

Ex-post Evaluation of the European Capitals of Culture

Annexes

Tim Fox
James Rampton



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: 978-92-79-50448-8
doi: 10.2766/053954

© European Union, 2015
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).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... **i**

1.0 Introduction **1**
1.1 Purpose of the report 1
1.2 The European Capital of Culture Action 1
1.3 Evaluating the European Capital of Culture 4
1.4 Evaluation Methodology 7

2.0 Umeå **10**
2.1 Background 10
2.2 Development of the ECOC 11
2.3 Cultural programme 15
2.4 Governance and funding 18
2.5 Results 27
2.6 Legacy 37
2.7 Conclusions 39

3.0 Rīga **42**
3.1 Background 42
3.2 Development of the ECOC 43
3.3 Cultural programme 47
3.4 Governance and funding 53
3.5 Results 59
3.6 Legacy 69
3.7 Conclusions 71

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations **73**
4.1 Relevance 73
4.2 Efficiency 74
4.3 Effectiveness 76
4.4 Sustainability 77
4.5 Recommendations 78

5.0 Postscript: Effective promotion of a European Capital of Culture **80**
5.1 Introduction 80
5.2 Developing messages to communicate 81
5.3 Building capacity 82
5.4 Reaching audiences 84

Annex One: List of Interviewees

Rīga Interviews

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
ECoC delivery agency			
1	Diāna Čivle	Rīga 2014	Director and programme curator - Rīga Carnival
2	Aiva Rozenberga	Rīga 2014	Programme Director
3	Gundega Laiviņa,	Rīga 2014 / New Theatre Institute Latvia	Programme curator - Road Map
4	Gints Grūbe	Rīga 2014 / Journalist and film-maker	Programme curator - Freedom Street
5	Solvita Krese	Rīga 2014 / Latvian Centre for Contemporary Arts	Programme curator - Survival Kit
6	Vita Timermane-Moora	Rīga 2014 / Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Programme curator - Amber Vein
7	Uģis Brikmanis	Rīga 2014 / Director	Programme curator - Thirst For The Ocean
8	Dace Vilsone	Rīga 2014	Head of Programme implementation unit
9	Anna Mukha	Rīga 2014	International Communications
10	Ints Teterovskis	Rīga 2014	Volunteer Programme Manager
Government			
11	Selga Laizāne	Secretariat of Latvian Presidency of Council of the the EU	Head of Public Diplomacy and Culture Programme
12	Karina Petersone	Latvian Institute	Director
13	Jolanta Borite	Sigulda municipality	Head of Culture Department
14	Andrejs Pildegovics	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	State Secretary
15	Evelina Melbarzde	Information and Public Relations Department / Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director of the department
Cultural operators			
16	Dace Bluķe	Council of Creative Unions of Latvia.	Chairman
17	Alija Turlaja	Sarkandaugavas attīstības biedrība (Society of development of	Head of board

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
		Sarkandaugava district)	
18	Haralds Matulis	Association of Creative Unions	Academic
19	Māra Lāce	National Museum	Director
Media organisations/journalists			
20	Jegors Jerohomovičs	Dienas newspaper	Journalist
21	Ieva Rozentāle	Latvian public TV	Head of Cultural Department
Business and tourism			
22	Vita Jermoloviča	Rīga Tourism Development Bureau Foundation	Board Member
Education and research			
23	Gints Klasons	Researcher	Rīga 2014 evaluation team
24	Anda Lake	Latvian Academy of Culture	Rīga 2014 evaluation team

Umeå interviewees

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
ECoC delivery agency / Municipality of Umeå			
1	Fredrik Lindegren	Umeå2014	Artistic Director
2	Albert Edman	Umeå2014	Head of Urban Development and Sustainability
3	Dan Vähä	Umeå2014	Administrative Manager
4	Elisabeth Lind	Umeå2014	Head of Communication
5	Shauna Adams	Umeå2014	Program Producer
6	Robert Tenevall	Umeå2014	The "Cultural Boost"
7	Malin Johansson	Umeå2014	Business Partner Relations
8	Margareta Ling	Umeå2014	Program Coordinator
9	Kirsi Abrahamsson	Municipality of Umeå	EU Officer, Umeå Municipal International Office
10	Marie-Louise Rönnmark	Municipality of Umeå	Mayor
National, regional, local government			
11	Pia Erson	Ministry of Culture	
12	Anna Selvåg	Statens kulturråd	
13	Per-Olof Remmare	Tillväxtverket	
14	Ola Kellgren	Region Västerbotten	Regionkulturchef
15	Ingrid Lundmark	Municipality of Örnsköldsvik	Co-ordinator
Cultural operators			
16	Eva Conradzon	Umeå2014 Sami artistic council	Sami Advisor
17	Ulrika Grubbström	Västerbottens museum	Museum director, Museichef
18	Shauna Adams	Kulturväven Cultural Centre	Program Producer at Kulturväven from Jan 2015
19	Kjell Englund	Norrlandsoperan	CEO and Artistic director

