

Final Report for the evaluation of the line A-3042: Organisations promoting European culture

Final report document edited by Katerina Kolyva,

Evaluators : Katerina Kolyva, Rinske van den Berg et Anne Mette Holt

Table of contents

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and understanding of the evaluation, p.3

Main contents of the Final Report, p.3

Methodology, p.4

Sources, p.5

II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE A-LINE

Information on Community budgetary procedures, p.5

History and General Objectives, p.6

Selection Criteria, p.6

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE 17 ORGANISATIONS

Music Organisations

Specific objectives, p.6

Staff, internal management and structure, p.7

Funding, p.7

Representativeness

Geographic, p.8

Thematic, p.8

Achievements, p.9

Networks

Specific objectives, p.10

Staff, internal management and structure, p.10

Funding, p.11

Representativeness

Geographic, p.11

Thematic, p.12

Achievements, p.12

Project-oriented networks (PON)

Specific objectives, p.12

Staff, internal management and structure, p.13

Funding, p.13

Representativeness
Geographic, p.13
Thematic, p.14
Achievements, p.14

IV EVALUATION OF THE 17 ORGANISATIONS

General part (based on the common points for all categories), p.14
Specific part (specific evaluation points for each category), p.16

V CONCLUSIONS

Efficacy, efficiency and sustainability of the financing, p.20
Operational costs versus project financing, p.21
Added value for the Community contribution, p.21

VI EVALUATORS' RECOMMENDATIONS, p.22

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and understanding of the evaluation

The evaluation exercise of the line A-3042 responded to a restricted call for tender organised by the European Commission, which followed a request from the European Parliament in 2001.

This Final Report is the result of the evaluation study that took place between January 2002 and June 2002. The 17 organisations, which have been evaluated as part of this report, belong to the line A-3042 and had been receiving funding under different EU budget lines for a maximum of three years at the time this evaluation was set up.

The main purpose of this evaluation study is to provide an objective view of the way these 17 organisations operate by concentrating on their objectives, ways of operation and achievements.

It was estimated that the 17 organisations included in this report could have different areas of action, diverse objectives and various modes of operation. However, it was noted that certain organisations had common objectives and shared fields of action. Consequently, the evaluators considered the 17 organisations as belonging to three different thematic areas/sections. This division was used for the purposes of this evaluation first in order to present the organisations' objectives and activities in a comparative way and secondly in order to provide comments on similarities and differences among the organisations in a more efficient way.

The three thematic areas/sections the 17 organisations belong to are as follows¹:

- Music organisations promoting European musical heritage while providing training for (mostly) young musicians²;
- Cultural networks operating as information centres and interest groups³;
- Project-oriented networks (or foundations).⁴

Main contents of the Final Report

The Final Report document consists first of an introductory note on the line A-3042, followed by a descriptive account of the 17 organisations considered within their specific sections. Next comes their actual assessment. The Final Report ends with conclusions and recommendations that can be drawn about the organisations and the A-line as a whole. A detailed, separate individual evaluation report for each organisation can be consulted in the Annexes section, Part One.

The following sub-categories have been taken into consideration for the description and evaluation of the organisations:

¹ For an explanation of the 17 organisations' abbreviations, see the Annexes section, Part Two, Annexe 5.

² These organisations are EUYO, EUBO, EOC, EUCO, EuropaChorAkademie and EJYO.

³ These organisations are EFAH, IETM, EWC, ECA and Europa Nostra.

⁴ These organisations are ELIA, EUnetART, ETC, ENCATC, Pegasus Foundation and IYMF.

- Specific objectives: this section regards the specific aims and objectives for each section separately (i.e. music organisations, networks and project-oriented networks).
- Staff, internal management and structure: this section provides information on administration, management and general structure of the organisations.
- Funding: this section first outlines the percentage of EU funding and provides then more information on the organisations' main sources of funding and their main expenses.
- Representativeness in terms of geography and themes selected: this section analyses first the geographical representativeness of the organisations. Geographical representativeness refers to where the organisations are based, where their activities take place, where their members come from and where they operate. This section also takes into account how organisations respond to enlargement issues and whether they have incorporated enlargement countries in their objectives and activities. Thematic representativeness regards the cultural themes/areas the organisations have chosen for their activities and events (for instance, theatre, music, arts, , etc).
- Achievements: this section provides information on the organisations' achievements. The specific activities and achievements for the year 2001 were used indicatively.

Methodology

The methodology that was used for this evaluation exercise involved first a preliminary study of the organisations' contracts with the European Commission (EC), their documentation submitted to the EC and their websites. Following this, the evaluators organised visits to all 17 organisations and had contact with their immediate target groups. Interviews and questionnaire analyses, as well as comparative approaches, were essential tools for this study.

