

*The EL-CSID project is coordinated by the Institute for European Studies (IES)*



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 693799.

# Culture in the ENP South: Broad Ambitions, Little Strategy, Insufficient Means

Riccardo Trobbiani  
United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration  
Studies (UNU-CRIS)

Issue 2018/08 • May 2018

## Executive summary

This policy brief analyses the key shortcomings of European Union (EU) cultural cooperation in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) South and proposes recommendations for reform. It looks at both the *strategies* and *instruments* in place.

- ❖ Euro-Mediterranean cultural relations lack strategic thinking. While a great deal of attention is given to the Mediterranean within the nascent EU strategy for International Cultural Relations (ICR), a region-specific plan is still missing. Also, culture does not seem to be at the heart of either the EU Global Strategy or the latest ENP review, and therefore its role in EU's external action and relative importance vis-à-vis other foreign policy tools remain unclear.
- ❖ Partially because of this lack of strategies and coherence, several challenges affect the practice of EU support for culture in the region. Most EU initiatives are based on a donor-recipient relationship with target countries, making it difficult to establish co-created spaces for cultural cooperation. Also, EU-financed programmes remain short-termed in nature, thus failing to give to southern cultural actors the certainty of continuous support, which would strengthen their independence and political clout vis-à-vis their governments. Finally, programmes are endowed with resources that are not proportional to the ambitious objectives of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership.

For these reasons, the EU should:

- ❖ Under the leadership of EEAS, better incorporate culture into the EU's overall foreign policy objectives and give it more relevance therein. This process should also give greater centrality to the role of the Cultural Diplomacy Platform in the definition of the strategy on ICR.
- ❖ In cooperation with DG NEAR (so far marginal in the debate on ICR), draft a region-specific plan for culture in the ENP South. This should be defined in close consultation with the governments and cultural sector in partner countries, through 'trialogues' that can rely either on pre-existing fora (e.g. the Union for the Mediterranean) or on new specific ones to be set up by the European Commission. A key component of this region-specific approach should overcome a donor-recipient relationship by foreseeing a stronger strategic and financial contribution of southern partners.
- ❖ Seek stronger co-ownership with other actors with a regional relevance, by stepping up cultural cooperation with regional organisations (e.g. the League of Arab States), enhancing joint actions with EU member states and their cultural institutes and ensuring coordination with other international donors (e.g. Ford Foundation, Open Society Foundations, DOEN Foundation).
- ❖ Close the gap between the limited available means and the ambitious stated objectives of supporting intercultural dialogue, cohesion and stability as well as political, social and economic development in the region by, on the one hand, devoting more financial resources to cultural cooperation and, on the other hand, identifying realistic objectives. For example, building upon the experience of Med Culture in Jordan, the EU should focus on the creation of a permanent dialogue between the cultural sector and national authorities in all ENP South countries.
- ❖ Design longer-lasting funding instruments for culture in the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). In the longer term, a system of stronger co-funding from participating countries should be envisaged, possibly taking as a model the new-born Partnership on Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area (PRIMA – 2018-2028) in the field of science.
- ❖ Design funding instruments in close consultation with managers and cultural actors who have implemented previous EU programmes and projects, as well as with civil society and the independent cultural sector in partner countries, trying to follow up on the incorporation of their concerns in future programmes.

## Euro-Mediterranean cultural relations: still waiting for a coherent strategy

The EU has a long-standing experience in supporting culture in its Southern Neighbourhood, based on the third chapter of the 1995 Barcelona Declaration establishing a 'partnership in social, cultural and human affairs'<sup>1</sup>. The specific importance of culture in fostering dialogue and cooperation within the Euro-Mediterranean partnership has been stated multiple times in the past decades. Also, the process of policy formulation concerning culture in EU external relations started with the 2007 EC **Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world**<sup>2</sup> and leading to the 2016 Joint Communication **Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations**<sup>3</sup> dedicated a great deal of attention to the Mediterranean, in particular with regard to the need for intercultural dialogue with the Arab world in an historical phase of rising insecurities and religious radicalisation. Interestingly, the 2018 EC Communication on **A New European Agenda for Culture**, which focused on ICR as one of its three strategic objectives, briefly stated that the EC and the High Representative will develop regional strategies for cultural cooperation, including on the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)<sup>4</sup>. However, the potential timing for this was generically identified after the expected appointment of cultural focal points in EU delegations<sup>5</sup>, which has in itself an unclear deadline. Most importantly, the usefulness of designing a strategy targeting the whole MENA region, whose policy-specific boundaries will anyway need to be clarified, remains to be explained. This is especially true as ENP South countries are so far the only ones having a structured legal and political basis for cultural cooperation, which is mostly based on the legal framework of the ENP itself, with its own distinct assets and criticalities. The bilateral relations between EU and Gulf countries or Iran require completely different approaches than Euro-Mediterranean cultural cooperation as established in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the ENP.

