



EUROPEAN CAPITAL  
OF CULTURE

**Selection of the  
European Capital of Culture  
in 2021 in Romania**

**The Selection Panel's report  
Pre-Selection Stage**

**Bucharest  
January 2016**

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
Panel Meeting .....	2
Assessments of the candidates .....	3
Alba Iulia .....	4
Arad .....	6
Baia Mare .....	7
Bacău.....	9
Braşov .....	10
Brăila .....	11
Bucharest .....	12
Cluj-Napoca .....	14
Craiova .....	15
Iaşi .....	17
Sfântu Gheorghe.....	18
Suceava .....	19
Târgu Mureş.....	20
Timișoara .....	21
Recommendations .....	23
Elections June 2016 .....	23
General .....	23
ECOC and Cultural Strategy .....	24
European Dimension .....	24
Cultural and Artistic programme.....	25
Capacity to deliver .....	26
Outreach .....	26
Management .....	26

---

## Introduction

This is the report of the selection panel (the “panel”) for the pre-selection phase for the competition for the European Capital of Culture in 2021 in Romania.

The Ministry of Culture of Romania (the “ministry”) is the managing authority of the competition which is governed by:

Decision 445/2014/EU of the European Parliament and the Council of 16 April 2014 (the “Decision”)<sup>1</sup> and

Rules of procedure – Competition of the European Capital of Culture in Romania in 2021 – (the “Rules”) signed by the Romanian Minister of Culture on 10 December 2014 and published on the Ministry’s website<sup>2</sup>.

A panel of 12 independent experts was established for the selection process in line with Article 2 of the Rules. Ten members were appointed by the European Union institutions and bodies (European Parliament, Council, Commission and the Committee of Regions). Two members were appointed by the ministry.

The competition is in two phases: pre-selection (shortlisting) and selection. The ministry issued a call for applications on 10 December 2014. Fourteen applications were submitted by the closing date of 10 October 2015:

**Alba Iulia, Arad, Baia Mare, Bacău, Braşov, Brăila, Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Craiova, Iaşi, Sfântu Gheorghe, Suceava, Timişoara and Târgu Mureş**

The bidbooks of the candidates are available, in Romanian and English, on the ministry’s website<sup>3</sup>.

## Panel Meeting

The panel met in Bucharest on 7-10 December 2015. The panel elected Steve Green as its chair and Raluca Velisar as vice-chair. All panel members signed a declaration of no conflict of interest and confidentiality. Representatives of the European Commission and the Ministry attended as observers. These observers took no part in the panel’s deliberations or decision.

At the meeting each candidate, in alphabetical order, presented their case (in 45 minutes) and answered questions from the panel members (in 45 minutes). Each delegation consisted of up to ten members.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L\\_.2014.132.01.0001.01.ENG](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2014.132.01.0001.01.ENG)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.capitalaculturala2021.ro/>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.capitalaculturala2021.ro/noutati\\_doc\\_22\\_dosarele-oraselor-ale-caror-candidaturi-au-fost-acceptate\\_pg\\_0.htm](http://www.capitalaculturala2021.ro/noutati_doc_22_dosarele-oraselor-ale-caror-candidaturi-au-fost-acceptate_pg_0.htm)

---

At a press conference on 11 December 2015 the chair of the panel announced the panel's unanimous recommendation that the Minister invite the following cities to submit revised bids for final selection (in alphabetical order):

Baia Mare, Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca and Timișoara

### **Next Steps**

The ministry will arrange for the formal approval of the shortlist based on this report (Article 8 of the Decision). The ministry will then issue an invitation to these cities to submit revised applications for final selection.

The shortlisted cities should take into account the assessments and recommendations of the panel in this report.

The deadline for submission of revised applications is **1700hrs 12 August 2016**.

The final selection meeting will be held in Bucharest on **15-16 September 2016**.

Two to four members of the panel will pay a one-day visit to the shortlisted cities shortly before the meeting to obtain more background information. Representatives of the European Commission and the ministry will accompany the panel members as observers.

### **Thanks**

The panel members would like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved in this pre-selection phase of the competition.

In particular the panel noted that this is the first time cities in Romania have developed specific cultural strategies. This is already a significant potential legacy of the ECOC competition. The panel encourages all cities, not just those short-listed, to continue with the development and implementation of their strategy.

The panel thanks all fourteen bidding candidates and everyone who contributed to their bids; the European Commission for their advice and the Minister of Culture and his staff for their excellent administration.

### **Assessments of the candidates**

In their assessment of the candidates the panel noted the general and specific objectives in Article 2 of the Decision and the requirement for the application to be based on a cultural programme with a strong European dimension created specifically for the title (Article 4).

The panel assessed each bid against the six criteria in Article 5:

- Contribution to the long term strategy of the city
- European dimension
- Cultural and artistic content

- 
- Capacity to deliver
  - Outreach
  - Management

The panel noted that several candidates had not yet completed the formal approval of their cultural strategy or bid at city council level. The panel sought advice from the European Commission who confirmed from previous competitions that full approval was not mandatory at this stage of the completion. However it is mandatory at final selection. Bids at that stage will not be considered if full council approval of the cultural strategy and the bid is not made before the submission of the bid.

In the commentaries which follow the panel notes the main elements of their discussions. In the case of the four shortlisted cities specific recommendations are made to assist them in their preparation of the final bidbooks. There are also recommendations which apply to all the shortlisted cities.

The panel commended the ministry for publishing the bidbooks on their website before the start of the pre-selection meeting. This is a positive step and the panel hopes this will also apply to the bidbooks of the shortlisted cities at final selection.

The panel emphasise that their assessments of the candidates was based on the proposed programme set out in the bidbook and presentation session. A city's history, its recent and current policies, and cultural offer may form a basis for a programme but play no part in the selection process.

### **Alba Iulia**

Alba Iulia presented their bid under the theme of "The Other Capital". The aim is to build on the successful restoration of the Citadel and increasing the momentum behind heritage restoration, cultural tourism and the development of culture in the city. The programme has four directions: Revisiting Cultures, the Heart of a Multicultural Europe, Sharing the City and Connecting the Dots.

The proposed budget is €13.6m of which €9.1m would be allocated for programme expenditure.

The bid has the full support of the municipality.

During the presentation the panel learned that the cultural strategy and ECOC bid were developed at the same time to ensure consistency. The panel noted the recent impressive development of the use of public space as a stage for cultural events and happenings notably open air festivals, especially in the Citadel. These will form the central element of the ECOC concept and programme. Moreover there is an intention to revive the city neighbourhoods outside the Citadel by investing in a mapping of resources and small-scale cultural initiatives. Finally, due to absence of a cultural infra-structure, some buildings notably industrial sites would also be renovated for cultural venues.

