

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0061/2006**

10.3.2006

**\*\*\*I**

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council  
establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for  
the years 2007 to 2019  
(COM(2005)0209 – C6-0157/2005 – 2005/0102(COD))

Committee on Culture and Education

Rapporteur: Christa Prets

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\* Assent procedure  
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases  
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and  
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- \*\*\*I Codecision procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*\*II Codecision procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\*III Codecision procedure (third reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission.)

### ***Amendments to a legislative text***

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION .....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	23
MINORITY OPINION .....	27
PROCEDURE.....	28



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019

(COM(2005)0209 – C6-0157/2005 – 2005/0102(COD))

(Codecision procedure: first reading)

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2005)0209)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 251(2) and Article 151 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C6-0157/2005),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education (A6-0061/2006),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
  2. Calls on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intends to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
  3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and the Commission.

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1

Recital 2

(2) A study which has been carried out into the results achieved by European Capital of Culture event until 2004 showed that it has a positive impact in terms of media resonance, the development of culture and tourism and the recognition by inhabitants of the importance of their city having been designated. **However, this** action still needs to be improved.

(2) A study which has been carried out into the results achieved by European Capital of Culture event until 2004 showed that it has a positive impact in terms of media resonance, the development of culture and tourism and the recognition by inhabitants of the importance of their city having been designated; **however, the** action still needs to be improved, **particularly with regard to its long-term effect on the cultural development of the city and region concerned.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Not yet published in OJ.

Amendment 2  
Recital 2 a (new)

***(2a) By enabling cities to involve their surrounding region, including islands, a wider public can be reached and the impact of the event can be amplified.***

Amendment 3  
Recital 3

(3) The stakeholders of the event stressed problems in the selection process laid down in *the* Decision 1419/1999/EC, and recommended monitoring the proposals, particularly in order to enhance their European dimension.

(3) The stakeholders of the event stressed problems in the selection process laid down in the Decision 1419/1999/EC, and recommended: monitoring the proposals, particularly in order to enhance their European dimension; ***improving competition; and redefining the role of the panel.***

Amendment 4  
Recital 4

(4) The importance and impact of the European Capital of Culture calls for the creation of a mixed selection process, involving national and European levels, and the introduction of a strong monitoring element.

(4) The importance and impact of the European Capital of Culture calls for the creation of a mixed selection process, involving national and European levels, and the introduction of a strong monitoring ***and consultative*** element, ***to incorporate a national component and strengthen the European dimension.***

Amendment 5  
Recital 6

(6) A monitoring phase after the designation is needed ***to guarantee the European added-value of the action.***

(6) ***To guarantee the European added value of the action,*** a monitoring phase after the designation is needed, ***in which firstly care is taken to fulfil the criteria laid down for the cultural programme, and secondly expert advice and assistance is provided.***

Amendment 6  
Recital 6 a (new)

***(6a) A panel of 6 national and 7 European experts should be established; the whole panel comprising 13 experts (the ‘selection panel’) will oversee the selection phase up to the designation of the city; only the 7 European experts on the panel (becoming the ‘monitoring and advisory panel’) will oversee the monitoring process and give guidance to the Capitals during the monitoring phase up to the event.***

Amendment 7  
Recital 6 b (new)

***(6b) For support and assistance, for both the applicant and the designated cities, a website is to be set up, constantly maintained and regularly updated by the Commission, on the subject of “European Capitals of Culture” (application, selection, implementation and links).***

*Justification*

*The rapporteur calls for a website maintained and updated by the Commission. It should include the following: FAQs; links, best practice examples and useful tips for capitals of culture (CCs); provision of information on conditions for applying to be a CC; a list of mentors (such as directors and experts from previous CCs); contact addresses of experts on the monitoring and advisory panel; links to existing sites, such as the European Capitals of Culture and Cultural Month website.*

Amendment 8  
Recital 6 c (new)

***(6c) It is important to encourage the dissemination of good practice, especially to guarantee the European added-value of the action. Therefore, networks of former official European Capitals of Culture should be encouraged to play a constructive role in sharing their experiences and best practices with future European Capitals of***

***Culture, notably on the basis of exchanges during the preparation phase.***

Amendment 9  
Recital 7

(7) It is important to reward the quality of the programme in terms of the objectives and criteria of the action and particularly the European added value by awarding a prize.

