



Co-funded by
the Culture Programme
of the European Union



EU2013.LT



MINISTRY OF CULTURE
OF THE REPUBLIC
OF LITHUANIA

Report on the Lithuanian EU Council Presidency Conference 'Ready for Tomorrow? Culture as an Agent for Social and Economic Transformation'

Vilnius, 1-2 October 2013

Report by Darius Žeruolis, ESTEP Vilnius

With contributions from Vesna Čopič (Ljubljana University), Vilma Bačkiūtė (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania), Gediminas Rutkauskas (Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency), Zinaida Manžuch (Vilnius University) and Arūnas Bėkšta (Lithuanian Association of Adult Education)

This report consists of three parts. In the first part it restates the aims of the Lithuanian EU Presidency for this conference and explains the rationale behind the programme. The second part presents a synthesis of presentations delivered at the conference, presenting the statements, arguments and evidence as they were delivered, i.e. in the words of presenters and moderators. Presentations and video excerpts are available on the Lithuanian Ministry of Culture website http://www.lrkm.lt/go.php/eng/Presidency_conference_on_cultural_policy/650, so the reader may choose to inspect them for more details. This part also relies on the notes taken also by the fellow co-rapporteurs as acknowledged above. Finally, the third part assesses the proceedings of the conference from the participant observation point of view of the main rapporteur, which does not necessarily reflect the position of the Presidency.

Conference organized by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania
Co-funded by the Culture Programme of the European Union

Conference Programme

Tuesday, 1 October

9.30-10.00	<p>Opening Addresses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Šarūnas Birutis, Minister of Culture, Lithuania ▪ Androulla Vassiliou, Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth, European Commission ▪ Doris Pack, Chair of the Culture and Education Committee, European Parliament
SESSION 1. Culture: Relevant But Not (Yet) Evident Enough	
<p>Keynote Presentations Moderated by Péter Inkei, Director of the Budapest Observatory, Hungary</p>	
10.00-10.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pier Luigi Sacco, IULM University, Italy <i>Culture 3.0 as a new narrative: the impact of culture on social and economic development and how to measure it</i>
10.20-10.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Laszlo Bruszt, European University Institute, Hungary/Italy <i>Culture as a source for social capital and a bridge in fragmented societies: from molecular to modular development</i>
10.40-11.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andreas J. Wiesand, ERICarts Institute, Germany <i>Finally 'In from the Margins'? Cultural policy change in EU member states – comparative perspectives</i>
<p>Reflection Panel Moderated by Mikko Lagerspetz, Abo Academy, Finland</p>	
11.30-12.30	<p>With the participation of Šarūnas Birutis, Minister of Culture, Lithuania, Rein Lang, Minister of Culture, Estonia, Doris Pack, Chair of the Culture and Education Committee, European Parliament, Jan Trzuszczński, Director General for Education, Training, Culture and Youth, European Commission, Anton Rombouts, Chair of Commission for Education, Youth, Culture and Research (EDUC), Committee of the Regions</p>
SESSION 2. Public Interventions for Culture: European and National	
<p>Contributions from the European Commission Moderated by Darius Žeruolis, ESTEP Vilnius</p>	
14.00-14.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Karel Bartak, Head of the Culture Programme Unit, Directorate-General for Education and Culture <i>Culture in the EU 2020 strategy and Creative Europe programme 2014-2020</i>
14.20-14.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marco Pino, Policy Analyst, Competence Centre Smart and Sustainable Growth, Directorate-General for Regional Policy <i>EU Cohesion Policy 2014 – 2020. ERDF support to Culture and related investments</i>

14.40-15.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Javier Hernández-Ros, Head of Unit Creativity, Directorate-General for Communication Networks, Content and Technology <i>Digital culture: new paradigms, challenges and opportunities</i>
Contributions from the Member States Moderated by Vesna Čopič, Ljubljana University, Slovenia	
15.30-15.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ragnar Siil, Undersecretary of State for Fine Arts, Ministry of Culture, Estonia <i>How to make creative industries development strategies work? The key elements for success and major pitfalls</i>
15.50-16.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ramūnas Dilba, Deputy Director of Department for Management of EU Structural Funds, Ministry of Finance, Lithuania <i>Culture as a horizontal priority in the Lithuanian long-term Progress Programme for 2014-2020: challenges and opportunities</i>
16.10-16.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clas-Uno Frykholm, Director of the Swedish Agency for Cultural Policy Analysis <i>Decentralizing distribution of state cultural funding – a way to promote cross-sectorial perspectives in cultural policy. The Cultural Cooperation Model in Sweden</i>
16.30-16.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pierre Lescure, General Director of the Marigny Theatre, author of the report “The Cultural Exception – Act 2: Contribution to Cultural Policies in the Digital Era”, France <i>Developing proactive cultural policies in the digital environment</i>

Wednesday, 2 October

SESSION 3. Tracing the Evidence in Public Interventions for Culture				
Introductory Presentation Moderated by Arūnas Bėkšta, Chair of the Lithuanian Association of Adult Education				
9.00-9.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Moore, Professor of Creative Technologies, Head of School of Creative Arts, University of Ulster, and Anthony Lilley, Chief Creative Officer and CEO, Magic Lantern Productions Ltd <i>Counting What Counts: data as an asset for cultural policymakers and practitioners</i> 			
Parallel Sessions				
10.00-11.30	Parallel session No. 1 Creation of Demand for Culture: Creative Partnerships for Schools and Museums	Parallel session No. 2 Re-positioning of Context for Cultural Services: Libraries, Culture Houses and Community Participation	Parallel session No. 3 Heritage and Conversion of Buildings / Spaces for Innovative Cultural and Social Use	Parallel session No. 4 Access to Culture through Digital Shift: from Digital Preservation to Demand for Digital Content



	<p>Moderated by Vilma Bačkiūtė</p> <p>Ida Brændholt Lundgaard Senior Advisor for Museums, Danish Agency for Culture <i>Museums as social learning spaces for knowledge creation</i></p> <p>Milda Laužikaitė Head of Programme “Creative Partnerships Lithuania”, Education Development Centre <i>„Creative Partnerships Lithuania“: challenging the assumptions about school</i></p> <p>Sybille Linke Head of Programme “Cultural agents for creative schools”, Forum K&B GmbH, Germany <i>Cultural agents for schools in Germany</i></p>	<p>Moderated by Vesna Čopič</p> <p>Kęstutis Juškevičius Head of Project “Libraries for Innovation”, Lithuania <i>“Libraries for Innovation”: new role of libraries in digital age as model for emulation and continuation in 2014- 2020</i></p> <p>Kristīne Pabērza State Agency Culture Information Systems, Latvia <i>The boundaries of public library services redefined: evidence of social and economic potential in Latvia</i></p> <p>Péter Inkei Director of the Budapest Observatory, Hungary <i>Culture Houses, the Cinderella in European Cultural Policies</i></p>	<p>Moderated by Gediminas Rutkauskas</p> <p>Erminia Sciacchitano Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, Italy <i>Shifting the centre: people at the heart of heritage policy in Italy</i></p> <p>Przemysław Niedźwiecki Deputy Director of the Department of European Funds, Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Poland <i>The idea of 'creative cities' as a source of shaping urban space with the help of EU investment</i></p> <p>Luciano Cupelloni Architect, LCA - Luciano Cupelloni Architettura, Italy <i>Industrial Heritage in Rome: from Slaughterhouse to Cultural Complex</i></p>	<p>Moderated by Zinaida Manžuch</p> <p>Jill Cousins Executive Director, Europeana Foundation, The Netherlands <i>Europeana and the cultural heritage ecosystem</i></p> <p>Paul Manwaring Creative Director, Glimworm, The Netherlands <i>Collaboration for effective digital content distribution: creating interactive mobile platforms with open culture data and cultural heritage content</i></p> <p>James Davis Program Manager Global Operations, Google Art Project, United Kingdom <i>Building a museum of museums on the web</i></p>
12.00-12.45	<p>Feedback from Parallel Sessions Moderated by Andreas J. Wiesand, ERICarts Institute, Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vilma Bačkiūtė, Ministry of Education and Science, Lithuania ▪ Vesna Čopič, Ljubljana University, Slovenia ▪ Gediminas Rutkauskas, Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency, ICOMOS expert, Lithuania ▪ Zinaida Manžuch, Faculty of Communication, Vilnius University, Lithuania 			
12.45-13.00	<p>Concluding Remarks by the Lithuanian Presidency and Close of the Conference</p>			