In most cases, the constant mentioning of the Mediterranean in EU documents has been limited to praising the innovative initiatives taken by the EU and its partners in this region of the world – for instance the establishment of the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue Between Cultures, the Euro-Mediterranean University of Slovenia and multiple financial programmes and fora – without putting them in a strategic perspective of future action or bringing them under a single and well-endowed institutional framework. Also, in these policy documents, the political, security and economic goals that are to be pursued through culture and intercultural dialogue have been disproportionate if compared to the resources invested. These goals include contribution to mutual understanding and bringing people closer together<sup>6</sup>, and helping stabilisation in 'political tension, economic upheaval, violent radicalisation and migratory flows'<sup>7</sup>.

Political leadership and strategic guidance in Euro-Mediterranean cultural relations are neither strong nor coherent. At the regional level, the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) remains a 'light' multilateral arrangement without own financial capacity and limiting itself to 'label' regional projects that are funded by other actors: predominantly the EU, UfM member states, International Organisations, private foundations and others. While the 2008 Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers of Culture in Athens laid down optimistic priorities for Euro-Mediterranean cultural cooperation, ten years after this meeting a new one is nowhere in sight, and political and cultural divergences between countries in the region often curtail cultural cooperation at the regional level. A representative example of the

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Barcelona declaration', adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Conference, Barcelona, 27-28 January 1995, [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/euromed/docs/bd\\_en.pdf](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/euromed/docs/bd_en.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> EC (2007) Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world, COM(2007) 242 final, Brussels, 10 May 2007.

<sup>3</sup> EC and HR (2016) Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations, JOIN(2016) 29 final, Brussels, 8 June 2016.

<sup>4</sup> EC (2018) A New European Agenda for Culture, COM(2018) 267 final, Brussels, 22 May 2018, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> EC (2018a) Staff Working Document accompanying COM (2018) 267 final, SWD(2018) 167 final, Brussels, 22 May 2018, p.18.

<sup>6</sup> Barcelona Declaration, op. cit., p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> EC and HR (2016), op. cit., p. 6.

way in which long-standing political tensions can affect cultural cooperation appeared in 2017, when Israel decided to pull back from Creative Europe, the main EU funding programme for culture, because of the potential exclusion from financing of cultural projects based in settlements of West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights<sup>8</sup>.

In most recent years, a positive sign of political leadership has come from an inter-regional forum. The first 5+5 Dialogue Culture Ministers Meeting took place in Tunis on 10 February 2017, including high-level observers from the Arab Maghreb Union, the Anna Lindh Foundation, the EU and the UfM. The meeting issued a 'Tunis Declaration' endorsing the launch of a segment on culture for the 5+5 dialogue. The declaration sets ambitious priorities regarding the promotion of common values through ad-hoc policies and initiatives; policy dialogue; mobility of cultural actors; development of cultural and creative industries; support for initiatives in audio-visual, literature, protection of cultural heritage; involvement of civil society and youth based on the experience of actors like the Anna Lindh Foundation and programmes like Creative Europe, and more<sup>9</sup>. However, the extent to which these words will be followed by action is unclear, and the current low level of co-financing by southern partners and the related absence of real co-created Euro-Mediterranean cultural programmes in the framework of regional or inter-regional arrangements<sup>10</sup> suggest that this might be once again a declaratory exercise.