(7) It is important to reward the quality of the programme in terms of the objectives and criteria of the action and particularly the European added value by awarding a prize ***in the form of a financial allocation.***

*Justification*

*The financial prize will be based on the final report by the monitoring and advisory panel. This means ensuring that the aims and criteria of the action are fulfilled and recommendations of the selection panel and the monitoring and advisory panel are taken into account.*

Amendment 10  
Recital 7 a (new)

***(7a) To safeguard the long-term effect of the Cultural Capital event it is desirable to use the initiative, and the structures and capacities that it creates, as the basis for a lasting cultural development strategy for the cities concerned.***

Amendment 11  
Recital 7 b (new)

***(7b) To enable third countries to take part in European cultural initiatives, the Cultural Month<sup>1</sup>, or a comparable initiative, should be explored.***

-----  
<sup>1</sup> *Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1990 on future eligibility for the “European City of Culture” and on a special European Cultural Month event (OJ C 162, 3.7.1990, p. 1.)*



Amendment 12  
Recital 8

(8) The designation process laid down in this Decision needs a period of six years to be implemented ; this period cannot be guaranteed for the years 2011 and 2012 given that this Decision enters into force in 2007. For these years a designation process is provided, as laid down in Decision 1419/1999/EC as **modified** by Decision 649/2005/CE.

(8) The designation process laid down in this Decision needs a period of six years to be implemented ; this period cannot be guaranteed for the years 2011 and 2012 given that this Decision enters into force in 2007. For these years a designation process is provided, as laid down in Decision 1419/1999/EC as **amended** by Decision 649/2005/EC.

Amendment 13  
Article 2, paragraph 1

1. Cities in Member States shall be entitled to be designated as European Capitals of Culture for one year, **in turn, as set out in the list of the Annex.**

1. Cities in Member States **and in countries acceding to the European Union after 31 December 2006** shall be entitled to be designated **in turn as European Capitals of Culture for one year, in the order set out in the Annex.**

*Justification*

*Arrangements must be made for future enlargement phases, so as to clarify the situation of countries currently negotiating their accession and ensure they are treated equally. The provisions in the proposal on Romania and Bulgaria particularly need clarifying.*

Amendment 14  
Article 3 paragraph 3

**3. The cultural programme shall meet the following criteria, grouped into two categories called “The European Dimension” and “City and Citizens”:**

**deleted**

**As regards “The European Dimension”, the programme shall:**

**(a) foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from other**

*Member States in any cultural sector,*

*(b) highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe,*

*(c) bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.*

*As regards “City and citizens”, the programme shall:*

*(a) raise the interest of the citizens living in the city and its surroundings as well as of citizens from abroad,*

*(b) be sustainable and be an integral part of the long term cultural development of the city.*

*Justification*

*The criteria are dealt with separately in a new article.*

Amendment 15

Article 3, paragraph 3 a (new)

***3a. The programme shall be consistent with any national cultural strategy or policy of the relevant Member State or, where applicable under a Member State’s institutional arrangements, any regional cultural strategies, on condition that any such strategy or policy does not aim to restrict the number of cities which may be considered for designation as Capitals of Culture under this Decision.***

*Justification*

*This meets the Member States’ wish to take account of the national cultural policy dimension.*

Amendment 16

Article 3 a (new)

***Article 3a***

***Application criteria***

***The cultural programme shall fulfil the following criteria, subdivided into two***

*categories, ‘the European Dimension’ and ‘City and Citizens’:*

*As regards ‘the European Dimension’, the programme shall:*

- (a) foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from the relevant Member States and other Member States in any cultural sector,*
- (b) highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe,*
- (c) bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.*

*As regards ‘City and Citizens’, the programme shall:*

- (a) foster the participation of the citizens living in the city and its surroundings and raise their interest as well as the interest of citizens from abroad,*
- (b) be sustainable and be an integral part of the long-term cultural and social development of the city.*

#### Amendment 17

##### Article 4, paragraph 1, subparagraph 2

These calls for submission of applications, aimed at the candidate cities for the title, shall mention the criteria laid down in Article 3 of this Decision and on the Commission website.