More specifically, extensive research and analysis of all 17 organisations' websites, promotional material, publications, cds/videos/projects (where applicable) took place from January 2002 until May 2002. Follow-up on certain activities in particular took place in June 2002.

All organisations were visited by evaluators between February 2002 and April 2002. Where it was thought necessary, a second visit took place. For a detailed chart of these visits see the Annexes section, Part Three, Annex 9. For information about the internal documentation used for visits, including a list of the questions asked during the interviews, see the Annexes section, Part Two, Annex 3.

Contacts with former members of music organisations and networks' members were made either by email, mail or over the phone. The evaluation team created questionnaires that were used as a sample test. For further information on the questionnaires, see the Annexes section, Part Two, Annex 4.

For an overall detailed account of the methodology of this evaluation, see the Annexes section, Part Two, Annex 1.

Sources

Specific documentation sources for the evaluation exercise are restricted to information received by the European Commission and information received from the organisations themselves.

This external evaluation exercise of the line A-3042 took place for the first time. This meant that there were no previous external reports or external evaluators to be consulted.

The information that the evaluators had at their disposal varied considerably from one organisation to another. Information ranged from detailed data and several publications for certain organisations, to a few short documents for others. This resulted in a discrepancy with regard to the data collected. Evaluators dealt with this problem by asking for detailed information from the organisations.

Documents received from organisations were mostly: brochures and promotional material, reports on events and activities achieved, publications, press releases as well as cds/video tapes/dvds (where applicable). For a detailed account of the specific sources used for this evaluation for each organisation, please consult the bibliography in the Annexes section, Part Two, Annex 2.

II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE A-LINE

Information on Community budgetary procedures

In order to understand the framework of A budgetary lines, and hence line A-3042, some background information on the European Community budget is essential.⁵

The statement of expenditure is divided into six sections: the European Parliament (Section I), the Council (Section II), the Commission (Section III), the Court of Justice (Section IV), the Court of Auditors (Section V), the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (Section VI).

The appropriations entered in Section III (Commission) are of two types: administrative appropriations and operating appropriations.

Administrative appropriations, grouped in Part A, cover Commission expenditure on staff, buildings and equipment, publications, IT, operation of the delegations, expenditure arising from special functions, such as grants and certain inter-institutional expenditure, such as the pensions of officials and temporary staff of all the institutions.

Part B contains operating appropriations.

From the credits grouped in Part A of the general budget, the EU can grant support aimed at covering the operating costs of organisations of European interest having as an objective the promotion of European Civil Society. Such financial support is summarised under the title A-3, chapter A-30.

The budgetary line A-3042 in particular, which is part of chapter A-30, supports organisations whose work is in the European cultural interest.

⁵ All information of this section has been extracted from the Europa Server and from discussions with European Commission and European Parliament officials.

History and General objectives of line A-3042

The line A-3042 was introduced and created under Budget 2000 procedures. Historically, before the budget in 2000, cultural organisations that EU budgetary authorities felt should receive Community support, were funded through earmarking under B-lines.

In summer 1999, during discussions for the preparation of the 2000 budget, the European Commission proposed the creation of the budget line A-3042. This line brought together cultural organisations that had previously received funding through different B-3 budget lines. There has also been some transfer from organisations belonging to the line A-3021 (organisations advancing the idea of Europe) to line A-3042 (cultural organisations).

The current general objectives of the chapter A-30 and hence of the line A-3042 as well, can be summarised as follows:

- Promotion of European integration;
- Development of networks throughout Europe;
- Encouragement of partnerships with organisations in the public and the private sectors, and
- Creation of networks between Member States and pre-accession countries' organisations.

Selection criteria

The budgetary authority (European Parliament (EP) and Council, but especially on the basis of amendments from the EP) designates each year in the comments section of the appropriate line the organisations to benefit from Community funding as well as the specific amounts they receive. These differ considerably from one organisation to another. The selection criteria are not made public. Hence, the evaluators have not been able to identify any general or specific selection criteria for the organisations that belong to this exercise.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE 17 ORGANISATIONS

Music Organisations

Music organisations' specific objectives

The specific objectives of the music organisations evaluated in this study are two-fold, namely education and promotion. Firstly, the organisations act as training centres for young musicians providing them with the opportunity to join a European orchestra/choir/opera. Furthermore, music organisations act as mediators between their young members' college life and professional careers. Secondly, music organisations see themselves as 'EU ambassadors' in the world by promoting the EU through their activities and events outside Europe.⁶

⁶ The expression 'EU ambassadors' is mostly used by the organisations themselves and often figures in their promotional material and publications.