I. Introduction: setting of the scene from the Lithuanian EU Presidency perspective

The programme of the conference was accompanied by the general concept note from the Presidency and specific conceptual elaborations for each of the sessions. There is no need to repeat the contents in detail as these documents are easily accessible. It will be sufficient to summarize that the Presidency sought (i) an assessment of the new narrative (Culture 3.0) based on the notions of social mobilization and cultural welfare, as well as its co-existence with other two established strands of intrinsically valuable cultural and cultural heritage sector and commercially marketable cultural and creative industries. The Presidency was seeking an overview of the readiness of the EU member states to embrace the new narrative. It suggested an analysis of (ii) the instruments (public interventions) to sustain the cultural policy as well as (iii) measures (projects) implementing the policy and evidence that they indeed do so.

The three sessions were designed to reflect the policy cycle. The discussion in the first session on cultural policy (centering around, but not limited to the 'new narrative', that is, the 'macro' level), was intended to be followed by assessment of instruments available, mostly financial interventions from national and EU budgets (the 'mezzo' level), in the second session. Finally, the third session combined both the project (measure, the 'micro') level and analysis of evidence generated by the projects, but also the data shift on policy level if the new narrative is embraced.

The contents of the programme were also heavily shaped by the interests arising from recent developments in the cultural policy of Lithuania¹, both its contents and financial aspects, and the stock of social and civic capital. Secondly, a broader domestic aim of the Lithuanian EU Presidency was to enhance networking and co-operation capacity and potential of civil servants and policy experts with colleagues from the EU member states and EU institutions.

¹ The reader can consult The Guidelines on the Lithuanian Cultural Policy Development (approved by the Seimas (Parliament) of Lithuania in 2010, (http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=423232), Country Profile Lithuania (June 2013) in the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (<http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/lithuania.php>), and presentation in this conference on the Lithuanian plans for culture within the EU structural funds during 2014-2020.

II. Conference proceedings

1. Opening Addresses

Minister **Šarūnas Birutis** emphasized the connection between the intrinsic value of culture and the need to entrench culture 'horizontally' in policy making. European cultural assets, such as strong public institutions and democratic governance, dynamic societies rooted in rich cultural traditions, creative ideas, a pool of talent and the creative industries, high ICT literacy, brands in technology, fashion, design, media and architecture, and the conditions for their development are unparalleled. The key question is how to take advantage of these assets and the public interventions, investments and inter-sectoral co-operation needed for culture and creativity to become the engine of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. While the value and impact of the cultural and creative industries lend themselves to quantification more easily, hard evidence about the effects of heritage, libraries, creative activities, the production of cultural content and urban regeneration is difficult to generate. Therefore we need to compare more by learning from good practices, innovative approaches, as well as failures. Data about investment into culture from the EU budget demonstrates that culture has not yet moved from its subsidiary function. But in order to change that perhaps we need to change our thinking about culture and learn to position it at the cross-roads of inter-sectoral co-operation. Only then will culture and creativity become the key foundation and not a derivative.

Commissioner **Androulla Vassiliou** underscored the double dimension of culture, namely, as a set of shared values and therefore having an intrinsic, non-quantifiable value, and a sector of economic activity. This is a guiding principle for policy at the European level. But lately the Commission has been seeking to demonstrate a huge potential for growth and jobs (cf. Communication on Promoting the Cultural and Creative Sectors for Growth and Jobs in the EU (2012)). Against the backdrop of the current economic crisis, of key importance are the arguments in favour of the economic and social potential of investing in culture. Public spending on culture is not a luxury, but a smart investment because, in the words of Umberto Eco, 'when it comes to the debt crisis, we must remember that it is culture, not war, that cements our European identity'. The arguments for investing into culture are well known and not new. Long-term vision and thinking 'outside of the box' are needed, as well as new instruments. All partners must do their share, especially the national governments. At the EU level, the answer will be the Creative Europe programme, which will enjoy an overall increase of 9% compared to the previous funding period. It will serve as a 'one stop shop' for the cultural and creative industries. In comparison to the past, it will diversify support by creating the Cultural and Creative Sector Guarantee Facility (enabling easier access to bank credits) which will complement the traditional support based on grants. Creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in Europe will also be supported by Erasmus+ (for education and vocational training), COSME (for industries and enterprises), Horizon 2020 (for research and innovation), and last but not least by the Structural Funds which will continue to be available to the cultural community at the national, regional and local level. In order to take advantage of this latter opportunity, the Commissioner invited the Member States to embed the investments in culture and creativity in the integrated development strategies. This requires a new intervention logic and, perhaps, a new strategic approach.

In her welcoming address, the Chair of the European Parliament CULT Committee **Doris Pack** was critical about the insufficient emphasis on the role of culture in the European competitiveness strategy (EU 2020). She also regretted the dominant view of culture as an absorber of subsidies which

consumes more than the value added it generates. The European institutions, particularly the Commission, must do more than they did during the last ten years to change this. The European Parliament is in favour of a more comprehensive approach to culture and cultural policies. She also touched upon the new challenges of which two were explained in a more elaborate way, namely, the technological progress and cultural diplomacy (where the EU risks falling behind to emerging and new economies, such as China, where allocations to culture have grown by an impressive 20%). The financial context for culture in the EU member states is not bright at the moment as culture is one of the first targets of austerity measures. Such a trend must be reversed or at least stabilised. EU structural assistance provides a welcome source of funding and we all should be grateful for this opportunity.

2. Culture: Relevant But Not (Yet) Evident

This was a session with three key note presentations. In his presentation on the new narrative of culture (what he labels as Culture 3.0) and the new elements for the measurement of the impact of culture on social and economic development, Professor **Pierre Luigi Sacco** emphasized two issues. First, the social context of culture is rapidly changing. A new regime is emerging, which is centering around the communities of practice. They are enabled by technological advancement and generate value without the mediation of markets. This new regime (Culture 3.0) is not replacing but rather coexists with the other two, by now already traditional regimes, which value the intrinsic value of cultural objects (Culture 1.0) and market impact (mass or pop culture, Culture 2.0). The criteria for judging culture is also changing. In the emerging new regime the criterion is defined by the mobilization impact, because in this regime culture will be produced, accessed and consumed in the communities of 'meaning' in which culture will be the enabling element, a 'social software', a system of references. This has profound policy implications for employing culture for economic and social development. On the other hand, it will coexist with the other two regimes. Investment into 'stones' (physical objects of cultural heritage, Culture 1.0) will still be needed, but for the development agenda it will be equally if not more important to invest into generation of the 'social software'.

The relationship between cultural policy and developmental issues were addressed by Professor **László Bruszt**. In his view, culture acts both as a cause and a consequence of sustainable development. He critically analysed the impact of EU structural policies on fostering social cohesion. The positive impact of EU financial transfers (i.e. developmental assistance) was in changing the inter-organizational culture of recipient countries and creating an organisational base for endogenous local development (i.e. development from within). But in many cases this policy has clearly not delivered on its original goal as set by the Jacques Dellors' European Commission some 25 years ago. As evidenced by empirical research in the new EU member states of Central Europe in 2007, it created regions without regionalism. Regionalism is understood as a regime supported by peoples with common references, shared aspirations, compatible or complementary identities. This missing element is substituted by external actors (EU institutions and/or central governments) which mobilise resources, define developmental policies and monitor and enforce change for or on behalf of local populations. But such substitution is not sustainable and creates incentives for the prolongation of dependence, to stay within "learned helplessness". Therefore at best only the status quo is conserved or, worse, the developmental position might even worsen. In his conclusion, cultural policies which nurture regionalism are the missing key factor. While the European Union cannot change national institutional

conditions and cannot create regions, it can foster regionalism through investing into cultural policies aiming at this.

