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow it, to what extent have the general, specific and operational objectives of the Action been proved relevant to Article 167 of the EC Treaty? | 5.1 |
| **EQ11** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allows it, to what extent has the Action proved to be complementary to other EU initiatives in the field of culture? | 5.1 |
| **EQ11a** | To what extent has each ECOC been reinforced by and added impetus to investments by the EU Structural Funds? | 5.1 |
| **EQ11b** | To what extent have ECOC complemented other EU initiatives | 5.1 |

| | Efficiency | Report Section |
|---|---|---|
| **EQ12** | How have the organisational models of the formal governing Board and operational structures played a role in the European Capital of Culture? What role have the Board and operational structures played in the ECoC event's implementation? At what stage were these structures established? | 3.2.3<br>3.4.1<br>4.2.3<br>4.4.1 |
| **EQ13** | Who chaired the Board and what was his/her experience? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the Board and operational structure used and personnel involved? | 3.4.1<br>4.4.1 |
| **EQ14** | Has an artistic director been included into the operational structure and how was he/she appointed? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the artistic director and personnel involved? | 3.4.1<br>4.4.1 |
| **EQ15** | What was the process of designing the programme? | 3.3.1<br>4.3.1 |
| **EQ16** | How were activities selected and implemented? | 3.3.1<br>4.3.1 |
| **EQ17** | How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs? | 3.3.1<br>4.3.1 |
| **EQ18** | To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy been successful in/contributed to the promotion of city image/profile, promotion of the ECoC event, awareness-raising of the European dimension, promotion of all events and attractions in the city? | 3.4.3<br>4.4.3 |
| **EQ19** | To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels? | 3.4.3<br>4.4.3 |
| **EQ20** | What was the process of securing the financial inputs? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ21** | What was the total amount of resources used for each ECoC event? What was the final financial out-turn of the year? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ22** | What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ22a** | How was the Melina Mercouri Prize used? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ22b** | To what extent did the award of the Melina Mercouri Prize create symbolic value for the cities holding the ECoC title? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ22c** | To what extent did the ECoC title trigger complementary sponsorship? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |

| | Efficiency | Report Section |
|---|---|---|
| **EQ23** | To what extent were the inputs consistent with the Action and with the application? (special focus on the European dimension) | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ24** | What was the total expenditure strictly for the implementation of the cultural programme of the year (operational expenditure)? What is the proportion of the operational expenditure in the total expenditure for the ECoC event? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ25** | What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation) | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ26** | What were the sources of funding for the ECoC event? How much came from the EU Structural Funds (e.g. ERDF, ESF)? | 3.4.2<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ27** | Was the total size of the budget sufficient for reaching a critical mass in terms of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the same results have been achieved if the structure of resources and their respective importance was different? | 5.2 |
| **EQ28** | To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the ECoC event been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes? | 3.4.1<br>3.4.2<br>4.4.1<br>4.4.2 |
| **EQ29** | Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms have provided greater cost-effectiveness? As a result, could the total budget for the ECoC event be considered appropriate and proportional to what the Action set out to achieve? | 5.2 |
| **EQ30** | To what extent have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the ECoC event? | 5.2 |
| **EQ30a** | To what extent has the informal meeting following the designation as well as other advice offered by the panel and by the Commission influenced the results of the ECoC event? | 5.2 |
| ***EQ30b*** | *To what extent has the new EU selection process and requirement for national competitions influenced the results of the ECoC event* | *5.2* |

| | Effectiveness | Report sections |
|---|---|---|
| **EQ31** | Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the Action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.) | 3.7.1<br>4.7.1 |
| **EQ32** | How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the ECoC event? (explore role of Board, Chair, Artistic Director, decision-making, political challenges, etc.) | 3.4.1<br>4.4.1 |
| **EQ33** | What quantitative indicators (number of visitors, overnight stays, cultural participation of people, etc.) of the social, tourist and broader economic impacts of the event have been gathered by the ECoC? | 3.5.3<br>4.5.2 |
| ***EQ33a*** | *What was the local approach to evaluation and monitoring (e.g. who carried it out, what were the key results)* | *3.5*<br>*4.5* |
| **EQ34** | To what extent did the ECoC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city and as set out in the application (refer to list in the intervention logic)? | 3.5<br>4.5 |
| **EQ35** | To what extent has the ECoC event been successful in attaining the objectives set (general, specific and operational) and in achieving the intended results as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)? | 3.5<br>4.5 |
| **EQ35a** | Was the cultural programme perceived as being of high artistic quality? To what extent did the ECoC prove successful in bringing their chosen artistic themes/orientations to the fore? | 3.5.1<br>4.5.1 |
| **EQ35b** | To what extent did the ECoC title contribute to an increased cultural offer in the cities holding the title (e.g. in terms of scope and scale)? | 3.5.1<br>4.5.1 |
| **EQ36** | To what extent have the ECoC been successful in achieving the intended impacts as set out in the application or others (refer to list in the intervention logic)? | 3.5<br>4.5 |
| **EQ37** | To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met? | 3.5.2<br>4.5.3 |
| **EQ38** | To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met? | 3.5.2<br>4.5.3 |
| **EQ39** | What were the most significant economic outcomes of the Capital of Culture experience? | 3.5.3<br>4.5.2 |
| **EQ40** | What have been the impacts of the ECoC event on regional development? | 3.5<br>4.5 |
| **EQ41** | Can impacts on tourism be identified? What was the total number of visitors (from abroad and from the country) to the ECoC event: before the title year, during the title year, after the title year? | 3.5.3<br>4.5.2 |
| **EQ42** | Are there any instances where the ECoC event has exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had? | 3.7.1<br>4.7.1 |
| **EQ43** | Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the Action? | 3.7.2<br>4.7.2 |
| **EQ44** | To what extent has the implementation of the Action contributed to the achievement of the objectives of Article 167 of the EC Treaty? | 5.3 |

| | Effectiveness | Report sections |
|---|---|---|
| **EQ45** | As far as the conclusions made for the 2 cities allow, what is the Community added value of the European Capital of Culture being an EU initiative? | 5.3 |
| **EQ46** | What lessons can be learnt in terms of how to deliver ECoC effectively which might have wider applicability to future ECoC events? | 3.7.2<br>4.7.2 |