The panel considered that a cultural strategy would cover a wider and longer scope than an ECOC and were unclear on the specific ambitions of the ECOC programme compared to a merely enhanced cultural events programme. The

---

focus on a festival approach sees the ECOC more as a venue for cultural consumption rather than the requirement in the criterion for developing artists and the creative and cultural industries in the city. The relatively high proposed spend on marketing (26% of the programme expenditure but with a limited international focus) re-inforced this perception. The future development of the urban fabric is to be applauded; the panel would have liked to have seen concurrently a strategy to develop and build the capacity of sustainable artistic, cultural and creative organisations and projects in those premises as the bidbook diagnosed a lack of permanent cultural institutions. A capacity building plan should have been developed with the capital expenditure investments.

The European Dimension was considered under-played with an imbalance between incoming artists' productions compared to creating sustainable partnerships to develop new work and content. The proposed programme centred on performance with little focus on creation and innovation; it would not meet the criterion's need to increase citizen's awareness and understanding of the diversity of cultures in Europe. There was also an imbalance towards the performing arts compared to other artforms. The related involvement of the local population was also underdeveloped. The panel was disappointed to see that projects involving the Roma citizens were classed under the European Dimension rather than as citizens of the city.

Additionally the concept of Alba Iulia as a "Symbol of Unification" (in Romania and in Europe) did not propose a concrete new narrative with specific links and common values.

The process of involving the community, including the existing cultural sector, was not clear, most notably, the intention to bring other ethnic communities back to the city was not accompanied by a concrete programme or outreach strategy.

The organisational proposal was not clear most especially the connection and hierarchies between coordination, conception and implementation/production as well as between the political and executive.

The panel had doubts about the management structure presented in the bid-book. It was not quite clear how the responsibilities would be shared, and the independence of the foundation that would take care of the ECOC project management. The governance of the foundation with respect to the local authorities raised questions.

The panel had doubts about the connection of the project with the final ECOC legacy.

The panel considered the proposed budget to be low for a project as complex and large as an ECOC; it would be unlikely to make an impact at a European level. Within the budget breakdown the panel felt the 5% for staffing was far too low compared to previous ECOC experience.

Overall the panel considered that the bid was well-suited to the city's strategic objective of providing a range of artistic venues for artistic performance both for

---

local and touristic benefits. The urban development programme and increased Festival approach deserves to continue.

## Arad

Arad presented their bid under the banner of "Look out Europe". Their objectives are to activate their citizens, develop the urban and extra-urban cultural spaces, increase cultural relations across Europe, increase the quality of culture in the city, instil a sense of pride, harmonise traditional artforms with contemporary and enshrine entrepreneurship and creativity. The programme is built around five pillars: ecoACTIV, artACTIV, interACTIV, digiACTIV and communicACTIV. The proposed budget is €28m of which €16.979m is allocated for programme expenditure.

The bid has the support of the city and county councils.

During the presentation the bid-team focused on the current cultural activities of the city, the cultural strategy and the ECOC overlap. The mayor pointed out that the city had offered to take 15% of Romania's incoming refugees. The renovation of the Citadel area will be a significant addition to cultural venues in the city. The bid envisaged Arad becoming a model of innovation and of youth commitment for Europe.

The panel welcomed the news of the Citadel and the outline plans to use it as a spectacular venue. They appreciated the inclusion of projects focusing on the negative aspects of the Citadel's history. The revitalisation plans for the riverbanks, including cultural initiatives, are also an important element to improve the city public space culturally and environmentally. The panel appreciated the recent increases in the city's cultural budget. The outline programme in the bidbook contained several potential interesting projects but at this stage the panel thought it was under-developed. Many of the projects continued existing partnerships. There was relatively little information about partnerships with European artists and organisations and this weakened the bid's European Dimension.

The bidbook described an extensive consultation engagement with citizens and cultural operators making interesting use of the city bloggers and social networks' capacity as well as involving schools. The panel welcomed the efforts of the city administration to increase volunteering activities. The programme could have developed a strong strand to develop the independent arts sector and the creative industries to boost local cultural creation and production. The panel felt the bid could have been enhanced by building on the artistic legacy of such groups as Kinema Ikon (and its innovative digital projects) and TEBA. The references to multilingualism as a focus are not translated onto a concrete strategy programme. The plans to invest on the Roma quarter – "Dead Mures" canal – and re-integrate via culture into the city dynamics are also to be welcomed however the process of involvement and its reflection on the programme was not clear.

---

The panel was not convinced about the management and governance structures which were underdeveloped, for this stage, in both the bidbook and the presentation.

Overall the panel felt that the bid had the makings of a sound local and regional cultural offer, especially when the Citadel becomes operational. However the panel did not see enough content in the outline programme or its artistic vision to make an impact at European level let alone become "a model of innovation for Europe".

### **Baia Mare**

Baia Mare presented their bid under the slogan of "Culture of Hosting". The objectives include opening the city to all forms of culture and performance in the cultural industries, reconnecting the city, a former industrial centre, to the international and national cultural, economic and tourist circuit as a top of the mind regional centre. The programme has ten lines: Digital Masters, Living Academia, Open Embassies, Artcrafts, Play Along!, Portal, Translating Traditions, Pulse, You are Welcome!, Social Art and Interventions.

The proposed budget is €40m of which €26.5m would be allocated to programme.

The bid has the full support of the city council.

The panel appreciated that the presentation addressed the criteria in the Decision. During the presentation the panel learned the city was at a tipping point after a period of rapid change from a heavily polluted city to one of the greenest in Romania. The mayor pointed out that the city is diverse and its Roma citizens are the main cultural and social challenge for the city. The panel felt that the bid needs to further define how it will improve social cohesion by integrating this community and other minorities into the ECOC cultural programme by addressing negative views of the majority in the city cultural strategy. The multilingualism objectives were sound but the supporting programme less developed.

The panel learnt that the mayor was determined to implement the projects in the bid regardless of the outcome of the competition. This demonstrated a clear public commitment. The funding from the city and the region was clearly confirmed. The ECOC objectives fitted into the city's long term cultural strategy up to 2030.

The "cultural multipass" card was seen by the panel as tackling a feature facing the cultural sector across Europe: as cities become "smart" the cultural sector will also need to learn how to use "big data". Issues of data privacy need to be addressed.

The panel noted the evident enthusiasm and approach of the current bid team leader as "a translator, a mediator and a facilitator". This was an innovative approach to the senior content role in an ECOC although the panel would want to be re-assured that there was more specialist artistic vision and depth to the bid.



