



Summary of the European Commission conference
“Celebrating 25 years of
European Capitals of Culture”

Brussels, 23-24 March 2010



EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE





Education and Culture DG





I. Introduction

2010 marks the 25th anniversary of the European Capitals of Culture (ECoC). The conference which took place on 23 and 24 March 2010 sought to celebrate this occasion, and host a strategic reflection on its impact with a view to helping future Capitals make a long-term success of the event.

The conference brought together a large number of past, present and future Capitals, as well as many bidding cities. It was also keenly attended by a large number of policy makers and representatives of local and regional government. In total more than 50 Capitals or bidding cities and 500 participants were present.

The first day of the conference was devoted to the official and festive part of the anniversary, as well as to the exchange of best practices between past, present and future Capitals, which the Commission is seeking to facilitate on a regular basis.

The conference was opened by Commissioner Vassiliou, with keynote speeches from President Barroso, Ms Doris Pack, chairperson of the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education, and Mr Robert Palmer who gave the practitioner's perspective, as he was the Director of Glasgow 1990 and Brussels 2000. The speakers highlighted

the positive evolution and maturing of the ECoC initiative and its relevance to broader European Union objectives, including the recently adopted EU-2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

One of the highlights of the first day was the ECoC "fair" which provided the opportunity for participants – in particular bidding and potential future bidding cities - to circulate between the stands of 20 past, present and future Capitals to exchange experiences and talk about their own plans.

The second day had a more strategic character and was devoted to two issues which are at the core of the current debates about the ECoC and which are essential for the future development of the initiative: the potential legacy of the title in the cities and the evaluation processes and methodologies used and implemented by them. These issues were explored in two plenary sessions and three workshops.

The present report summarizes the main points raised in discussion during the conference. It does not necessarily reflect the official views of the European Commission.



II. 25 years of European Capitals of Culture

There was a large consensus among the participants that over 25 years the ECoC have become one of the most sustained ambitious cultural initiatives in Europe, both in scope and scale.

They have also become one of the most visible and prestigious initiatives of the European Union and probably one of the most appreciated by European citizens. It undoubtedly has a unique brand value for the European Union and remains a much sought after designation by European cities.

At the beginning, many capital cities held the title but as time moved on this focus shifted to other cities, including medium-sized ones. At the same time, during the past 25 years the cultural landscape within many Member States has evolved massively.

For example, in some countries in the past the capital city or perhaps one other major city typically dominated the national cultural landscape, whereas nowadays medium-sized cities also increasingly have good cultural infrastructure or are interested in developing it and provide an environment where real engagement between the city and its cultural operators is possible.

The ECoC process has changed considerably since it began, including the process for designating them. In the beginning, they were not a formal initiative of the European Union, and from 1985 to 2004, they were simply designated by national governments in the Council of Ministers, without the involvement of external experts or any formal assessments. In 1999, the ECoC were transformed officially into a European Union action.

New criteria and selection procedures were established, a chronological list of Member States was drawn up indicating the order in which they were entitled to host the event, and a European panel of experts was created to assess the applications.

The rules were renewed in 2006 in order to boost the impact of the event further by stimulating competition which would foster high quality bids. These new selection rules, which were applied for the first time for the 2013 title, also introduced various measures to accompany the cities in their preparation, including a monitoring process between the designation of a city as Capital and the beginning of the event.

In parallel, the objectives of the ECoC have evolved. In setting up the Capitals, the main objective was to promote and celebrate cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue - to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures, to stress the common bonds, and to provide a space where mutual understanding between European citizens could grow.

This is reflected very clearly in the criteria for the selection of the Capitals to this day. Indeed, at their best, the ECoC pull together all the different strands – of people, of cultures – that make a city; they instil a sense of pride and belonging, of community and to Europe. In this respect, the Capitals are a unique opportunity for cities, for their people, and for the European Union as a whole.

Over the years, the ECoC have also become a unique opportunity to regenerate cities, to boost their creativity and to improve their image. Although not initially specifically conceived to have long lasting effect on the hosting cities, the ECoC event has evolved into a structural type of investment that goes beyond the logic of an annual cultural programme to encompass impacts on the longer term socio-economic development of the city and its surrounding area.