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
20	Katarina Pierre	Bildmuseet	Museum director, Museichef
21	Gunilla Samberg	Convoy/Molnskugga	Artist
22	Olle Sundin	FrostByte	Non-profit organisation, UmeLan
23	Adam Dahlgren,	FrostByte	Non-profit organisation, UmeLan
Media organisations/journalists			
24	Eva Eriksson*	Västerbottens-Kuriren AB	Media partner of Umeå2014
Business and tourism			
25	Anna Wikholm Kjellberg	Visit Umeå / Umeå Turistbyrå	Main partner of Umeå2014
26	Maritta Holmberg	Visit Umeå / Umeå Turistbyrå	Main partner of Umeå2014
27	Davis Melender	Swedbank	Theme partner to Umeå2014
28	Torbjörn Halvardsson	Företagarna	Partner for Umeå2014
29	Anna Ericsson	Motorcentralen	Partner for Umeå2014
30	Fredrik Forsell	Ultra	Partner for Umeå2014
Education and research			
31	Britta Lundgren	University of Umeå	Strategic involvement in Umeå2014
32	Rolf Hugoson	University of Umeå	Local research into effects of Umeå2014
33	Katrin Sten	University of Umeå	Local research into effects of Umeå2014

Annex Two: Main Topic Guide

Topic guide for interviews with managing teams

	Questions
Background	Explore background of interviewee and his/her organisation Explore role of interviewee and in the ECoC 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) What was the process of determining objectives? (How far) did they adopt each of the objectives listed in the intervention logic? In particular, how was the European dimension taken into account? To what extent was the European dimension a bolt- on or integral? What was the relative importance of each objective? 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/ development phases	How did the City apply to its Member States for the nomination? How effective was the selection process at Member State *and EU* level? In what ways did the ECoC take into account the recommendations of the EU selection panel? 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? What were the main milestones in the planning/development phase? 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? What were the inputs in terms of EU, other public and private funding? How effective were attempts to raise funds through sponsorship? How helpful (or not) was the ECoC brand in this? What was the balance of expenditure on infrastructure, events,

	Questions
	management, communications, etc.? (NB We need the split between revenue and capital spend) To what extent did the actual financial inputs reflect those promised in the application? 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? What were the artistic themes? What activities did they undertake? How did the European dimension feature in the themes and the activities? Again, how integral was it - or was it a bolt-on? How were activities selected, implemented and monitored? *What was the local approach to evaluating the impacts of ECoC?* How/how effectively was the cultural programme publicised (through a communications strategy)? What difficulties were encountered and how were they overcome? 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? What outputs did they produce from the set in the intervention logic? (special focus on the **European** dimension) Any other significant outputs (not in the intervention logic)? 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? What is the evidence that the results listed in the intervention logic were achieved? (special focus on the **European dimension**) Any other significant results (not in the intervention logic)?

	Questions
	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**) Any other significant impacts (not in the intervention logic)? 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?) What elements of the delivery structure (will) continue to operate? How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the title year? What has been the contribution of the ECoC to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term) 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 Explore role of interviewee and his/her organisation in the ECoC 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) What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of consultation / partnership building to define aims and objectives? How relevant were the objectives chosen to the needs/potential of the city and the interests of the partner organisation? 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? 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.)? How helpful (or not) was the ECoC brand in attracting funding and sponsorship? 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? What were the key success factors and failure elements related to the process of selecting, implementing and monitoring activities, events and projects? *What was the local approach to evaluating the impacts of ECoC?* In their view, how/how far did the European dimension feature in the themes and the activities? Again, to what extent was the European dimension a bolt-on or integral to the cultural programme?