---

The panel welcomed the intention to place Quality and Education as criteria in project selection.

The potential to build on the city past connection to arts via the artists' colony that gathered in Baia Mare 125 years ago is very interesting yet it needs further development so this legacy can be incorporated into a new contemporary artistic vision and mission for the city and the ECOC programme.

The bid outlined concepts of tolerance, mobility, exile, identities and workforce as important departure points to address within the European dimension, yet they need to be further articulated into an original artistic vision and programme.

The aim to create new jobs in the creative economy (currently 10,000 out of the 58,000 jobs in the city) by 2021 in the cultural and creative industries was admirable and very ambitious. The panel would need to see the detailed overall business strategy and the investment needs and plans in considerably more detail how this will be achieved (including which particular sectors and the intended markets for such a considerably increased output). The panel also noted the intention to make the city a "blooming regional capital of journalism". How this was to be achieved is uncertain as is its connection to the ECOC programme.

The panel noted the intention to renovate the Cuprom building as a creative and cultural centre. This is similar to the intention of Plzen2015 where the project was seriously delayed because of asbestos. As the renovation is a key part of the programme the panel would seek re-assurance that the building has been surveyed and will indeed be ready for 2021.

The approach to audience development was considered sound; the panel would expect more concrete plans in the next stage. The panel acknowledged the wide consultation in the bid process and the willingness to open up all areas of debate.

The panel noted the humorous approach taken to the "Dracula" image. It was more concerned about more recent negative criticism of actions by the council which could have an adverse impact on the brand of the European Capital of Culture. It is expected that the core issue will be rectified by the final selection. The panel has concerns over the proposed management and governance structure. It is not clear where decision making authority rests; a loose and large advisory body can be effective at bid preparation but experience has shown less effective in implementation.

Overall the panel considered the innovative approach to the direction of the bid to be an interesting approach in ECOC management even if at this stage the artistic vision was less developed than expected. There is a possible conflict between the fluid managerial approach and the more concrete objectives, most notably on the European Dimension.

---

## Bacău

Bacău presented their bid under the slogan "Gateway to Europe". In the bidbook the objectives are set out as:

"Bacău will evolve into a culturally creative, dynamic city which is environmentally, culturally, socially and economically sustainable. The process dictates a city which is creative about all aspects of its daily life. We will not create a year of events and spectacles – although we'll pay due to both. Our program will be premised on building sustainable collaborative projects of the highest possible standards between our local creative practitioners, national and international creators, and community participation of all ages".

The programme has three major directions: Urban Re-vitality, Eastern Promises and A Gate to Europe.

The proposed budget is €24m of which €13.8m for programme expenditure. The bid at this stage does not have the express support of the city council.

The panel appreciated the honest and open analysis of the city and its cultural offer. The panel heard how the city has suffered from the collapse of its industry. It has, as yet, no cultural strategy; one is in preparation. The independent cultural sector is very limited. The mayor is preparing a strategy, including a long term partnership with Moldova to showcase Romanian traditions.

The panel welcomes the intention to come out of passivity and build up a cultural strategy out of the re-invention of the public space. It remained unclear how culture is planned to contribute in a sustainable manner to urban, social and economic development of the city.

The panel was impressed by the commitment and energy of the Theatre Festival to act as an anchor for the programme. The Festival itself is a success and could provide a firm foundation for an increased cultural offer in the city. The panel would have liked to have heard from other arts sectors and organisations to see the all-round offer and how to build the capacity for attaining the aim of turning the city into a hub for artists.

The panel noted that the intention was to have 50% of the events in the programme in Chisinau. This is a significant element of the bid, almost making the ECOC bid a joint bid from the two cities. It was very unfortunate that there was no cultural operator or administrator from Chisinau to explain how the cultural programme in that city would be developed, the degree of co-production and co-curation leading to the long term development of the cultural sector in Moldova.

Several key elements of the criteria were not addressed in depth in the bidbook or the presentation including outreach, marketing and management structure. This was a major weakness of the bid. The panel felt that the proposed budget of €13.8m for programme expenditure was low for a project of the complexity and size of an ECOC which needs to make an impact at European as well as national level.

Overall the panel thought the bid had energy with strong possible elements in cross border co-operation (beyond showcasing). The proposed programme was too centred on the performing arts rather than other artforms. Other than Moldova there was a limited outline of other European partners and so the bid did not meet the European Dimension criterion. At this stage the bid was very under-prepared but showed promise.

## **Braşov**

Braşov presented their bid under the banner of "Europa Corona". The bid is a catalyst for a major change in the overall cultural development of the city; it challenges the culture of closed institutions. The programme is divided into two dimensions; The European Dimension "Among the Mountains" and the local dimension "Under the Mountain". Each has three sub-themes.

The projected operating budget is €37.261m of which €27.294m would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The bid has the full support of the city and county councils.

The recent decision to recognise culture as a core element in the city's development strategy is a positive step. The panel considered the long term nature of the cultural strategy, in two phases, 2016-21 and 2022-30, to be sound as it enables a clear sense of stability for investment (in urban renovation) and cultural sector development. The panel appreciated the ambition for a radical deviation from the current offer. The ECOC's strategic objectives supported the first stage of the strategy and help lay the foundations for the second stage.

The panel was less convinced on the dual nature of the two programme strands even if the mountains idea could be an interesting concept. An aim of the European Dimension is to integrate different arts and culture (and their practitioners) from other countries. The separation of the strands into local and international was not a reliable way of meeting the criterion. This duality of approach seemed to highlight the weakness of the overall artistic vision: a list of criteria for projects does not give enough strategic insight. Both strands contained interesting projects (which were not simply the continuation of existing activities) which deserve to be carried out. The linking of Sports agenda for 2021 and the ECOC could be an interesting feature.

The panel appreciated the outreach into developing arts in schools as part of audience development focusing on children as multipliers for the ECOC dissemination within their families and communities. It felt the policies to integrate Roma citizens into the school system an area which needs encouragement and continuation. However the programme did not tackle adequately how to integrate other communities from the city, as Hungarian and German that have closed cultural productions.

The management of an ECOC is a considerable task and the panel was not convinced that there was the capacity to manage such a high volume of events compared to the current cultural offer of the city. Consequently, it lacked a plan

---

to develop capacity and training for the sector, as it is one of the pillars of the long-term strategy. The management structure, notably the consultation and decision-making processes, presented in the bid-book were not very clear and the vision for artistic leadership could have been better presented.