This second dimension has taken on ever-increasing importance in recent years and the ECoC are now frequently quoted as exemplary “laboratories” for strategic investment in culture at local and regional level.

25 years of European Capitals of Culture



This very clearly links the ECoC to the current discussions at EU level on the contribution of culture in local and regional development and to the growing recognition of the role culture can play as a catalyst for economic regeneration, for instance through promoting tourism, contributing to the emergence of new economic activities, linking creativity to innovation as a tool for social and territorial cohesion and as a tool to enhance the attractiveness of cities and regions as places to live, visit and invest in.

These issues were explored at length by the Member States in the Council of Ministers of the European Union during the preparation of its conclusions on the contribution of culture to regional and local development adopted in May 2010 during the Spanish Presidency of the EU.

Feeding into the ongoing political reflection, a study on the contribution of culture to local and regional economic development in the context of European cohesion policy and of the structural funds has been finalised for the European Commission during 2010.

The study showcases a large number of case studies - several of which are taken from ECoC - and which help underline the value of investing in the cultural and creative sectors and illustrate the links between these investments, specific regional development objectives and the overall EU strategy for growth and jobs.

The ECoC event is certainly not the only culture-led regeneration strategy. One has only to think of the impact of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao. However, it came out during the conference that what gives the ECoC a very specific place is twofold. The first is that it is a unique "brand", and therefore a unique opportunity for international visibility.

The benefits of the brand do not, however, flow automatically, and a city can also end up getting negative media coverage, but the opportunity is there

and it is up to the city to make the best use of it. Secondly, although the ECoC have a special regeneration potential, it should not be forgotten that one of their main aims is to increase mutual understanding among Europeans and bring them closer together. This is unique and makes them very different to other development strategies. It includes an emphasis on involving citizens, sometimes in preparing the bids to ensure the local population is really behind the project, but also in the implementation stages, engaging them in activities, or as volunteers, or simply as part of the audience.

Many participants in the conference insisted that in spite of the undoubted regeneration potential of the event, it was nevertheless important not to lose sight of the intrinsic value of culture and what it means for individuals and the creativity of our societies. A balance between the cultural objectives of the event and the local development priorities was therefore necessary. And it was stressed that capital regeneration was only one model and may not be appropriate to every city, social regeneration and innovation were important too. Cities must determine their own strategic priorities.

The question of what constitutes success or failure for an ECoC was raised on several occasions and one of the main lessons of the conference is that all ECoC, past, present or future, are different because all cities are different. The reasons why cities bid for the title, the long term objectives, the ways to prepare are all different and therefore the achievements are different.

There is not one unique legacy, nor one single way to be successful; each city must decide on what constitutes success for them and for whom.

This is probably part of the reality and success of the concept. Cities must stay authentic and build on their strengths, draw on their past, on all their communities, while looking to the future. They should learn, but not copy from each other.



25 years of European Capitals of Culture



However, it became very clear from the various discussions that the key to long-term impact is embedding the event as part of a long-term strategy by the city to culture-led development. This could be a challenge, as usually the delivery team would move on to other jobs and often different cities and countries. Strong political commitment was therefore necessary, as was the case for Lille's mayor.

Indeed in Lille's case, key members of the ECoC delivery team were retained by the city to implement the Lille 3000 strategy. Culture must be recognised as a process rather than simply as a series of events. It is difficult, complex and challenging.

With regard to failures, there was no hiding the fact that some Capitals have been more successful than others. When the Capitals fail, or do not optimise the event, it is often down to inadequate governance structures which fail to protect the event from political interference or enable the delivery team to operate efficiently.

In some cases the procedures put in place to administer the funds were overly bureaucratic and almost unworkable. Cities ought to be encouraged to be honest about their struggles and difficulties so others could learn from them.

Indeed, one of the key challenges by the Capitals is to manage the delicate relationship between politics and artistic independence.