| | Sustainability | Report Sections |
|---|---|---|
| EQ47 | Which of the current activities or elements of the ECoC event are likely to continue and in which form after the EU support is withdrawn? | 3.6.1<br>4.6.1 |
| EQ48 | Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the ECoC event after the closure? | 3.6.1<br>4.6.1 |
| EQ49 | How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the ECoC event? | 3.6.2<br>4.6.2 |
| EQ50 | What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the ECoC event and how will the organisational structure change? | 3.6.2<br>4.6.2 |
| EQ51 | What has been the contribution of the ECoC event to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term) | 3.6.2<br>4.6.2 |
| EQ52 | What are the likely impacts of the ECoC event on the long-term cultural development of the city? | 3.5.1<br>3.6.2<br>4.5.1<br>4.6.2 |
| EQ53 | What are the likely impacts of the ECoC event on the long-term social development of the city? | 3.5.2<br>3.6.2<br>4.5.3<br>4.6.2 |
| EQ54 | What are the likely impacts of the ECoC event on the long-term urban and broader economic development of the city? | 3.5.3<br>4.5.2 |
| EQ55 | What lessons have been learnt from the 2013 ECoC in terms of achieving sustainable effects that might be of general applicability to future ECoC events? | 5.4 |

# Annex Three: Research Materials

# Topic Guide for Interviews with Managing Teams

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| Background | Explore background of interviewee and his/her organisation<br>Explore role of interviewee and in the ECoC<br>Explore views of interviewee on the background context of the city (e.g. state of cultural sector, socio-economic context, etc.) |
| Objectives | What was their overall motivation? (motivation of the partner organisation and of the city as a whole)<br>What was the process of determining objectives?<br>(How far) did they adopt each of the objectives listed in the intervention logic?<br>In particular, how was the European dimension taken into account? To what extent was the European dimension a bolt- on or integral?<br>What was the relative importance of each objective?<br>To what extent did objectives change in the 4 years between the application and the start of the title year? What were the most important changes? |
| Application and planning/<br>development phases | How did the City apply to its Member States for the nomination?<br>How effective was the selection process at Member State *and EU* level?<br>In what ways did the ECoC take into account the recommendations of the EU selection panel?<br>In what ways have the mechanisms applied by the Commission for selecting the European Capital of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the Action?<br>What were the main milestones in the planning/development phase?<br>What difficulties were encountered during the planning/development phase and how were these overcome? |
| Inputs | What was the process of securing the necessary financial resources?<br>What were the inputs in terms of EU, other public and private funding?<br>How effective were attempts to raise funds through sponsorship? How helpful (or not) was the ECoC brand in this?<br>What was the balance of expenditure on infrastructure, events, management, communications, etc.? (NB We need the split between revenue and capital spend)<br>To what extent did the actual financial inputs reflect those promised |

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| | in the application?<br>To what extent were the financial inputs sufficient to achieve the desired outputs, results and impacts? |
| Activities | What was the process of agreeing artistic themes and designing the programme?<br>What were the artistic themes?<br>What activities did they undertake?<br>How did the European dimension feature in the themes and the activities? Again, how integral was it - or was it a bolt-on?<br>How were activities selected, implemented and monitored?<br>*What was the local approach to evaluating the impacts of ECoC?*<br>How/how effectively was the cultural programme publicised (through a communications strategy)? What difficulties were encountered and how were they overcome?<br>To what extent did the themes and activities change between the application date and the title year? (Which were achieved most/least?) |
| Outputs | How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?<br>What outputs did they produce from the set in the intervention logic? (special focus on the **European** dimension)<br>Any other significant outputs (not in the intervention logic)?<br>To what extent did the ECoC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?) |
| Results | How did the delivery mechanism improve management of culture in the city during the title year?<br>What is the evidence that the results listed in the intervention logic were achieved? (special focus on the **European dimension**)<br>Any other significant results (not in the intervention logic)?<br>To what extent did the ECoC achieve the results hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?) |
| Impacts | What is the evidence that the impacts listed in the intervention logic were or will be achieved? (special focus on the **European dimension**)<br>Any other significant impacts (not in the intervention logic)? |

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| | To what extent did the ECoC achieve the impacts hoped for by the city (and as set out in the application)? (Which were achieved most/least?)<br><br>What elements of the delivery structure (will) continue to operate?<br><br>How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the title year?<br><br>What has been the contribution of the ECoC to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)<br><br>Has there been a long term impact on levels of funding for culture in the city? Are bids to other EU sources in train or planned? |

# Topic guide for interviews with ECoC stakeholders and partners

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

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

# Topic guide for interviews with projects

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| Background | Explore background of interviewee and his/her organisation<br>Explore background information on the project (e.g. how project idea was developed, key activities)<br>Explore views of interviewee on the background context of the city (e.g. state of cultural sector, socio-economic context, etc.) |
| Development phase | What are key success factors and challenges during development phase (e.g. selection of projects, feedback on activities of the key actors/stakeholders/promoters)?<br>To what extent ECoC objectives are relevant to culture sector in the city? |
| Project Activities | Did the project exist prior to the title year?<br>What difference title year made to the activities i.e. new cultural activities, different type of activities etc?<br>To what extent development of European dimension, citizen involvement was important for your project?<br>To what extent ECoC resulted in changes of audience numbers and visitors characteristics taking part in activities of your organisation?<br>What activities are likely to continue?<br>What impact implementation of your project had on your organisation (e.g. development of partnerships, increased visibility, increased cultural offer, increased scope of activities)? |
| Feedback on ECoC | What effect ECoC had on culture sector in your city?<br>How useful was support provided from the delivery agency for your project?<br>To what extent the delivery agency/overall co-ordination organisation succeeded in marketing and communication activities especially in increasing visibility of the ECoC programme locally, nationally and internationally?<br>Do you agree that culture programme was of high quality?<br>To what extent ECoC achieved in attracting high numbers of visitors? |
| Impact | To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased cooperation among cultural operators?<br>To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased cooperation with organisations outside culture sector?<br>To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased capacity of your organisation?<br>What activities of your project are likely to continue? |

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| | To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased vibrancy of cultural life in the city?<br>To what extent ECoC had an impact on improvements in culture infrastructure? |
| Other comments | Do you have any other comments regarding effects that ECoC had on your organisation, city and/or region? |