Overall the panel felt that the presentation significantly improved its comprehension of the bid compared to the bidbook but the ambition of the strategy was not carried through to the proposed programme. There was a reliance on existing cultural activities and a less radical change than the strategy called for. Contemporary artistic production and development was noticeably weak in the proposed programme. The programme is eminently suited for the city to develop a touristic development whereas an ECOC seeks to significantly develop the cultural and creative sectors in a city with clear cultural, creative and social outcomes.

### **Brăila**

Brăila presented their bid under the slogan "Quantum Culture". The aim is to make Brăila, joining forces with the many towns in the regions, a cultural reference point for the entire European continent. The programme is built around four Dimensions: Geographical, Temporal, Social and Spiritual.

The proposed budget is €23.075m of which €10.975m would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The bid has the support of the city and county councils.

After hearing more about the Quantum Concept in the presentation, the panel gained a clearer understanding; it gave an improved comprehension to the proposed programme. The panel appreciated the strong bottom up approach in the bid initiative and development of a city cultural strategy; a strong point for the city authorities to adopt. One area to develop is the medium term objectives and changes in the current cultural offer. The integration into the Danube Delta area would also deserve to be further explored notably regarding the Danube cultural hub company project. This has potential in the European Dimension. The city manages around 150 cultural events a year; the panel was uncertain whether it had the capacity to manage many times that number in a small ECOC.

The proposed programme was sound but less developed than would be expected at this stage. The panel did not see the level of innovation, risk and ambition that was promised by the Quantum Culture concept; there was a tendency to focus on the historical. The programme was very short of content to enable it to meet the three elements of the European Dimension criterion. The panel appreciated the planned cultural education in schools. The references to reach out to and include the Greek community in the city were not translated into a concrete strategy nor integrated in the programme. This was disappointing as the co-ECOC in 2021 will be in Greece.

---

The panel felt the proposed programme budget of just under €11m to be rather low for a project as complex and large as an ECOC which needs to make an impact at European as well as national level.

The organisational structure, presented in the form of the "Atom Chart", needed further clarification regarding notably the decision-making processes and leadership.

Overall the panel appreciated the dynamism in the Quantum Culture concept evident in the broad scope of the bid development team. The integration of science and art has been a successful approach in ECOCs, most notably Turku in 2011. The bid was stronger in the development of the existing traditional cultural offer rather than taking a radical forward looking step and encouraging the development of its own contemporary artistic offer. The proposed programme, although sound, lacked that additional ambition required in an ECOC.

## **Bucharest**

The Bucharest bid is centred on the theme of "in-visible city". It has four key objectives: rebuilding citizens trust in the city and their lost city pride; rediscovering Bucharest's identity as a European city; providing a new perspective on Europe and balancing cultural inequalities in the city especially in the peripheral quarters. The programme has three directions: Lost and Found, Peripheries: Outsiders-Insiders, and Microtopias.

The proposed budget is €75m of which €52.5 would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The bid, according to the bidbook, has the support of the current acting City Mayor and the six District Mayors.

The analysis of the city context was very well addressed in the presentation. The panel learnt that the city is facing several cultural challenges: it has an identity crisis, there is a blocked memory of the past and its role in Europe is unclear. The panel was informed that the city's main cultural institutions have not addressed contemporary issue or worked with the independent sectors; it is time, the panel learnt, for a change with the ECOC as the driver. The bid was prepared by an NGO commissioned by the council (the panel saw this as a positive element of outreach). This open and self-critical approach to the strategic assessment of the city, before programme development, was appreciated by the panel.

The decision-making processes and articulation of this NGO as well as the Curatorium with the city council and the six districts throughout the whole ECOC process, notably during implementation, needs to be further clarified and planned.

The bidbook referred to the position of the city in the crossroads between east and west; it is not a unique claim by any means and requires a deeper insight and translation into the artistic vision and programme.

The city has not finalised its cultural strategy; it is due in 2016. This is acceptable at this stage of the competition but it needs formal final approval by the city council in time for the final selection bidbook; without it the application will be disqualified.

The panel found the "curatorium" approach interesting. It sought clarification that it had a wide and diverse membership rather than a limited selection which could be prone to groupthink. A heavily participative method is appropriate to bid development although unlikely to be suited to implementation.

The panel noted the programme outline was good at this stage. It would like to see more vision and depth in the second phase. The panel would also like to see the role of the major cultural institutes in the city. This will be important for the bid to meet the criterion requiring the attraction of the programme for international visitors. The panel welcomed the recognition of the importance of the blocked memory challenge; it would hope to see more projects tackling this key topic in the final programme and how they will be communicated internationally.

The proposed programme outlined a promising three-element strategy to address the European Dimension criterion: a) working with Europe b) The Europe of Bucharest and c) Engaging in European themes. These three strategies should be translated in concrete projects with possible European partners.

The panel were less convinced about the degree of consultation with citizens outside the independent cultural sector. For a city the size of Bucharest the numbers involved were limited. The involvement of the different cultural and ethnic communities, notably the Roma, in the consultation as well as its integration in the programme was not adequate. A considerable amount of this outreach is left to the second stage.

The plans for staffing were noted including a strong focus on capacity building of cultural managers and operators. The panel consider the proposed recruitment of senior staff to be rather late. The management structure could be much more straightforward, especially because of the existing poor dialogue between public, private and independent cultural sectors. The participation of existing cultural institutions and the social fabric of the different districts should be guaranteed in the final project and management structure. The panel expects a clear exposition of the management structure.

The panel appreciated the in-depth SWOT which showed the bid team had a good understanding of the challenges facing them.

Overall the panel felt the outline programme was moving in the direction to meet the challenges faced by the city. The curatorium approach was participatory especially for the independent cultural sector but less so for other citizens. In the second phase the bid will need to ensure that its focus on the challenges in the city can be matched with the European Dimension criterion.

## Cluj-Napoca

Cluj-Napoca presented their bid under the banner of "East of West". The objectives are set out in this way:

"We desire to be a European Capital of Culture to open ourselves not only outwards, by welcoming the foreigners who visit us, but also inwards, towards ourselves, to be able to tell Europe what we have learned about one another, for Europe to see itself reflected in our diversity".

The programme has five lines: Wonder, Explore, Activate, Share and Trust.

The proposed budget is €35m of which €24,550m would be allocated for programme expenditure.

The bid has the support of the city and county councils and all-party support. The presentation highlighted the high degree of civic participation in the development of the cultural strategy in the last five years and proved the interest and efficiency of the "urban lab model" implemented so far. The proposal for the Open Academy of Change project was also recognised and encouraged by the panel. The city was described as a "federation of communities".

The panel recognised from both the presentation and the bidbook that the preparation period for the bid has been long and sustained: the team has had time to identify and understand many essential issues which underpin the Cluj-Napoca's ECOC project.