These calls for submission of applications, aimed at the candidate cities for the title, shall mention the criteria laid down in Article 3 of this Decision and ***the guidance available*** on the Commission website.

#### *Justification*

*The Commission website should give clear and comprehensible details of the requirements that cultural capitals must meet. At the same time the website should assist cities in meeting the criteria for their cultural programme.*

#### Amendment 18

##### Article 5, paragraph 2

2. The selection panel shall consist of 13 members. ***The members are appointed by*** the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions ***and*** by the Member State concerned

2. The selection panel shall consist of 13 members. ***Seven of them shall be nominated by the European Institutions: two from*** the European Parliament, ***two from*** the Council, ***two from*** the Commission and

*each year. It shall designate its chairman among the personalities nominated by the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions.*

*one from the Committee of the Regions. The remaining six shall be nominated by the Member State concerned in consultation with the European Commission. The Member State shall then formally appoint the selection panel. The panel shall designate its chairman among the personalities nominated by the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions.*

#### *Justification*

*This amendment specifies the composition of the selection panel.*

*It is proposed that the official appointment of the panel should be simplified by concentrating the procedure in one decision, rather than having multiple appointments taking place at different times. However, the European institutions would continue to be responsible for nominating their respective members of the selection panel. The Member State's role in appointing the panel would therefore be a formality and the Member State would not be able to change the nominations made by the institutions.*

#### Amendment 19 Article 5, paragraph 3

***3. Two Panel members shall be appointed by the European Parliament, two by the Council, two by the Commission and one by the Committee of the Regions.***

These selection panel members shall be independent experts with no conflicts of interest and with substantial experience and expertise in the cultural sector, in cultural development of cities or in organization of European Capital of Culture.

***They shall be appointed for three years.***

By way of derogation *to the first subparagraph* in the first year this Decision is in force, two experts shall be appointed by the Commission for one year, two by the European Parliament for two years, two by the Council for three years and one by the Committee of the Regions for three years.

***3.*** These selection panel members shall be independent experts with no conflicts of interest ***with regard to the cities which responded to the call for submission of applications***, and with substantial experience and expertise in the cultural sector, in cultural development of cities or in organization of European Capital of Culture.

***The seven members nominated by the European Institutions shall be appointed for three years.*** By way of derogation in the first year this Decision is in force, two experts shall be appointed by the Commission for one year, two by the European Parliament for two years, two by

the Council for three years and one by the Committee of the Regions for three years.

*Justification*

*This amendment clarifies the composition of the selection panel.*

Amendment 20  
Article 5, paragraph 4

**4. Each of the Member States concerned shall nominate six personalities as members in agreement with the Commission, who shall be independent from the cities which applied to the call for submission of applications.** *deleted*

***These selection panel members shall be independent experts with no conflicts of interest and with substantial experience and expertise in cultural sector or city development.***

*Justification*

*This amendment clarifies the composition of the selection panel.*

Amendment 21  
Article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraph 3

It shall submit its report to the competent Member State and the Commission.

It shall submit its report to the competent Member State and the Commission.  
***Each of the Member States concerned shall formally approve the short-list based on the reports of the selection panel.***

Amendment 22  
Article 7, paragraph 2, subparagraph 1

2. Each of the Member States concerned shall convene the relevant selection panel, for final selection, nine months after the ***first***

2. Each of the Member States concerned shall convene the relevant selection panel, for final selection, nine months after the ***pre-***

*selection* meeting.

*selection* meeting.

*Justification*

*Clarifies the proposal wording.*

Amendment 23

Article 8, paragraph 2, subparagraph 1

2. The European Parliament may forward an opinion to the Commission not later than **two** months after receipt of the nominations of the Member States concerned.

2. The European Parliament may forward an opinion to the Commission not later than **three** months after receipt of the nominations of the Member States concerned.