The lack of leadership and strategy in the field of culture is accompanied by an equally problematic neglect of culture in the main documents framing EU external action both globally and in the neighbourhood. On the one hand, the **2016 Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy**, presented in the same month of the Joint Communication on ICR, only mentions cultural diplomacy once and in a generic way, suggesting that it does not represent a central aspect of EU global engagement<sup>11</sup>. Additionally, the **Communication on the 2015 Review of the ENP**, which guides the EU's future relations with its neighbours, only mentioned culture in the context of intercultural dialogue to support the EU's security concerns on issues of radicalisation and migration<sup>12</sup>. The ENP review is also ambiguous when considering cultural cooperation in the framework of broader EU support for civil society in its Southern Neighbourhood. In fact, the ENP review seems to constitute a step back in this regard, putting emphasis on stabilisation and good relations with southern governments – which are mostly authoritarian and enforcing a shrinking space for civil society – at the expense of democratic transformation<sup>13</sup>. This is particularly worrisome for the cultural sector, which is traditionally independent and reluctant to sing the official government tunes and is targeted with repression and censorship in many countries in the region. The uncomfortable role of the EU is visible in countries like Egypt, where EU-funded projects and associations (including the Anna Lindh Foundation) have to deal with strict government control, restriction on foreign funding to local organisations and even outright hostility, while the EU itself tries to foster amicable relations with Abdel Fattah el-Sisi's illiberal and autocratic presidency.

Finally, but also importantly, EU cultural action in the Mediterranean takes place in a context where multiple donors and other supporting actors operate, some in close coordination with the EU (e.g.

---

<sup>8</sup> Perlson, H. (2017) Israeli Government Backtracks on 'Creative Europe' Funding Program. Artnet News. 31 January 2017, <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/israeli-government-creative-europe-funding-program-837713>.

<sup>9</sup> Agence Afrique Tunis Presse (2017) 'Tunis Declaration': Call for implementing co-operation programmes in all cultural fields, <https://www.tap.info.tn/en/Portal-Culture-and-Media/8700939-tunis>

<sup>10</sup> See Trobbiani, R. (2017) EU Cultural Diplomacy in the MENA Region: A Qualitative Mapping of Initiatives Promoting Regional Cooperation, EL-CSID Working Paper Issue 2017/2, <https://www.ies.be/node/4072>.

<sup>11</sup> Higgott, R. and Van Langenhove, L. (2016) Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations: An Initial, Critical but Constructive Analysis. EL-CSID Policy Brief Issue 2016/1, [https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/0bc3be\\_261d8b4db5344a11abdce75250c5eb54.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/0bc3be_261d8b4db5344a11abdce75250c5eb54.pdf).

<sup>12</sup> EC and HR (2015) Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, JOIN(2015) 50 final, Brussels, 18 November 2015.

<sup>13</sup> Schumacher, T. (2016) Back to the Future: The new ENP Towards the Southern Neighbourhood and the End of Ambition. CEPOB 1.16, College of Europe, Bruges, [https://www.coleurope.eu/system/files\\_force/research-paper/schumacher\\_cepob\\_1-16.pdf?download=1](https://www.coleurope.eu/system/files_force/research-paper/schumacher_cepob_1-16.pdf?download=1).

UNESCO, other UN agencies, Council of Europe), some in growing coordination but still pursuing their own goals (e.g. EU member states and their cultural institutes, some European and Arab foundations), some in parallel and at times in competition with EU activities (e.g. some private foundations, funds and development agencies from US, China and Gulf Countries). Taking into account the role of these actors and strengthening cooperation to avoid duplication of efforts and confusion on the side of recipient organisations should be fundamental aspects of future EU strategies.

In brief, EU support for cultural initiatives in its Southern Neighbourhood needs a region-tailored strategic approach focused primarily on regional and secondarily on bilateral cooperation. Also, it necessitates stronger political backing to gain centrality within EU foreign policy objectives and become a topic on the table of regional and bilateral high-level politics. These shortcomings clash with the high security stakes dictated by the perception of cultural and religious differences between Europe and the Arab world, and with the many unresolved disputes between – and within – states in the region. The Arab revolts in 2011 have shown the need to revive the third chapter of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, within the broader effort of putting political goals back at the centre of regional cooperation. The EU has developed a limited response and now seems to retreat on concerns of short-term political stability. Instead, it should increasingly focus on support for a stronger civil society serving longer-term security and peace in the region, to which the cultural sector and culture as such should contribute significantly.

