Basic information

1995/0078(COD) COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure) Decision	Procedure completed
Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël **Subject** 4.45.06 Heritage and culture protection, movement of works of art	

Key players

European Parliament

Former committee for opinion	Former rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
BUDG Budgets	CHRISTODOULOU Efthymios (PPE)	01/06/1995
ENER Research, Technological Development and Energy	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	
RELA External Economic Relations	ALAVANOS Alexandros (GUE/NGL)	23/05/1995

Council of the European Union

Council configuration	Meetings	Date
Economic and Financial Affairs ECOFIN	1942	1996-07-08
Transport, Telecommunications and Energy	1979	1996-12-13
Agriculture and Fisheries	2025	1997-07-22
Culture	1841	1995-04-03
Culture	1884	1995-11-20
Culture	1981	1996-12-16
Culture	1936	1996-06-11
Culture	2022	1997-06-30

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
29/03/1995	Legislative proposal published	COM(1995)0110	Summary
15/05/1995	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 1st reading		
27/09/1995	Vote in committee, 1st reading		

27/09/1995	Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading	A4-0225/1995	
11/10/1995	Debate in Parliament		Summary
20/11/1995	Debate in Council		Summary
08/07/1996	Council position published	06831/2/1996	Summary
08/07/1996	Modified legislative proposal published	COM(1996)0333	Summary
18/07/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 2nd reading		
08/10/1996	Vote in committee, 2nd reading		Summary
08/10/1996	Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading	A4-0307/1996	
21/10/1996	Debate in Parliament		Summary
13/12/1996	Parliament's amendments rejected by Council		
16/12/1996	Debate in Council		Summary
28/05/1997	Formal meeting of Conciliation Committee		
30/06/1997	Debate in Council		
02/07/1997	Final decision by Conciliation Committee		
15/07/1997	Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs	3620/1997	
22/07/1997	Decision by Council, 3rd reading		
04/09/1997	Report tabled for plenary, 3rd reading	A4-0267/1997	
15/09/1997	Debate in Parliament		Summary
13/10/1997	Final act signed		
13/10/1997	End of procedure in Parliament		
08/11/1997	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information

Procedure reference	1995/0078(COD)
Procedure type	COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure)
Procedure subtype	Legislation
Legislative instrument	Decision
Legal basis	EC Treaty (before Amsterdam) E 128
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CODE/4/08527

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		A4-0225/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0005	27/09/1995	

Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		T4-0458/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0149-0161	12/10/1995	Summary
Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading		A4-0307/1996 OJ C 347 18.11.1996, p. 0006	08/10/1996	
Text adopted by Parliament, 2nd reading		T4-0507/1996 OJ C 347 18.11.1996, p. 0019-0029	22/10/1996	Summary
Report tabled for plenary by Parliament delegation to Conciliation Committee, 3rd reading		A4-0267/1997 OJ C 304 06.10.1997, p. 0008	04/09/1997	
Text adopted by Parliament, 3rd reading		T4-0423/1997 OJ C 304 06.10.1997, p. 0023-0031	16/09/1997	Summary

Council of the EU

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Council position	06831/2/1996 OJ C 264 11.09.1996, p. 0069	08/07/1996	Summary

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Legislative proposal	COM(1995)0110	29/03/1995	Summary
Modified legislative proposal	COM(1996)0333 OJ C 265 12.09.1996, p. 0004	08/07/1996	Summary
Commission communication on Council's position	SEC(1996)1317	15/07/1996	Summary
Commission opinion on Parliament's position at 2nd reading	COM(1996)0627	05/12/1996	Summary
Follow-up document	COM(2004)0033	23/01/2004	Summary

Other institutions and bodies

Institution/body	Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
EESC	Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report	CES0805/1995 OJ C 256 02.10.1995, p. 0038	06/07/1995	Summary
CofR	Committee of the Regions: opinion	CDR0302/1995 OJ C 100 02.04.1996, p. 0119	20/09/1995	Summary
CSL/EP	Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs	3620/1997	15/07/1997	

Additional information

Source	Document	Date

European Commission	EUR-Lex	
European Commission	EUR-Lex	

Final act	
Decision 1997/2228 OJ L 305 08.11.1997, p. 0031	Summary

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 15/07/1996 - Commission communication on Council's position