	Questions
	Explore key success factors and failure elements related to specific activities involving the interviewee's organisation 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? Explore key success factors and failure elements related to specific outputs involving the interviewee's organisation 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? Explore interviewee's views relating to achievement of results i) involving the interviewee's organisation; ii) results in general 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) Explore interviewee's views relating to achievement of impacts i) involving the interviewee's organisation; ii) impacts in general 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 Explore background information on the project (e.g. how project idea was developed, key activities) 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)? To what extent ECoC objectives are relevant to culture sector in the city?
Project Activities	Did the project exist prior to the title year? What difference title year made to the activities i.e. new cultural activities, different type of activities etc? To what extent development of European dimension, citizen involvement was important for your project? To what extent ECoC resulted in changes of audience numbers and visitors characteristics taking part in activities of your organisation? What activities are likely to continue? 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? How useful was support provided from the delivery agency for your project? 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? Do you agree that culture programme was of high quality? 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? To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased cooperation with organisations outside culture sector?

	Questions
	To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased capacity of your organisation? What activities of your project are likely to continue? To what extent ECoC had an impact on increased vibrancy of cultural life in the city? 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?

Annex Three: Terms of Reference



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Creative Europe programme - Culture

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Ex post evaluation of 2014 European Capitals of Culture

Contracting authority: European Commission

TERMS OF REFERENCE 1
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 2014 4
1.3.1. Rīga 4
1.3.2. Umeå 5
1.4. Monitoring provisions 5
1.4.1. First monitoring 6
1.4.2. Final monitoring: 6
1.4.3. The "Melina Mercouri "Prize 7
2. TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT 7
2.1. Description of Action implementation 7
2.2. Evaluation questions 8
2.3. Other tasks under the assignment 13
2.3.1. Monitoring arrangements 13
3. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES 14
3.1. General reporting requirements 14
3.1. Inception Report 14
3.2. Initial Bulletin 14

3.3. Interim Report 14
3.4. Draft Final Report 14
3.5. Final Report 15
4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET 16
4.1. Organisation 16
4.2. Meetings 17
4.3. Timetable 17
4.4. Budget 17
5. REFERENCES 18
5.1. Action documents 18
5.2. Background and reference documents 18
6. REQUIREMENTS 19
6.1. Methodology 19
6.2. Quality assurance 19
6.3. Resources 19

CONTEXT

1.1 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 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 Latvia and Sweden are each entitled to host a European Capital of Culture in 2014. Under the current selection arrangements 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.

[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.

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

The three pre-selected cities in Latvia were Rīga, Cēsis and Liepāja. The jury recommended that the ECOC title be given to Rīga. Of the two pre-selected Swedish cities, Lund and Umeå, the jury decided to recommend Umeå for the ECOC title. In May 2010, the Council of Ministers of the European Union formally designated Rīga and Umeå as the 2014 European Capitals of Culture.

1.2 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.

1.2.1. General objectives

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

1.2.2. Specific objectives

In accordance with Article 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC, this 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;
- Bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.

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*

[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

economic development through culture". It is generally considered highly relevant to ECOCs implementation.

1.3. European Capitals of Culture 2014

1.3.1. Rīga

Rīga is the first Latvian city to hold the ECOC title. The motto of its programme is “Force Majeure” with culture acting as an irresistible force, which is able to direct changes into a positive stream, turning fear into a challenge and uncertainty into trust in a creative spirit.

The artistic programme includes almost 200 events, which are based on the following six thematic chapters connected with the overall concept of “Force Majeure”:

- Freedom Street: focuses on issues of power and freedom, and is rooted in the fact that the year 2014 will mark 100 years since the beginning of the World War I;
- Survival Kit: offers synergy of ancient skills and modern knowledge in various forms of culture;
- Road Map: invites everyone to discover the unnoticed Riga and think about the city development issues;
- Amber Vein: seeks to reanimate the historical Amber Route encompassing the Baltic Sea, the Mediterranean and the Black Sea in order to create a new European cooperation network of culture;
- Thirst for the Ocean: focuses on the human striving for intellectual and spiritual values and wisdom;
- Riga Carnival: designed to help everyone forget the ordinary and at least for a moment become somebody else, mingle in the crowd and rejoice.

For information, in the progress report provided by Rīga 2014 ahead of the last monitoring meeting with the Panel of independent experts in April 2013, the budget for operational expenditure amounted to EUR 19.4 million.

1.3.2. Umeå

Umeå is the second Swedish city to hold the ECOC title after Stockholm in 1998. It is also the northernmost European Capital of Culture in the EU ever.