On the one hand, political support is fundamental, and without it a city cannot have a credible bid, and it is understandable that elected representatives should want to ensure a sound return on the investment of public funds in the event. However on the other hand, the implementing team needs its artistic independence to be respected in order to protect the credibility of the event.

Stable working relations based on trust and united partnership between the political authorities and the implementing team are therefore essential.

Among recent Capitals Linz had been particularly effective in this regard.

In many cases the relatively long period of time between the designation and the event itself (currently four years), meant there was a risk of political configurations changing in the meantime and undermining previous commitments. The key here was to ensure cross-party support from the outset.

A lot of past Capitals have also struggled with the European dimension of the event and there was considerable discussion on whether it should be further defined.

It presently entailed three aspects: fostering cooperation between artists and cultural operators from different countries, highlighting the richness of Europe's cultural diversity, and bringing the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.

It seemed to be agreed in the end that there were limits to how far the European dimension should be pre-defined as each city had its own European narrative depending on its geographical location and its history, its past and present populations, and that in some cases it might also extend beyond the borders of the current European Union.

In some cases the cities did in fact have a good European dimension in their projects, but did not make it visible enough in their communication material. This was therefore an area where cities needed to do more and could also benefit from advice early on.

Quite a few speakers were uncomfortable with the amounts being incurred in the bidding process or even by the event itself if the city won the title. They stressed that true artistic creativity did not necessarily entail massive amounts of funding, which could sometimes even undermine innovativeness. A difference in scale and in budgets should be accepted and recognised.



III. About legacy

The legacy of the ECoC title on cities, or in other words its long-term impact, has become a major theme of discussion in recent years.

Being an ECoC does of course induce a number of immediate results which can be impressive (+ 12 % of tourists on average for a Capital compared to the previous year; 10 million people attended a cultural event in Liverpool during 2008 and all the children of all the schools of the city participated in at least one activity during the year; the 200 cultural projects which took place in Linz in 2009 generated 7700 events, involved 5000 artists and led to additional regional GDP of 8.4 million €; nearly 60% of the residents of the city of Luxembourg visited an ECoC event in 2007 and 139 cross-border projects were implemented with partners from the Grande Région; during Stavanger 2008, collaborations, co-productions and exchanges took place with 54 countries; 73 official international delegations were received in Sibiu 2007;...).

But the ECoC are first and foremost a process of change and transformation for a city, its image, its infrastructure, its cultural sector and its citizens, and these changes are expected to have positive effects for many years after the event actually takes place. As Luxembourg nicely worded it in its bid for the 2007 title: "Luxembourg 2007 starts in 2008".

The two central questions which were raised during the conference were what kind of legacies can the ECoC really strive for, and how can these desired legacies best be planned and achieved?

The answers highlighted the large variety of possible legacies. Some of these are measurable, others less so. Many participants felt that it was not because better tools exist to measure the economic impacts that the social and cultural impacts should be neglected as these are just as important for the city and its people.

The first kind of legacy that was mentioned by many cities was material in nature and relatively easy to quantify. This included cultural infrastructure, in other words new or revamped cultural venues

which live on after the event and better equip the city to put on festive events, and help make a city more attractive for its residents. This can have spillover effects for other parts of the local economy. There are too many examples to mention them all here: the Grande Rotonde in Luxembourg 2007 (a building initially erected for engineering works related to trains and restored as a cultural venue), the Maison Folies of Lille 2004 (a series of old industrial buildings in sensitive neighbourhoods regenerated for hosting cultural exhibitions, performances and workshops), the new Arena built on the docks in Liverpool 2008, new centres for contemporary art in Salamanca 2002 or Stavanger 2008...

In many cases of course the projects were being planned anyway, but the prospect of the ECoC year helped focus minds and serve as a catalyst for completing the projects.

Legacy can also consist of other kinds of physical infrastructure – such as road building projects – which are not directly required by the event, but which are often brought forward because of the event and which can change the geography and economic opportunities for the city permanently by improving its accessibility (Pécs 2010 told us for example of the new highway which will soon link the city to Budapest).