In its opinion on the common position, the Commission states that, while in general it accepts the adjustments made by the Council in its common position (particularly regarding the structure of the programme), it considers the budget proposed by the Council to be far too small in relation to the objectives and the measures to be taken under the programme. Meanwhile, as regards commitology, the Commission suggests that the evaluation report which the Commission is to submit to the committee after two years of implementation of the programme should be purely informative and should be presented outside the ambit of any 'commitology' procedures. The Commission considers that these procedures apply only in cases where it possesses implementary powers. The evaluation report concerning the results of Raphael should not constitute a proposal for measures to be adopted. Otherwise the Council would be required to state its position a priori (under the management committee procedure) on a report which the Commission is required to submit to it by virtue of its own institutional powers. The Commission expresses itself in favour of deleting the provisions concerning the regular evaluation reports (Article 11) to be submitted to the EP and Council, after consultation of the committee, and the individual projects of more than ECU 30 000 which are likewise to be submitted to the committee; the Commission considers the management committee procedure too cumbersome for dealing with these.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 23/01/2004 - Follow-up document

The Raphael Programme was developed and devised in response to Article 128 of the Treaty of Maastricht. This Article, (later changed to Article 151 following the adoption of the Amsterdam Treaty) gave culture its own rightful place within the EU context. Cultural co-operation became an officially recognised objective of the European Union. The aim of the Raphael programme (1997-2000) was to support and supplement cultural heritage of European importance. The overall programme was awarded EUR 30 million and between 1997-1999 some 222 projects benefited from Raphael funding. In addition the programme sponsored 18 "European Heritage Laboratories". The later related to technically complex operations on monuments or sites of exceptional interest. There were six specific objectives enshrined in the Decision establishing the Raphael programme. They were: - encouraging the conservation and restoration of sites with a cultural and historic significance; - encouraging the exchange of know-how and experience for the preservation of cultural and historically sensitive sites; - improving public access to heritage sites and improving public participation in safeguarding Europe's cultural heritage; - encouraging technical co-operation in preserving traditional cultural heritage trades and techniques; - taking account of heritage when devising EU programmes; - encouraging co-operation with third countries and international organisations. These objectives were then divided into four action lines intended to implement the objectives outlined above. The Commission, in accordance with mandatory procedures, announced the calls for proposals in the Official Journals as well as announcing them through press releases. The selection, monitoring and dissemination procedure were applied uniformly to all of the projects receiving Raphael funding. At the end of the Raphael programme's life the European Commission asked external evaluators to examine and report on how effective the programme was in achieving its stated objectives. In preparing this task the evaluators took account of the following points: The relevance of the programme; its coherence, efficiency and its effectiveness. In terms of its relevance the authors deemed it to be entirely relevant, even though some operators of the programme regretted that it showed no real European ambition in the cultural field. In terms of efficiency and effectiveness of the programme the evaluators voiced very little criticism, finding that the results obtained were proportional to the resources committed, i.e they were effective but not commensurate with the more ambitious expectations formulated in the Decisions establishing the programme. Concerning promotional activities the evaluators expressed some concern that the Commission was providing far too little information to cultural operators. The Commission, however, begs to disagree pointing out that not only are all the programmes published in the Official Journals it has also set up the "Culture 2000" Internet site as well as cultural contact points. Since 2002 anyone requesting it can receive a free monthly newsletter. Finally, a cultural portal was created in March 2002 on the Internet to present all EU cultural related activities. On the question of monitoring the Commission's response to the evaluator's criticism that more should be done by the Commissionto visit projects on the ground, is rejected. The Commission points out that, whilst it continues to monitor and assess projects, the lack of human resources makes it impossible to visit every project. Each Commission project manager, for example, is responsible for between forty and ninety projects. The evaluators point out that combining the old programmes into the Culture 2000 framework programme has helped to make the Community's contribution more effective and more visible. Combining the previously existing cultural programmes into one specific unit has helped make the exercise not only cheaper but also more effective. To conclude the cultural programmes, including the Raphael programme, were a useful springboard for the creation of the Culture 2000 programme. In spite of some shortcomings Raphael worked well. Along with the Kaleidoscope and Ariane programme Raphael represented a first, essential step towards the attainment of the objective set out in Article 151 of the Treaty.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 05/12/1996 - Commission opinion on Parliament's position at 2nd reading

In its opinion amending the proposal following the EP's second reading, the Commission announces that it can incorporate, in whole or in part, 5 of the 7 amendments adopted by Parliament. In particular, it accepts the amendments clarifying the promotion of the European touristic heritage and redefining the 'sensitive' groups eligible for assistance under the programme. It also accepts the deletion of the article providing for a review of the overall budget after 2 years of implementation (while retaining its original budget of ECU 57 m over 4 years rather than ECU 30 m as the Council wished). It approves the amendment increasing the ceiling for amounts for projects under Action I (it regards the new ceiling of ECU 250 000 as more realistic than that of ECU 150 000). However, the Commission does not accept the amendments seeking to increase the budget to ECU 86 million over 4 years or the amendment on commitology.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 20/11/1995