Professor **Andreas Johannes Wiesand** undertook to make an assessment of the cultural policy change in the EU member states from a comparative perspective. In essence, this analysis would have amounted to answering the question who is ready for tomorrow? A simple answer proved to be impossible, not least because of the absence of systematic support for comparative cultural research in Europe. Professor Wiesand was struck by the continuous (or renewed) relevance of findings and proposals of the 'In from the Margins' report on culture by the European task force submitted to the Council of Europe back in 1996. Its recommendations on the promotion of cultural identity and diversity, creativity and participation were intended to re-orient (or mainstream) existing cultural policies in the contexts of the 'demography of exclusion', the 'economics and management of the digital revolution' and the 'renewal of civil society', i.e. the background themes applicable to the Vilnius conference too. Professor Wiesand assessed the content of the cultural policies of the EU member states (available through the Council of Europe project Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe) against 16 indicators of structural (institutional) conditions of culture, transversal policies (i.e. the presence of emphasis on diversity or social cohesion), sectoral developments and funding priorities and policies addressing the old and new media. He concluded that a variety of cultural policies exists in the member states and 'we have not yet landed in a European policy melting pot'. On the other hand, a wide definition of cultural policy (proposed by the European task force in 1996) to reach for economic, social, educational and other domains has indeed turned into a European mainstream. Professor Wiesand noted that the willingness of a 'great many politicians and administrators to take for granted that some areas in society, particularly the arts, have an intrinsic value and need support (...) has faded rapidly' and that many cultural experts 'may have contributed to the collapse of a protective shield with 'translation' or 'expansion' efforts, that is by linking the arts with economic, political or educational effects'. He recommended an approach based on balance: while culture indeed contributes to economic growth and social cohesion, it should not be interpreted as a remedy for all the needs and illnesses of society. In order to meet a need for evidence-based policy making, evidence must also be inspired by comparative policy analyses and qualitative benchmarks, by success stories and an honest admission of failed action. At the same time not everything that counts can be counted – culture goes far beyond measurable economic outputs (such as demanded by the EU structural funds regulations), its innovations help us to 'discover hidden realities' and 'our increasingly mixed identities'.

The key-note session was followed by the high level reflection panel. Professor **Mikko Lagerspetz** began the discussion by noting that culture is good for the economy and social cohesion, but its effects are indirect. Moreover, the meaning of culture (in transition to Culture 3.0) is changing too. This creates difficulties in measurement in strict terms.

Minister **Šarūnas Birutis** of Lithuania regretted that the conference was attended, as usual, mostly by representatives of the cultural sector. Therefore the discussion was taking place among those 'already convinced'. He welcomed a consensus on a broad definition of culture, because a narrow definition leads to a narrow understanding of the role of culture and limited financing. On the other hand, a common definition would be helpful. He emphasised the role of culture in preserving national identities, which have not only an intrinsic value, but is also a key factor in maintaining Europe's competitive advantage. He also spoke in favour of securing fair return to creators of cultural and artistic content in the area of copyright law, though the solution to the existing challenges is not obvious and needs further political deliberation.

Minister **Rein Lang** of Estonia was happy to note that in political discourse culture in Estonia is already recognised as a generator of added value and not as a consumer of resources. His key concern was the common European digital market and the obstacles which still exist on its path. He gave an example of mutual recognition of digital signatures which would ease life for microenterprises in the area of creative entrepreneurship relying a lot on inputs from other countries. He also noted that access to certain content, available to the members of the EU, is missing in some of the countries (including Baltic countries), and it raises issue with free movement of good within the EU. Despite talks on the EU level over the last ten years, the free movement of services does not yet work.

MEP **Doris Pack** emphasised that the European Parliament was instrumental in pursuing two recent reports for the creative sector which emphasised better working conditions and remuneration for the sector and support for new businesses. She noted differences which still exist between the European institutions in the application of state aid rules for the cultural sector (though the UNESCO convention is clearly in favour of this) and in the EU-USA negotiations for the free trade agreement where the European Parliament wants to have a better oversight. Director General **Jan Truszczyński** remarked that in terms of upgrading cultural policies, the EU has gone a long way already and that Rome was not built in a day. He predicted a long muddling through, but progress nevertheless. It is a difficult road, deeply political, because the difference in the interests of the member states is big. The joined up approach is working in cultural heritage, but in other fields is less advanced. He mentioned the area of cultural statistics, where the member states would advance if they implemented the recommendations of the 2012 ESSnet-Culture report. He cautioned against relying too much on evidence.

Anton Rombouts explained the relevance of culture on the local and regional level from three different but related perspectives of city mayor, rapporteur for the Opinion on Cultural and Creative Sectors and chair of the EDUC Commission within the Committee of the Regions. He claimed that only a city which invests in culture and education can be successful and what is good for a city is good for the nation and for the (European) continent. He told the conference that his (Dutch) city of 's-Hertogenbosch (The Duke's Forest) put together a 36 mio EUR public and private budget (comparable to that of the European Capitals of Culture) to commemorate in 2016 the 500th anniversary of the death of Hieronymus Bosch, the leading Dutch painter of the Middle Ages. The city is taking this programme as a ten year investment aimed specifically at young people. Culture is seen as an antidote to hanging around in the streets, prejudice, fears of foreigners and a too rigid vision of the world. Thus culture is best defined through what it takes away from the young people and children. While education gives young people the necessary skills and knowledge to find a job and make a living, and sport gives health and a healthy preoccupation to the young, culture brings more tolerance and openness to new ideas, concepts and people, leading to enrichment, innovation and progress.

3. Public Interventions for Culture: European and National

This session was divided into two parts. First, three presentations from representatives from the European Commission addressed the (financial) instruments envisaged by the European Commission for culture in 2014-2020, specifically the EU level programmes of Creative Europe, Horizon 2020 and Structural Funds. Representatives of three different directorates (Education and Culture, Regional

Policy and CONNECT) gave their presentations first. Then the session turned to the national responses from four member states (Estonia, Lithuania, Sweden and France).

3. 1 European Interventions in 2014-2020

In the first part, **Karel Barták** reminded the conference that culture is one of the policy areas where action by the European Union is only complementary to national policies as subsidiarity must be fully respected. In proposing the EU level programme Creative Europe for 2014-2020, the European Commission has proceeded on the basis of four main considerations. First, in addition to the intrinsic value of culture the Commission sees culture, and more specifically, the cultural-creative industries (CCI) as a driver of economic growth and employment. It is very telling that the CCI have resisted the economic crisis much better than other sectors (this was also demonstrated later in the conference in the Estonian presentation). However, it faces challenges/problems too. Creative Europe has been designed to address them in overcoming fragmentation of the markets (mainly due to linguistic barriers), the digital shift (the need to engage the audience as active participants and not passive recipients), access to finance (the SMEs in the cultural sector, of which 60% are microenterprises), face an estimated funding gap of 2.8-4.8 billion EUR) and lack of data (comparable evidence). In addition to traditional, already tested measures, from 2016 the European Commission will make available a 121 million EUR financial guarantee facility (available as bank loans). It will increase funding for better and more comparable data collection, studies, evaluation and statistical surveys and facilitate the extension of the mandate of the European Audiovisual Observatory to other cultural and creative sectors.

Marco Pino presented the investment opportunities available for culture in the next programming period (2014-2020) within the EU structural funds. In 2007-2013, about 6 billion EUR or 2% of the EU budget were invested into culture, of which 2.9 billion went to the protection of the cultural heritage, 2.2 billion to cultural infrastructure and 797 million to the improvement of cultural services. This does not account for investments into culture made under various other headings, such as RTD and innovation, SMEs, the information society, tourism, urban regeneration and human capital. The challenge for 2014-2020 is to achieve more with less. The Commission wants a shift from heritage and sports infrastructure to cultural services, i.e. investments with sound economic rationale, though preservation of heritage will continue to be supported if underpinned by developmental strategy, for example of social inclusion (especially for marginalized communities). As with any other investment, investment into culture will be scrutinized for their intended results and therefore clear and measurable targets (even if the Commission realizes that for this sector it is a particular challenge). Though culture does not directly feature in the EU 2020 strategy, investments into culture are possible under six out of 11 thematic objectives (1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9).