Music organisations' staff, internal management and structure

Music organisations' administration and management are based in the organisation's country of origin (UK, DE or DK, in the case of the evaluated organisations) although most of their staff travel with the orchestra/choir/opera. Out of all music organisations only one (Opera Europe) has its own 'music home' where rehearsals, daily practice and events can take place. The rest of the organisations need to rent places for rehearsals.

The total number staff for each organisation varies considerably. More specifically, the number of full-time staff of the 6 music organisations that were evaluated ranges from 2 to 5 permanent members of staff. In addition to their permanent staff, music organisations employ music teachers and usually well-known conductors to teach their members and conduct their orchestras/choirs/operas during their annual tours. Some of them employ stagiaires/trainees to help with the organisation and administration of events whereas others use as limited a level of staff resources as possible (for instance EUCO administration depends on two members of staff who are also the founders and managers of the orchestra).

Music organisations' staff duties involve the organisation of their annual tours and annual events, the update of their websites, the publication of brochures or promotional material and the contacts with their members, teachers, conservatoires, conductors and the press.⁷ Music organisations' members of staff are also responsible for the recruitment of their orchestras/choirs/opera members who change every year.

Music organisations' funding

Indicatively, for the year 2001, A-3042 music organisations' EU funding was as follows:

Music Organisations' name/acronym	A-3042 funding for 2001 in Euros	% of A-3042 funding of their overall resources
EUYO	600,000	48%
EUBO	300,000	42%
EOC/Opera Europe	400,000	83%
EUCO	150,000	40%
EuropaChorAkademie	250,000	17%
EJYO/Swinging Europe	338,000	57%

Music organisations' resources do not come from Community funding alone; They also include profit from concerts/events and productions. In certain cases funding from national authorities was achieved although this is a rare practice.⁸ Private sponsorship is another funding strategy for music organisations.

Music organisations' expenses involve their administration and management operational costs, the organisation of their members' recruitment and the organisation of their events

⁷ It should be noted that music organisations attract a lot of press attention.

⁸ This case was observed in Denmark. Contacts with the Arts Council in the UK led us to conclude that with one exception, music organisations do not have a close and systematic contact with national authorities.

and productions (concerts, operas, and other activities) along with the financial support of their members. For certain music organisations' recruitment, candidates are asked to cover their expenses in order to attend the audition whereas for others, the music organisation covers expenses for them. Music organisations' members do not usually receive any salary but have their expenses covered instead.

Music organisations' representativeness

Geographic

Out of 6 music organisations, 4 organisations were initiated in the UK and their administration is based there, 1 organisation is based in Germany and one in Denmark. Their members come from different EU and other European (and in certain cases American or Asian) countries.

More specifically, EUYO is located in the UK. EUYO has members from the EU-15.

EUBO is also located in the UK and has members from around 22 countries. Besides the EU 15, EUBO also has members from Norway, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Macedonia and Croatia.

EUCO is located in the UK and has members from 17 countries. Apart from members from the EU 15, EUCO also has members in Romania and the Czech Republic.

Opera Europe is located in the UK as well. Opera Europe has members from 30 European countries. More specifically, Opera Europe has members from the entire EU (except for Portugal) and from Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Yugoslavia and Turkey. Moreover, Opera Europe has made contacts in Moldova, Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia. Outside Europe, Opera Europe has had members from Asia and Australia.

Europa Chor Akademie is located in Germany and is very much focused on partnerships with enlargement countries. It has members from EU countries (France, Germany, Spain, Italy and Austria) and non-EU countries (Switzerland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland). The choir has also had members from Latin American countries.

Swinging Europe is located in Denmark. Swinging Europe has members from 25 countries: EU 15 (except for Luxemburg and Portugal), Norway, Switzerland, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia. Outside Europe, Swinging Europe has contacts in the USA, Latin America and in the Middle East.

Thematic

Five of the six music organisations evaluated promote classical music, and one organisation promotes jazz. No elements of ethnic, popular, folk or other kinds of music have been noted.

Music organisations' achievements

Music organisations' specific achievements could be summarised as being in two main areas of activity. The first area of activity regards the organisation of events usually in the form of an annual tour, which takes place inside and outside Europe. The second area of activity regards the training and intercultural experience that the members of the orchestras/choirs/operas receive during their year's stay with the organisation, which constitutes a particularly interesting achievement of music organisations. This is specifically demonstrated through the presentation of members' views in the Annexes to this report (see individual reports in the Annexes section, Part One).

More specifically, EUYO organises every year a summer tour, which includes a series of concerts in the European Parliament in Brussels, in several European cities and one outside Europe. Their repertoire varies and the respective programmes are published on their website.