# Topic guide for other stakeholders (e.g. at EU level)

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| Background | Explore background of interviewee and his/her organisation<br>Explore role of interviewee and his/her organisation in the ECoC<br>Explore views of interviewee on the background context of the city (e.g. state of cultural sector, socio-economic context, etc.) |
| Culture programme | To what extent was the cultural programme balanced in terms of the following:<br>a. High profile events and local initiatives [some cultural operators mentioned that too much attention was given to big spectacles and productions from abroad and not enough to grassroots initiatives and trust in local cultural operators.]<br>b. Artistic vision and political interests<br>c. Traditional and contemporary culture<br>d. City centre and suburban/regional locations<br>e. "High" art and popular art/culture<br>f. Established cultural institutions and independent groups and artists<br>g. Attractiveness to tourists and the local population<br>h. International names and local talent<br>i. Usual activities and new activities<br>j. Professional and amateur/community projects<br><br>To what extent was the involvement of citizens part of the cultural programme?<br>To what extent did the programme reflect the potential of local cultural operators and build on local cultural innovation? What contribution did ECoC have on the cultural scene for the city hosting the title and the country as a whole?<br>In your opinion, would you say that ECoC was of high artistic quality? Please provide more information why?<br>To what extent did the cultural programme achieve prominence and recognition a) nationally; b) internationally?<br>What were the key strengths of the cultural programme?<br>What were the areas for further improvement? |
| European dimension | To what extent was the European Dimension represented in the cultural programme? How was the European dimension interpreted?<br><br>What key themes of European significance were emphasised in the |

| | Questions |
|---|---|
| | cultural programme? Could some other themes/issues have been emphasized more strongly? |
| EU added value | What is your opinion of the value of ECoC as a general concept and as an EU initiative? Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission regarding the future of ECoC? |

# Annex five: Interviews

## Košice Interviewees

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ECoC delivery agency** | | | |
| 1 | Jan SUDZINA | Košice 2013 | Managing Director of Kosice 2013 |
| 2 | Vladimir BESKID | Košice 2013 | Artistic Director |
| 3 | Michal HLADKÝ | Košice 2013 | Creative Industries and Development |
| 4 | Peter GERMUŠKA | Košice 2013 | Tourism, regional development and evaluation |
| 5 | Christian POTIRON | Košice 2013 | SPOTs programme manager |
| 6 | Blanka BERKYOVÁ | Košice 2013 | SPOTs project manager |
| 7 | Tomas ČIŽMÁRIK | Košice 2013 | Head of PR |
| 8 | Peter SOKOL | Košice 2013 | Head of Marketing and Fundraising |
| 9 | Martin PETRO | Košice 2013 | Head of Finance |
| 10 | Adela FOLDYNOVÁ | Košice 2013 | Project Manager Košice Artists in Residence |
| 11 | Michal ŠTOFA | Košice 2013 | Artistic / programme production for Kunsthalle |
| **Government** | | | |
| 12 | Richard RAŠI | Košice City Council | Mayor |
| 13 | Mrs LENÁRTOVÁ | Košice City Council | Deputy mayor |

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Jana ŠAVELOVÁ | Ministry of Culture | Director of national authority for EU funding |
| 15 | Stanislav VALLO | Ministry of Culture | Former General Director, International Cooperation |
| 16 | Jana KOVÁCSOVÁ | Košice Self-governing Region | Head of Dept. of Culture and Tourism |
| 17 | Jozef MARKO | Coalition 2013+ chairman | Coordinator, Košice Mayor assistant |
| 18 | Peter NEUWIRTH | Pentapolitana association (previously Košice 2013) | Coordinator of regional cooperation and program |
| 19 | Iveta NIŇAJOVÁ | Košice - Tourism cluster/ City Tourism Office | Executive Director |
| 20 | Zuzana VRTIELOVÁ - | Slovak Tourist Board | Head of Events Department |
| 21 | Jozef BRNGÁL | Slovak Tourist Board | Marketing Director |
| 22 | Alica ŠTRBAVÁ | Slovak Tourist Board | Head of Communication |
| 23 | Martin ŠEBESTA | Slovak Tourist Board | Spokesperson |
| **Cultural operators** | | | |
| 24 | Zora JAUROVÁ | Ex-ECoC team | Co-author of the ECoC project and former Artistic Director |
| 25 | Paul BOGAN | Consultant | Creative industries trainer, strategy development |
| 26 | Ivan BUFFA | Quasars Ensemble | Artistic director |

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | Peter HIMIČ | Košice State Theatre | Director |
| 28 | Richard KITTA | DIG gallery | Executive director |
| 29 | Róbert POLÁK | East-Slovakian Museum | Director |
| 30 | Katarína MARTINKOVÁ | British Council | Partnerships & Projects Manager |
| **Media organisations/journalists** | | | |
| 31 | Milan KOLCUN | Freelance | Journalist / cultural correspondent /tourist guide |
| 32 | Stanislav LAŽO | Slovak Television | Cultural correspondent |
| 33 | Jana PATARÁKOVÁ | Slovak Radio | Cultural correspondent |
| **Business and tourism** | | | |
| 34 | Tomáš JANČUŠ | Airport Košice | CEO Deputy for finance/Memeber of management board |
| 35 | Beáta JURČIŠINOVÁ | Hotel DoubleTree by Hilton | Director of sales and marketing |
| 36 | Beáta KRÁĽOVÁ | Progress - commercial tour operator | Owner and director |
| 37 | Katarína FABIANOVÁ | Hotel Yasmin | Deputy director of sales |
| 38 | Ján BAČA | U.S. Steel Košice | Director Public Affairs |
| 39 | Arpád KOTELES | U.S. Steel Košice | Specialist for electronic |

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | presentations |
| 40 | Ľubica ŠÍPOŠOVÁ | U.S. Steel Košice | Events specialist |
| 41 | Andrea DANIHELOVÁ | East-Slovakian Energetics, RWE Group | Head of Communication Dept./Spokesperson |
| 42 | Andrea VLKOVÁ | East-Slovakian Energetics, RWE Group | Communication specialist |
| **Education and research** | | | |
| 43 | Prof. Oto HUDEC | Technical University of Košice | Economic Faculty - evaluation of key events |
| 44 | Sikko CLEVERINGA | CAL-XL Netherlands | SPOTs project evaluation and impacts |