*Justification*

*Parliament should have sufficient time to draw up the opinion. A period of three months also complies with Decision 1419/1999/EC of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019.*

Amendment 24

Article 8 a (new)

*Article 8a*

***Monitoring and advisory panel***

***A monitoring and advisory panel shall be established to monitor the implementation of the objectives and criteria of the action and provide capitals with support and guidance from the time of their designation to the start of the European Capital of Culture event.***

***1. The panel shall consist of the seven experts nominated by the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions. In addition, the relevant Member State may nominate an observer to this panel.***

***2. The cities concerned shall issue progress reports to the Commission three months before the meetings of the panel.***

***3. The Commission shall convene the panel and the representatives of the city concerned. The panel shall be convened on two occasions to give advice on, and to take stock of, the preparations for the event with a view to helping cities to develop a high-quality programme with a strong European dimension. Its first meeting shall take place at least two years before the event; its second meeting shall take place at least eight months before the event.***

***4. After each meeting the panel shall issue a report on the state of preparations for the event and any steps to be taken. The reports shall pay particular attention to the European added value of the event in accordance with the criteria set out in Article 3 and the recommendations laid down in the reports of the selection and the monitoring and advisory panels.***

***5. The reports shall be forwarded to the Commission and to the cities and Member States concerned. They shall also be published on the Commission's website.***

#### *Justification*

*The new arrangement of the text aims to improve the coherence of the wording. New Article 8a not only simplifies the structure of the text but also clarifies the role of the monitoring and advisory panel. This emphasises the panel's assistance to CCs when drawing up their programmes, which mainly involves obtaining expert advice and tackling any problems at an early stage.*

Amendment 25

Article 9

***Article 9***

***deleted***

#### ***Mid term Monitoring***

***1. The designated Capitals of Culture shall issue a mid term progress report to the Commission, at the latest 27 months before the event is due to begin, on the state of the preparations of the***

*programme for the event.*

*The Commission shall ensure independent evaluation of this report.*

*2. No later than 24 months before the event is due to begin, the Commission shall convene the seven experts nominated by the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the authorities responsible for the implementation of the programmes of the cities designated as European Capitals of Culture.*

*From this stage these experts form a “monitoring panel”.*

*They shall meet to evaluate the preparation of the event, particularly concerning the European added value of the programmes.*

*The monitoring panel shall issue a mid term monitoring report on the state of the preparations for the event, and the steps still to be taken, in line with the objectives and criteria of the action and the recommendations laid down in the reports of the selection panels referred to in Article 7(2).*

*The mid term monitoring report shall be transmitted to the Commission and to the cities and Member States concerned not later than one month after the mid term monitoring meeting. It shall be published on the internet site of the Commission.*

#### *Justification*

*The new arrangement of the text aims to improve the coherence of the wording. The content of old Article 9 has been incorporated in new Article 8a.*

Amendment 26  
Article 10

*Article 10* *deleted*  
*Final monitoring*



***1. The nominated Capitals of Culture shall issue a final progress report to the Commission, at the latest nine months before the event is due to begin, on the state of the preparations of the programmes for the event. The Commission shall ensure independent evaluation of this report.***

***2. The Commission shall convene a meeting of the monitoring panel with the authorities responsible for the implementation of the programmes of the cities which have been designated as European Capitals of Culture no later than six months before the event is due to begin in order to evaluate the preparation of the event, particularly concerning the European added value of the programme.***

***The monitoring panel shall issue a final monitoring report on the state of the preparations for the event, and the steps still to be taken, in line with the objectives and criteria of the action and the recommendations laid down in the reports referred to in Article 7(2) third subparagraph and in Article 9(2), fourth subparagraph.***

***This final monitoring report shall be transmitted to the Commission and to the cities and Member States concerned not later than one month after the final monitoring meeting. It shall be published on the internet site of the Commission.***

*Justification*

*The new arrangement of the text aims to improve the coherence of the wording. The content of old Article 10 has been incorporated in new Article 8a.*