Following detailed discussion, particularly on the question of financing, the Council noted that it was unable to achieve the unanimity required for a common position. It therefore instructed Coreper to continue examining the point still outstanding so that the common position could be adopted at a forthcoming Council meeting.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 12/10/1995 - Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading

In adopting the report by Mr Fernando SANZ FERNANDEZ (PSE, E) on the proposal establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (Raphael), the European Parliament gave its support to the programme and placed particular emphasis on the following points; - the importance of this programme as recognition of a Europe that was not only an economic, political and social entity but also a cultural reality; - the fact that the concept of cultural heritage included movable (works of art), immovable (monuments), and intangible (traditions, folklore) heritage, cultural sites and landscapes (cultural and natural assets) and any commemorative site which helped to define Europe's historical and cultural identity; - the problems of theft, vandalism and impoverishment of the European cultural heritage, due equally to the high number of visits to certain sites and the lack of resources to maintain them; - among the programme's objectives, Parliament emphasised in particular: . consideration of economic and social life when promoting cultural heritage, . the restoration of heritage, . the need to ensure that all the people of Europe, and particularly disadvantaged groups, had access to the programme, . the provision of information concerning heritage (taking account of disadvantaged social and cultural groups and young people), . cooperation with third countries and organisations such as the Council of Europe and UNESCO; - with regard to the implementation of the measures themselves, Parliament asked that all actions receiving Community support display the Union flag and acknowledgement of the funding, that they be implemented by the disadvantaged and that young people had access to the programme. It called on the Commission to give priority to broad publicity for this programme and to ensure an appropriate balance in the financial support granted and complementarity with other similar Community actions. Parliament also emphasised: . the need to analyse the specific problems involved in the conservation of heritage within the context of policies combating pollution, . the development of European standards and/or recommendations with a view to improving good heritage conservation and management practice, . the encouragement of forms of sponsorship for firms to make them aware of the need to safeguard heritage, . restoration: a significant proportion of the programme's appropriations would be devoted to the restoration of architectural heritage (at least ECU 4.7 million per year), . the training of professionals in the fields of management and technology with regard to cultural heritage and exchanges between specialists in Europe. Parliament also called for financial support for schools or foundations organised as part of networks designed to provide vocational training for "heritage trades". Similarly, the EP called on the Commission to finance studies in this area and the publication of a database covering all the cultural objects which had been unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State or even the compilation of a guide to European cultural routes. Furthermore, Parliament highlighted the need for support for transnational cooperation between the Member States with a view to the adoption of common approaches for the conservation of cultural heritage. - with regard to the budget: Parliament regretted that, although it had been calling for 1% of the Community budget to be allocated to culture since 1979, the European Union only devoted 0.014% of its budget to cultural measures. It felt that the budget proposed for the Raphael programme, (ECU 67 million over five years) was not sufficient to implement a global coherent cultural policy. It called for a financial framework of ECU 96 million for the programme. Moreover, given that the draft budget for 1996 proposed a reduction in appropriations (ECU 10 million instead of ECU 10.8), Parliament felt that it was ridiculous to launch such a far-reaching programme while providing it with less resources than previous actions had received. The annual allocations for the Raphael programme should be established during the budgetary procedure; - opening up the programme to third countries: the EP welcomed the fact that the Raphael programme was being opened up to European countries outside the European Union (Cyprus, Malta, EFTA countries, associated CEECs) and third countries which had signed cooperation agreements containing a clause on cultural affairs; - finally, Parliament called for a report to be drawn up by 30 June 1998 outlining the financial support provided and the results achieved.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 16/09/1997 - Text adopted by Parliament, 3rd reading

In adopting the report by Mr Francisco Javier SANZ FERNANDEZ (PSE, E), Parliament approved the joint text from the Parliament-Council Conciliation Committee establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (RAPHAEL). It was particularly difficult to arrive at the special agreement between the two parties, especially since the Council wanted to limit the budget to ECU 30 million for four years, while Parliament believed that ECU 86 m should have been allocated. Finally, an agreement has been made allocating appropriations of ECU 30 m which

will be authorized by the budgetary authority within the limits of the financial perspective (Parliament will have a certain degree of freedom once this is non-compulsory expenditure). In addition, the programme should be reviewed two years after its introduction.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 29/03/1995 - Legislative proposal