## Marseille-Provence Interviewees

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ECoC delivery agency** | | | |
| 1 | Jean François CHOUGNET | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Director General |
| 2 | Bernard LATARJET | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Advisor to the President and Director General / ex-Director General |
| 3 | Julie CHENOT | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Chargée de mission International et Protocole |
| 4 | Ulrich FUCHS | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Deputy Director General |
| 5 | Hugues de CIBON | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Director of sponsorship, marketing and tourism |
| 6 | Bertrand COLLETTE | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Director of Territorial Coordination and Planning |
| 7 | Sabine CAMERIN | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Deputy head of communication - in charge of publics |
| 8 | Cédric MARTIN | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Director of Production |
| 9 | Sandrina MARTINS | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Manager of Euro-Mediterranean Workshop |
| 10 | Nathalie SULTAN | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Communication manager |
| 11 | Thierry TORRES | Marseille-Provence 2013 | Administrative and Financial Director |
| **Government** | | | |
| 12 | Nathalie ALLIO-DUCLOS | City of Aix-en-Provence | Director of Cultural affairs (DAC) |

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Jean-Sébastien GAYDON | City of Aix-en-Provence | Cultural programme co-ordination |
| 14 | Claire ANTOGNAZZA | City of Arles | Member of Municipal Council - in charge of culture |
| 15 | Christophe LESPILETTE | City of Arles | Director of Cultural affairs (DAC) |
| 16 | Odile BLANC | City of Marseille | Responsible of the MP2013 mission |
| 17 | Jean-Claude GONDARD | City of Marseille | General director of the Services of the City |
| 18 | Rudy VIGIER | Pays d'Aubagne et de l'Etoile | General coordinator of Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| 19 | Philippe CHALLANDE | Marseille Provence Métropole | Marseille-Provence 2013 Manager |
| 20 | Annick COLOMBANI | General Council (Bouches-du-Rhône department) | Director General of Culture |
| 21 | Alain GIRAUD | Regional Council (PACA region) | Culture and Youth manager |
| **Cultural operators** | | | |
| 22 | Denis DECLERCK | DRAC | Deputy Director |
| 23 | Dominique BLUZET | Théâtre du Gymnase, Théâtre du Jeu de Paume and Grand Théâtre de Provence (Aix-en-Provence and Marseille) | Director |
| 24 | Macha MAKEIEFF | Théâtre de la Criée | Director |

| No. | Name | Organisation | Role / description |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | Alexandre MADELIN | Théâtre de la Criée | Administrator |
| 26 | Bruno SUZZARELLI | MuCEM | President |
| 27 | Alain ARNAUDET | System Friche Theater | Director |
| 28 | Claude SINTES | Musée Arles Antique | Director |
| 29 | Bruno ELY | Musée Granet | Director |
| **Business and tourism** | | | |
| 30 | Laurent CARENZO | CCI Marseille Provence | Advisor to the CCIMP President Jacques Pfister |
| 31 | Alice HELLEBOID | CCI Marseille Provence | Advisor - in charge of MP2013 |
| 32 | Isabelle BREMOND | Bouches du Rhône Tourism | Director General |
| 33 | Francis PAPAZIAN | Société Marseillaise de Crédit | Director of Communication |
| 34 | Anne-Marie COLOMBIER | EDF | Regional Deputy |
| **Education and research** | | | |
| 35 | Thomas DELAHAIS | Euréval | Director |
| 36 | Romain DEL GROSSO | Institut National des Etudes Territoriales (INET) | In charge of territorial cooperation evaluation |

# Annex Four: Bibliography

## Košice 2013 documents and data sources

| Document / data source | Format | Author /source |
|---|---|---|
| Interface Brochure (application / pre-selection) | Paper | Košice 2013 ECOC Candidate City |
| Interface Brochure (final selection) | Paper and electronic | Košice 2013 Candidate for ECOC 2013 |
| Report from the Pre-selection Panel Meeting European Capital of Culture – Slovakia 2013 (December 2007) | Electronic | Selection Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Final Report of the Meeting of the Selection Panel of the second round of the ECoC competition - Slovakia 2013 (September 2008) | Electronic | Selection Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Report for the First Monitoring and Advisory Meeting for the European Capitals of Culture 2013 (December 2010) | Electronic | Monitoring and Advisory Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Report for the Second Monitoring and Advisory Meeting for the European Capitals of Culture 2013 (May 2012) | Electronic | Monitoring and Advisory Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Košice 2013 European Capital of Culture - Before and After the End of the World (2012) | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| Košice - Programme Booklet 2013 | Paper and electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013 – a development tool for the city through culture | Electronic copy of presentation | Košice 2013 |
| 3 promotional videos on Košice 2013 and European Capital of Culture | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice Artist in Residence project booklet | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| Cultural programme flyer - November | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| SPOTs project booklet | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013 ECoC 2013 and Interface 2013 flyer | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013 programme booklet 2nd edition 2012 (We Support Creativity) | Paper | Košice 2013 |

| Document / data source | Format | Author /source |
|---|---|---|
| Annual Report 2010 | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Annual Report 2011 | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Annual Report 2012 | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Annual Accounts 2011 | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Financial Plan 2012 | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013, ECoC, PPT presentation | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013, end of the project, press release | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013, 3.5 milion of pages, press release | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Košice 2013, video about the achievements of the ECoC project, PPT presentation | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| SPOTs PPT presentation | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Development Strategy of Culture for the years 2014-2018 | Paper | Košice 2013 |
| Master Plan for Creative Economy | Electronic | Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana - final report about the project, 2013 | Paper | Pentapolitana, Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana - financial report for the years 2011-2013 | Paper | Pentapolitan, Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana - 2013 flyer, main projects | Paper | Pentapolitan, Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana Report - 3x, journal | Paper | Pentapolitan, Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana - web statistics 2012-2013 | Electronic | Pentapolitan, Košice 2013 |
| City Report/Košice, Prešov, Bardejov, Levoča, Sabinov | Paper | Pentapolitan, Košice 2013 |
| Paralel stories, Budapest and Košice - book | Paper | Pentapolitana, Košice 2013 |
| The way we were - info booklet about the exhibition of amateur photography, 2013 | Paper | Pentapolitana, Košice 2013 |
| Pentapolitana WEB statistics | Electronic | Pentapolitana, Košice 2013 |
| Steel Park, press release | Electronic | Coalition 2013+ |