Amendment 27  
Article 11

***On the basis of the report referred to in Article 10(2), second subparagraph, the*** *deleted*

*Commission may award a prize to each of the designated cities provided that their programmes meet the criteria of the action and the recommendations issued by the panels during the selection and monitoring process as referred to in Articles 9 and 10. This prize shall reward the quality of the programme in accordance with the objectives of the programme as specified in Article 3.*

*Justification*

*The rapporteur proposes a new version of Article 11 in another amendment.*

Amendment 28  
Article 11 a (new)

*Article 11a*

*Prize*

*On the basis of the report issued by the monitoring and advisory panel after its second meeting eight months before the event, a prize in honour of Melina Mercouri shall be awarded to the designated cities by the Commission provided that they meet the criteria laid down in Article 3 and have implemented the recommendations made by the selection as well as the monitoring and advisory panels. The prize shall be monetary and shall be awarded in full at the latest three months before the start of the relevant year.*

Amendment 29  
Article 12, subparagraph 2

A report on that evaluation shall be presented by the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions.

A report on that evaluation shall be presented by the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions  
*by the end of the year following the European Capital of Culture event.*

Amendment 30  
Article 13

Decision 1419/1999/EC as **modified** by Decision 649/2005/CE is hereby repealed.

Decision No 1419/1999/EC as **amended** by Decision No 649/2005/CE is hereby repealed. ***That Decision shall however continue to apply in the case of cities which have been designated as Capitals of Culture for 2007, 2008 and 2009.***

Amendment 31  
Article 14

1. The cities designated as European Capitals of Culture for 2010 on the basis of Decision 1419/1999/EC as modified by Decision 649/2005/CE shall be submitted to the monitoring process laid down in Articles 9 **and 10** of this Decision. The Commission **may** award a prize to the designated cities on the basis of Article 11 of this Decision.

2. By way of derogation to Article 4 to 8, the nominations for European Capitals of Culture concerning the years 2011 and 2012 shall be governed by the following decision procedure:

1) Cities in Member States shall be designated as European Capital of Culture, in turn, as set out on the list contained in Annex.

2) Each Member State shall submit, in turn, its nomination of one or more cities to the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions.

3) This nomination shall be submitted no later than four years before the event in question is due to begin and may be accompanied by a recommendation from the Member State concerned.

4) The Commission shall each year form a selection panel which shall issue a report on the nomination or nominations judged against the objectives and characteristics of

1. The cities designated as European Capitals of Culture for 2010 on the basis of Decision 1419/1999/EC as modified by Decision 649/2005/CE shall be submitted to the monitoring process laid down in Article 9 of this Decision. The Commission **shall** award a prize to the designated cities on the basis of Article 11 of this Decision.

2. By way of derogation to Article 3 to 8, the nominations for European Capitals of Culture concerning the years 2011 and 2012 shall be governed by the following decision procedure:

1) Cities in Member States shall be designated as European Capital of Culture, in turn, as set out on the list contained in Annex.

2) Each Member State shall submit, in turn, its nomination of one or more cities to the European Parliament, the Council, the Commission and the Committee of the Regions.

3) This nomination shall be submitted no later than four years before the event in question is due to begin and may be accompanied by a recommendation from the Member State concerned.

4) The Commission shall each year form a selection panel which shall issue a report on the nomination or nominations judged against the objectives and characteristics of

this action.

5) The selection panel shall be composed of seven leading independent personalities who are experts on the cultural sector, of whom two shall be appointed by the European Parliament, two by the Council, two by the Commission and one by the Committee of the Regions.

6) The selection panel shall submit its report to the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council.

7) The European Parliament may forward an opinion to the Commission on the nomination or nominations not later than three months after receipt of the report.

8) The Council, acting on a recommendation from the Commission drawn up in the light of the opinion of the European Parliament and of the selection panel's report, shall officially designate the city in question as a European Capital of Culture for the year for which it has been nominated.

**9) The nomination shall include a cultural programme based on the criteria laid down in Article 3.**

this action.

5) The selection panel shall be composed of seven leading independent personalities who are experts on the cultural sector, of whom two shall be appointed by the European Parliament, two by the Council, two by the Commission and one by the Committee of the Regions.

6) The selection panel shall submit its report to the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council.