Javier Hernández-Ros explained both the context of the app economy and the efforts of Commission to contribute to what he labelled as the 'societal memory of the future' through the use of the ICT technologies. The European app economy currently stands at the estimated 10 billion EUR value (in terms of the revenues; 22% of the world market). It generates about 800 thousand jobs of which 530 thousand are direct jobs (the further 60% of which are developers). According to the ENUMERATE Core survey of 2012, the current level of effort in the cultural sector in terms of digitization is as follows: 83 % of the European cultural organisations are involved in digital activities. However, so far only 20% of their collections have been digitized (42% in the arts museums, and only 4% of the national libraries).

This leads to the conclusion that digitization needs to be further supported. The remaining three challenges are improved accessibility of cultural content for re-use, innovation in the cultural and creative sector (through ICT technologies and a more favourable business environment) as well as long-term preservation, which amounts to preparing for the challenges of tomorrow (for example, preservation of the web, digital-only publications, social media which to a large extent have become single sources for the memory of today). The European Commission contributes to the development of new technologies applicable to the use of the cultural content (e.g. ICT for capturing, rendering and visualisation of resources, 3-G based site guidance and visitor systems and leading edge technologies (semantic tools, knowledge management and visual interfaces). For CCIs, the European Commission intends to facilitate ICT technology transfer from leading European research and innovation centres, support to innovation, virtual production technologies and creation of enabling tools for further cultural and creative experiences. Europeana (later on presented in detail by its director Jill Cousins) continues to be a priority as the leading European depository of digitalized cultural heritage. Several innovative applications were presented too, such as CultureClick, Digital storytelling and augmenting reality at the Acropolis museum, Historypin and the Mogao Grotters at Dunhuang, mainly to demonstrate the potential gaming solutions, which for the new generation is likely to be the dominant experience of the cultural content. In addition to the EU structural funds, which will make the digital solutions eligible for financing, three EU level programmes will be used as a funding source, namely, Horizon 2020, Creative Europe and Connecting Europe Facility (the latter for further development of Europeana). All in all, a triple challenge of completion of the preservation of material cultural heritage through digitization, turning it into a cultural service (offer) and managing and preserving huge amounts of currently generated digital memory.

The moderator of this part **Darius Žeruolis** started by summarising the intentions of the European Commission and asked the presenters to reflect on how the intentions of the European Commission match up to the new narrative. It seems that the European Commission only recently firmly established CCIs as a vehicle for growth (cf. Commissioner's address in the morning session). However, while much needed, in Prof. Sacco's terms, this is yesterday's issue (Culture 2.0). The issues of 'cultural welfare' (Culture 3.0) are not yet articulated as being of primary importance, though as part of developmental strategy could be supported by the European financial instruments (structural funds or EU programmes).

3.2 National Interventions

Vesna Čopič opened the second half of the session designed for responses by the EU member states, on the basis of a few examples to check whether national cultural policies are 'ready for future'. She noted that the last 20 years were quite good in terms of development of cultural standards. Therefore one way of looking at the challenge ahead would be about preservation of the good legacy of previous decades reflected in the 'distinctive European responsibility for culture'. From the very beginning, the concept of cultural responsibility was very closely related to the European concept of the nation state (or even was a part of it). It nevertheless went through many different shifts of labels. It started from the humanistic concept as 'arts policy'. The first policy shift was the shift from the democratisation of culture to cultural democracy, in other words, from policy aimed at giving ordinary people and periphery access to high culture to more socially oriented policy that declared cultural diversity as its political credo.



Co-funded by
the Culture Programme
of the European Union



EU2013.LT



MINISTRY OF CULTURE
OF THE REPUBLIC
OF LITHUANIA

Cultural industries discourse and the ensuing mercantilist language in European cultural policy was introduced by Thatcherism. It was first adopted by the Arts Council England to impress politicians, especially ministers of finances in order to talk 'the only language that government understood' or in the words of the British minister of culture of the early 1990s, 'to push the bottom that works'. Cultural industries expanded to creative industries (with a strong ICT dimension) with the advent of information and communication technologies. All these shifts of labels are not neutral. They both involve theoretical and political stakes as they introduced their own cultural policy rationales.

However, during the last decades we have been witnessing a double agenda. On the one hand, politicians want to make arts and culture less dependent on budgetary funds, on the other, the cultural lobby is doing everything in its power to preserve and protect the legitimacy of public funding of arts and culture. The short study completed just recently for the European Commission (Trends in Public Funding of Culture in EU) shows that the latter was more successful, at least until 2010 as public funds have been permanently increasing. Vesna Čopič then formulated a series of questions. Is this an evidence of supply driven cultural production resulting in oversupply which is not sustainable anymore? If this is the case, why then we do not focus on cultural policy itself and tackle the problem of finding balance between supply and demand driven cultural production, especially because in 2010 the budgetary trends changed – there have been cuts in the EU member states, sometimes outpacing the overall cut in public expenditure? Does it mean that the rhetoric of creative industries does not work anymore? Or is it just that more evidence of the economic power of culture needs to be generated? Echoing Prof. Wiesand's presentation in the key note section, she asked whether indeed culture is becoming a victim of its own attempt to switch to mercantilist language. If the only problem for disqualifying culture from the EU 2020 strategy were 'wrong language', then is this new (right) language about the horizontal value of culture, as has been already suggested during the conference? But is going 'horizontal' really a winning language for the programming of the EU structural assistance for 2014-2020. Vesna Čopič concluded that it is not cultural policy labels that matter, be it creative industries discourse or the horizontal approach to culture, but the preservation and protection of the integrity of culture and its own logic based on intrinsic value of culture and arts as the key for European responsibility for culture.

Ragnar Siil (Estonia) shared his insights from work in his home country and chairmanship of the working group of the EU member states' experts on making the creative industries strategies work. First, in echoing the Commissioner's statements about CCIs weathering the crisis rather well, he presented empirical evidence that this has been indeed so in Estonia. The growth of number of CCIs enterprises outpaced the national average both during 2003-2007 and 2007-2011; they have stayed profitable, but have become more fragmented (from 8.6 employees per enterprise in 2003 they went down to 4.1 in 2011). He noted existing differences in defining CCIs in Europe and observed that it is not just a statistical, but a political issue as well. The Nordic and Baltic countries tend to associate this sector with innovation and new technologies, the Central European and big EU member states speak of 'industries', while the Southern European countries mostly mean by it cultural tourism. In 2012, the EU Open Method of Co-ordination working group developed a guiding framework for the development of CCIs, addressing preconditions (aiming at a favourable environment for the development of CCIs), the strengthening of existing and newly developed CCIs (competitive and exporting creating enterprises) and spill-over effects (on the rest of economy and society). In a snapshot he referred to many examples of available good practices and yet many cities and governments do not use them enough. While answering the question why this is, he relied on his policy making experience when

being entrusted with 6 million EUR budget in 2005 and tasked with doing something great for the country and not wasting time on strategy writing.

Ramūnas Dilba (Lithuania) explained why culture has been explicitly named as one of the (eight) priorities in the long term development strategy Lithuania 2030 and its operational medium term derivative the National Progress Programme 2014-2020 which for implementation mobilises all available financial resources, including the Lithuanian envelope from the EU structural funds. He also joked that in this conference he was the only advocate of culture from the standpoint of the Ministries of Finance. He said that the case for investment in culture-led solutions for solving several acute problems faced by the Lithuanian society and state was convincing. This was already recognised by the European Commission too in the negotiations on the partnership agreement and operational programme. The problems at stake were low general levels of creativity, low trust in the institutions, insufficient civic engagement and national pride. He explained that the planned interventions will centre around two pillars, namely, the strengthening of creativity and cultural identity. The novelty for 2014-2020 will be a coordinated horizontal approach which will synthesise vertical (sectoral, exclusively cultural) and horizontal (inter-institutional) implementation and funding approaches. 4% of the EU structural funding to Lithuania has been earmarked for culture. The value of culture as a driver for economic growth and social cohesion has been recognized. However, due to the limited funding opportunities to the sector in the past and limited evidence (EU wide, not just nationally) capacity will still have to be built and experimentation will be needed. It is hoped that EU funding will act as an important policy stabilizer, as it has been in other new EU member states.