| Document / data source | Format | Author /source |
|---|---|---|
| IT-Valley, invitation | Electronic | Coalition 2013+ |
| NESS KDC, press release | Electronic | Coalition 2013+ |
| East-Slovakian Energetics, RWE group, press release | Electronic | Coalition 2013+ |
| Report about allocated support to ECoC projects from EU Regional Operation Program | Electronic | Slovak Ministry of Culture |
| Cultural Islands and Terra Incognita, PPT presentation | Electronic | Košice self-governing region |
| Statistics about changes in overnight stays in Košice, 2012-2013 | Electronic | Regional Statistics office |
| Evaluation of Košice 2013, ECoC project, PPT presentation | Electronic | Technical University of Košice |
| Košice Tourism cluster - partial statistics about overnight stays, 2011-2013 | Electronic | Košice Tourism |
| Košice Tourism cluster - proportion of foreign tourists In Košice Info Center, 2012-2013 | Electronic | Košice Tourism |
| Košice Tourism cluster, PPT presentation | Electronic | Košice Tourism |
| Programme catalogue of Divadelna Nitra International Theatre Festival 2013 | Paper | Divadelna Nitra Association |
| Tomorrow's newspaper, 2014 | Paper | KRUK, n.o. |
| ENTER, Creative handbook | Paper | Dive Buki, n.o. |
| East-Slovakian Museum Annual report 2013 | Electronic | East-Slovakian Museum |
| State Theatre Košice Annual report 2013 | Electronic | State Theatre Košice |

## Marseille-Provence documents and data sources

| Document / data source | Format | Author / Source |
|---|---|---|
| Report from the Pre-selection Panel Meeting European Capital of Culture – France 2013 (December 2007) | Electronic | Selection Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Final Report of the Meeting of the Selection Panel of the second round of the ECoC competition - France 2013 (September 2008) | Electronic | Selection Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Report for the First Monitoring and Advisory Meeting for the European Capitals of Culture 2013 (December 2010) | Electronic | Monitoring and Advisory Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| Report for the Second Monitoring and Advisory Meeting for the European Capitals of Culture 2013 (May 2012) | Electronic | Monitoring and Advisory Panel for the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2013 |
| European capital of culture. Application form. Marseilles Provence 2013 – European and Mediterranean. Application to become the European Capital of Culture Under the tutelage of Albert Camus, who would have been 100 years old in 2013. 272p. [pre-selection file] | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2007) |
| D'Europe et de Méditerranée. Capitale européenne de la culture. Dossier de candidature. 454p. [sum-up of pre-selection and selection file] | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| European and Mediterranean. Volume 1. Pre-selection file for the title of European Capital of Culture. Application to become the European Capital of Culture Under the tutelage of Albert Camus, who would have been 100 years old in 2013. 272p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| European and Mediterranean. Volume 2. Final selection file for the title of European Capital of Culture. Application to become the European Capital of Culture Under the tutelage of Albert Camus, who would have been 100 years old in 2013. 222p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| Marseille-Provence 2013 Provisional Programme January 2012 | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Marseille-Provence 2013 Programme | Paper | Association Marseille- |

| Document / data source | Format | Author / Source |
|---|---|---|
| | | Provence 2013 |
| Marseille-Provence 2013 – Key figures | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| European and Mediterranean. Volume 3. Appendix. Programme Descriptions. 148p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| European and Mediterranean. Volume 4. Information Sheet. 208p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| Réponses au questionnaire. Capitale Européenne de la culture candidature.164p. (selection process) | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Summary. The ambitions of Marseilles-Provence for 2013 and the benchmarks of the bid project. 12p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2008) |
| Revue de Presse. Mars 2012. [press review from France at national and regional levels and from different European countries – e.g. Italy, Germany- for the month of March 2012] | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2012) |
| Marseille Provence 2013. La culture a trouvé sa capitale. 360p. Octobre 2012. [official program towards partners] | Paper / Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Marseille Provence 2013. Culture has found its capital. 210p. [early version of official program towards partners] | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| La culture a trouvé sa capital/Culture has found its capital. [General succinct programme towards public over the year and across the cities - bilingual] 74p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Progress Report. April 2011/ Some projects currently underway. 32p. | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 (2011) |
| Marseille-Provence 2013. [Promotional leaflet edited before the year] | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Grande fête d'ouverture à Marseille [Opening week-end program] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| A capital experience! [Leaflet for public - program schedule and basic information] | Paper (English)/ Electronic (French) | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Feuilleton [Thematic leaflets/program - events divided into episodes over the year] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |

| Document / data source | Format | Author / Source |
|---|---|---|
| Les expos de la capitale. Programme Janvier-Mai 2013. Episode 1 [Thematic program - exhibitions] 27p. | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Les expos de la capitale. Programme Juin-Août 2013. Episode 2 [Thematic program - exhibitions] 27p. | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Culture scientifique [Thematic leaflet/program - events on science over the year] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| J1 Programme Expositions et Ateliers. 12 Janvier-18 Mai 2013 [J1 program Episode 1] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Roms et Tsiganes, une culture européenne / Roma and Gipsies, a European culture [booklet on rationals/themes of Roma culture inclusion into the Capital of culture] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Roms et Tsiganes, une culture européenne. Programme au fil de l'année 2013 [Thematic leaflet/program - events on Roma culture over the year] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Le théâtre des cuisines / What's cooking? [Thematic leaflet/program - events on cooking over the year] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Transhumance 17 Mai - 9Juin [Event leaflet - Traditional seasonal cattle migration across the MP2013 territory] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Août en Danse. Danses en Méditerranée [Thematic leaflet/program - Episode 2 Zoom on Danse events in August] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Etoiles et cinéma [Thematic leaflet/program - Outside cinema projection July/August] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| GR 2013. Un sentier Metropolitain de randonnée pedestre/Semi-urban hiking trail [thematic leaflet/program with map] | Paper<br>Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Les grandes rencontres de l'université [Thematic leaflet/programme - Conference at universities of Aix and Marseille over the year] | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |

| Document / data source | Format | Author / Source |
|---|---|---|
| Bilan Quartiers Créatifs | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Bilan Quartiers Mécénat | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| État d'avancement Mars 2011; Exemples de projets en cours de construction | Paper | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Note on Marseille-Provence 2013 Projects Linked to the Policy Areas of the European Union | Electronic | Association Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| Programme Octobre 2013. [co-edition with the regional newspaper - monthly program] 31p. | Paper | La Provence and Marseille-Provence 2013 |
| La Friche Belle de Mai Marseille. 2013 Année capitale. [annual programme of La Friche] 133p. | Paper | La Friche |
| Leaflets and event descriptions from different museums, theatres, cultural centres (with the label MP2013). | Paper | Various |
| Topo guides. GR® 2013 Marseille-Provence. Sentier métropolitain autour de la mer de Berre et du massif de l'Etoile. 20 jours de randonnée. 200p. | Paper | Fédération française de la randonnée pédestre et Wildproject (2013) |
| Marseille-Provence 2013. Capitale Européenne de la Culture. 2013. France : Hachette. 208p. | Paper | Le Routard (2012) |
| Etude d'innovation sociale sur les Ateliers de l'EuroMéditerranée | Electronic | Recherche et Action en Sciences Sociales |
| Bilan Intermédiaire impact touristique | Paper | Bouches-du-Rhône Tourisme |
| Actualités du programme Tourisme | Paper | Bouches-du-Rhône Tourisme |
| Evaluation des impacts de Marseille-Provence 2013 Capitale Européenne de la culture; Rapport intermédiaire | Electronic | Euréval |
| Evaluation des impacts de Marseille-Provence 2013 Capitale Européenne de la culture; Rapport final | Electronic | Euréval |
| Marseille-Provence 2013: Leçons d'une expérience | Electronic | Promotion Simone de Beauvoir |

# Annex Seven: Results of Project Survey

# 2013 European Capitals of Culture (Kosice)

## 1. Are you responding as...

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Lead organisation or coordinator of a European Capital of Culture project | 9 | | 26 % |
| 2 Partner organisation involved in a European Capital of Culture project | 23 | | 66 % |
| 3 Other involvement in European Capital of Culture, please specify: | 1 | | 3 % |
| 4 None of the above | 2 | | 6 % |
| **Total respondents: 35<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 2. In which country is your organisation based?(If your organisation has facilities in more than one country, please select the country your European Capital of Culture project was mainly administered from)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Slovakia | 33 | | 100 % |
| **Total respondents: 33<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 3. In which city is your organisation based?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Košice | 28 | | 85 % |
| 2 Other, please specify | 5 | | 15 % |
| **Total respondents: 33<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 4. Please state the name of your organisation

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

| Response | Total | % of total respondents | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open answer | 16 | | 46 % |
| **Total respondents: 16**<br>**Skipped question: 16** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 5. What type of organisation is it?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Public cultural organisation | 11 | | 34 % |
| 2 Other public organisation | 2 | | 6 % |
| 3 Non-profit-making cultural association | 12 | | 38 % |
| 4 Private company in the cultural sector | 2 | | 6 % |
| 5 Other private company | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Private individual | 0 | | 0 % |
| 7 Don’t know | 1 | | 3 % |
| 8 Not applicable | 0 | | 0 % |
| 9 Other, please specify | 4 | | 12 % |
| **Total respondents: 32**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 6. In which cultural sector(s) do you or your organisation operate? Please select the sector(s) in which your organisation mostly operates (Please select all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Cultural Heritage | 12 | | 38 % |
| 2 Visual arts | 12 | | 38 % |
| 3 Music | 12 | | 38 % |
| 4 Dance | 10 | | 31 % |
| 5 Theatre | 13 | | 41 % |
| 6 Audio-visual | 7 | | 22 % |
| 7 Literature, Books and Reading | 7 | | 22 % |
| 8 Architecture | 6 | | 19 % |
| 9 Design, Applied Arts | 7 | | 22 % |
| 10 Education, training or research | 10 | | 31 % |
| 11 Youth | 3 | | 9 % |
| 12 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| 13 Other, please specify | 4 | | 12 % |
| **Total respondents: 32<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 7. Please state the name of your project

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 255 characters.)