7) The European Parliament may forward an opinion to the Commission on the nomination or nominations not later than three months after receipt of the report.

8) The Council, acting on a recommendation from the Commission drawn up in the light of the opinion of the European Parliament and of the selection panel's report, shall officially designate the city in question as a European Capital of Culture for the year for which it has been nominated.

#### Amendment 32

Article 14, paragraph 2 a (new)

***2a. By way of derogation from Article 3(3), the criteria set out in Article 3 and Annex II to Decision No 1419/1999/EC, as amended by Decision No 649/2005/EC, shall apply in the case of Capitals of Culture for 2010, 2011 and 2012, unless the city in question decides to base its programme on the criteria set out in Article 3(3).***

#### *Justification*

*Art. 13.1 - it is proposed that the text should be clear that the EC shall (rather than 'may') award the prize to cities. This is provided that, as noted in Article the cities meet the 'European dimension' criteria laid down in Article 3(3) and have implemented the*

*recommendations made by the selection and monitoring and advisory panels. However, cities should have the certainty that, provided they meet these requirements, they will receive funding under the Culture Programme (rather than this being left at the EC's discretion).*

*Art. 13.2 - while Articles 4 to 8 cover the selection procedures, there are additional requirements in Article 3 which have an affect on these selection procedures. Therefore it should be clarified that any derogation should be extended to Article 3 as well. However, 2011 and 2012 Capitals of Culture would still be subject to the new monitoring and advisory procedures.*

*Art. 13.3 - the 2010, 2011 and 2012 CC should all benefit from the monitoring and advisory panel procedures under the new Decision, and as a result be eligible for a prize. However, as they will have to apply to become CC by demonstrating how they will meet the criteria set out in the current 1999 Decision, it could be difficult and confusing for these Capitals to be assessed against the 'new' criteria when undergoing the monitoring and advisory procedure. Therefore, while cities could be encouraged to try to take into account the new criteria, it would be difficult to force cities to do so if they did not wish to.*

Amendment 33  
Article 15

This Decision shall apply from 1st January 2007.

***This Decision shall enter in force on the twentieth day following its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union. It shall apply from 1st January 2007, with the exception of Article 4, which shall apply from the date of entry into force of this Decision.***

*Justification*

*Clarifies entry into force of the decision.*

Amendment 34  
ANNEX

	ANNEX
	Order of entitlement to nominate a "European Capital of Culture"
2007	Luxembourg
2008	United Kingdom
2009	Austria - Lithuania
2010	Germany - Hungary
2011	Finland - Estonia
2012	Portugal - Slovenia
2013	France - Slovakia
2014	Sweden - Latvia

	ANNEX
	Order of entitlement to nominate a "European Capital of Culture" <sup>1</sup>
2007	Luxembourg - <b>Romania</b> <sup>2</sup>
2008	United Kingdom
2009	Austria - Lithuania
2010	Germany - Hungary
2011	Finland - Estonia
2012	Portugal - Slovenia
2013	France - Slovakia
2014	Sweden - Latvia

2015 Belgium - Czech Republic  
2016 Spain - Poland  
2017 Denmark - Cyprus  
2018 Netherlands - Malta  
2019 Italy

2015 Belgium - Czech Republic  
2016 Spain - Poland  
2017 Denmark - Cyprus  
2018 Netherlands - Malta  
2019 Italy - **Bulgaria** <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ireland was entitled to nominate a “European Capital of Culture” in 2005, Greece in 2006.*

<sup>2</sup> *Under the terms of Decision 1419/1999/EC, the Romanian city of Sibiu was designated as European capital of culture for the year 2007.*

<sup>3</sup> *Subject to accession to the EU, Bulgaria will participate in the European Capital of Culture event of 2019.*

### *Justification*

*The annex should be included as Decision 649/2005/EC which established the list will be repealed with the new Decision.*

*As Romania and Bulgaria are both nearing their accession to the EU, it is important to ensure their inclusion in the Annex to avoid the need for a further COD including them in the list.*

*As Romania is already due to host a CC event in 2007 as a third country it will not be able to have an additional CC, but the text highlights Romania as it should become a MS during 2007. The Annex allows Bulgaria to participate in 2019, but makes clear it would not be able to participate in the unlikely event that it has not acceded to the EU before 2019.*

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The European Capital of Culture Programme (ECC) was set up in 1985 by the then Greek cultural minister Melina Mercouri, with the aim of bringing citizens in Europe closer together.