The panel noted the "East-West" concept and saw it had resonance with the city and its strategy. The intention to "re-signify Europe and to redefine European values and perspectives" give a strong overall driver for the European Dimension. This is now especially strong in the current climate in Europe between "East" and "West" over a number of issues.

However the concept was less visible in the outline programme with little "west", even with the near neighbours. The panel felt it was faced with a strong concept and vision partly let down by some weaker project proposals and analysis. There were strong projects in the bidbook which will form a sound basis for an improved European Dimension.

The panel welcomed the honesty of the relations with its Roma citizens, of distrust with the Roma who are seen as exotic and not "properly" Romanian by the majority. The ECOC aim is to change this viewpoint of the majority and at the same time move beyond the emphasis on the folkloric aspect of Roma. The aim is for Roma to have the same opportunities as their fellow citizens.

The panel welcomed the translation project as part of a multilingualism policy. Both could be enhanced in the programme, notably by promoting artistic



---

interaction among the different and closed cultural communities through literature.

The ICT and new media content operators potential notably via the Cluj Media City project needed further involvement and exploration into the bid's artistic programme as well as the communication strategy, beyond the digitisation proposal.

The bidbook set out a strong audience development base (included even in the cultural strategy). Taken together with plans for participatory budgets this will lead to increased civic engagement in the culture and social sectors.

The panel noted the view that local industry has little appreciation of the benefit from good design, in many fields, and welcomed the ECOC's desire to engage industry with the creative sector. This aim currently lacks a clear strategy on how this mismatch of expectations and engagement will be overcome.

The monitoring and evaluation plans are strong but the panel felt there was a risk of over-collection and over-analysis. The legacy objectives should be set out in clearer terms.

Overall the panel felt the programme under development was dynamic, engaging and interesting with projects based on long-term thinking to sustain and build up the future. A stronger focus on international partnership within the European Dimension was added. The panel expects most projects to have partners from other European countries. The polished presentation enhanced the bidbook. The panel has concerns over the concrete legacy aspirations.

## **Craiova**

Craiova presented their bid under the title "Play IntenCity". The main objectives are set out in the bidbook:

"Through a joint effort, Craiova aims at bringing culture at the centre of the development of the city, which can create communication bridges where the social and economic situation led to inequalities of chances and perspectives. Conceived in a culturally and traditionally rich region, but insufficiently exploited and promoted, Craiova 2021 Programme has the magic power of a magnet. It reveals the less known parts and gathers together all those interested and implied in supporting, creating, promoting and consuming culture, contributing thus to the development of the city in the long run, and of the neighbouring regions, which might be even the whole Europe."

The programme has four cardinal points: Equity and Identity (TOGETHER), Space and Time (BORDERLESS), Enjoy and Inspire (EDUCATION) and Lost and Found (UPGRADE). Each has several sub-themes.

The proposed budget is €49.375m of which €30.859 would be allocated to programme expenditure.



---

The bid has the support of the city council and the five regional councils in Oltenia.

The panel welcomed the close integration of the new cultural strategy and the commitment by the mayor to continue with it regardless of the outcome of the competition. There are many projects which deserve to be implemented. The executive and artistic directors are already appointed.

The panel felt the outline programme contained many interesting embryonic ideas. These included the micro-centres taking culture to the areas with few cultural institutions so improving the access to culture especially in rural areas. The project lacked details of the governance and, importantly, a sustainable financial model for these centres. The calligraphy project was a viable way of understanding cultures from around the world. The involvement of the city bloggers into the project as well as schools was also recognised by the panel. The involvement of the Roma leaders, and the project for a Roma Arts Centre, were welcomed though it currently lacks a more concrete background artistic concept and programme. The panel had concerns over some aspects of the programme which appeared to formalise parallel cultural and social directions instead of integration, for example, the disabled Beethoven project.

Overall, the panel considered the cultural programme too underdeveloped, disoriented and locally centred: it lacked a clear vision and structure. There was an imbalance between "events for" people and artistic collaborations and co-productions. It did not promise to have enough content to attract wider European audiences.

The panel considered that the bid was less strong in developing a sustainable city (and regional) independent arts sector as a key legacy objective. For example whilst the programme featured Brancusi the panel felt that this could be a springboard for a sustainable centre for new sculptors as a key legacy. The international renowned figure of Brancusi was also not sufficiently developed beyond a major exhibition for its potential to brand the city and attract wide European audiences to the ECOC.

The panel noted the proposed budget but considered the marketing budget at 25% to be significantly higher than in recent ECOC experience. This may indicate a tendency for city promotion over cultural content.

The panel had concerns on the capacity of the city to manage an ECOC as it represented a considerable increase in the volume and complexity of the current cultural scene (notwithstanding the excellent Shakespeare International Festival).

Overall the panel was encouraged by the commitment and approach of the local authority and its recognition of the role of culture in the city's development. The proposed programme had elements of a very effective cultural offer in the next few years and with further analysis and development contribute to the city and region. An additional focus on building the capacity of cultural management in the area will probably be needed.

## Iași

Iași presented their bid under the banner of “Switch On Iași 2021”. The main objectives are to trigger a long term process which will turn Iași into an eastern interface of European culture and to build co-operation bridges across the EU border to Moldova and Ukraine. The programme has four main divisions: Creative Bridges, Celebrating Spiritual Diversity, Longing and Belonging and Connecting Dots and one addendum: Carbon Copy.

The proposed operating budget is €35.5m of which €23.625m would be allocated to programmes.

The bid had the support of the city council.

The cultural strategy of the city overlaps with the objectives of the ECOC. The panel noted the three pillars of the programme. The intention to share and replicate a considerable number of events and develop joint projects of training, collaboration and exchanges with cities in Ukraine and Moldova is ambitious and could provide a strong contribution to the European Dimension.

The panel was however disappointed not to have the opportunity to hear from representatives of the partner cities. Two and three-way cross border cooperation is a significant objective but the panel was not sure if the proposed cooperation was primarily showcasing or indeed contributed to the cultural and civic development in the proposed partners. The panel was also uninformed of the financial and management arrangements for this proposed co-operation.

The other elements of the proposed programme had many strong points and the potential to have a local impact. The panel was concerned that 250 of the 342 proposed projects are existing cultural projects with programme costs already fixed. The criterion for the ECOC requires a special programme to be developed rather than a continuation of the existing cultural offer in a city.

The cross-border project is potentially a positive element towards the European dimension criterion but the panel felt that the other strands of the programme were less developed with international partners or inter-cultural dialogue. The programme failed to sustain how it intends to become the eastern interface of western culture. It lacked notably a clear artistic vision to question and develop this crossroads position of a city with multiple influences.