EUBO organises every year a summer tour that includes one concert in Brussels (so far such concerts have taken place in the Museum of Musical Instruments or in Churches) and several concerts in European and other cities. Their repertoire concentrates obviously on the Baroque period and varies from one concert to the other. The respective programmes are published in their website.

EUCO organises every year a tour, which includes a series of concerts in Germany and other European countries. It also has good contacts in the Middle East and Latin America where they perform regularly. The repertoire varies and is adjusted to the location they play (for instance it's members played along with Middle Eastern musicians).

Opera Europe organises the creation of one Opera performance in one country, which has recently been an enlargement country (Hungary in 2001).

Europa Chor Akademie organises choir concerts in different European countries, having a strong enlargement focus.

Swinging Europe organises every year a tour, which includes jazz concerts in several European countries.

The respective programmes are published on their website.

Apart from their specific yearly concert/performance activities, the main achievements of music organisations include the production of cds/films/videos and the organisation of specific training and educational programmes⁹.

Networks

Networks' Specific objectives

Networks' specific objectives could be summarised as being the diffusion of information, promotion of transnational activities/projects and being the interface between the European institutions and the cultural sector.

⁹ See the Annexes section, Part One, where specific information for each organisation is provided.

More specifically, cultural networks are first and foremost information centres for their members in their specific area of expertise. Through their publications, events, regular newsletters and websites they provide up to date information and knowledge in the general field of culture and the specific field of their area of expertise (which in this case could be the performing arts, cultural policy, heritage, etc).

Networks' staff duties and responsibilities could be summarised as involving the diffusion/ circulation of information, efficient contact with members and representation of their members at events such as meetings and conferences, which are relevant to their areas of expertise. Networks use their interactive websites as information diffusion and communication tools where members exchange information. In order to represent their members efficiently, networks' members of staff follow meetings and conferences in their members' specific areas of expertise and then conduct reports or brief statements, which they forward to their members.

The promotion of transnational activities and projects is usually achieved successfully through the organisation of networks' annual events. Most networks organise a two-to-three day event where their members meet, interact, have the chance to express their opinion and often present their work. Such events provide the opportunity for the creation of sub-networks, enhance co-operation and lay the foundations for the creation of transnational exchange and the organisation of specific projects.

Furthermore, most networks act as interest groups in their specific areas of expertise and represent their members to the European Institutions.

Networks' staff, internal management and structure

The 5 networks, which are part of this report, are based in the countries in which they were initiated and have members in several European and non-European countries.

Networks' members of staff range usually from 2 to 5 permanent members of staff and stagiaires/trainees, who are involved in the administration and organisation of events. Their annual events are usually co-organised with one of their members.

Networks' funding

Indicatively, for the year 2001, A-3042 Networks' funding was as follows:

Networks' name or acronym	A-3042 funding for 2001 in Euros	% of A-3042 funding of their overall resources
EFAH	100,000	50%
IETM	50,000	36%
EWC	50,000	56%
ECA	100,000	76%
Europa Nostra	80,000	14%

--	--	--

Apart from A-line financial support, networks' funding also comes from membership fees, which tend to vary a lot. Network membership fees can go up to 900 € per year although for certain networks membership fees depend a lot on their members' financial status (i.e. a member's annual fee to a network depends on the organisation's size and budget).

Although there are certain networks that managed to establish contacts with national/regional authorities (for instance, one Danish Network has been supported by the Danish Ministry of Culture, a network based in Brussels has received support from the Flemish government, etc), in general they find it difficult to obtain funding from national, regional or local authorities.

Networks' expenses can be summarised as being composed of: administration of the network and organisation of their annual activities (meetings/events). As far as support to Eastern European members is concerned, certain networks have financially supported projects carried by Eastern countries while others have had members from these countries with free membership.

Networks' representativeness

Geographic

This Final Report includes 5 networks, 2 of which are located in Belgium, one in Germany, one in Denmark and one in the Netherlands.

EFAH is based in Brussels and has 85 member organizations. EFAH members are located in all EU 15 countries and in Norway, Switzerland, Cyprus, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Albania.

The second Network based in Brussels is IETM, which has around 400 member organizations all over the world. IETM is represented/has contacts in the EU 15, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Yugoslavia, Macedonia, Russia, Moldova and Croatia. IETM also has members in Africa, USA, Canada, Brazil, Lebanon and Palestine.

The European Writers' Congress, which is based in Germany, has 50 member organisations, located in the EU 15 and in Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Turkey. Moreover, it has contacts in Russia and the Faroe Islands.

