

EN

EN

EN



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels,

COMMISSION WORKING DOCUMENT

Application of Article 151(4) of the EC Treaty: use of the Structural Funds in the field of culture during the period 1994-1999

COMMISSION WORKING DOCUMENT

Application of Article 151(4) of the EC Treaty: use of the Structural Funds in the field of culture during the period 1994-1999

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 *Request from the European Parliament and the Council*

In its resolution of 5 September 2001 on cultural cooperation in the European Union¹, the European Parliament calls on the Commission “*to provide Parliament and the Council with a report reviewing the funding of cultural activities as part of the subsidies granted by the Structural Funds*”.

Moreover, the Council resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union invites the Member States and the Commission “*to cooperate in order to enable the Commission to update the assessment of the implementation of Article 151(4) of the Treaty and to report back to the Council*”².

Article 151(4) of the Treaty establishing the European Community lays down that “*The Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of this Treaty, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures*”. This provision, inserted in Title XII, which sets out Community competence in the field of culture, reflects the desire to place culture among the major objectives of the European Community. It places an obligation on the European Community to take account of the cultural objective as part of its activity. This requirement has certainly been put into practice during the Community’s history, but with the entry into force of the Treaty on European Union it has become statutory and systematic, both for legislative acts and joint policies.

1.2 *The need to update a first report*

A first report on the consideration of cultural aspects in European Community action was prepared by the Commission and published in 1996³. The scope of this report was fairly wide, as it covered all Community policies, divided between different chapters: “Culture, cohesion and balanced regional development”, “Culture, social and human resources policy”, “Culture and advanced technologies” (information and communication) and finally “Culture and other internal policies”. The taking into account in this exercise of all Community policies relating to culture is extremely laborious, given the diversity of measures and policies concerned and the increased volume of activity in recent years.

¹ European Parliament resolution of 5 September 2001 on cultural cooperation in the European Union (OJ C 72 E, 21.3.2002).

² Council resolution of 21 January 2002 on the role of culture in the development of the European Union (OJ C 32/02, 5.2.2002).

³ First report on the consideration of cultural aspects in European Community action, COM(96)160 final, 15 April 1996.

This document is therefore intended to update the previous report targeting regional policy. This policy takes pride of place with regard to funding for culture in the Member States, owing to the significance of the financial resources and the diversity of instruments at its disposal. The aim of this document is to specify the number and nature of projects supported, and the amounts from the Structural Funds used in the cultural field. These elements should provide fuel for the ongoing discussion on future action by the European Community, particularly in the context of its forthcoming enlargement to include 10 new Member States.

It should be pointed out at the start that this exercise was very different from the one currently being carried out in parallel by the Commission with a view to presenting a new programme to encourage transnational cooperation between cultural operators to follow on from the current Culture 2000 programme from 2007. The aim of this programme (transnational cooperation), its geographical coverage and its relatively modest resources (initially 167 million euro over five years) mean that there is no duplication of Community action carried out under the Structural Funds.

2. SURVEY METHOD

2.1 Data collection

In order to give the Commission as detailed a vision as possible of the amount of the Structural Funds used, directly or indirectly, in the cultural field, the Commission launched a questionnaire in June 2002 aimed at the Member States. The questionnaire was to include all measures funded in the cultural field by the Structural Funds and managed on a decentralised basis by the Member States. In parallel, a survey was carried out among other Directorates-General in the Commission, also with the aim of covering Structural Fund operations in the cultural field managed centrally by the Commission.

2.2 Period covered by the survey

This working document relates to the previous programming period (1994–1999), for which the national authorities may have data and specific examples more readily available. However, in the questionnaire sent by the Commission, the Member States were encouraged to provide, where possible, a summary for the current programming period (2000-2006). In some cases, therefore, the replies from the Member States (set out in Annex 2) contain, in addition to data for the period 1994-1999, information concerning the current programming period. During this period, two Community Regulations referring to culture as a factor in economic and social cohesion and, in consequence, as a possible area for intervention were adopted.⁴ It may be considered that the place of culture in economic and social cohesion policy was strengthened during the current programming period.

The new Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds considers that: “*cultural development, the quality of the natural and the man-made environment, the qualitative and cultural dimension of life and the development of tourism contribute to making regions economically and socially more attractive in so far as they encourage the creation of sustainable employment*” (recital 6). Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 1999 on the European Regional Development Fund lays down that the financial contribution of the ERDF shall support, inter alia: the development of tourism and cultural investment, including the protection of cultural and natural heritage, provided that they are creating sustainable jobs.