The bid book recognised that the city was less open to contemporary art, innovation and the avant-garde. The panel felt the proposed programme, with a strong focus on history and heritage, would re-inforce this perception rather than using the ECOC to transform the city’s cultural sector and audience. A more balanced approach would have improved the bid.

The panel felt that key areas were dealt with only in a cursory manner rather than in depth. Examples included the traumatic memory of the “Pogrom of Iasi” in 1941 and a project with the Roma; this was an area where the programme

---

could have been significantly increased to meet the inter-cultural dialogue component of the artistic vision criterion.

The city has a strong reputation for its creative industries and the panel appreciated the demonstration of one of possible projects. Several of the proposed projects included the CCIs although this area could be built into a stronger element of the programme notably including the reputed dynamism in fashion and clothes as well as in publishing and media; there was less information about their subsequent development. The bid was limited in its approach to both audience development and capacity building in the cultural sector.

The panel noted the information about consultation with citizens and cultural operators but was less clear how much of the outcomes of these consultations made it to the concept and programme.

Overall the panel felt the bid reflected a steady approach to the heritage basis of the city. Many of the projects, including plans for urban development, are already underway and will contribute to a stronger local cultural and tourist offer. The cross-border co-operation was less developed as noted above.

### **Sfântu Gheorghe**

Sfântu Gheorghe presented their bid under the theme of i2021; the "I" deriving from Identity. There is no firm slogan yet. The main objectives of the bid are to facilitate the understanding of individual and community identities, reduce tensions and improve social cohesion. The programme has four general objectives with a portfolio of linked projects. The objectives are iCare, iJoin, iBuild and iSee.

The proposed operating budget is €37,505m of which €29.4m would be allocated to programmes.

The bid has the support of the 5 cities and 2 counties in the region.

The panel appreciated the coherence of the bid and the attention paid, during its preparation, to the "bottom up" approach. Yet it is not clear how much the different communities in the city have contributed and integrated the programme. The bid demonstrated a sound analysis of society and culture in the city and region.

The outline programme in the bidbook contains several strong projects possibilities notably in the field of theatre and story-telling. The panel felt that at this stage of the competition they could have been further developed, most notably in the inclusion of international partners. This was a weakness against the European Dimensions criterion. Following the strategic analysis of the identity issue, the panel would have expected a greater focus on sharing; the "i-xxx approach" could potentially rebound and re-inforce separation. This was evident for example in the proposed Festival of Disabled Artists; most of whom

---

at a European level prefer to participate in festivals focusing on their art rather than on their disability.

There was a limited approach both to audience development and cultural education in schools and enhanced support to the creative and culture industries. These are areas where more work is needed.

The panel was concerned that the city would not have the capacity to manage a project as large as an ECOC. The jump in the culture budget from its annual €1.5m to the projected €34m would place a considerable strain. There were, however, some very promising examples of how such a small and remote city could manage being an ECOC, for example the Shuttle 2021 and Home 2021 projects.

The panel appreciated the unique circumstances of a national minority community being the majority community in the region. Shared cultural and participative activity can be a strong element in a programme to overcome distrust. The panel was concerned by the impression given in the presentation and the bidbook that this was a bid from just one community rather than a shared project. For an ECOC the outline programme was more inwardly focussed than required by the criteria, with a lack of a strong European Dimension. It lacked turning the issue of identity into a larger European debate by identifying other regions or communities with which to engage in a dialogue.

## Suceava

Suceava presented their bid under the title "Inspire. Imagine. Feel." The bid has two main motivations: to share the beauty, history and spirituality of the region and to decrease the gap between the current cultural offer of the city and the expectations and desires of its citizens. The programme has four sections revolving around the themes of Fairy Tale, Myth, Folk Deities and Legend.

The proposed budget is €25m of which €19m would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The bid has the support of the city and regional authorities and the most important political parties.

The presentation emphasised the binding commitment from the council for the programme and budget. The bid-team noted that spirituality and religion are at home in Suceava. The city is at the edge of the EU and the "Gateway to the East of Europe". The team had explored the legacy from Sibiu2007 and in particular how that ECOC had led to a considerable increase in income.

The panel welcomed the opportunity to hear from a Ukrainian representative who was able to explain more about the benefits of the partnership between Suceava and Cernauti. The partnership involved sharing responsibility, goodwill and finances (probably from EU funds although this has yet to be confirmed). This partnership was a strong factor towards the European Dimension.

---

The programme was based around fairy tales and mythology which can form the basis of an innovative contemporary programme. The panel learnt that the programme was planned to be 80% accessible to all and 20% more avant-garde. The panel felt the programme was under-developed at this stage and in most areas lacked a contemporary approach. There was not a clear over-arching artistic vision bringing the mythology into the present. It lacked a profiling and clarification of how the independent cultural sector (even if limited) has been called to participate in the programme.

The panel saw some innovative ideas, including commissioning game developers to use traditional tales as a foundation and the focus in some areas on an ECOC for children and parents (noting the children's book market is one of the major publishing sectors in Europe). With the exception of the Ukrainian partnership, the panel did not see a significant element in the programme to build sustainable partnerships and engage in two-way conversations with other European artists and operators.

The panel welcomed the clear ambition to work with the Greek co-ECOC in 2021. The bid-team recognised that audience development in the region was weak and sought to develop their programme in the future. The outreach strategy lacked clarifying the process of involvement of citizens, notably the different cultural communities in the programme. The panel was concerned at the seemingly low importance and authority attached to the artistic director post.

Overall the panel felt the presentation enhanced the bidbook. It introduced some interesting avenues, most notably the shared partnership with Cernauti. The panel hoped this could be developed if the EU funding for Ukraine materialises. Useful lessons can be learnt from Tallin2011 who used the fairy tale theme and demonstrated a contemporary take on tradition.

## **Târgu Mureş**

The bid from Târgu Mureş is to create a "Learning Hub". It will be a place where citizens and visitors learn by experimenting with diversity. It is a transformational intercultural project. The core of the programme is "TM. Made in Târgu Mureş"; it has five lines: Silent Roots, Decks and Bridges, Digital TM, A Tale of Two Cities and Territories.

The projected budget is €32.5m of which €23m would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The project has the support of the county council and of the three local councils; a further agreement recognises the support of all 102 localities.

During the presentation the bid-team explained the situation facing Târgu Mureş, most notably that investors are not coming to the region in enough numbers. The city suffers from a poor image and the ECOC bid is aimed to "move from stigma to self-esteem".