### **Strengthening and reforming the instruments of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation**

Especially since the late 1990s, cultural cooperation between the EU and Southern Mediterranean countries has been supported by the establishment of regional and bilateral programmes. Also, culture in a broad sense has been funded transversally by multiple EU instruments dealing with development assistance (Development and Cooperation Instrument), human rights (European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights), peace (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace), cross-border cooperation (CBC) and more<sup>14</sup>. Different phases of regional programmes like ‘Euromed Heritage’ (1998-2013), ‘Euromed Audiovisual’ (2000-2014), and ‘Euromed Youth’ (1999-2016) sought to create a regional dimension for cooperation in different domains of broadly-defined culture, with a growing attention to capacity-building and the creation of networks among cultural actors. More recent regional programmes created under ENPI/ENI also in response to the Arab revolts, namely ‘Media and culture for development in the Southern Mediterranean’ (2014-2017 – €17 million) and ‘MedFilm’ (created in 2015 – €5.3 million), build upon these experiences, targeting both governments and cultural actors with a long-term vision of development and empowerment of the cultural sector. Inter alia, the project ‘Med Culture’ aims to bring together cultural stakeholders and governments to design national strategies for culture – which is most successfully being done in Jordan – and achieve long-term development of the cultural sector<sup>15</sup>. At the same time, EU-funded projects and other EU-backed initiatives have created spaces for networking, exchange, project development and policy dialogue among cultural actors in the region and civil society at large, a notable example of which is the Mediterranean Forum of the Anna Lindh Foundation.

However, the EU regional response to the Arab revolts has been quite limited, and the future of regional programmes seems uncertain altogether. Future instruments are being defined in the ongoing negotiations concerning the next MFF, including a new phase of Med Culture with an emphasis on civil society support<sup>16</sup>. So far, a clear gap remains between the stated ambitions that the EU and its Southern Mediterranean partners have put on the shoulders of culture and the little means at the

---

<sup>14</sup> See Helly, D., Galeazzi, G. (2017) Mapping of EU funding for culture in the ENP, European Commission, Brussels, <http://ecdpm.org/publications/mapping-eu-funding-culture-enp/>.

<sup>15</sup> See Med Culture (2018) A strategic action plan for culture in Jordan, <https://www.medculture.eu/information/press-releases/med-culture-accompanies-steps-define-strategic-action-plan-culture-jordan>.

<sup>16</sup> See EC (2018a), op. cit., p. 15.

disposal of this sectoral cooperation. While constituting a rich set of experiences to build upon, regional programmes also show the limits of EU cooperation in culture. These have a predominant focus on North-South exchanges and cooperation, while the regional character of South-South cooperation is often faced with the social, cultural and political diversity and divergences of countries in the region, which not always allow for a one-size-fits-all approach, and have at times required the redefinition of the methods employed to the detriment of a regional dimension<sup>17</sup>.

Similarly, what has been witnessed in recent years is a partial shift of attention from regional to bilateral instruments. These engage cooperative local governments and cultural stakeholders as well as European actors which have the resources to implement EU programmes missing within EU Delegations – notably EU member states, their cultural institutes, and their European Union National Institutes for Culture network (EUNIC). Large bilateral programmes are currently being implemented in Tunisia ('Programme d'Appui au Secteur de la Culture en Tunisie' – €6 million) including a EUNIC-implemented project, and Egypt ('Support to Cultural Diversity and Creativity in Egypt' – €3.6 million), and other were funded in the past in Algeria ('Programme for the protection and valorisation of cultural heritage in Algeria' – €24 million of which 21,5 from EU budget and 2,5 from Algeria). However, while allowing for more country-specific approaches in line with the 2015 ENP review's stronger differentiation, these programmes should be seen as complementing rather than substituting regional cooperation, and are still affected by problems concerning EU cultural action in general.

First, the short-termed nature of EU instruments leaves cultural actors in a state of uncertainty over the continuity of financial and technical support to their work and endangers the capacity of the EU to build upon its achievements in a long-term perspective. This is especially problematic in a political context where local governments are either non-supportive or even hostile to cultural actors, and the certainty of other sources of funding strengthen the political clout and negotiating position of the cultural sector.

Second, the persistence of a strong donor-recipient relationship with target countries does not facilitate the creation of truly Euro-**Mediterranean** instruments for cooperation. The lack of interest of many southern governments in strong co-funding of cultural programmes and the tendency to look at the EU as a source of money rather than a partner hinder the effective co-design and co-ownership of initiatives. This becomes evident when it comes to programmes that are not based on unilateral aid and require a degree of financial and administrative commitment. For example, while Creative Europe, the main European programme for culture, is formally open to ENP countries – the presence of an 'entry ticket' based on GDP size and (politically-sensitive) legal pre-conditions for access to its MEDIA Sub-programme constitute some of the reasons behind the fact that only one country in the ENP South partially participates (Tunisia). A similar lack of co-ownership is found in Erasmus +, where ENP countries have comfortably chosen to be 'partner countries' rather than fully contributing as 'programme countries' as allowed by the Regulation establishing the instrument<sup>18</sup>.