2.3 *Definition of the concept of “culture”*

The “First report on the consideration of cultural aspects in European Community action” underlined the difficulty linked to defining “culture”: “(...) *the concept of Culture is a nebulous one which can vary from one school of thought to another, from one society to another and from one era to another. It may include the Fine Arts, literature, etc., but may also include all types of knowledge and features which characterise a society and make it possible to understand the world*”.⁵ The Commission has therefore chosen not to define the concept of culture within the framework of this survey, thus giving the Member States a degree of leeway.

2.4 *Presentation of results*

In the questionnaire, a per-Fund approach was chosen so as to include all objectives and all types of measures. For each Fund, the eligible measures⁶ therefore include measures with a direct or indirect influence on the cultural sector. The Commission did not want to go beyond the level of “measures”, as the “projects” level would excessively dilute the object of the exercise and could create additional difficulties for the Member States in collecting data. However, many Member States were still able to provide indications concerning “projects”.

The replies from Member States differ in terms of presentation: in addition to indications by Fund, some also provided data by region, programme or objective. The replies, slightly amended to ensure clarity and a degree of standardisation in presentation, are reproduced in an attached document.⁷

2.5 *Limits of this document*

The document is based on data provided by the Member States. The elements contained in their replies are not claimed to be exhaustive. The Member States faced a number of difficulties in collecting information as a result of their largely decentralised management. The various Funds give rise to programming at Community, national, regional or local levels, depending on their characteristics. A number of players are called upon to select and follow up projects which will receive co-financing. Information on projects with a cultural dimension is therefore fragmentary. The various Member States have also stressed the difficulty of evaluating precisely the amounts intended for culture, as most projects have a transverse or multi-sectoral dimension. Finally, the measures in question are already old, as they relate to the period 1994-1999.

To this may be added differing ideas of the concepts of “culture” and “project with a cultural dimension”. Thus a project considered in one country to have a cultural dimension will not necessarily be considered as such in another.

The contributions from the various Member States therefore differed widely in quantitative as well as qualitative terms. This makes reliable comparison of data difficult, and they must therefore be regarded with great caution and considered more as orders of magnitude.

⁵ COM(96) 160 final, 15 April 1996.

⁶ Measures eligible for intervention from the Structural Funds are defined in general terms in the regulations governing each Fund. See Annex 1 for a review of the Structural Funds.

⁷ See Annex 2.

On the basis of the information obtained, the document reviews Structural Fund operations in the cultural field firstly in general, then for each State, before drawing conclusions.

3. REVIEW OF STRUCTURAL FUND OPERATIONS IN THE CULTURAL FIELD

For the period 1994-1999, three main types of operations can be distinguished:

- programmes carried out in partnership between the European Commission, the States and the regions;
- “Community initiatives”;
- “innovative measures” or “pilot actions”.

3.1 Programmes carried out in partnership between the European Commission, the States and the regions

3.1.1 General presentation

Programmes are implemented by the Member States in accordance with a development strategy negotiated between the European Commission and each Member State. Where appropriate, it is the subject of a “single programming document” (SPD) or a “Community support framework” (CSF).⁸ The CSFs include operational programmes. The 1994-1999 programming period included three “Objective 1” operational programmes devoted to tourism and including operations in the cultural field⁹.

3.1.2 Examples

Germany

Völklingen steelworks; a World Heritage site

Total cost: 33.3 million DM

Community grant: 16.5 million DM

Description: This 60-hectare industrial complex, part of UNESCO’s cultural heritage since 1994, had been disused since the 1980s. The project made possible the restoration of the complex, promoting its architectural heritage. Some buildings have been converted into a business and technology centre. The other part contains entertainment venues with exceptional acoustics and rooms for all sorts of cultural events.

⁸ The CSFs only involve regions eligible under Objective 1. Regions eligible under Objective 2 are mainly the subject of SPDs.

⁹ These involve Greece, Ireland and Portugal. For the current programming period (2000-2006), Greece and Portugal have adopted operational programmes or sub-programmes entirely “Culture”-oriented. The main priorities are: development of cultural heritage, promotion of improved access to various sites and activities, modernisation of cultural infrastructures and institutions, etc. The amounts committed by the Structural Funds to the “Culture” operational programmes for the period are 414 300 000 € for Greece and 237 278 000 € for Portugal.