ECA is based in Denmark and has members in 10 out of the 15 EU countries. It does not have members in Sweden, Luxemburg, Italy, Greece and Finland. Outside the EU it has members in Iceland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Georgia, and the Faroe Islands.

Europa Nostra is based in the Netherlands. This organisation has 219 members in 14 countries of the EU (Luxembourg is not a member), as well as in Norway, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Yugoslavia, Macedonia, Croatia, Turkey Lebanon and Andorra.

Thematic

The main areas of expertise of networks are cultural policy, the performing arts (dance, theatre, music), literature, the plastic arts and (mainly architectural) heritage.

Networks' achievements

Achievements could be summarised as being the organisation of annual meetings, contribution to the set up of new sub-networks and projects, and active involvement in the cultural policy field.

All networks organise annually a specific event where their members meet and interact. Through these meetings new forms of co-operation and specific transnational projects have been achieved. Moreover, most of the networks are members of EFAH (which sees itself as a platform for discussion and interaction) and through that co-operation contribute to cultural policy development, by organising informal task forces, which publish reports and present their views on current and future challenges of EU cultural policy.

Project-oriented networks (PON)¹⁰

PONs' specific objectives

Project-oriented networks have similar objectives, staff structures, representativeness and achievements as “pure” networks. Their main difference from “pure” networks is that PON promote their members' objectives also through the set up of specific projects. In order to avoid repetition of information, this section will concentrate on providing information on what PON do in particular that “pure” networks do not.

PON staff, internal management and structure

The same comments that were made for “pure” networks are also valid for PNO. One further point to be made is that PON use their already existing members as part of a team that sets up and organises specifically defined projects.

PON funding

Indicatively, for the year 2001, A-3042 PON funding was as follows:

PON name or acronym	A-3042 funding for 2001 in Euros	% of A-3042 funding of their overall resources
ELIA	110,000	20%

ENCATC	110,000	59%
EUnetART	50,000	31%
ETC	110,000	40%
Pegasus Foundation	150,000	67%
IYMF	321.750	79%

The same comment that was made for “pure” networks is also valid for PNO. Furthermore, it should be noted that PON receive funding both from membership fees and project activities.

PON Representativeness

Geographic

ELIA is based in the Netherlands. ELIA has 186 members, which are located in all the EU 15 countries, as well as Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Yugoslavia, Croatia, Ukraine and Turkey. Outside Europe, ELIA has members in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, India, Lebanon, Singapore and Brazil.

EUNETART, also based in the Netherlands, has 104 members located in the EU 15 countries (except for Luxembourg), as well as Norway, Switzerland, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Kosovo, Macedonia, Croatia, Russia, Canada and Israel.

ETC is based partly in Belgium and partly in France. ETC has 35 members. These come from all the EU countries, except for the Netherlands. In addition, members also come from Norway, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Croatia.

ENCATC is based in Denmark with members in all EU 15 countries, except for the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Portugal. ENCATC has also members in Norway, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Croatia, Moldova, Ukraine, Russia and in the USA.

The PEGASUS FOUNDATION, based in Brussels, has worked with members that participated in the project ‘adopting a monument’. These partners were located in the EU 15 countries and in Poland, Malta, Yugoslavia, Macedonia and Latin America.

IYMF is based in Brussels and has 165 members. These members were partners that cooperated in the MUS-E program. 9 out of the 15 EU countries participated (France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Spain, Italy, Ireland and Portugal). Outside the EU partners exist in Switzerland, Estonia and Hungary.

Thematic

The themes that PNO promote can be summarized as: artistic creativity and performance, music, artistic education and theatre. Artistic education in particular seems to be a strong thematic field for PNO. Furthermore, it should be noted that music is represented mainly through IYMF, which is mostly concerned with the promotion of less represented ethnic groups and minority cultures, and not with classical music.

PON achievements

The same comments that were made with regard to “pure” networks are valid here. An additional achievement of PNO is the successful completion of their specific projects, which vary from one organisation to the other. For more specific details on each organisation’s specific achievements see the individual reports in the Annexes section, Part One.

IV. EVALUATION OF THE 17 ORGANISATIONS

GLOBAL

Specific objectives

On the basis of what precedes, the evaluators consider that, in general terms, the majority of organisations succeed in fulfilling the aims and objectives they have set up.

The fact that most organisations in the A-line have the youth as their main target group (either through their music training or artistic education activities) has been evaluated as a highly positive and interesting factor for the promotion of European culture.

Staff, internal management and structure

As revealed by the questionnaires created by the evaluators, in certain cases the limited management and administration resources prove problematic for the smooth and efficient management of certain organisations.