Experience has shown that the programme leads to a long-term positive effect on the development of the cities selected while generating a great deal of interest with the citizens concerned.

### THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL

The document aims to highlight the wealth, diversity and common features of the cultural heritage in Europe and facilitate better mutual understanding between European citizens. At the same time the proposal plans to strengthen the competitive element and European added value, and introduces a monitoring phase.

#### *Involving the new EU Member States*

In accordance with the current list of 'pairs' of Member States entitled to propose cultural capitals of the period 2009-2019, from 2009 two capitals of culture will be designated in order to enable the 10 new EU Member States to take part in the programme.

#### *Financial aspect*

The proposal will have no direct financial implications as this aspect is covered under the Culture 2000 Programme and the forthcoming Culture 2007 Programme. At the present time the Commission proposal would make it possible to triple the Community contribution for the Culture 2007 Programme.

#### *Prize*

A prize will be awarded to the cities selected if the preparation of the programme complies with the aims and criteria of the event. This prize also represents financial support for implementing the CC programme.

#### *Selection panel/monitoring panel<sup>1</sup>*

A joint selection panel meets during the selection phase, composed of seven experts from the European institutions and six experts from each of the Member States concerned. During the monitoring phase a monitoring panel meets to watch over, assist with and advise on the CC's preparations for the year. It is composed of the seven European experts.

#### *Procedure*

The Commission proposal under discussion is a recasting of the 1999 text, Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019<sup>2</sup>.

The time-frame for the procedure looks like this:

---

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur proposes a change of terminology: *monitoring and advisory panel*\*.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 166, 1.7.1999, pp. 1-5.

<b>Time frame</b> * n = Capital of Culture year		<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Commission proposal</b>	<b>Rapporteur's amendments</b>		
n-6		Call for applications	Member State (MS)
n-5		Pre-selection meeting of panel in the MS concerned (13 experts)	MS
n-5 + 9 months		Final meeting of selection panel in the MS concerned (13 experts)	MS
n-4		Notification of the European Institutions of nominating a city	MS
n-4 + 2 months	<b>n-4 + 3 months</b>	Parliament opinion on the nomination	Parliament
		Designation of Cultural Capital	Council
n-2 – 3 months (three months before mid-term monitoring)		Mid-term report of the designated cities to the Commission (COM)	Cultural capital (CC)
n-2		Mid-term meeting of the Monitoring Panel* (7 European experts + COM representatives)	
n-2 + 1		Mid-term report of the Monitoring Panel* to the COM and MS	
n-9 months (three months before final monitoring)	<b>n-11 months</b> (three months before final monitoring)	Final report of the designated cities to the Commission	CC
n-6 months	<b>n-8 months</b>	– Final monitoring meeting (7 European experts + COM representatives)	
	<b>n-7 months</b>	– Final report of the Monitoring Panel* presented	
	<b>n-3 months (at the latest)</b>	– <b>Prize (financial support for the CC)</b>	Commission
n		Year of CC	CC
n + 1	<b>n+ max. 1 year</b>	Evaluation of results of the event	Commission



## RAPPORTEUR'S COMMENTS AND AMENDMENTS

The rapporteur welcomes the fact that the proposal strengthens the European dimension and improves the transparency of the selection procedure.

She also welcomes the fact that the Community contribution under the Culture 2007 programme will be three times that of the present programme.

At the same time she stresses the need for the prompt provision of sufficient Community funds, to enable the Capitals of Culture to implement their programme of events successfully and on schedule, and in this context proposes the following:

### *Prize*

A prize in honour of Melina Mercouri will be awarded in the form of a financial allocation to the selected city. To obtain a prize, the cities concerned must fulfil the aims and criteria of the action and take account of the recommendations of the selection panel and the monitoring and advisory panel for those cities. The prize will be based on the final report by the monitoring and advisory panel.