Greece

Restoration of the monuments of Mystras

Total cost: 2 935 000 €

Community grant: 2 201 000 €

Source: ERDF

Description: The town of Mystras, near Sparta, is a unique example of Byzantine religious and secular architecture (1262-1460). Between 1995 and 2001 this collection, part of UNESCO's cultural heritage, was restored. Today, it offers visitors a vast museum complex displaying different aspects of the culture of this citadel.

3.2 *Community initiatives*

3.2.1 General presentation

“Community initiatives” enable the Commission to initiate and develop measures of particular interest to the Community. During 1994-1999, 13 initiatives were launched, generating more than 500 programmes. Replies from the Member States have made it possible to identify the main initiatives likely to involve the field of culture:

- Interreg II: cross-border cooperation between regions (strand A), energy networks (strand B), cooperation in the field of land-use planning (strand C) ;
- Leader II: rural development;
- Urban: revitalisation of urban areas in crisis;
- Pesca: economic diversification in zones dependent on the fishing industry;
- Peace: supporting the peace and reconciliation process in Northern Ireland.

The Member States also manage these programmes on a decentralised basis. Several Funds may contribute to each initiative.

3.2.2 Examples

Luxembourg

Rediscovering countryside paths

Total cost: 1 796 000 €

Community grant: 1 008 000 €

Source: INTERREG IIC

Description: The European green network is inviting tourists to rediscover the charms of disused railway lines, abandoned towpaths and trails rich in history (Roman roads, pilgrims' ways, etc). Since it was set up in October 1999, the network is emphasising through its many

initiatives the role that these forgotten paths could play again in decongesting polluted town centres or enhancing rural areas which have become abandoned. Although it is currently confined to north-west Europe and covers Belgium, Luxembourg, France and Ireland, the aim is to extend the initiative in future to other countries.

Portugal

Europe of traditions

Source: LEADER II

Description: This transnational cooperation project was established in June 1997, at the initiative of the LEADER group Vale do Lima (Portugal), bringing together five top-of-the-range national tourist accommodation organisations. The aim of the consortium is the promotion at European level of tourist accommodation in old buildings with character and the preservation of their historical and architectural heritage.

3.3 *Innovative measures or pilot actions*

3.3.1 Under the ERDF

Article 10 of the ERDF enables regional authorities in the European Union to submit directly to the European Commission cooperation and innovation projects on previously established themes.¹⁰ DG XVI (Regional policy and cohesion) decided in 1995 to launch a call for proposals to promote innovative pilot actions with a cultural theme, considering culture to be a possible factor in restoring the balance between different areas of the Community. In addition, cultural development “cannot fully take shape without networking, which permits exchange of experiences, mutual enrichment, the transfer of know-how or the development of joint projects”.¹¹ The budget for the period 1995-1999 was 15 million euro, enabling support for 32 projects. They may be grouped in four areas: enhancement of heritage; integrated development of cultural activities, particularly traditional activities; cultural development through the use of new technologies and cultural innovation and local development through networking based on economic and social objectives. These projects have led mainly to the enhancement of local cultural heritage and the creation of structures and support for learning and information.¹²

3.3.2 Examples

United Kingdom, Northern Ireland, Italy and France

Coast heritage

Total cost: 895 780 €

Community grant: 485 285 €

¹⁰ These are usually therefore managed centrally by the Commission.

¹¹ Publication by Regional Policy DG “Culture and territorial development: a challenge for the future”.

¹² Information on this subject can be found on the site:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/innovation/innovating/culture.htm

Description: The main aim is the development and consolidation of the COAST network linking European coastal towns. For this, the preservation, revitalisation and commercialisation of defined elements of the partners' physical and social cultural heritage emphasise economic development at local level adapted to the needs of the local population. The objectives involve significant exchanges of information between partners and enhancement of the variety of coastal cultures and of their particular heritage.

3.3.3 Under the EAGGF

During the period 1994-1999, two pilot projects with a cultural component were supported, on the basis of Article 8 of Regulation 2085/93 on the EAGGF. These projects aim to enhance the rural heritage, buildings and walls of cultivation terraces. The pilot measures, by means of technical assistance or demonstration projects, are the first step towards later measures funded by the operational programmes. It should be pointed out that the EAGGF no longer funds pilot projects in the current programming period.