As far as internal information flow is concerned, not all organisations prove efficient towards this end. The use of new technologies has played a significant part towards increasing interaction and virtual exchange, although it should be noted that not all organisations have the same level of website usage and multimedia practices. Websites vary from up to date and highly interactive ones to old fashioned, out of date ones, which lack in information.

Overall networks tend to have more organised and structured websites than music organisations, and they also tend to have better and more regular contact with their members. Music organisations find it difficult to keep in touch with former members and their websites include information on their concerts and future activities, but rarely (only in a couple of cases) offer a platform for interaction among current and former members, which could facilitate alumni practices and could provide a good practice for further recruitment. Overall, music organisations’ websites could be more interactive, although it is clear that the website is not as important a tool for a music organisation as it is for a

network. The two foundations' websites are rather poor and do not include enough adequate and detailed information.

Funding

It is clear from the tables outlining A-3042 funding for 2001 that there are organisations that make extensive efforts towards fundraising, through systematic search for sponsors and profitable partnerships. Others are less active towards this end.

Representativeness

Geographic

The main aspects relating to geographic representativeness concern the location where the organisations are based, their European profile and their commitment to enlargement.

As far as location of A-line organisations is concerned, there seems to be no rationale as to why out of 6 Music Organisations in this evaluation exercise, 4 are based in the UK. There might be a rationale however as to why 5 out of 11 Networks/PNO are based in Brussels. For networks in particular, Brussels seems to be an interesting base in terms of their contacts. Members of cultural networks operating outside Belgium have noted that being based in Brussels might contribute to more efficient operations and better/more up to date information on the European Institutions.

With regard to the organisations' European profile, most of the organisations have a strong European profile since their activities, members and events originate from many European countries and European transnational co-operation. Almost all organizations have members in all EU countries. Luxembourg is not represented in 6 organizations. Portugal is not represented in 4 organizations, whereas Greece, Sweden and the Netherlands do not appear on the membership lists of 3 organisations out of 17.

Although organisations operate mainly in Europe, some of them have members and organise activities outside Europe as well. Thus they add a more global/international profile to their European one, which is indeed positive, especially for the area of intercultural knowledge. Although the importance of keeping well-established contacts cannot be neglected, the evaluators regard as particularly positive the commitment of certain organisations to visiting different areas every year, which leads to the broadening of their contacts and geographical coverage.

Certain organisations are more committed to enlargement issues than others. Generally speaking, networks tend to be more organised and committed towards enlargement issues than music organisations. Only one organization (EUYO) did not look for partnerships outside the EU at all because it operates only at an EU level.

Thematic

Overall, the organisations tend to promote rather "high" culture as opposed to popular and minority cultures, which means that, with few exceptions, multicultural and minority issues as well as popular cultures are underrepresented. Themes such as social exclusion,

gender inequality, ethnic minorities and multiculturalism are rarely taken into consideration.

SECTIONAL

Music organisations

Music organisations' specific objectives

As was noted from contacts with former members of music organisations and follow-up of music organisations' activities and events, music organisations on the whole fulfil their objectives successfully. They have an organised structure of annual events and complete successfully their objective of training and intercultural knowledge.

However, an obstacle for the achievement of music organisations' objectives has been noted. Diversity with regard to music educational systems seems a big challenge for music organisations. Although some of them have attempted to overcome this difficulty by creating training sessions and specific summer schools, apparently there is no extensive strategy with regard to this matter.

Music organisations' staff internal management and structure

Most music organisations are organised in terms of setting up their annual events and training the members of their orchestras. Most organisations have a well established yearly schedule set up year structure that begins with extensive recruitment, and is followed by an annual tour across Europe (and in certain cases beyond Europe) and some training in schools or extra concerts.

There is a great difference among the 6 music organisations in terms of recruitment procedures, which can range from a highly organised, transparent and well established recruitment strategy for certain organisations (for instance EUYO, EUBO), to recruitment based on personal/professional contacts of the organisation's management (for instance EUCCO, Europa Chor Akademie).

As far as information flow is concerned, most music organisations have problems with keeping in touch with former members and in the majority of cases they do not seem to have any alumni practices. Only one music organisation (EUBO) has an extensive and organised alumni list. Websites tend to be up to date but not as rich in information or as interactive as they could be. Furthermore, websites are mostly monolingual (EUBO is an exception).

As far as promotional material and activities are concerned, music organisations seem to be working well towards this end. Most music organisations have received excellent reviews from local/regional/national press and their concerts and operas have been broadcast on both the radio and TV. However, broadcasting usually takes place in the country the organisation is based in.

Music organisations' funding

Music organisations have more or less succeeded in fundraising strategies with searching large private companies as sponsors.