Similarly, the prospect of the ECoC often leads to an increase and improvement in the hotel stock.

The ECoC have led to the creation of many new cultural events or festivals. Lille 3000 for example is a "cultural season" which takes place every 2 or 3 years. It is based on the same basic concept as Lille 2004 and is a way to re-activate the partnerships created in the framework of the ECoC and maintain the attractiveness of the city.

The Zinneke Parade which is now held every two years was first created in the framework of Brussels 2000. The organisation of the event mobilizes all the socio-cultural organisations and is a way to bring together the different districts of the city.

About legacy



Hosting the event often also leads to the creation of many organisations, structures or networks. One of the main objectives of Luxembourg 2007 was for example to increase cross-border cultural cooperation with its partners in the Grande region (Wallonia in Belgium, Lorraine in France, and Rhineland-Palatinate and Saarland in Germany). Following the year, a permanent structure was created to keep the momentum and continue the common work that was initiated between the partners.


Essen for the Ruhr 2010 led to the creation of a framework for discussion between the 53 mayors of the Ruhr. This new interface is expected to enable the dialogue to continue after 2010 and so to make the most of the different assets of the metropolitan area and ensure consistent choices across the different cities involved.

In the United Kingdom, the 12 cities which participated in the bid for the 2008 title cooperated together in several initiatives since then, such as for example a large scale project for young people entitled "Portrait of a nation".

The conference also heard about other legacies which were harder to quantify and measure. This included artistic quality and excellence and image improvement, as in the case of Glasgow 1990, Lille 2004, Liverpool 2008 and many others.

These cities all suffered in the past from economic crises which had a negative impact on their image. Being an ECoC has turned them into more attractive places which manifested itself for example in a continued increase in tourism. In a similar way, Cork 2005 is proud that the city has been named as one of the top 10 cities in the world to visit in 2010 by the Lonely Planet travel guide while a few years before hosting the title, the same guide published a rather negative review of the city.

In the case of Linz, the city had already regenerated itself, so the image change was more about positioning itself as an alternative cultural centre to Vienna and Salzburg, and coming to terms with its past during the Nazi era. (Similarly Liverpool had



explored its history with slavery.) For some of the Capitals in the Member States which joined in 2004, it is a way of showing that they are part of Europe, and projecting a more prominent and positive image internationally.

Similarly for some Nordic Capitals, including Turku and Umeå (which will be the northernmost Capital ever) it will help to open eyes to the fact that Europe also reaches far to the north and has many cultural riches to be discovered.

Although changed image is hard to capture, media coverage can often play a key role in influencing the process. 12 000 press articles worldwide covered Liverpool 2008, while a total of 25 000 media reports mentioned Linz 2009. Sibiu 2007 and Pécs 2010 stressed that the ECoC title helped to put their relatively small cities on the map. Longitudinal surveys of public perceptions, as in the case of Liverpool, are another tool, but need to be well planned in advance.

An improved image can help to attract new residents ("creative workers") - which is one of the hopes expressed by Mons, which will host the title in 2015 - and consequently new investments leading to new jobs and growth. In some cases it was reported to have helped increase the number of Erasmus students coming to the city's universities.

Other types of legacy which are harder to quantify are improved skills among local cultural operators. Cork 2005 for example mentioned that the European dimension of the event stimulated a lot of transnational cultural cooperation and this exposure to international cooperation helped local operators "leap frog" forward in terms of acquiring skills and experience and fostering contacts and partnerships which continue today.

However the event could also help to professionalise other parts of the local economy, as in the case of Liverpool and Linz, where great efforts were made to mobilise all economic actors to the importance of giving a positive welcome to visitors and there is now greater pride in welcoming visitors.

About legacy



Local policy-makers also acquired new skills. For example, hosting the event can raise their awareness of the potential of culture in long-term local development. It can also give them confidence and improved skills for bidding for other major events, such as Helsinki which after the ECoC title in 2000 will be World Design Capital 2012. They also learnt to engage with new actors, which could be enriching in other ways to their work.