Umeå's programme for the year is based on the eight seasons of the Sami calendar. It will invite Europeans to enjoy the Sami as well as many other European cultures, and reflect on the challenges facing ethnic and migrant minorities across Europe. It is also very much based on an "open source" approach using modern interactive technologies to involve people directly in the year's creation process.

The title-year has been for the city the kick-off for a long term development plan aiming at a sustainable economic growth until 2050, strengthening culture as a driving force for regional development.

For information, in the progress report provided by Umeå 2014 ahead of the last monitoring meeting with the Panel of independent experts in April 2013, the budget for operational expenditure amounted to EUR 44.8 million.

1.4. 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 and
- 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.[7]

1.4.1. 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.

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

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.[8]

1.4.2. 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.[9] The report recommends to the Commission whether to award the Melina Mercouri prize.

1.4.3. 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 2014 European Capitals of Culture were awarded the Melina Mercouri Prize in 2013.

2. TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

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

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

The evaluation should cover the European Capital of Culture Action, the events in Rīga and Umeå that took place in 2014.

[8] http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/ecoc/first-monitoring-report-umea-riga2014.pdf

[9] http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/ecoc/20130514-second-monitoring-report.pdf

2.1. Description of Action implementation

The contractor must provide in its report:

- A brief description of the conception of the ECOC Action;
- The conceptual framework that guided the study;
- The evaluation questions that the research aimed to answer and the methodology followed;
- 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 Rīga and Umeå, 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.

2.2. Evaluation questions

The contractor must provide answers to the evaluation questions (EQ) 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.

Relevance, EU added value and coherence

EQ1: To what extent are the objectives of the ECOC Action, as defined in Decisions 1419/EC/1999 and 1622/EC/2006, consistent with and relevant to the objectives of Article 167 (ex-Article 151) of the EC Treaty?

- 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 proved relevant to Article 167 (ex Article 151) of the EC Treaty?

EQ2: What is the EU added value of the ECOC Action?

- 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 initiative?

EQ3: To what extent were the ECOCs complementary to other EU initiatives?

- 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?
- To what extent has each ECOC been reinforced by and added impetus to investments by the EU Structural Funds?
- To what extent have ECOCs complemented other EU initiatives, e.g. European Youth Capital, European Green Capital?

EQ4: To what extent were the objectives of each ECOC relevant to the objectives set at the EU level and, by extension, to the objectives of broader EU policy?

- What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture?
- What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives?
- What were the objectives of the city in being ECOC? What was the relative importance of each objective?
- Have any specific objectives of the ECOC event been related to social impacts?
- 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?
- To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined?

EQ5: To what extent were the ECOC's cultural programmes and associated activities relevant to their own objectives and to the objectives set at the European level?

- To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECOC's own application? (special focus on the European dimension)
- 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)
- 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?

Efficiency

EQ6: How did the management arrangements of each ECOC contribute to the achievement of outputs, results and impacts?

- 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- What was the process of designing the programme?
- How were activities selected and implemented?
- How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?
- 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?

- To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy including the use of social media successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels?

EQ7: To what extent did the ECOCs manage to raise the necessary resources? How efficiently and cost-effectively were such resources used?

- What was the process of securing the financial inputs?
- What was the total amount of resources used for each ECOC event? What was the final financial outturn of the year?
- What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total?
- To what extent did the ECOC title trigger complementary sponsorship?
- To what extent were the inputs consistent with the Action and with the application? (special focus on the European dimension)
- What was the total expenditure strictly for the implementation of the cultural programme of the year (operational expenditure)? What was the proportion of the operational expenditure in the total expenditure for the ECOC event?
- What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation)
- 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)?

EQ8: To what extent were the selection, monitoring and EU co-financing procedures, introduced by Decision 2006/1622/2006/EC efficient?

- 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?
- 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?
- How was the Melina Mercouri Prize used?
- To what extent did the award of the Melina Mercouri Prize create symbolic value for the cities holding the ECOC title?

EQ9: To what extent could alternative policy instruments or mechanisms be applied? To what extent is the total budget for the Action appropriate and proportional?

- 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?
- To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the ECOC event been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes?
- 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?

Effectiveness

EQ10: To what extent were the EU-level objectives achieved?

- Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.)
- 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)?
- 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?
- 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)?

EQ11: To what extent were the ECOCs' own objectives achieved?

- 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.)
- 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?
- 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)?