However, not all music organisations' financial support to their members is equal. Certain organisations pay their members' travel and subsistence expenses in order for them to participate at recruitment and pre-selection competitions whereas others fund only successful candidates' expenses. Furthermore, since none of the organisations provides a salary to their members but covers their travel and living expenses instead, certain members of music organisations expressed their wish to receive a small salary while they practice with the orchestra/opera/choir.

Music organisations' representativeness

Geographic/Thematic

Due to the fact that certain organisations either charge fees for recruitment or do not follow a transparent recruitment strategy at all but recruit via word of mouth, recruitment cannot be transparent and open to all. Hence, there are problems with incorporating less privileged (financially, socially and geographically speaking) groups.

Music organisations' achievements

In terms of content it has been noted that the repertoire chosen is of high quality, as so are the composers and educators involved in the concerts/operas that the organisations coordinate. All music organisations have produced high quality CDs and have good contacts with production companies.

The feedback from the former young members of music organisations is highly enthusiastic and very positive both with regard to they way the orchestras/opera/choir operate and the activities they organise. Involvement in such organisations has not only provided members with further stage experience but also with the possibility of further co-operation and of generating more partnerships and friendships. It should be noted that as a result of music organisations' initiatives, former members of music organisations have set up informal networks and smaller choirs or orchestras.

Networks

Networks' specific objectives

As results from contacts with networks' members, both networks' objectives of information and representation are fulfilled successfully.

Networks' staff, internal management and structure

It has been noted that the successful management and efficient structure of networks depended a lot on good information and communication strategies organised mainly through newsletters and websites.

Good practices for newsletters (whether published or electronic) and websites entail frequency of and efficiency with information. Many networks' websites are updated

regularly, or even immediately as information is published (e.g. IETM). Moreover, good practices that have been observed in terms of coverage regard efficient and detailed information on EU initiatives, data and minutes of EU policy discussions (EFAH) detailed information on the specific sector of the network (for instance theatre, heritage, or literature), as well as related developments, information on members' activities and vacancies for artists in the field.

Some networks have achieved the goal of facilitating as much member contacts as possible by having internal information exchange systems within their websites (i.e. as intranet accessible only to members). However, the media used for dissemination of information should be accessible to all.

The language used needs to be simple and easy to understand for all. It has been noticed that in certain cases the use of too many abbreviations or names/titles could be understood only by few experts in the field and could not reach the wider public. Multilingual newsletters are resource demanding, but could be recommended. At the moment few websites are truly multilingual (most are in English and French).

Networks' funding

Overall, it has been noted that the financial resources of networks are quite limited and tend to depend considerably on Community funding.

Networks have difficulty in building partnerships with private companies and other sponsoring bodies, since they contribute to an on-going process which does not present necessarily immediate and tangible results. On the other hand, event-based organisations, such as orchestras, find it easier to generate extra funding.

Given the fact that members of the networks usually do not have many financial resources themselves, networks have limited possibilities of overcoming their financial difficulties by asking for higher membership fees. In some cases, networks organise optional activities for their members charging them a fee for the particular activity, part of which is directed to the network.

Networks' representativeness

Geographic

The main point to be made in this section regards enlargement. Certain networks have followed good practices of successfully integrating members who come from Eastern or other non-EU countries. They have organised conferences or other events in enlargement countries, or have used 'enlargement' as a main theme in their conferences and annual meetings/events. In these cases, enlargement countries do not only participate through membership in networks' activities but also contribute actively to the organisation of events. In this context, the evaluators regarded as particularly positive the fact that certain networks have assisted their members from enlargement countries in several ways, namely by providing funding, reducing membership fees and assisting members with advice and consultation on their internal national cultural policy challenges.

Thematic

Overall, it was found that networks overall support their specific thematic fields efficiently.

Networks' achievements

Networks have achieved an informal co-operation among themselves, for which the membership with the platform EFAH has contributed. This co-operation can be considered as interesting and constructive and, in the evaluators view, should be used as a common practice.

The fact that networks differ in size has consequences in terms of efficiency. The analysis of the answers to the questionnaires sent by the evaluators makes clear that members prefer to be part of a smaller rather than a bigger network. The reason for that is that in their view smaller networks operate efficiently and are well organised, which gives members the possibility to have their voice heard and to participate actively in discussions. According to members, larger networks do not necessarily provide the opportunity for extensive and open discussion for all their members. Furthermore, the fact that certain members belong to more than one network does not help with commitment to larger networks.

However, it should also be noted that larger networks also present advantages, since they normally have more means of access to information and might in certain cases provide more opportunities for exchange and co-operation than smaller ones.