Within the overall theme of the combination of central and local public finances for culture, **Clas-Uno Frykholm** (Sweden) presented a new model of co-operation between the central and regional level in culture introduced by the government of Sweden in 2011 and applied to all 21 regions except one (Stockholm) which decided not to join. The basic idea behind the plan is that the government transfers the central budget for culture to regions on the basis of regional cultural development plans, which in line with the old Nordic tradition are developed through the close consultation of all stakeholders and in addition is agreed with one of the central national cultural agencies – the Swedish Arts Council. In exchange for receiving the central transfer, the regions commit themselves to contributing to certain central cultural policy objectives as covered by the regional cultural development plan, although the priorities set by the regions remain untouched (it very much resembles, though with fewer strings attached, the negotiated partnership agreements between the European Commission and the member states over the use of the EU structural funds). The outcome and feelings in general so far have been mostly positive thanks to the better visibility of the regions, though so far there has been very little change in the way the resources are actually allocated. However, suspicions and fears remain about the increasing central controls with possibly hidden agendas for slashing of expenditures in the future by the state on culture, thus turning the previous ‘suitcase’ into a ‘briefcase’. It is not clear whether such model would survive in the circumstances of declining financing, as it is rather easy to agree when the expenditures on culture have been incessantly growing during the last ten years or so by (a combined 25% during that period). On the other hand, the decentralisation of budgetary capital to culture is leading to better capacity at the local level and even more (from the already high level) of cross-sectoral partnerships and co-operation.

Pierre Lescure (France) explained how the well-known policy of cultural exceptionalism formulated in France in the 1980s should be adapted and sustained in the new circumstances during the digital shift (technological change). He elaborated on several propositions which he recently authored in the report entitled The Cultural Exception – Act 2. Contribution to Cultural Policies in the Digital Era



(commissioned by the French government). Cultural exceptionalism is the position, that due to the ethical, social and political dimension of culture and its contribution to the system of values, it deserves special regulatory treatment (and funding) which may not coincide with that of the market economy. Due to technological change, such a position must be revisited in order to find ways to ensure what he labelled to be the balance between demand (users of cultural content) and supply (artists and other creative professionals) in the cultural sphere. Thus exceptionalism is not protectionism, but rather a way of balancing interests. The re-balancing must proceed from the understanding that cultural policy is nowadays not just another branch of digital policy, but a policy geared at ensuring creativity. New regulatory measures are necessary in the area of author's rights in order to ensure fair remuneration (which is now being pushed away from the authors), taxation (to dismantle tax havens for commercial giants), against piracy and illegal downloading (could be based on self-regulatory initiatives, such as in the USA), as well as the protection of cultural works. Authors and their interests should remain at the centre of such policy – they should decide on the conditions for the use and reproduction of their works. European cultural policy should not be subordinated to the requirements of international (free) trade. A new regulatory environment is needed for convergence of media too, for example, to ensure the neutrality of technology in order to avoid the dominance of one supplier.

4. Tracing the Evidence in Public Interventions for Culture

This session consisted of one plenary presentation and four parallel evidence gathering thematic blocks. Introductory remarks were offered by **Arūnas Bėkšta** (Lithuania). He presented and explained an input-output scheme, which could be used to analyse effectiveness and for efficiency of any system, including culture.

Input is where we normally feel comfortable when measuring, because the object is clear: finances, human resources and other tangible components plugged into the system. This is where politicians always think that they are putting in too much into culture. The question is how much is too much and how little is not enough to produce any valuable outputs?

When inputs are being processed (transformed) into outputs, politicians often lapse into restructuring thinking. They think that the new structures (created by them) will necessarily work better (than those established before them) and produce intended outputs. Have we ever measured how much all those reorganizations and restructurings cost and whether they influenced efficiency at all?

In fact all systems produce two kinds of outputs. Should one analyse how much the outputs depend on the quantity and quality of the input? To which output is our system tuned? How do we recognize outputs which are valuable for us? Are we measuring indicators which we need or just indicators which we know how to measure?

We hope that our cultural activities will have at least some influence on those who are outside the system (the wider society). This is the most difficult thing to measure. Here one wonders whether the big data (the topic of the presentation to follow) can help us solve this problem?

When finally generated, the data need to be used for policy making. How exactly is it being done when done? And what is the focus of our investments in culture?

Professors **Paul Moore** and **Anthony Lilley** (UK) delivered a presentation on the potential of so-called big data for cultural institutions. They noted that social impact is notoriously difficult to measure. On the other hand, following Einstein's well-known statement, 'not everything that counts can be counted, and that not everything that can be counted, counts'. Their question was whether technology in the network society is changing what we measure and how. Their basic proposition was that big data (implicitly understood as generated by web traffic) will not necessarily change the arts and culture, but bigger (based on peer to peer activity) will. Then the definitions of data were presented according to what was called the data maturity spectrum (ranging from Data 1.0 to Data 3.0). In Data 1.0, existing ways are digitalised. Data 2.0 takes the new forms of data (as generated by web traffic). Finally, Data 3.0 reflect the fundamental shift to peer to peer activity. When thinking about the impact of availability of new data and its plug into the policy process, it is important first to answer the question what is happening to data. A shift is occurring from a small and controlled landscape of data ownership (e.g. by broadcasters) into open but very complex big data vectors characterised by volume (i.e. large quantities of data), variety (of kinds of data) and velocity (data become 'live'). Thus capturing the data at regular intervals (as previously) is not enough.

A shift is occurring (as explained by Prof. Sacco) in perception of culture and creativity, which are no longer simply commodities, but rather conceived as everyday experience. How can it be measured? Though Prof. Moore does not believe that everything can be measured, but because at the end of the day the cultural sectors will be asked for proof anyway, he thinks that instead of staying on the side lines it is better to have a say about how to measure and what to measure. Prof. Moore then presented the technological and social challenges of the future. Many of them are exciting but not certain. It is in some ways frightening to the current generation to think that about 65% of students at some point of their lives will work in jobs which do not yet exist. The invention of the smart phone and its impact on our lives could be compared to what for the previous generation the landing of the astronaut Armstrong on the moon was in 1969. And yet we seldom think about the power of smart phones, partly because we got used to them so quickly and because they became so inexpensive. The smart phone enables data 3.0. Digital is yesterday. Cash generated at the ticket box (i.e. the economics side) is not everything. The feelings of customers about services are important and are the driving force.

Big data provides the glue to all these trends as it offers three possibilities for measurement, namely 'macro' (the measurement of exactitude, i.e. scale and breadth), 'granular' (or the statistical measurement of certain characteristics) and 'curation' (i.e. the movement away from causation, still often considered to be 'pure' measurement) to the identification of patterns, links, and correlations, or the 'analysis of sentiment'. Big data enables us to expand our analysis which so far would normally be limited to testing a small number of hypotheses formulated before data collection to make sense of broad patterns, i.e. to 'letting the data speak,' and reveal hidden connections (such as in the example of research at the intersection of natural language processing, machine learning, and cognitive science by Deb Roy of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Media Lab ('Birth of a Word')).

Professors Moore and Lilley then went on to present conclusions of their recent report on big data ('Counting what counts: what big data could do for the cultural sector'), mainly the obstacles and challenges existing in the cultural sector to take advantage of the big or bigger data. The advancement of work on big data is pioneered by the marketing and advertisement sectors. But big data has social value, which is not yet sufficiently appreciated by the cultural field. There is little understanding of how the network economy works, i.e. if one is not paying for the product, one is the product. Crucially, despite a lot of normative talking (conceptualizing the potential) and advocacy already for three to

four years now, there have been no serious attempts to use big data for the cultural sector. Therefore, prototyping experiments are needed and the two presenters announced that Arts Council England will finance several such endeavours which will send data scientists into cultural institutions to help them uncover the potential of the data they are sitting on. And last but not least, the HIPPOs (highest paid person's opinion) need to be formed. Policy makers need to be shown the benefits to actually use such data for policy making.