The task of the monitoring and advisory panel is to evaluate objectively, from the moment that the cultural capital is designated, the state of preparations for the programme of events, while also providing assistance to the capitals in devising their programmes, consisting mainly of expert advice and early action to deal with any problems in the monitoring phase.

The rapporteur takes the view that a solution must be found to enable Romania and Bulgaria to be included in the COC initiative.

With regard to the selection criteria for cultural programmes listed in the proposal, the rapporteur draws attention to the need for the prompt provision of further details and clarification, so that cultural capitals have a clear idea which requirements they need to fulfil. These details should be set out on the cultural capitals website.

The rapporteur calls for a website to be set up, to be constantly maintained and regularly updated by the Commission. This should:

- provide further information and assistance for cities in the application, selection and implementation process;
- set up links between the programmes of nominated cities;
- and promote links for the exchange of experience and know-how between the present and previous capitals of culture.

The website should particularly contain the following:

- frequently answered questions (FAQs);
- links, best practice examples and useful tips for cultural capitals;
- the list of mentors (for instance, directors and experts of previous cultural capitals);
- contact addresses for the experts on the monitoring and advisory panel;

- links to existing sites, such as the European Capitals of Culture and Cultural Month website.

The rapporteur supports the general Commission proposal to provide third countries with an opportunity for taking part in European cultural events by reviving the Cultural Month initiative<sup>1</sup> or a comparable initiative.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1990 on future eligibility for the 'European City of Culture' and on a special European Cultural Month event (OJ C 162, 3.7.1990, p. 1.).

## MINORITY OPINION

### Minority opinion by Mrs Erna Hennicot-Schoepges under Rule 48 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure

Erna Hennicot-Schoepges draws attention to her amendments which were not adopted in the final vote final, and which aimed primarily to:

- facilitate and simplify procedures by abolishing the role of the panel, leaving the Member States responsible for selecting and nominating the European capital of culture in accordance with their own criteria, and in full knowledge of the regional and local particularities of the various candidate cities;
- organise former European capitals of culture as a network for supporting future capitals of culture during the preparatory phase, on the basis of the experience they have gained in previous events, so as to ensure the European added value of the operation.

Not wishing to oppose the consensus, she nevertheless underlines the risks inherent in the revised procedure: it is important to avoid the negative experience that Luxembourg went through during the procedure by a panel for selection as Capital of Culture 2007.

When pronouncing judgment on the candidates' initiatives, the panel will need to show a keen awareness of the sensibilities of those with whom it deals, and of the context of the region concerned, so as to aid cultural development rather than reward what already exists.

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture for the years 2007 to 2019
<b>References</b>	COM(2005)0209 – C6-0157/2005 – 2005/0102(COD)
<b>Date submitted to Parliament</b>	30.5.2005
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	CULT 29.9.2005
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	
<b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b> Date of decision	
<b>Enhanced cooperation</b> Date announced in plenary	
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Christa Prets 16.6.2005
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>	
<b>Simplified procedure – date of decision</b>	
<b>Legal basis disputed</b> Date of JURI opinion	/
<b>Financial endowment amended</b> Date of BUDG opinion	/
<b>European Economic and Social Committee consulted – date of decision in plenary</b>	
<b>Committee of the Regions consulted – date of decision in plenary</b>	
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	3.10.2005    28.11.2005    23.1.2006
<b>Date adopted</b>	23.2.2006
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+:    20 -:    0 0:    1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Maria Badia I Cutchet, Christopher Beazley, Giovanni Berlinguer, Guy Bono, Marie-Hélène Descamps, Věra Flasarová, Milan Gaľa, Manolis Mavrommatis, Ljudmila Novak, Doris Pack, Miguel Portas, Christa Prets, Karin Resetarits, Nikolaos Sifunakis, Hannu Takkula, Helga Trüpel, Thomas Wise, Tomáš Zatloukal
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Emine Bozkurt, Hanna Foltyn-Kubicka, Nina Škottová
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	
<b>Date tabled</b>	10.3.2006
<b>Comments</b> (available in one language only)	...