Numerous participants stressed the opportunity which the event gives for improving cooperation between cultural operators and local authorities and between cultural operators and citizens. Antwerp 1993 mentioned how the ECoC title initiated a large consultation of the cultural sector in the city.

The process prepared the ground for new ideas on how to change structures, on how to involve people and how to bridge the gaps between people and between them and the politician.

Today, cultural policy planning in Antwerp is still very much influenced by the dynamics that were launched almost twenty years ago. Salamanca 2002 and Cork 2005 also mentioned that being an ECoC helped to bring culture in from the margins and put it high on the local political agenda.

While it is relatively easy to measure visitor numbers, numbers of volunteers, etc, the participants recognized that the longer-term impact on local people is much harder to assess.

Little information exists as to whether the efforts to reconnect the disadvantaged actually impacted on them long term. It would also be interesting to know more precisely to what extent the ECoC event improves interest and consequently audiences and involvement of people for culture.

At the same time, does it make people learn more about Europe and feel more European thanks to the event?

The debate on legacy was lively and demonstrated how different the various ECoC are from one another, how different their objectives are and thus how diverse the legacies of the title can be.

However, as mentioned earlier, one element emerged very clearly from the debate: legacy is far from automatic simply because a city holds the title. Indeed, it has to be planned, budgeted for and worked at.

One of the main keys to success in terms of ensuring long-term legacy was embedding the event as part of a long-term cultural development strategy, designed itself within the long-term development of the city as a whole through synergies between culture and other areas (urban development, education etc).

Some of the past Capitals acknowledged that in retrospect they had not done enough to forward plan for the period after the event and some regretted not having budgeted for the year after the title. It will therefore be interesting to see to what extent the cities which will host the title after 2013 will be different, as the long-term cultural and social development of the city is included as one of the criteria to be met at selection stage.

Interestingly, some concluded that it was never too late to work at legacy! Although the title is only held for a year, in some ways the label can live on if effort is invested in it. The Mayor of Cork indicated that the conference had inspired him to work on Cork's legacy upon his return to Ireland.



IV. How to evaluate legacy?

The potential of the ECoC has become increasingly recognised over recent years and as we have just seen there is now an emphasis on the ECoC to generate a programme of change within cities and for this transformation to be real and sustainable. This goes hand in hand with the need to evaluate the impact and the legacy of the title in a city and this question raises many challenges for the cultural sector, policy-makers or politicians: how to assess the impact and legacy of the ECoC event in a city? What kinds of information should be monitored and measured? What can realistically be measured?

There was a consensus among the participants that strong evaluation is important and impossible to avoid in the 21st century. On the one hand, public administrations across Europe are increasingly under pressure to justify the impact of public expenditure, not least at a time of crisis when public finances are under severe pressure. On the other hand, the sector has a lot to gain from evaluation, be it quantitative or qualitative to show the significance of the arts and culture and their impacts on city development and social cohesion.

The Commission recalled for example the study it carried out in 2006 and which estimated that in 2003 the cultural sector contributed 2.6% of the EU's GDP: more than the ICT or car sector. This is a powerful figure. Similarly, Lille 2004's estimate that every euro of public money spent generated between 8 and 10 is also a powerful testimony to the potential of cultural investment.

And Liverpool's estimate that there were 10 million visits to cultural events during 2008 and that it generated £800 million are also powerful indicators of the potential impact of the ECoC event. This type of data is important to get more investment in culture in the long-term.

The evaluation of an ECoC can focus on many different aspects, at various times after the event:

- the way a city has fulfilled its own objectives with the event. Ideally, these objectives should be clearly designed at the very beginning of the bidding process, on the basis of the challenges a city faces;
- the quantitative impacts of the event in the short-and long-term such as tourism, cultural audiences, infrastructures, employment, growth, directly and indirectly derived from the event;
- the qualitative effects (generally over the longer term) such as the image of the city, social cohesion, new "cultural habits";
- the way a city has fulfilled the European objectives of the ECoC such as to promote and celebrate cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue, to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures or to stress the common bonds between European citizens.