| Response | Total | % of total respondents | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open answer | 28 | | 80 % |
| **Total respondents: 28<br>Skipped question: 1** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 8. Did your project exist before 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – at same scale as in 2013 | 4 | | 57 % |
| 2 Yes – at smaller scale than in 2013 | 2 | | 29 % |
| 3 No | 1 | | 14 % |
| 4 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Other, please specify | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 7**<br>**Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 9. How was your project selected for inclusion in the European Capital of Culture programme?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Open call for projects | 4 | | 57 % |
| 2 Directly commissioned by Delivery Agency | 2 | | 29 % |
| 3 Don't know | 1 | | 14 % |
| 4 Other, please specify | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 7**<br>**Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 10. Did the project change from initial application to implementation?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – most activities changed / to a large extent | 1 |  | 14 % |
| 2 Yes – some activities changed / to a little extent | 3 |  | 43 % |
| 3 No - it was implemented in the same way as the project application | 3 |  | 43 % |
| 4 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 7**<br>**Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 11. How useful was the support provided by the Delivery Agency (the NGO Košice 2013) for your project?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very useful | 4 |  | 57 % |
| 2 Useful | 2 |  | 29 % |
| 3 Neither / we did not need any support | 1 |  | 14 % |
| 4 Not useful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Not at all useful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 7**<br>**Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 12. Did the European Capital of Culture logo or EU branding feature in the marketing and communication materials of your project?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 To a great extent | 6 | | 86 % |
| 2 To a modest extent | 1 | | 14 % |
| 3 Not at all | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 7**<br>**Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 13. Did your project involve cultural organisations or artists in other countries? (please select all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes - performers from other countries took part | 23 | | 82 % |
| 2 Yes - works from other countries were featured | 17 | | 61 % |
| 3 Yes - performers from Košice or Eastern Slovakia performed in other countries | 9 | | 32 % |
| 4 Yes - works from Slovakia were exhibited or performed in other countries | 10 | | 36 % |
| 5 Yes - in the form of international cultural exchanges | 6 | | 21 % |
| 6 Yes - we collaborated with non-cultural organisations/people | 13 | | 46 % |
| 7 Yes – Other, please specify | 1 | | 4 % |
| 8 Don't know / none of the above | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 14. In which other countries are these organisations/artists located? (Please select all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Austria | 7 | | 25 % |
| 2 Belgium | 2 | | 7 % |
| 3 Croatia | 1 | | 4 % |
| 4 Cyprus | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Czech Republic | 16 | | 57 % |
| 6 Germany | 9 | | 32 % |
| 7 Spain | 3 | | 11 % |
| 8 Finland | 1 | | 4 % |
| 9 France | 9 | | 32 % |
| 10 Hungary | 17 | | 61 % |
| 11 Ireland | 2 | | 7 % |
| 12 Italy | 2 | | 7 % |
| 13 Lithuania | 4 | | 14 % |
| 14 Luxembourg | 1 | | 4 % |
| 15 Netherlands | 5 | | 18 % |
| 16 Poland | 14 | | 50 % |
| 17 Portugal | 2 | | 7 % |
| 18 Romania | 2 | | 7 % |
| 19 Sweden | 2 | | 7 % |
| 20 Slovenia | 3 | | 11 % |
| 21 Slovakia | 16 | | 57 % |
| 22 United Kingdom | 7 | | 25 % |
| 23 Other, please specify | 6 | | 21 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 15. Was it a new collaboration?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – we collaborated with all partners for the first time | 7 | | 25 % |
| 2 Yes - we collaborated with some partners for the first time | 14 | | 50 % |
| 3 No - we had worked with all partners previously | 5 | | 18 % |
| 4 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Other, please specify | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 16. Will this cooperation continue after the end of 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – and there will be more co-operation in future | 10 | | 36 % |
| 2 Yes – there will be a similar level of co-operation in future | 9 | | 32 % |
| 3 Yes – but there will be less co-operation in future | 4 | | 14 % |
| 4 No further co-operation | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Don't know | 4 | | 14 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 17. Did your organisation establish new collaboration with organisations and/or artists in Slovakia? Please mark all the relevant answers.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – with cultural organisations/artists in our core disciplines | 21 | | 75 % |
| 2 Yes – with cultural organisations/artists in different cultural fields | 11 | | 39 % |
| 3 Yes – with organisations/people outside the cultural sector | 12 | | 43 % |
| 4 Don't know / None of the above | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Total respondents: 28<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 18. Will this new cooperation continue after the end of 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – and there will be more co-operation in future | 16 | | 59 % |
| 2 Yes – there will be a similar level of co-operation in future | 7 | | 26 % |
| 3 Yes – but there will be less co-operation in future | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 No - there will be no further co-operation in future | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Don't know | 3 | | 11 % |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 1** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 19. Did your project feature new artistic works? (please select all that apply)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – new works were commissioned or created | 12 |  | 43 % |
| 2 Yes – new works were performed or exhibited | 15 |  | 54 % |
| 3 Don't know / None of the above | 8 |  | 29 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 20.1. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- Greater numbers of young people

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 12 |  | 55 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 10 |  | 45 % |
| **Average: 1.45 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 22**<br>**Skipped question: 6** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 20.2. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- Greater numbers of older people

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 10 |  | 71 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 4 |  | 29 % |
| **Average: 1.29 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 14<br>Skipped question: 14** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 20.3. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- Poor or disadvantaged communities

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 8 |  | 89 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 1 |  | 11 % |
| **Average: 1.11 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 9<br>Skipped question: 19** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 20.4. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- Specific minority or ethnic groups

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 8 | | 67 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 4 | | 33 % |
| **Average: 1.33 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 12<br>Skipped question: 16** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 20.5. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- People with disabilities

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 8 | | 73 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 3 | | 27 % |
| **Average: 1.27 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 11<br>Skipped question: 17** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 20.6. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- All different types of people

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 19 | | 73 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 7 | | 27 % |
| **Average: 1.27 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 26<br>Skipped question: 2** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 20.7. Did your project specifically attempt to involve the following groups? (please select all that apply)

- Any other groups (please specify)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 As audience members or 'consumers' | 0 | | 0 % |
| 2 As creators, performers or direct participants | 1 | | 100 % |
| **Average: 2 — Median: 1.50** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 1<br>Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 21. How successful was your project in meeting its objectives?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very successful | 15 | | 54 % |
| 2 Successful | 13 | | 46 % |
| 3 Neither successful not unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 Unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Very unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 22. Will the activities of your project continue after 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Yes – all activities will continue | 16 | | 57 % |
| 2 Yes – some activities will continue | 10 | | 36 % |
| 3 No | 1 | | 4 % |
| 4 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 23. To what extent has your European Capital of Culture project(s) strengthened the capacity of your organisation to undertake future cultural events?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly strengthened | 7 | | 25 % |
| 2 Strengthened | 13 | | 46 % |
| 3 Neither / was not important to strengthen our capacity | 7 | | 25 % |
| 4 Weakened | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Significantly weakened | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 24. If you would like to provide additional information on your project or its achievements please do so here

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

| Response | Total | % of total respondents | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open answer | 13 | | 37 % |
| **Total respondents: 13**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 25. Overall, would you say that Košice 2013 presented a cultural programme of high artistic quality?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 High artistic quality | 9 | | 32 % |
| 2 Reasonable artistic quality | 16 | | 57 % |
| 3 Low artistic quality | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 No artistic quality whatsoever | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Don't know | 3 | | 11 % |
| **Total respondents: 28<br>Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 26. What level of artistic independence did the Delivery Agency (the NGO Košice 2013) appear to enjoy? (to what extent was the delivery agency able to resist political or commercial pressures when drawing up the cultural programme)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 High level of artistic independence | 1 | | 4 % |
| 2 Reasonable level of artistic independence | 18 | | 64 % |
| 3 Low level of artistic independence | 3 | | 11 % |
| 4 No artistic independence whatsoever | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Don't know | 6 | | 21 % |
| **Total respondents: 28<br>Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 27. How effective was the marketing and communications activity undertaken by the Delivery Agency (the NGO Košice 2013)?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very effective | 2 | | 7 % |
| 2 Effective | 11 | | 39 % |
| 3 Neither | 6 | | 21 % |
| 4 Ineffective | 4 | | 14 % |
| 5 Very ineffective | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 5 | | 18 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 28. Overall, how effective was the Delivery Agency in managing the European Capital of Culture 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very effective | 2 | | 7 % |
| 2 Effective | 14 | | 50 % |
| 3 Neither effective nor ineffective | 6 | | 21 % |
| 4 Ineffective | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Very ineffective | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 6 | | 21 % |
| **Total respondents: 28**<br>**Skipped question: 27** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 29.1. How visible was the European Capital of Culture 2013 ?