The conference then moved to four thematically designed parallel sessions, all looking at various projects (case studies) and analysing them against a set of the following four elements:

- Explanation of innovation and the logic of intervention;
- Results achieved and evidence of impact;
- The prospects of sustainability and the possibility of replication in other countries/contexts;
- If any: good practices in the project set-up and management as well as evidence collection;
- If relevant: explanation of inter-sectorial co-operation and factors behind its success.

4.1 Creation of Demand for Culture: Creative Partnerships for Schools and Museums

In her presentation on museums as social learning spaces for knowledge creation, **Ida Brændholt Lundgaard** (Denmark) highlighted the importance of research from the users' (customers') perspective for museums which should inform educational programmes. The Danish project carried out a survey to explore the learning potential of museums. Through annual national user surveys Danish museums get feedback on their contribution to education and learning. The results of the recent survey have been disappointing in terms of reaching the target audiences. A recent survey found that young people are underrepresented and one third of museum visitors have academic backgrounds. This finding is disappointing in terms of the cultural and educational mission of museums as public spaces. Thus, the Danish project addresses the issue of education and learning in museums, making for rethinking museum spaces and exhibition curation. Pedagogical (didactic) competences in the scientific context are developed through partnerships between museums and schools.

Based on the Danish experience, Ida Brændholt Lundgaard offered three sets of recommendations (to museums, individuals and society/the community). In her opinion, modern museums should develop into learning organizations that build on strategic resource development of staff diversity, invest in the staff's specialized knowledge including their pedagogical competence, challenge the institutional assumptions of its staff and create learning partnerships with citizens and private / public institutions, including schools.

Milda Laužikaitė (Lithuania) presented insights from the project 'Creative Partnerships', which is in the third year of implementation in Lithuania. The project is based on the UK's expertise and transferred to the national scale in Lithuania. At this stage 97 schools (about 10% of the total number) are actively involved. The project has made progress in terms of its shift to learning through reflecting on the

learning process. Creative learning, which is at the core of the project activities, happens through the interchange of experience and design. It is meant to help schools with overcoming challenges and changing perspectives. The project has already collected 'hard' evidence of the impact on positive individual and institutional changes through an intense emotional and authentic experience, which primarily adds to the participants' confidence. Some schools involved report better attendance, improved marks for learning achievements, and better discipline.

The main areas of impact on pupils behaviour are confidence, motivation to learn, creative skills and habits of mind; on teachers - approaches to the abilities of all children, understanding the meaning of creative approaches and methods in the classroom, understanding of reflection and evaluation as a tool for improvement and learning, and improving teaching practice; on schools - development of schools as reflective and learning communities.

Sybillie Linke (Germany) introduced the insights from a similar project being implemented in Germany, where in five federal states schools work with cultural agents. The German project involves 138 schools that applied for getting a cultural agent and a budget to implement activities. The project is long-term and relies on social partnerships through local organizations which advise cultural agents on the regional level. Project activities are cross-discipline, based on access and participation and sustainable partnerships. The long lasting process for moderated change should develop audiences of tomorrow and today for cultural institutions. The project has its own targets and instruments for sustainability, and institutions should see their role and plan extra time for achieving the goals. The project aims at partnerships between schools and cultural institutions to become part of everyday life in schools, as well as the schools acquiring ability to develop a cultural profile. Also, the project aims at capacity building for the schools in developing know how to organize cultural projects, to apply for funding and to find suitable local partners, as well as experience sharing between the culture agent schools and other schools.

Vilma Bačkiūtė (moderator, Lithuania) concluded by noting that such moderated creative partnerships and investment pay off even if the change happens at the individual rather than the institutional level. The education institutions struggle with measuring competences as opposed to technical skills and subject knowledge, but the demands of the modern world require education systems to rethink their education strategies. Educators and the cultural sector need to rise to the expectations of more ambitious aims to educate and develop members of society who can build a better future not only in terms of economic growth, but also in terms of human values and sustainability. Thus, mediators from outside the formal education system, such as creative and cultural agents can bring in a welcome different perspective. Still, all need to learn how to plan, implement and measure success.

4.2 Re-Positioning of Context for Cultural Services: Libraries, Culture Houses and Community Participation

Three presentations were delivered to show the potential of libraries and cultural houses for local development and community participation. **Vesna Čopič** (Slovenia, the moderator) noted that the debate about the economic and image impact very often overshadows the real power of culture as a marker of a significant qualitative change in society. It is too often forgotten that libraries and cultural houses represent the largest subsectors of local public funding of culture which puts them in the centre of the current cultural policy realities marked by globalisation, European integration,

institutional fatigue, dominance of creative industries rhetoric and shrinking public subsidies. How to valorise the impacts of culture on development? Are the methodologies which are available feasible at all? Is this a key aspect of culture and development connections?

Kęstutis Juškevičius (Lithuania) delivered a presentation entitled 'Libraries for Innovation': the new role of libraries in the digital age as a model for emulation and continuation in 2014-2020'. It presented an assessment of the impact of several outreach campaigns in Lithuanian libraries, for example, the 'E-senior' campaign, inviting people to come to the library for a live internet broadcast lecture on how to find information about health, savings, and entertainment online; the 'Internet for Your Garden' campaign, inviting people to come to the library and watch live internet broadcast lectures about gardening and other upcoming seasonal activities; and the 'First Time Online? Let's Do It!' campaign, inviting people to come to public libraries and try to use the internet for the very first time. Mostly on the basis of comparison of data between the years 2008 and 2011 the presenter estimated that the librarians became much more pro-active promoters and trainers; that the number of residents who participated in IT training has grown rapidly; that the use of e-services in rural areas of Lithuania reached the level of urban areas; and that the image of libraries in society has significantly improved. The presentation employed descriptive graphical analysis and claimed that the effects displayed on the graphs are the consequence of the outreach campaigns.

Kristīne Pabērza (Latvia) gave a presentation on 'The boundaries of public library services redefined: evidence of social and economic potential in Latvia'. It was mainly the summary of the report of the larger study on the 'Economic value and impact of public libraries in Latvia'. It presented mainly descriptive data on public libraries in Latvia. An interesting piece of information was the dramatic rise in the number of users. The study estimated the economic impact of public libraries in Latvia by using the contingent valuation method (CVM) in a very innovative and interesting way. However, the study made a jump from estimating economic value to estimating economic impact. According to the moderator of the session Vesna Čopič, the question is if it is possible to do it only on the basis of the willingness-to-pay since this is not the only benefit to society from public libraries. If one does not take into account, for example, the effects on new employment, revenues and incomes, value added and other important elements, then the more appropriate term is economic value and not economic impact.

In the final presentation, **Péter Inkei** (Hungary) presented a case for cultural houses (his presentation was entitled 'Culture Houses: The Cinderella in European Cultural Policies'). In it he presented the phenomenon of 'culture houses' as institutions present in almost every European country, yet almost completely neglected in discussions about cultural policy on the national but also and mainly on the international level. Besides, there are significant terminological differences in the different parts of the EU, as well as different perceptions of their role which very often result from different ideological origins. He showed that more than one third of all resources in Poland go to such institutions and that it is the largest subsector of local financing of culture, followed by the libraries. He extensively presented the example of Poland with a comparison of data on the financing of different cultural institutions in this country. In the second part this presentation addressed different aspects of culture houses, such as culture houses as institutions, their activities and functions, the employees, governance, challenges and risks, the rationale and responsibility. The presentation raises many possibilities for future work in this area and at the same time points to the need to recognise this topic as relevant for a future research and conferences.