Over the past 25 years many ECoC published detailed final reports prepared by the delivery agency or external evaluations carried out by academics or consultants.

These evaluations, often very valuable, focussed however mainly on quantitative indicators, targeting economic impacts in the city (Glasgow 1990, Luxembourg 1995 and 2007, Graz 2003, Cork 2005, Sibiu 2007, Stavanger 2008).

How to evaluate legacy?



Other fundamental aspects, such as citizens' participation, increase in the city prestige, vibrancy have been less chartered until recent years, although, using the words of one conference speaker "ECoC are first and foremost a cultural event and culture is not a commodity, it is a process and this process needs to be captured by the evaluation".

The most comprehensive evaluation model so far fully endorsed by a city is probably Liverpool 2008's evaluation called "Impacts 08". This longitudinal study, carried out by the two Liverpool universities, assessed the city change over a period of nearly 10 years. Dimensions examined covered economic issues and tourism, but also more intangible effects such as increase in citizens' participation, better image of the city, increased cultural vibrancy. However the European dimension was not included.

Complementarity was sought between on the one hand a wide range of quantitative indicators and solid figures and on the other hand narratives and quality elements. In the words of the project leader: "Don't be scared by numbers, use them and complement them with the stories". The evaluation model developed with Impacts 08 is being considered as part of the legacy of Liverpool 2008 and the European Commission is currently supporting a project within the framework of the Culture programme in order to transfer and adapt this model to the needs of other ECoC such as Turku 2011, Marseilles 2013 and Essen for the Ruhr 2010.

The European Commission also evaluates ECoC but from a specific angle. The main aim of the Commission's evaluations is to draw on past ECoC experience to learn lessons for future Capitals, thus improving the overall implementation of the action.

The first contribution of the Commission was of course the Palmer/Rae study which examined the

Capitals from 1995 to 2004. The study provided very useful data and made recommendations about improving the design and organisation of the event and it was one of the sources which ultimately influenced the revisions to the legal base and the current system of ECoC.

The second contribution is the evaluations which the Commission now carries out every year of the previous year's Capitals. This is a requirement of the new legal base adopted in 2006. The first evaluations of the 2007 and 2008 Capitals were completed in 2009 and a report was prepared for the European institutions. The Commission's evaluation has adapted classic evaluation criteria such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability to the specific nature of the ECoC event.

The Commission's evaluations put single ECoC in a European context, enabling wider circulation of information, allowing for comparisons and drawing useful lessons for future ECoC. These evaluations cannot, however, provide primary data on the impact of the event and are based on data collected at a local level. Therefore it is essential that the Capitals themselves put in place measurement mechanisms. Cities are the first recipients and beneficiaries of the evaluation results and they should remain the key players in the evaluation process.

One impression which emerged was that planning evaluation and evaluation tools well in advance helped many cities to clarify their vision of their strengths and weaknesses, to analyse what they could realistically strive to achieve through the ECoC title, and thus to refine their objectives, which could also in practice help improve the end result of the year.



V. Conclusion

The conference clearly showed that after 25 years, the ECoC title still has a high potential and it has developed a strong “brand” value. However, the title must strive to remain relevant; to retain and expand this “brand” value in the long term, it is essential to ensure that the title remains credible and therefore to pay close attention to the quality and prestige of every new Capital and the processes and strategies around their development.

ECoC have many potential benefits when they are planned with consideration. They are first and foremost a cultural event, and must reflect our times and the way art is made and distributed; but they can also have significant social and economic benefits. Some cities were more successful than others in capitalising on the potential of the event, although they had all learnt a great deal. The most effective ones were without any doubt those which embedded the event as part of a long-term culture led regeneration strategy.

This shows a clear link with the new EU-2020 strategy for promoting smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. For 25 years, the ECoC have been a laboratory for creative cities, inclusive societies and smart economies and there are many lessons to be learnt from this experience at a moment when the EU is struggling to find its way out of the crisis.