As far as the members are concerned, their attitudes also vary considerably. There are members who are actively involved with the activities of their network, and who organise events, undertake publications or other activities. Some other members could be identified as being rather passive.

PON

PON specific objectives

The same comments made for the networks are applicable in this context.

PON staff internal management and structure

The same comments made for networks are applicable to the PON. The evaluators would, however, like to add that in particular foundations should make further efforts in improving the quality of their websites, namely by adding more detailed and pertinent information about their members and partners (this is the case for Pegasus and IYMF).

PON funding

Foundations have not made an effort at all regarding seeking funding and do not seem able to follow their activities adequately unless they receive Community funding. This is the case for Pegasus and IYMF.

Geographic and Thematic Representativeness of the PON

Please refer to the comments made earlier about this point for networks.

PON achievements

The same comments that were made for networks are also valid for PON. PON's particular advantage with regard to their project management is that they use their own members as partners for the running of their projects. This means that projects become the result of an already generated network, which in principle assures continuity and strong partnership.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the financing.

Efficiency has to do with the extent to which the organisations carried out their tasks with an appropriate consumption of resources.

Effectiveness is a measure of the degree to which the organisations achieve their objectives in the relatively short term.

Concerning the effectiveness of the EC funding, and according to what has been described before, it is the evaluators view that the organisations financed by the A-3042 seem to be able to develop their activities according to their objectives and targets, which leads to the conclusion that their level of effectiveness is high.

It has proved difficult to evaluate the efficiency of EC funding as such, since the financial resources of the organisations originate in different sources. However, taking into account what precedes, the evaluators consider that the organisations made a good use of the funding received. It has been noted that for certain organisations (especially for those whose EC funding exceeds 50% of their overall resources) EC funding is crucial for their sustainability.

Operational costs versus project financing

- On the whole, organisations tend to spend more on the successful follow up of their activities and the setting up of their events than on their administration and management. Hence, their operational costs remain as limited as possible. On one hand this is considered positively since it provides more resources for the actual activities. It has however also been noted that limited operational costs (and hence limited administration resources) may prove problematic for the smooth running, efficient information and administration of the organisations.

- Added value of the Community contribution

Music Organisations

The main added value of music organisations is, according to their view, the fact that they bring together members from different European countries. However, the evaluators

would like to point out that orchestras tend to be international anyway, not only in the case of those included in the line A-3042. Music organisations that systematically seek to include all European nationalities and other countries as part of their members can probably be regarded as more successful towards added value than others, which represent only some European countries.

Networks and PON

Networks respond to added value issues via their trans-national activities and by bringing their members together while generating ideas and provoking discussion on European cultural issues.

Although there seems to be a strong will towards trans-national co-operation and European practices, according to the responses received from members' questionnaires, the outcome is not always the one desired. Many members have stated their difficulty in abandoning their local, regional and national networks in order to be more active with European networks. Certain networks themselves have stated their difficulty with many of their members being still anchored to their local/regional/or national practices. This indicates perhaps the need to reinforce the activities of networks, as there is still much to be done in order to make a true European civil society emerge.

VI. EVALUATORS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the positive aspects of the majority of organisations' profiles that were observed during the evaluation of line A-3042, ***the recommendations to be made do not necessarily regard the organisations' management, working strategies, activities, aims and objectives but rather the A-line as a whole.***

Recommendations for the line A-3042 are made in terms of selection criteria, funding, geographical and thematic distribution.¹¹

In this respect, the *A-line* could follow ***transparent calls for tender, specific deadlines for submission of interim activity reports*** (same for all organisations), ***extensive evaluation and long-term contracts*** (at least three years) in order that the funded organisations are able to achieve sufficient impact and results.

First, with regard to selection criteria and funding, the line A-3042 needs to have a guiding principle for selection and specific funding according to each organisation's needs.

Recommended ***selection criteria*** for inclusion of a cultural organisation in line A-3042 could be based on:

¹¹ Culture 2000 does not seem to be the right programme for supporting these organisations, since not all of them are project based and their network mechanisms are far from the set up of a consortium.

- the cultural theme the organisation works on;
- the expertise and experience of the organisation's management in the area;
- the local area where the organisation is based and the countries it operates in;
- the organisation's aims and objectives, activities and specific work programme of actions;
- the organisation's experience in generating partnerships;
- the organisation's European or international profile;
- the organisation's ability to extensive fundraising;
- the organisation's ability to survive without EU funding.

It would be advisable for the EC/EP to follow extensive evaluation and pre-selection/selection procedures in order to avoid duplication of activities.

Transparency could also be guaranteed by providing more public access to all (internal and external) procedures of A-line (for instance via the relevant websites of the EU).