In the opinion of Vesna Čopič, the session opened up two main questions, namely, the valuation of the impact of libraries and cultural phenomena in general, and culture houses as a neglected aspect of the cultural policy. On the first question it can be summarised that both presentations provided a very interesting descriptive analysis, but a more elaborate and robust statistical perspective would be needed to be able to answer the questions of (economic, social, etc.) impact in a more convincing way. On the second question, Péter Inkei opened up an interesting aspect of cultural policy, but it remains open as the problem was only raised and has not been resolved.

4.3 Heritage and Conversion of Buildings/Spaces for Innovative Cultural and Social Use

Erminia Sciacchitano (Italy) delivered a presentation about placing people at the heart of heritage policy in Italy. Statistical data indicate the decrease of both international and local visitors in Italian museums. This creates a twofold challenge of raising the quality of service and improvement of communication with potential visitors. Despite the fact that Italian museums possess perhaps the richest and most impressive collections in Europe, they nevertheless lately are slowly abandoning their previously leading positions due to administrative conservatism and a lack of knowledge as to how to approach potential customers, arouse their interest and meet their expectations. One possible solution, namely, a case study of an expert's / curator's work in one of the national museum in Naples was presented (marketing was not analysed much in the presentation). A three-year work study by the museum curators with visitors allowed museum experts and administrators to inspire the museum's administration and curators to open up to a more critical perception of their professional work, as well as to an acknowledgment of the need to communicate with potential customers, also through new means of communication and technologies. Through this changed approach the social value of heritage was rediscovered.

Przemysław Niedźwiecki (Poland) gave a presentation on the idea of creative cities as a source for shaping urban space with the help of EU investment. He presented an overview of the restoration, renovation and conversion of historic buildings in Warsaw, Lublin, Poznan and Torun. He described the needs for public cultural services in these cities and stressed the recognised necessity (by the general public) of the restoration and regeneration of historic (registered) properties by their adaptation for new uses. He also described the experience of the government in communication with the local urban communities in order to define joint socio-cultural interests and priorities. The conversion of historic buildings for modern use was assessed in the light of their importance to the city's (sometimes even national) history, as well as urban contemporary cultural welfare and economic competitiveness. The case of the new Copernicus Science Centre in Warsaw was presented as an innovative experience in the public promotion of scientific progress and technologies, especially in order to attract young people into the world of science. The presentation was concluded by reminding that the immovable cultural heritage in Poland, in the same way as in most European countries, remains a fundamental resource for future cultural, social and economic (re)development as well as a sustainability denominator of the development itself.

Architect **Luciano Cupelloni** (Italy) presented the case of the conversion of an industrial heritage complex into a multifunctional centre. The slaughter house built in 1891 in the central district of Rome (Testaccio) stood abandoned for more than a decade, but in 1979 started to be used for exhibitions, parties and concerts by the local community. Due to its central location and therefore perfect accessibility, the quality of construction and architecture of the building, the Municipality of Rome

initiated the re-planning and conversion of this historical facility. It was done through cooperation between the Municipality of Rome, Sapienza University, and the Art Academy of Fine Arts of Rome. New cultural institutions (such as, for example, the Contemporary Art Museum „Macro Future“, the Media Production Centre at the Art Academy of Fine Arts, the Faculty of Architecture of Sapienza University and the Popular Music School of Testaccio) found their homes and successfully commenced their activities there in the newly founded City of Arts. Further to this, in 2005 several youth associations working in bio-agriculture and trade were given permission by the Municipality of Rome to develop an Alternative Economy City at the same complex. This case demonstrates how intangible socio-cultural capabilities and intangible physical historic relicts could be put together, be socially and economically revived and through proper and innovative management generate economic and social urban value.

Moderator **Gediminas Rutkauskas** (Lithuania) summed up the session by stating that the three cases of heritage and conversion from different contexts demonstrated the generation of social and economic value. Relevant planning, conversion, functional adaptation based on the needs of modern publics, and the exploitation of cultural heritage properties could inspire and bring a new life to stagnating urban environments. The tangible cultural heritage therefore should not be managed by heritage experts or managers exclusively. Rather it should be (re) analysed and (re-)valued by sociologists, economists, urban planners and developers, and local residents too.

Communication still needs to be better employed in the promotion and management of cultural heritage. In a rapidly changing communication environment, messaging based on purely expert knowledge appears to be just too narrow. Innovative means of communication and technologies need to be cultivated. All three presentations underscored the great importance of communication and cooperation (social interaction) between local communities and institutions. Consequently, the quality of regenerated cultural heritage very much depends on the capacity of cultural property managers to enrich their professional perceptions through social dialogue with the local communities and contribution to addressing the socio-economic needs of communities.

4.4 Access to Culture through Digital Shift: from Digital Preservation to Demand for Digital Content

Jill Cousins (executive director of Europeana Foundation) presented the developments of Europeana, the European digital library of cultural content. According to her, Europeana positions itself as a large-scale depository of digital cultural content. The value of Europeana is that it aggregates vast collections and makes them available for re-use in diverse sectors like business, including creative industries, education, research, etc. In order to encourage the re-use of Europeana collections, it engages in collaborative work with various communities of potential re-users of content. Europeana does not consider its portal to be a direct destination for end-users but rather a large-scale depository available for the development of a variety of services and products.

Paul Manwaring (creative director of Glimwork, a private company dealing with the development of mobile applications and services) analysed the demand for collaboration between the private and public sectors to develop attractive cultural products and services in the digital environment. He illustrated such collaboration by the example of Vistory, which is an interactive application for mobile devices enabling users to explore cultural heritage objects and find appropriate audiovisual

information for specific objects at different locations. According to him, the app market is so much saturated that the further development of cultural apps is attractive only through public-private partnerships.

James Davies (programme manager of global operations at the Google Art Project) presented the activities and organisational model of the Google Cultural Institute which deals with projects aimed at developing digital cultural content and services. For projects with the participation of the Google Cultural Institute, the cultural institutions supply the content while Google applies cutting-edge technology and experience in publishing and organizing digital cultural content in attractive ways for end-users. No monetary transactions happen either end. He also demonstrated several examples of this cutting edge technology and available analytical tools to track the use of the content.

In her summary moderator **Zinaida Manžuch** (Vilnius University) stated that the discussion inspired by the presentations revolved around the existing obstacles for the further improvement of digital initiatives in the public sector, such as copyright issues (of which many cultural institutions are not sometimes aware or too afraid), the lack of motivation of cultural institutions to collaborate and open their collections for re-use as well as the absence of mechanisms to involve small and medium enterprises in the production of digital cultural content. The session also discussed the problem of developing attractive cultural services for existing digitalised cultural collections. The current state of digital cultural collections were deemed to be insufficiently user-friendly and at times hardly understandable thus functioning as 'warehouses'. The question of the role of cultural institutions in digital content production was raised too, namely, if they are still mere curators of valuable collections or their role should be expanded to interpretation and active engagement in the development of educational, research and other applications serving particular user needs.

5. Summary and conclusions

Instead of a summary, Prof. **Andreas Johannes Wiesand** sketched several elements of what he labelled to be a potential European business plan of culture. He built on his earlier remark that if 'one does not have good songs, business plans would not help'. After the conference, he was ready to qualify this statement by saying that 'when good songs exist, a business plan would certainly help'. In his view, such a plan should consist of the following: (i) recognition of complexity of the task (which was obvious, given the diversity of presentations), (ii) addressing the need for working in partnerships across boundaries and cross-sectors, (iii) strategy and process orientation to encompass medium term perspective and taking account of the necessary time and resources needed for achievement of results and (iv) oriented towards securing more respect and recognition of the cultural sector.

On behalf of the Lithuanian Presidency of the EU Council, **Eglė Saudargaitė** drew conclusions. She explained how the conference agenda was related to the ongoing work on cultural policy at the EU level. The plan of the three Presidencies (Irish, Lithuanian and Greek) in the area of culture was to demonstrate culture's contribution to job creation and growth, mainly through the cultural and creative industries and also to social cohesion. The conference followed up on the work done by the previous EU presidencies in particular the Cyprus Presidency and its Council conclusions on cultural governance. Finally, the conference reflected on the many issues of recent European Commission communications, especially on promoting the cultural and creative sectors for growth and jobs in the European Union.