Indeed, the financial crisis was understandably generally seen by participants as a threat to cultural budgets and therefore the budgets of the ECoC. But at the same time the financial crisis makes jobs in the cultural and creative industries – a sector with strong growth potential in a knowledge-based economy - all the more important in order to tackle current social and economic challenges. It is therefore all the more important for the cultural sector to reach out for dialogue, following the example of the most successful ECoC, in which artists and cultural professionals unite with politicians and the business sector to re-create their cities and pave the way for the future.



EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE





Agenda of the European Commission conference

“Celebrating 25 years of European Capitals of Culture”

Brussels, 23-24 March 2010



EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE



Agenda - 23 March 2010

10:30-12:30: Information session about the European Capitals of Culture dedicated to bidding and future bidding cities (Studio).

12:30-13:30: Arrival of participants for the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the European Capitals of Culture (Coffee break)

13:30 – 14.45: Opening session / Keynotes (Henri le Boeuf room)

- Master of ceremonies: Mrs Vassiliou, Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth.
- Mr Barroso, President of the Commission: the contribution of the European Capitals of Culture to the strategic objectives of the European Union
- Robert Palmer (Director of Glasgow 1990 and Brussels 2000): looking back at 25 years of the Capitals.
- Doris Pack, Chairwoman of the Education and Culture Committee of the European Parliament: the view from the European Parliament on 25 years of the European Capitals of Culture

14.45 – 15.00: Session 2 - Quiz : A very special Trivial Pursuit

So you think you're an expert on the European Capitals of Culture?

Moderator: Sir Robert Scott (leader of the Liverpool's application for the title of European Capital of Culture 2008, former ambassador of the Liverpool Culture Company)

15.00 - 17:00: Session 3

The past and the future European Capitals of Culture: achievements, legacy, hopes and challenges

Moderator: Sir Robert Scott

Round table discussion between Mayors and representatives of past, present and future Capitals:

- Athens 1985: Nikítas Kaklamánis, Mayor
- Helsinki 2000: Tuula Haatainen, Deputy Mayor
- Lille 2004: Catherine Cullen, counsellor to the Mayor for cultural affairs
- Cork 2005: Cllr. Dara Murphy, Mayor
- Luxembourg 2007: Mme Colette Mart, Councillor to the Mayor
- Liverpool 2008: Councillor Flo Clucas, Deputy Leader of Liverpool City Council
- Essen 2010: Dr. Scheytt, Essen for the Ruhr.2010
- Marseille 2013: Jean Claude Gaudin, Mayor
- Riga 2014: Nils Usakovs, Mayor
- Umeå 2014: Marie-Louise Rönmark, Mayor

17:00 – 19:00: Session 4

European Capital of Culture "fair": exchange of practices with past, present and future European Capitals of Culture

This session will provide the opportunity for participants to circulate between the stands to talk to representatives from past, present and future Capitals about their experience and/or plans and have coffee and other refreshments. The following Capitals will be present at stands: Graz 2003, Lille 2004, Cork 2005, Luxembourg 2007, Sibiu 2007, Liverpool 2008, Stavanger 2008, Vilnius 2009, Linz 2009, Essen for the Ruhr 2010, Pécs 2010, Istanbul 2010, Turku 2011, Tallinn 2011, Maribor 2012, Guimarães 2012, Marseille 2013, Košice 2013, Umeå 2014, Riga 2014.

19:00 - 21:30: Opening of the European Capital of Culture exhibition and cocktail

(Hall Horta). Opening by Commissioner Vassiliou, the Mayor of Athens and Mr Spyros Mercouris, Co-ordinator of Athens 1985. *The exhibition has been organised by the Athens Documentation Centre on the European Capital of Culture event, on the basis of material gathered from past European Capitals of Culture.*

Agenda - 24 March 2010

9.00 – 9.10: Opening - European Commission (Room M)

9.10 - 11:00: Session 5 - Leaving a legacy (plenary session)

Moderator: Mary McCarthy, deputy director of Cork 2005, currently manages the National Sculpture Factory in Cork, former member of the European Capital of Culture panel.