The panel appreciated the clear leadership of the mayor and the open assessment of the city's current position. The "learning hub" concept was

---

appropriate. However the panel was unclear on the involvement and benefits to the surrounding localities.

The panel was disappointed that in the bidbook and the presentation the team did not outline the proposed programme in more detail. There were potentially strong elements in the programme, mostly related to refurbishment of former industrial buildings. The rehabilitation of the Citadel ends in 2016 and this will form a good venue for cultural performance. A significant part of the programme was based on current festivals rather than, as required for an ECOC, a special programme. The panel did not discern enough about how local artists will be developed. There were relatively few international partners lined up to participate, a weakness on the European Dimension. The panel thought the Digital TM strand showed promise. On the other hand, given that the county has the largest population of Roma (and it is a mosaic of different cultures), the panel was surprised to see how little they featured in the team and the bid. A feature of recent ECOCs is how they use the programme to tackle blocked memory; the city's recent history, especially the sad interethnic conflict of 1990s could have been handled in the cultural programme

The cultural education programme with its focus on schools was well-received although there was less on how cultural institutions themselves would extend into audience development programmes. Although the Digital TM strand was present there was little about the development of the cultural and creative industries.

Overall the panel felt there was enough in the bid to enhance the cultural offer of the city as part of its attempts to both change the image of the city and boost the self-esteem of citizens. Most of the progressive steps involved renovation of former industrial buildings and if these can be accomplished (and a sustainable programme established in them) then there will be a radical change in the city. The panel did not see how the under-developed programme was substantial enough for an ECOC; the European Dimension was considerably under-developed and the city would have difficulty in managing such a major event. This was certainly a consequence of a late start to the bid process.

## **Timișoara**

Timișoara presented their bid under the title "Shine your light; light up your city!". The main objective is to tackle several urgent issues for the city: a lack of civic energy, the increase in exclusion, distrust in ownership of public spaces, a lack of a visible international profile and the lack of a shared vision for the future of the city. The programme presented in the bidbook has five themes, spread through the year: Inner Light, Shared Sight, Light and Dark Spaces, Light over Borders and Lightscapes.

The projected operating budget is €48.5m of which €33.950m would be allocated to programme expenditure.

The project has support of the city and county councils and by political agreements between all the political parties.

The bid has been four years in development. The city, the panel were informed, has lost its key “middle class” values of interconfessional, civic engagement, multiculturalism and entrepreneurship. The programme seeks to recapture the cultural and social spirit present in the 1930s where ethnicity was irrelevant. The themes of the programme are linked to these values. The cultural strategy is well developed and confirmed by the city’s authorities (12 documents approved so far). The long development period has enabled the bid team to analyse and understand the underpinning issues facing the city.

The panel noted the prevalence of behavioural change elements in the programme. It aims to overcome passivity, tackle racism and give audience development a positive route map. Such aims require a special multi-year project based, rather than event based, approach.

The panel noted the honesty of the statement “when the Roma turn up, people stand back” and the clear aim of the programme to tackle this racist attitude in the majority.

The programme outlined in the bidbook is sound at this stage with clearly defined objectives. The panel has a concern that an emphasis on large scale events may generate popular and indeed international appeal but at the same time become a disproportionate drain on the budget. The panel noted the listing of leading international names and organisations but would want clarification that these have agreed to participate. The financial balance between large and smaller scale projects needs reconsidering.

The panel felt recognition could be given to the long term influence of the significant 1970s arts movement. The European Dimension was partially developed and needed both broadening and deepening; the panel expects most projects to have a European partner. The bidbook clearly outlined the bid team’s awareness of the impact at a European level.

The panel welcomed the positive intention to work with other bidding cities. The panel welcomed the audience development trajectory summed up by “from audience to participant to ownership of events and organisations”.

The panel had concerns over the proposed governance and management structure. The panel did not feel that an open membership assembly with decision making authority is appropriate for the implementation phase. The panel was also concerned about the authorities of the Director and the three-way Artistic Director role.

Overall the panel considered the bid to be ambitious. The presentation focussed on the criteria and enhanced the bidbook. The programme is developing on sound lines and there is a clear linkage between strategy and projects. The European Dimension is well structured. The behavioural change objectives are critical to the overall objectives and if the bid-team can find a way around annualised budgets to develop multi-year projects a strong legacy will emerge.



---

## Recommendations

The following recommendations apply to the four shortlisted candidates.

The panel considers that all shortlisted cities need to develop their bids for the final selection in order to reach the required level of quality for such a demanding event as an ECOC. There is a considerable step-change between proposals at pre-selection stage and those at final selection.

The panel will expect significant changes in the final bidbooks to reflect these recommendations.

The shortlisted candidates are advised to study carefully the **six criteria in the Decision** and the comments in the assessments above.

In particular the cities should note that the **criteria are different to those used to select Sibiu for its ECOC in 2007**.

A study of the evaluations of recent (since 2013) ECOCs may also be of value. These are available on the European Commission's ECOC pages.

## Elections June 2016

The panel is aware that municipal elections take place in June 2016 before the submission of the final bidbooks. The panel expects the new Mayors, councils and political parties, to approve (or re-approve) the city's cultural strategy and the bidbook, including the financial commitments, before the bidbooks are submitted.

Cities which have not finally approved their cultural strategy by the submission date will be disqualified under criterion 1.

## General

The bid-book at final selection becomes the de facto contract for the designated city; it sets out the artistic vision and the key objectives, projects, directions, financing and management of the programme. Close concurrence with the bidbook is a factor when the monitoring panel will recommend the payment of the Melina Mercouri prize.

In the final selection bidbook candidates must cover all the questions in Annex 1 (the "application form") in the call for applications. The panel expects a considerably more developed section on the proposed artistic vision, the programme and the European Dimension.

The selection panel (and the subsequent monitoring panel) has a responsibility to protect the long term brand of the European Capital of Culture programme. Candidates should be aware that with the level of international attention now being given to ECOCs, policy decisions over a wide area (not just cultural) may affect the reputation of the city, and in turn the ECOC image. The panel would expect to see candidates being aware of this and taking steps to minimise international and national negative images of their city through policy changes rather than marketing/PR.



---

## ECOC and Cultural Strategy

The panel will expect a tighter focus in the next bidbooks. In the next bidbook cities should indicate the priorities of the strategy, its target outcomes and how resources will be changed over the next few years (rather than broad changes in the total budget allocated to culture).

A city's cultural strategy will normally be wider in scope than the objectives of an ECOC. Bidbooks should indicate more clearly which priorities of the broader cultural strategy the ECOC is seeking to contribute to.