The conference presentations and discussion demonstrated once again that policy measures and instruments to count culture and to take culture into account and to integrate them further into other policy fields have to be reinforced. Therefore, the Presidency highlighted four particular outcomes of the Conference.

First, there is a strong acknowledgement of the success of horizontal strategies designating culture-related investment. Therefore policy makers responsible for national development strategies and in particular in the areas of innovation and regional development should be encouraged to mobilize cultural and creative assets. During such mobilisation, the logic of interventions should balance investments into cultural infrastructure with the development of services, cultural activities and human resources.

Second, strategies have to be anchored in the reliable system of indicators and on this point many EU countries have still to do a lot. While not everything can be counted, cultural policy makers and institutions, working together, should not be afraid of aiming at evidence, especially for interventions going beyond the boundaries of the cultural sector. Otherwise the effects of the interventions in culture for economic development and social cohesion will not be tested.

Third, partnerships and trans-sectoral co-operation have to be further strengthened and elaborated. The Presidency invited policy makers and professionals from different fields to participate in this conference. Financial experts, sociologists, regional development experts, lawyers, educators, digital experts offered their solutions to the challenges faced by the cultural and creative sectors. The discussion showed that players in the social, education, industry and business sectors could find it attractive to work in partnership to develop better, innovative cultural products and services.

Fourth, the culture and creative sectors will become more competitive only through capacity and know-how building of the actors in the cultural sector. There were numerous examples provided during the conference. Insufficient skills competences in management, marketing, ICT, and finances could become a major problem for the participation of the cultural and creative sectors in the new financing programmes and schemes, so well described by the European Commission. This needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.

It was fitting to conclude by noting that in their chronologically simultaneous informal meeting in Vilnius the EU Ministers of Culture reflected too on the issues addressed by the conference agenda and endorsed the Lithuanian EU Presidency statement which calls on the Member States and the European Commission to make efforts for the culture and creative sectors to be addressed properly by strategies and planning documents at all levels.

III. Assessment through participant observation

This assessment makes a strict measurement of conference proceedings against what the presenters were asked by the organizers to reflect upon, namely, the new narrative of cultural policy, the needed interventions to support it and good evidence generating projects. It therefore leaves out assessment of various other interesting and valuable contributions which are noted in the full synthesis of conference proceedings in the second part of this report.

The conference was opened up by two arguments. First, Professor Pierre Luigi Sacco gave a strong argument in favor of investment into culture as ‘social software’ which in the digital age creates communities of meaning. This does not replace earlier regimes of culture governed by public patronage of cultural production and a market mediated system of mass culture advanced by copyright laws. The three regimes will continue to coexist (and consequently financial interventions and regulatory policies will not fully merge to support them). However, the third regime is increasingly important, as it is becoming the dominant medium not only for creating and consuming culture, but also for its potential of social mobilization, providing meaning to participants of such communities and a contribution to economic development. In short, the effects of the digital shift are social, technological, economic and political (perhaps in that sequence of triggering). This needs a new cultural policy.

Second, Professor László Bruszt demonstrated the need for cultural policy which cares for common reference points, identity creation and aspiration generation at the local level as the key and still missing element for sustainable indigenous development in many European countries. EU structural funds so far failed to achieve this goal. They created the organizational basis for local development, but failed to create the ‘people’ who would meaningfully relate to it and in the longer run would be able to define a developmental agenda, mobilise resources and politicize developmental issues on their own. While the EU cannot change national institutions, through investing into culture it can facilitate the birth of the regions with their true meaning, namely the people with similar aspirations, common references and identities.

The general analytical conclusion following the conference is that ‘readiness for tomorrow’ in the cultural policy field is not obvious. By and large the cultural sector continues to speak to itself and still does not lend itself well to quality comparative analysis. This is not to suggest that nothing is happening in adjusting to the digital shift and employing culture for the needs of (social and economic) development. However, if the evidence generated in the conference should be taken as representative, this adjustment is spurious, more by accident than by design and still on a small scale only. There is an almost universal adjustment to the new narrative, but it looks like it is mostly rhetorical. Yes, there are variations between member states. For example, the presentations of Prof. Andreas Wiesand of the ERICarts Institute (Germany) and Ragnar Siil (Estonian Ministry of Culture) clearly demonstrate the variation in the funding of cultural policy, the ability to anchor culture horizontally (‘transversally’) in relation to other sectors, and to promote cultural and creative industries as a driving force. But little if anything can be yet said about the reasons for these variations and different degrees of success. Somewhat paradoxically, better evidence is needed to be generated not just on the impact (contribution) of culture, but also cultural policy making, as a response of the member states during the panel was purely ethnocentric or normative while data available on cultural policy in the Compendium for Cultural Policies do not allow for good comparisons and inferences

about policy makings to be made. Thus, the view that country specific organizational factors are the best explanatory elements of cultural policy (as explained by Prof. Wiesand) cannot be tested.

As evidenced by the presentations and debate in the political panel of the conference, the European Commission will move forward on culture. Apart for 'slow, but nevertheless progress' in the area of audiovisual and copyright regulations (which was not part of this conference theme), there will be more funding (9%) for the Creative Europe 2014-2020 programme, a wider set of instruments available to ensure better access to finance (e.g. bank guarantees for loans to the cultural sector from 2016), and sustained financing and promotion of evidence generation in culture through research and statistical work. Yet even these efforts are not universally supported by the member states, for example in establishing a common statistical platform based on the work of the ESSnet-Culture working group. The Commission is unlikely to escape the straightjacket of the Treaties and expects only a muddling through and will comfort itself, as it did during the conference that 'Rome was not built in a day'. The European Commission does have more leverage vis-à-vis the member states when negotiating the programmes to implement European Union structural funds. As it is known and was widely criticized by the representatives of the sector and the European Parliament, culture does not figure in the EU2020 competitiveness strategy as a direct priority and therefore is only complementing other priorities. There will be a strong emphasis on investments generating direct economic returns (e.g. CCI). Investment into 'social inclusion' will be accepted, especially for disadvantaged groups and minorities. However, the need to promote social cohesion in certain member states far exceeds what is conventionally understood by social inclusion in the EU. It looks like such a type of investment will be accepted by the European Commission, but not necessarily promoted – a clear mismatch between the general thesis of the conference and what is being planned. While contemplating investments into digital culture, the Commission seems to be preoccupied by the unfinished agenda of the preservation of existing material (tangible) objects of culture (only 20% of cultural heritage objects have been digitized so far, and just 4% of library volumes), the daunting task of finding solutions to preserving digital production and other global issues. It finances many interesting projects addressing the digital shift (and will approve expenditures from structural funds in this area). However, in order to respond to the needs of Culture 3.0, the demand side (the service part) should be emphasized more than it is now. For example, it was confirmed that Europeana functions only as a depository of digitized objects and needs applications for its materials to be aggregated and made ready for either individual consumption or education purposes. However, it is expected that these applications will surface from the market or user community.

Evidence-based cultural policy making is facing three issues. First, more could be done to improve statistical standards for the collection of data about culture and for doing it in a way suitable for comparative analysis. Second, as the effects of culture are often indirect, 'strict' data should be complemented by qualitative evidence. On both counts the sector should do more. Third, the potential of using the big data for culture is not yet fully tapped, even though it fits well with the Culture 3.0 paradigm (data are defined through peer to peer activity). While there is a clear demonstration of where it could be used, the first experiments are only starting now. And to date they are more driven by cultural entrepreneurs than by policy makers.

'Readiness for tomorrow' amounts to recognition, putting this in the words of the conference speakers, that 'digital (or, for that matter, CCI) as the pivot for cultural policy is yesterday'. Traditional and digital elements of culture, of course, remain important parts of cultural policy, but no longer at the forefront. Beyond experimentation, there is little or no evidence about the systematic pursuit of this recognition at the member state or European Union level.