3.3.4 Example

France

Project No 95FR06001

Community grant: 762 511 €

Description: demonstration project: restoring cultivation terraces

4. SUMMARY BY STATE

The amounts given below were calculated on the basis of indications provided by the Member States; any shortcomings have already been mentioned previously.

Due to the difficulties of collection even within the Member States, the multi-sectoral nature of co-financed projects and the absence of a precise and uniform definition of the concept of culture, the following amounts should be considered simply as orders of magnitude.

Indicative amounts of the contribution from the Structural Funds for the field of culture during the period 1994-1999

MEMBER STATE	Indicative amounts of the contribution from the Structural Funds for the field of culture during the period 1994-1999¹³ (x million euro)	Comments
Germany	180.558	This amount was provided by the German authorities. However, adding up the total grants per project gives a total of 185.074 million euro.
Austria	18.502	This amount was provided by the Austrian authorities.
Belgium	8.591	
Denmark	4.464	
Spain	59.279	
Finland	36.9	This amount was provided by the Finnish authorities. It does not include Leader II.
France	219.417	
Greece	293.180	
Ireland	389.935	This amount was calculated on the basis of data provided by the Irish authorities; they have expressed reservations concerning the cultural nature of some of the measures

¹³ The amounts given in national currencies in the replies from the Member States were converted into euro at the rate for December 1999.

		listed.
Italy	148.040	
Luxembourg	5.365	
Netherlands	91.890	This amount was provided by the Netherlands authorities.
Portugal	0.083	
United Kingdom	1 217.687	
Sweden	97.8	This amount was provided by the Swedish authorities. However, adding up the total grants per project gives a total of 87.027 million euro.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Lessons

The difficulty encountered by most Member States in gathering the information required, owing frequently to their decentralised management, enables a number of lessons to be learnt.

5.1.1 The nature of projects supported

The projects supported differ widely, and their cultural dimension varies. There are three different degrees: some Structural Fund operations, particularly within the framework of “operational programmes”, provide direct support for cultural infrastructure or installations (e.g. conservation of archaeological sites). Other operations provide indirect support for culture by developing infrastructure facilitating access to culture (e.g. roads leading to a site). Finally, some operations provide general support for infrastructure (roads, hotels) in a region, thus promoting the economic, tourist and, indirectly, cultural development of a region.

5.1.2 The amounts

The amounts announced are significant, but must be considered with a great deal of caution. Because of the range of definitions of the concept of culture, these figures take into account different situations from one country to another. Moreover, the Member States have frequently stressed the fragmentary nature of the data forwarded, linked to the highly decentralised management of the Structural Funds.

5.1.3 The objectives

The development of cultural activity is not in itself an aim of the Structural Funds. Their aim is regional development and cohesion, using various means. Cultural and tourist activity represents one of these means, without it having a specific place allotted to it. In this context, one is reminded of the conclusions of the “First report on the consideration of cultural aspects in European Community action”: *“Although considerable means are devoted to cultural activities or activities with a cultural dimension, the operations implemented are not, or are*

rarely, covered by a specific policy which is a response to the tasks assigned to the Community in the cultural field. They do not correspond to a cultural project and have few or no Community cultural objectives".¹⁴

5.2 Conclusions

5.2.1 Community operations in the field of culture

The various Community operations in the field of culture pursue different objectives. The aim of the Structural Funds is regional development within the European Union, while the "Culture 2000" programme, the main financial instrument for direct support for cultural activity developed by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture¹⁵, encourages multilateral cultural cooperation in Europe. The aim of operations is also very different: for the Structural Funds, the main aim is funding for cultural infrastructure or for heritage conservation, while in the case of the "Culture 2000" programme the accent is on collaboration on a common project between players in the cultural life of a number of European countries. It is therefore about supporting cultural cooperation measures which may take very different forms. This dimension of cooperation is almost completely absent from projects funded by the Structural Funds except, up to a point, those funded by Interreg.

While the various Community cultural operations are distinct, and have their own autonomy and *raison d'être*, they are nevertheless complementary. The Structural Funds, by contributing to economic and social dynamism within regions, create fertile ground for cultural organisations and institutions to thrive, and these may take part in rewarding cooperation projects. The "Culture 2000" programme is aimed solely at providing a "layer" of European added value by developing multilateral transnational cooperation between cultural operators. The Structural Funds work to promote economic and social cohesion.