EQ12: What impact has the action had on the cities?

- 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)?
- To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met?
- To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all sectors of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met?
- What were the most significant economic outcomes of the Capital of Culture experience?
- What have been the impacts of the ECOC event on regional development?
- 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?
- To what extent has the implementation of the action contributed to the achievement of the objectives of Article 151 of the EC Treaty?

EQ13: To what extent has the action resulted in unintended effects?

- Are there any instances where the ECOC event has exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had?
- Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the action?

Sustainability

EQ14: To what extent can the positive effects of the ECoC Action be considered to be sustainable?

- 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?
- Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the ECOC event after the closure?
- How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the ECOC event?
- What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the ECOC event and how will the organisational structure change?

- What has been the contribution of the ECOC event to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the long-term)
- What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term cultural development of the city?
- What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term social development of the city?
- What are the likely impacts of the ECOC event on the long term urban and broader economic development of the city?

2.3. Other tasks under the assignment

2.3.1. Monitoring arrangements

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

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

3. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES

3.1. General reporting requirements

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

All reports must be drafted in English and submitted according to the timetable below to the responsible body. The Executive Summary should be translated into French and German. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format and in 3 hard copies. Authorized pictures of ECOC events 2014 will be welcome in the cover page and in the report.

3.2. Inception Report

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

3.3. Initial Bulletin

The initial bulletin to be delivered early in February 2015 should provide some first messages on the two 2014 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 2014 ECOC of interest to the press and the general public.

3.4. 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.

3.5. 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 of need, a glossary of terms used

3.6. 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.

- **Best practices:** they highlight any kind of practices in terms of governance, management or work organisation which contributed to the smooth delivery of the project.

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.

It should be noted that the European Parliament and the Council are expected to agree on a Decision covering the European Capital of Culture action from 2020 to 2033. When drafting general recommendations about the action, the contractor should make sure that they have not been already addressed in the new Decision.

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

Graphic requirements for the final deliverables

All studies and evaluations produced for the European Commission and Executive Agencies shall conform to the corporate visual identity of the European Commission by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo.

For graphic requirements please refer to the template provided in Annex 2. The cover page shall be filled in by the contractor in accordance with the instructions provided in the template. For further details you may also contact comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu.

The Commission is committed to making online information as accessible as possible to the largest possible number of users including those with visual, auditory, cognitive or physical disabilities, and those not having the latest technologies. The Commission supports the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 of the W3C.

For full details on Commission policy on accessibility for information providers, see: http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm

Pdf versions of studies destined for online publication should respect W3C guidelines for accessible pdf documents. See: http://www.w3.org/WAI/

4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET

4.1 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.

4.2 Meetings

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

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

4.3 Timetable

The indicative date of contract signature is 01/07/2014.

Deadline	**Task**
10 September 2014	A **kick-off meeting** may be held after the signature of the contract.
10 October 2014	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.
1 February 2015	Contractor submits the **initial bulletin** to Steering Group.
14 March 2015	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 2015	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.
25 June 2015	Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits the **final report and executive summary** to Steering Group.
15 July 2015	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.

4.4 Budget

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

5. REFERENCES

1.1 Action documents

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

- The bids and progress reports of ECOCs 2014

5.2 Background and reference documents

Knowledge of the following documents is required for the tender. Unless differently specified, they are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/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[10]
- Ex-post Evaluation of 2012 European Capitals of Culture (as soon as available)[11]
- The panel's report concerning the 2014 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[12]

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

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

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

6. REQUIREMENTS

6.1 Methodology

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

- The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques.

- 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.

- Comparability of results with evaluation of ECOC 2007-2012 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.

6.3 Quality assurance

The Contractor shall, as a minimum, apply the quality assurance procedures described in the Quality Plan included in their bid for Framework Contract EAC/50/2009. The offer should describe how the Quality Plan will be applied during the implementation of this specific contract.

6.3 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 people:

Ingveig ASTAD, Telephone: 64 808, ingveig.astad@ec.europa.eu
Sylvain PASQUA Telephone: 62 511, sylvain.pasqua@ec.europa.eu
Valérie MOERMANS, Telephone: 94 281, valerie.moermans@ec.europa.eu

Annex 1 Dissemination Plan for the ex-post evaluation of ECOC 2014
Annex 2 Graphic requirements for the final deliverables

NC-01-15-584-EN-N



Publications Office

ISBN: 978-92-79-50448-8