An ECOC is a transformational opportunity for a city.

The pre-selection bidbooks set out in general terms the objectives of why a city is seeking the title. The panel would expect a more focussed (and shorter) explanation which can link to the programme vision, themes, the programme, and through evaluation, to the outcomes in the subsequent legacy. There is considerable literature and research available for cities to see the range of cultural, economic and social benefits of an ECOC.

There was a tendency in the evaluation sections of the bidbooks to list many indicators. There is a risk of overkill of statistics and data gathering. The final bidbook should focus on the **priority** objectives for the ECOC (rather than those for the entire cultural strategy). One of the priority areas should refer to how the ECOC will meet the four elements of the European Dimension criterion.

Consideration should be given the monitoring arrangements during the ramp-up period, 2016-2020, which can inform management on a timely manner to take action. Shortlisted cities may wish to involve management consultancies in addition to the more academic approach currently proposed.

## European Dimension

The panel felt that this criterion was considerably under-developed. At this stage the proposals are too inward looking in their local context in the city, the region and Romania. The panel would wish to see a greater deepening and widening of programmes to ensure a more relevant **European dimension**. That a city is in Romania, in Europe, has a vibrant existing cultural offer and will market itself in Europe is not in itself a strong interpretation of the European dimension. An ECOC enables a city to promote itself internationally but that is only half the story.

The European dimension has a two-way direction. An equal focus is on seeking to broaden the understanding and awareness of the city's own citizens on the diversity of cultures in Europe and linking through cultural and other projects with citizens in other countries. It is this focus on other cultures which primarily differentiates an ECOC from a national city of culture. An ECOC offers the opportunity for a city and its citizens to learn from others in an open way. One important legacy area is the creation of new and sustained partnerships between a city's cultural players and those from other countries.

The panel expects to see a significantly increased focus on European partnerships: co-productions, co-curations, conferences, networking as well as visiting artists/performers. Most recent ECOCs have included European and international partners in well over half their projects. Cities should encourage their cultural operators to be active participants in European cultural networks. Most ECOCs feature multi-year projects which develop during the four years before the ECOC. There were few such projects in the bidbooks. That public sector budgets in Romania are annually based should not preclude such projects. The ministry is asked to consider ways the winning city can implement multi-year projects which require advance stability of funding.

The panel will expect more information on the proposed partnerships with the shortlisted cities in **Greece (announced end February) and in a candidate country/potential candidate (Novi Sad and Herceg Novi)** The panel would also expect to see further collaborations with the ECOCs designated for 2016-2020.

One of the elements of the artistic criterion for the ECOC title is the ability to attract **visitors from the rest of Europe**. This attraction has to be in the programme and distinct from the normal tourist offers of the city and region to meet this criterion. The panel would expect to see proposed ideas in the ECOC programme in 2021.

### **Cultural and Artistic programme**

The focus of the final selection is the **operating programme** between 2016, when the ECOC will be formally designated and, in particular, the ECOC year of 2021.

**A city's previous cultural history and heritage and its recent and current cultural offer, may form a basis for this programme but plays no part in the decision.**

Many ECOCs in recent years have used the opportunity provided by an ECOC to address difficult issues from their 20<sup>th</sup> century past which still resonate today. The panel suggest candidates re-consider their approach to the appropriate topics from Romania's 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The panel will expect to see considerably more detail on the programme and its projects. The four cities should set out their artistic vision, the programme and projects more clearly; differentiating between partners who have indicated firm interest and those who are still only potential or possible partners. ECOC programmes normally cover a wide range of artforms and include the increasing development of creative interventions in social issues. An approximate budget should be shown for each major project for the panel to understand the relative balance of projects in the programme.

The panel recommends a more focussed and detailed approach to digital cultural content (not just social media promotions and inter-actions) as integral parts of their programme. This was under-developed in all bidbooks.

---

Information on urban development and infrastructure programmes, cultural heritage restoration projects and new cultural premises is useful as background and context at pre-selection. The final selection will focus on **the capital projects which directly impact on the programme activities** (e.g. a new cultural centre in a restored building which becomes a focal point for community arts projects contained in the programme). A timeline for these projects and the realistic estimate of completion should be given.

### Capacity to deliver

Candidates should re-confirm that their bidbook, including the programme and the financial commitments have the formal approval of the mayor, the city (and county if appropriate) councils and all political parties after the June 2016 elections.

All four shortlisted cities explained their capacity to manage large one-off cultural events. Candidates are reminded that the criterion for an ECOC requires a special programme for the year in addition to the normal cultural offer. The panel expects more information on the managerial capacity in the city/region to manage the depth and range of an ECOC.

### Outreach

The **audience development** programme is expected to be much further developed in the final bidbooks including online and offline measures and channels for all identified target groups.

The panel would expect to learn about the audience development policies of the main cultural organisations including the main independent operators. The role and contribution of universities (except for evaluation work) was underplayed in the pre-selection bidbooks.

Special focus should be dedicated to those audiences which are more difficult to reach but being crucial for a new "cultural climate" in an ECOC city (e. g. the elderly, disabled, people temporarily in the city). These are under-represented in the bidbooks at preselection. The bidbooks should cover the participation of schools, youth groups, volunteers etc in the city.

### Management

The **membership of and independence from city administrations of governing boards** should be explained, with post holders (or positions) and the method of appointment. The decision making role of the board should be explained.

The **General and Artistic/Cultural Directors** play a key role in all ECOCs. The selection, preferably through an open international call, of these posts before the candidates' appearance at the final selection meeting, will be to their advantage. This is especially important for the Artistic Director as, unlike many such appointments, the artistic vision is already set out in the bidbook. The same applies if a candidate proposes a collective artistic leadership. It is

---

acknowledged that the appointments may be conditional on the outcome of the competition.

If projects are planned to be funded from competitive EU programmes (e.g. Creative Europe) this should be indicated.

The final bidbooks should clearly indicate how potential **capital investments crucial for the ECOC** (those mentioned in the capacity to deliver criteria above) will be managed (management structures, state-of-play related to the EU-ESI-Funds such as the connection with the relevant Operational Programme, time line and public procurement).

The planned staffing arrangements from 2016 to 2021 should be outlined including secondments, interns and volunteers.

### **Signed**

Steve Green (Chair)  
Sylvia Amann  
Cristina Farinha  
Ulrich Fuchs  
Valentina Iancu  
Jordi Pardo  
Anton Rombouts  
Aiva Rozenberga  
Pauli Sivonen  
Raluca Velisar (vice-chair)  
Agnieszka Wlazel  
Suzana Žilič Fišer

**Bucharest**  
**January 2016**