5.2.2 On the choice of using the Structural Funds in the cultural field

From one Member State to another, the cultural projects supported by the Structural Funds may be of various types, and represent differing amounts. This survey has therefore shown that the Member States make very different choices as to the use of the Structural Funds.

The collecting of data for this survey gave rise to a discussion in each Member State on the use of the Structural Funds in the field of culture. This document may provide fuel for the debate by giving national, regional and local authorities information and data for comparing the situation in each Member State, which may be useful in making choices as to the future use of the Structural Funds.

¹⁴ COM(96) 160 final.

¹⁵ The Directorate-General for Education and Culture also has a programme ("MEDIA") specifically for the audiovisual sector, aimed at strengthening the competitiveness of the European audiovisual industry through a series of incentives.

Annex 1

REVIEW

OF THE DIFFERENT STRUCTURAL FUNDS AND POTENTIAL MEASURES RELEVANT TO THE CULTURAL FIELD

1. GENERAL PRESENTATION

1.1 Background

Promoting regional development is a major policy of the European Community, accounting for more than 30% of the overall budget. It assists disadvantaged regions or those severely affected by economic change to catch up with other regions, while at the same time fostering social cohesion. This policy is financed through the Structural Funds, i.e. the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG).

The Single European Act of 1986 established the use of the Structural Funds, which underwent radical change in 1993. Agenda 2000, which describes the financial perspective for the 2000-06 period, further modified the Structural Fund regime with a view to the Union's enlargement.

1.2 Characteristics of the 1994-99 period

During this period, the Structural Fund outlay exceeded EUR 175 billion. Although the regulations relating to the Structural Funds for this period did not explicitly refer to culture, it was one of the factors underpinning the efforts of various Member States to bring about economic and social development.

1.3 Tasks and objectives

The objectives and tasks of the Structural Funds for the period in question were as follows:¹⁶:

- Objective 1¹⁷: to promote the development and structural adjustment of regions whose development is lagging behind;
- Objective 2¹⁸: to convert the regions, frontier regions or parts of regions (including employment areas and urban communities) seriously affected by industrial decline;
- Objective 3¹⁹: to combat long-term unemployment;
- Objective 4²⁰: to facilitate the occupational integration of young people;
- Objective 5: in connection with the reform of the common agricultural policy:
 - a) to speed up the adjustment of agricultural structures;
 - b) to promote the development of rural areas²¹.

Moreover, a new objective for the Structural Funds was established by the Act of Accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden:

- Objective 6²²: to promote the development of regions with an extremely low population density.

The Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) was not at this time a Structural Fund as such. However, it financed structural measures in the fisheries sector within the framework of the Structural Fund programmes.

The Structural Funds contributed in 1994-99, each according to its specific provisions²³, to the attainment of Objectives 1 to 6, broken down as follows:

¹⁶ Council Regulation (EEC) No 2081/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 on the tasks of the Structural Funds and their effectiveness and on coordination of their activities between themselves and with the operations of the European Investment Bank and the other existing financial instruments (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 5-19) and Council Regulation (EEC) No 2082/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 4253/88 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards coordination of the activities of the different Structural Funds between themselves and with the operations of the European Investment Bank and the other existing financial instruments (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 20-30).

¹⁷ Based on the general criterion of per capita GDP lower than 75% of the Community average, with certain exceptions; the 1993 regulation laid down the list of eligible regions under Objective 1 for the 1994-99 period. Austria's Burgenland was added to this list for the 1995-99 period.

¹⁸ During the reference period, Objective 2 eligibility was determined mainly by three criteria being satisfied: an unemployment rate higher than the Community average; a percentage share of industrial employment exceeding the Community average; an observable fall in industrial employment.

¹⁹ Operations linked to Objective 3 are not limited to specific regions.

²⁰ Operations linked to Objective 4 are not limited to designated regions.

²¹ During the 1994-99 period, the general criterion for Objective 5(b) eligibility was a low level of socio-economic development (assessed on the basis of GDP per inhabitant). A further requirement was that two out of three key criteria should be satisfied: high rate of agricultural employment; low level of agricultural income; low population density and/or significant depopulation trend.

²² The Act of Accession contained the list of regions eligible for this Objective over the 1995-99 period.

²³ ESF: Council Regulation (EEC) No 2084/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 4255/88 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards the European Social Fund (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 39-43).