Third, and along the same lines, while there have been some achievements concerning the participation of government services and agencies from Southern Mediterranean partners in predominantly EU-funded initiatives, EU programmes are mostly designed in Brussels and need to better build upon the experience of both local and European actors who have implemented previous instruments. In order to tailor its action to local needs, the EU strives to involve civil society in the design and evaluation of programmes. However, there are also shortcomings in this respect, and it has been suggested that beyond initial formal consultations the EU fails to follow-up on how the

---

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. EuroMed Youth (2016) EuroMed Youth IV final Publication, p. 27, [http://www.euromedyouth.net/IMG/pdf/euromed\\_youth\\_iv\\_-\\_final\\_publication.pdf](http://www.euromedyouth.net/IMG/pdf/euromed_youth_iv_-_final_publication.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> Perilli, A. (2017) Erasmus student or EU ambassador? People-to-people contact in the European Neighbourhood policy: the cases of Georgia, Ukraine and Tunisia, Bruges Political Research Papers 59 / 2017, College of Europe, Bruges, pp. 30-31, <http://aei.pitt.edu/92488/>.

opinion of local civil society is incorporated in its actions<sup>19</sup>. For a long-lasting development of the cultural sector in the Southern Mediterranean to take place, the EU should step up policy 'dialogues' with governments and civil society on culture, strengthening this component in both bilateral and regional cooperation.

## Conclusions and policy recommendations

While arguably being the region that has attracted most resources and attention from the EU in the cultural domain, the Mediterranean still calls for a more coherent and better-endowed framework for cultural cooperation. This is particularly true given its centrality among the EU's recent political concerns. Coherently with the EU's vision of a stronger cultural sector and intercultural dialogue as instruments for social cohesion, peace, democratisation, economic, political and social development – a long-term vision for Euro-Mediterranean cultural relations is needed. For this to happen, EU strategies and instruments need to be reformed. This overhaul of EU policies should be based on changed assumptions concerning the roles played by the EU and its southern partners as cultural actors. The EU should stop presenting itself as a donor and seek for more co-ownership in the design and financing of cultural programmes. Similarly to the broader reformed ENP, the challenge behind this shift is involving Southern Mediterranean governments without giving up conditionality on issues of freedom of the cultural sector, independence of civil society from political and religious power, gender equality and more. In the context of cultural relations, this should be done by investing more in policy dialogue and by bringing together local governments and the cultural sector for the design of national strategies. Also, more financial and human resources need to be dedicated to cultural cooperation in order to bring action in line with the stated objectives, and longer-term instruments need to be designed.

The EU should act both at the level of strategies and instruments.

Strategies:

- The nascent strategy for ICR, strongly focused on the Mediterranean, should be better integrated with EU foreign policy objectives and given more relevance therein. For this to happen, a stronger leadership of the EEAS in mainstreaming culture in external policies is needed. This process should take into account the existing experience of design and implementation of EU and member states' programmes and projects, by giving greater relevance to the role of the Cultural Diplomacy Platform in the definition of the strategy.
- Within this process, a specific plan for the ENP South should be drafted. This could be incorporated in but should remain distinct from a broader MENA strategy, as the uniqueness of the ENP political and legal framework for cooperation and the specificities of Euro-Mediterranean relations and common challenges do not allow for a one-size-fits-all approach. DG NEAR, so far relatively silent in debates concerning ICR, should take a stronger role in this. Clearer goals should be defined for cultural cooperation by focusing on realistic objectives to be endowed with sufficient resources. For example, building upon the experience of Med Culture in Jordan and some bilateral projects<sup>20</sup> the EU should focus on the creation of a permanent dialogue between the cultural sector and national authorities in all ENP South countries, strengthening the technical and human capacities of the latter and guiding these actors towards the design of national strategies.