- In the local/regional media

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Highly visible | 11 | | 41 % |
| 2 Visible | 14 | | 52 % |
| 3 Neither / Don't know | 2 | | 7 % |
| 4 Not visible | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Not at all visible | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 1.67 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 29.2. How visible was the European Capital of Culture 2013 ?

- In the national media

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Highly visible | 4 | | 15 % |
| 2 Visible | 14 | | 52 % |
| 3 Neither / Don't know | 4 | | 15 % |
| 4 Not visible | 5 | | 19 % |
| 5 Not at all visible | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 2.37 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 29.3. How visible was the European Capital of Culture 2013 ?

- In international media

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Highly visible | 1 | | 4 % |
| 2 Visible | 14 | | 52 % |
| 3 Neither / Don't know | 10 | | 37 % |
| 4 Not visible | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Not at all visible | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Average: 2.52 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 29.4. How visible was the European Capital of Culture 2013 ?

- In other types of media, please specify

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Highly visible | 2 | | 40 % |
| 2 Visible | 1 | | 20 % |
| 3 Neither / Don't know | 1 | | 20 % |
| 4 Not visible | 1 | | 20 % |
| 5 Not at all visible | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 2.20 — Median: 1.50** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 5<br>Skipped question: 22** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 30.1. How successful was European Capital of Culture in attracting visitors and audiences?

- Visitors and audiences from the city and the region

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very successful | 9 | | 33 % |
| 2 Successful | 13 | | 48 % |
| 3 Neither / don't know | 4 | | 15 % |
| 4 Unsuccessful | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Very unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 1.89 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 30.2. How successful was European Capital of Culture in attracting visitors and audiences?

- Visitors from other parts of the country

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very successful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 2 Successful | 20 | | 74 % |
| 3 Neither / don't know | 5 | | 19 % |
| 4 Unsuccessful | 2 | | 7 % |
| 5 Very unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 2.33 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 30.3. How successful was European Capital of Culture in attracting visitors and audiences?

- Visitors from other countries

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very successful | 2 | | 7 % |
| 2 Successful | 15 | | 56 % |
| 3 Neither / don't know | 8 | | 30 % |
| 4 Unsuccessful | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Very unsuccessful | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Average: 2.41 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 27<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 31. How clear or prominent was the European dimension of Košice 2013?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very clear | 6 | | 23 % |
| 2 Clear | 15 | | 58 % |
| 3 Neither / don't know | 2 | | 8 % |
| 4 Not clear | 3 | | 12 % |
| 5 Not at all clear | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Total respondents: 26<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 32. To what extent will the cultural life of the city be more vibrant after 2013 as a result of the European Capital of Culture?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Much more vibrant | 15 | | 58 % |
| 2 Slightly more vibrant | 6 | | 23 % |
| 3 About the same as before | 3 | | 12 % |
| 4 Less vibrant | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Much less vibrant | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 2 | | 8 % |
| **Total respondents: 26**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 33.1. To what extent has the European Capital of Culture 2013 improved the image of Košice?

- In the city and region

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 14 | | 54 % |
| 2 Improved | 9 | | 35 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same | 1 | | 4 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 1 | | 4 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Average: 1.73 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 26**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 33.2. To what extent has the European Capital of Culture 2013 improved the image of Košice?

- Nationally, amongst Slovakian people in general

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 8 | | 31 % |
| 2 Improved | 12 | | 46 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same | 4 | | 15 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 2 | | 8 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 2 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 26<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 33.3. To what extent has the European Capital of Culture 2013 improved the image of Košice?

- Internationally

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 9 | | 35 % |
| 2 Improved | 14 | | 54 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same | 3 | | 12 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 1.77 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 26<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 34.1. To what extent do you think that the following have improved as a result of the European Capital of Culture 2013?

- The governance or administration of culture in Košice

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 4 | | 16 % |
| 2 Improved | 12 | | 48 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same as before | 6 | | 24 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 3 | | 12 % |
| **Average: 2.56 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 25<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 34.2. To what extent do you think that the following have improved as a result of the European Capital of Culture 2013?

- The local cultural infrastructure (cultural facilities, buildings, support, structures)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 14 | | 56 % |
| 2 Improved | 11 | | 44 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same as before | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 0 | | 0 % |
| **Average: 1.44 — Median: 1** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 25<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 34.3. To what extent do you think that the following have improved as a result of the European Capital of Culture 2013?

- The general urban or economic infrastructure

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Greatly improved | 3 | | 12 % |
| 2 Improved | 18 | | 72 % |
| 3 No difference / about the same as before | 3 | | 12 % |
| 4 Deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 5 Greatly deteriorated | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Average: 2.16 — Median: 2** | | | |
| **Total respondents: 25<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

### 35. Overall, how successful would you say the European Capital of Culture 2013 was?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

| Response | Total | % of responses | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Very successful | 7 | | 28 % |
| 2 Successful | 15 | | 60 % |
| 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 4 Unsuccessful | 2 | | 8 % |
| 5 Very unsuccessful | 0 | | 0 % |
| 6 Don't know | 1 | | 4 % |
| **Total respondents: 25<br>Skipped question: 0** | | 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% | |

## 36. If you would like to make any other comments about the European Capital of Culture 2013 please do so here

(Each respondent could write a single open-ended response of maximum 2000 characters.)

| Response | Total | % of total respondents | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open answer | 6 |  | 17 % |
| **Total respondents: 6**<br>**Skipped question: 0** | |  | |



Click here to view your responses or click 'Finish' to submit

NC-04-14-107-EN-N

ISBN:978-92-79-44661-0



Publications Office