Objective

- Objective 1: ERDF, ESF, EAGGF Guidance Section and FIG;
- Objective 2: ERDF and ESF;
- Objective 3: ESF;
- Objective 4: ESF;
- Objective 5(a): EAGGF Guidance Section and FIG;
- Objective 5(b): EAGGF Guidance Section, ESF and ERDF;
- Objective 6: ERDF, ESF, EAGGF Guidance Section and FIG.

2. THE INDIVIDUAL FUNDS AND ELIGIBLE MEASURES

2.1 European Regional Development Fund

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) provides support for productive investment, the creation or modernisation of infrastructures geared to the development or conversion of the regions concerned, and measures aimed at developing the indigenous potential of those regions. The ERDF also provides support for studies or pilot schemes concerning regional development at Community level, particularly in connection with frontier regions of the Member States.

Eligible measures:

- Productive investment to permit the creation or maintenance of permanent jobs
- Investment in infrastructure varying according to the objectives
- Indigenous development: local and SME development

In the cultural field, measures might include direct financing of cultural facilities, support for exploiting cultural heritage; measures to boost local skills and knowledge, support for businesses manufacturing craft products or typical products of a particular region, or urban regeneration measures with an impact on tourist routes.

ERDF: Council Regulation (EEC) No 2083/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 4254/88 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards the European Regional Development Fund (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 34-38).

EAGGF "Guidance": Council Regulation (EEC) No 2085/93 of 20 July 1993 amending Regulation (EEC) No 4256/88 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) Guidance Section (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 44-47).

FIG: Council Regulation (EEC) No 2080/93 of 20 July 1993 laying down provisions for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 2052/88 as regards the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (OJ L 193, 31.7.1993, pages 1-4).

2.2 European Social Fund

The priority of the European Social Fund (ESF) is to provide support throughout the Community for vocational training measures and employment aid, and for the creation of self-employed activities, in order to combat long-term unemployment and integrate young people into working life.

Eligible measures

- Occupational integration of unemployed persons exposed to long-term unemployment
- Occupational integration of young people in search of employment
- Integration of persons exposed to exclusion from the labour market
- Promotion of equal opportunities on the labour market
- Adaptation of workers to industrial change
- Employment growth and stability
- Boosting human potential in research, science and technology
- Strengthening education and training systems

In the cultural field, measures might include creation of jobs in the cultural sector, financing of basic training and continuing training in the cultural sphere, measures concerning the information society²⁴, improvement of structures for education, training and aid towards employment in the cultural sector, or the creation of partnerships between training institutions and companies impacting on the cultural sector.

2.3 European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund — Guidance Section

Operations under the Guidance Section of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF/Guidance) are geared in particular to strengthening and re-organising agricultural structures, ensuring the conversion of agricultural production and fostering the development of supplementary activities for farmers, guaranteeing a fair standard of living for farmers, helping to develop the social fabric of rural areas, to safeguard the environment, to preserve the countryside (inter alia through the conservation of natural agricultural resources) and to offset the effects of natural handicaps on agriculture.

Eligible measures relating to agricultural structures:

- Measures to support farm incomes and to maintain activities in mountain, hill or less-favoured areas, and encouragement for the installation of young farmers
- Measures to improve the efficiency of the structures of holdings
- Measures to encourage the creation of producers' groupings

²⁴ In particular, gathering and exchanging data with an impact on culture and cultural heritage.

- Conversion, diversification, reorientation and improvement of the quality of agricultural products

Eligible measures geared to diversification of rural areas:

- Development of rural infrastructures
- Encouragement for tourist investment
- Other measures aimed at preventing natural disasters, renovating villages, protecting rural heritage, developing and optimally utilising woodlands, protecting the environment and the countryside.

In the field of culture, measures might encompass tourism and crafts, promotion of cultural heritage and the local area, enhancement and protection of the countryside, management of the environment and redevelopment of landscape having an impact on the cultural sector, or measures to promote cultural activities as part of efforts to restore villages.

2.4 Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance

The Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) has the following tasks: contribute to achieving a sustainable balance between resources and their exploitation; strengthen the competitiveness of structures and the development of economically viable enterprises in the sector; improve market supply and the value added to fishery and aquaculture products.

Eligible measures:

- Adjustment of fishing effort
- Fleet modernisation
- Aquaculture development
- Marine environment protection
- Fishing port facilities
- Fishery product processing and marketing
- Product promotion

In the cultural field, measures might include enhancement of the fishery and aquaculture sectors (e.g. creation of fishing museums) or revitalisation of areas dependent on fisheries and aquaculture.