The potential of the European Capitals of Culture has become increasingly recognised and debated over recent years. Cities are increasingly competing with each other for investment, citizen retention and attraction as well as tourists. There is now a renewed emphasis on the ECOC to generate a programme of change within cities and for this transformation to be real and sustainable. There is an increasing emphasis on legacy and evaluation. This raises challenges for the cultural sector, policy makers and politicians.

This session will explore :

- What kinds of ambitions can an ECOC programme realistically set itself?
- What kinds of legacies can the ECOC really strive to achieve?
- Can these be generalized or are they specific to local contexts?
- How can these desired legacies be best planned for, communicated, monitored, measured and achieved?
- What really constitutes success and are there failures and if so why?

The European Commission will present its perspective on the legacy of the European Capitals of Culture and its evaluations. Prominent researchers will present their perspectives and evaluation models, and the Spanish presidency will talk about the importance of the ECOC to local and regional development, on which the Culture Council is negotiating conclusions during their Presidency.

- Vladimir Šucha (Director, European Commission): the European Commission perspective
- Mr Guillermo Corral van Damme, Director General for Cultural Policy and Industries, Spain: The ECOCs and the impact on local and regional development
- Robert Palmer, on the Palmer/Rae study on the 1995-2004 European Capitals of Culture
- Beatriz Garcia, researcher for IMPACTS 08
- Danuta Glondys, researcher on the European Capitals of Culture

11.00 - 11.30: Coffee break

11.30 - 13.30: Session 6 - Workshops on Leaving Legacy

Participants will break out into three workshops to discuss the issues raised by the previous session.

The workshops will be enlivened by contributions from a range of speakers from past, present and future Capitals, bidding cities, and networks involved with the European Capitals of Culture.

Workshop A (Studio)

Moderator: Manfred Gaulhofer, Manager of Graz 2003

Speakers :

- Lille 2004: L Dréano
- Sibiu 2007: C Radu
- Liverpool 2008: N Peterson
- Essen for the Ruhr 2010: H Dietrich Schmidt
- Turku 2011: Cay Sevon
- Kosice 2013: Zora Jaurova

- University Network of the European Capitals of Culture (UNECC): Flora Carrijn
- European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC): Steve Green



Workshop B (Room M)

Moderator: Gottfried Wagner, consultant, former Director of the European Culture Foundation

Speakers :

- Antwerp 1993: Eric Antonis
- Luxembourg 2007: Robert Garcia
- Linz 2009: Ulrich Fuchs and Martin Heller
- Istanbul 2010: Esra Nilgun Mirze
- Tallinn 2011: Mikko Fritze
- Guimaraes 2012: Cristina Azevedo
- Marseille 2013: Bernard Latarjet
- Riga 2014: Diana Civele and Aiva Rozenberga
- Laborculture: Katherine Watson
- Eurocities: Bjorn Holmviik, Director General of the departments Culture, Sport and business development of the city of Bergen



Workshop C (Terarken 1 room)

Moderator: Jordi Pascual, Coordinator, Agenda 21 for culture, United Cities

Speakers:

- Bruges 2002: Hugo de Greef
- Salamanca 2002: Enrique Cabero
- Cork 2005: Liz Meaney
- Stavanger 2008: Rolf Noras
- Pécs 2010: Csaba Ruzsa
- Maribor 2012: Vladimir Rukavina
- Umeå 2014: Fredrik Lindegren
- Les Rencontres: Roger Tropeano
- Athens Documentation Centre: Rodolfo Maslias
- Cultural Cities Network : Paula Murray



13:30 – 14:30: Lunch break

14:30 – 16:15: Session 7: Back to the future: legacy lessons (Room M) (plenary session)

Moderator: Mary McCarthy

The panel moderators will report back in plenary and the participants will give their views on the lessons to be learned for European Capitals of Culture and ensuring legacy.

Speakers: Manfred Gaulhofer, Gottfried Wagner, Jordi Pascual, Ms Odile Quintin, Director General of DG Education and Culture and Katarina Mathernova, Deputy Director General of DG Regional Policy, European Commission.

16:15 – 16:30: Session 8

Closing by Ms Odile Quintin, Director General of DG Education and Culture