---

<sup>19</sup> See EPLD (2013) Meeting Report: Civil Society Dialogue Network Meeting European Union – League of Arab States cooperation and the EU response to changes in the Arab region: Views from civil society, Valletta, 1-2 June 2013, [http://eplo.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/EPLO\\_CSDN\\_meeting\\_EU-LAS\\_Report.pdf](http://eplo.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/EPLO_CSDN_meeting_EU-LAS_Report.pdf).

<sup>20</sup> For example, the EUNIC-implemented project 'Towards a policy for the creative economy of Egypt' (2018-2019 – €120,000), which seeks to establish a dialogue between the government and cultural stakeholders to support the creative economy of the country.

- This region-specific strategy should be defined in close consultation with the governments and cultural sector in the Southern Mediterranean, through 'trialogues' that can rely either on pre-existing fora (e.g. the UfM) or on new specific fora set up by the European Commission. The EU's narrative in this dialogue should especially focus on the great potential of culture for job creation and economic development in general, rather than on its own security concerns. Attention should be given to the need to enhance the South-South dimension as part of a stronger regional cooperation. In this framework, a new meeting of the Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers of Culture, last held in 2008, constitutes a fundamental step.
- Stronger co-ownership should also be sought with other actors with a regional relevance, trying to step up cultural cooperation with regional organisations (e.g. the League of Arab States) but also ensuring coordination with other actors that are financing culture in the region, including international private foundations and funds based in Arab countries.
- A key component of this region-specific strategy should be overcoming a donor-recipient relationship by foreseeing a stronger financial contribution of southern partners in the creation of common programmes, based on their increased participation in defining the objectives of the policy. In this process, more emphasis should be placed on the mutually beneficial nature of a stronger cultural sector as a factor of economic development and social cohesion.

#### Instruments:

- In the preparation of the next MFF, longer-lasting funding instruments for culture should be foreseen, ideally moving towards the creation of a single regional programme to be renewed at every financial framework and periodically tailored to the changing needs of the cultural sector in Southern Neighbourhood countries. The EU should also dedicate more financial resources to regional cultural cooperation altogether, bringing the means in line with the ambitious stated objectives of supporting intercultural dialogue, cohesion and stability as well as political, social and economic development in the Mediterranean. With the current means, while it is possible to achieve some results in small countries like Tunisia or Jordan, it is unlikely to have any real impact on the cultural sector of a country like Egypt.
- In the longer term, a system of stronger co-funding from participating countries should be envisaged, possibly taking as a model the new-born Partnership on Research and Innovation in the Mediterranean Area (PRIMA – 2018-2028) in the field of science. Similarly to PRIMA, where southern countries financially contribute to find jointly defined solutions to environmental and other factors depleting agro-food systems and water resources, a joint programme should present culture as a tool to address common social, economic and security challenges.
- The design of the programmes should be based on a strong involvement of both managers and cultural actors who have implemented previous EU programmes and projects, as well as on a strong contribution of civil society and the independent cultural sector from southern countries, trying to follow up on the incorporation of their concerns.
- Finally, financial and human resources at the disposal of EU delegations for cultural activities beyond pure communication and showcasing of European culture should be strengthened. The closer cooperation with member states and their cultural institutes foreseen by the administrative arrangement signed by EEAS, EUNIC and the EC in May 2017<sup>21</sup> should be endowed with specific financial means, in order to get the best out of their experience, resources and networks.

---

<sup>21</sup> EEAS, EUNIC and EC (2017) Administrative arrangement for activities to be developed by the European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) in partnership with the European Commission Services and the European External Action Service, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26249/national-institutes-culture-and-eu-further-enhance-cooperation\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/26249/national-institutes-culture-and-eu-further-enhance-cooperation_en).



## About the author



Riccardo Trobbiani is a Project Researcher at the United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS) and Academic Assistant at the College of Europe in Bruges. At UNU-CRIS, he researches on EU Cultural, Science and Economic Diplomacy initiatives in various regions of the world, within the EU-funded project 'European Leadership in Cultural, Science and Innovation Diplomacy' (EL-CSID). His main research interests include EU cultural relations with the MENA region, EU science diplomacy and Multilevel Governance.

The EL-CSID project  
is coordinated  
by the  
Institute for European Studies (IES)  
[www.el-csid.eu](http://www.el-csid.eu)

Institute for European Studies  
Pleinlaan 5  
B-1050 Brussel  
T: +32 2 614 80 01  
E: [ies@vub.be](mailto:ies@vub.be)  
[www.ies.be](http://www.ies.be)



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 693799.