The purpose of this proposal for a decision by the European Parliament and Council is to set up a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (RAPHAEL programme) for the period from 1 January 1996 to 31 December 2000 with a total budget of ECU 67 million. The RAPHAEL programme covers both the movable and immovable cultural heritage, the archaeological and sub-aquatic heritage, museums, collections and archives. It includes 5 actions: - upgrading and extending the influence of the cultural heritage: . support for projects to conserve the movable cultural heritage ("European heritage laboratories") such as monuments or sites of exemplary value (European commemorative sites), . support for "European heritage sites" working on a common theme linked to the conservation of the movable/immovable cultural heritage, . support for the development of "standards" or recommendations with a view to improving good heritage conservation and management practices (e.g. recommendations on protecting objects or monuments from fire), . encouraging joint management of major works of art, . developing complementary cultural studies; - networks and partnerships: . support for networking of "European heritage sites" (association of persons in charge of sites), . collection and dissemination of specialised information on practices and systems in the field of culture in the Member States (guides, manuals, etc.), . support for trans-national projects between museums and/or monuments using multimedia (in order to show a specific monument in a country to visitors in relation to similar monuments in other Member States), . support for cooperation projects between specialist heritage training institutes or research centres (dissemination of information, system of exchanges etc.); - access for citizens to common heritage through awareness-raising campaigns with a European dimension (e.g. "European heritage days", events prepared as part of the festival of Europe etc.) and support for projects to apply multilingualism in museums or modern information technologies to improve public access to the heritage; - innovation, further training and mobility of professionals: . support in identifying research requirements, . support in organising seminars and exchange or training projects for professionals in the sector; - cooperation with third countries and international organisations in order to create synergisms, especially with the Council of Europe. The Commission will be assisted in implementing the programme by the advisory committee for which provision is made in the KALEIDOSCOPE programme and must ensure that projects are consistent with other Community programmes and policies in this field.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 16/12/1996

The Council noted that the main problem still to be resolved with Parliament concerned the financial allocation for this initiative. The Conciliation Committee would be convened under the Dutch Presidency.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 08/07/1996 - Modified legislative proposal

The amended Commission proposal incorporates more than half of the amendments adopted by Parliament at first reading. The accepted amendments are aimed, in particular, at: - adding the restoration of cultural heritage to the specific objectives of the programme; - giving more precise and detailed information about activities to be undertaken with regard to information (for different publics, including operators, Community support, and in relation to other EU policies). All projects receiving financial support under the Raphael programme are required to display the European Union flag and acknowledge funding; - opening up the programme to the participation of the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Cyprus and Malta, and cooperation with the Council of Europe and UNESCO; - encouraging access, whether virtual or otherwise, for everyone (especially particular groups such as young people) to culture. The Commission has not accepted the amendments relating to the budgetary aspects. In this connection, the overall budget planned for the implementation of the programme, for the period 1996-2000, totals MECU 67.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 13/10/1997 - Final act

OBJECTIVE: to establish a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage to support and supplement the action taken by the Member States in this field. COMMUNITY MEASURE: Decision 2228/97/EC establishing a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage (the Raphael programme). SUBSTANCE: Raphael is established for a period of 4 years, from 01.01.1997 to 31.12.2000, and ECU 30 m is allocated to it for this period. This allocation is to be reviewed and if necessary adjusted after 2 years. The programme is intended to encourage cooperation between Member States in the field of cultural heritage, while respecting the principle of subsidiarity and bringing Europe's common cultural heritage to the fore. Projects must improve access to the cultural heritage in its European dimension, be of an exemplary character, contribute to the development of better preservation practices and produce a multiplier effect. Projects receiving support must display the emblem of the European Union and mention the source of their financing. Raphael covers the following fields: 1) conservation, safeguarding and development of the European cultural heritage through European cooperation (particularly where the heritage is endangered): setting-up of 'European heritage laboratories' which are of European interest and of exemplary value (monuments, sites of exceptional historic or architectural importance). Support is also available for safeguard projects on common themes (e.g. fountains); 2) support for the exchange of experiences between professionals in the sector and development of advanced techniques applied to heritage: pooling of know-how focusing on innovation and new technologies applicable to heritage disciplines and professions, support for mobility and for the carrying out of research and inquiries into various aspects of heritage; 3) support for improved public access to heritage: development of multimedia tools to present the European heritage, support for events to raise public awareness organized at European level,

encouragement of participation by the general public (children, young people, the disadvantaged, people in peripheral or rural areas), support for multilingual presentations at museums, sites, etc., support for transnational cultural itineraries; 4) participation by third countries in certain Raphael projects. The programme is implemented by the Commission, assisted by a committee whose competence varies according to the issue in question (advisory or management). The Commission will seek to ensure that the programme is consistent with and complementary to other compatible Community cultural measures. Raphael is open to the associated countries of Eastern Europe and Cyprus and Malta and other third countries with which the Community has concluded association or cooperation agreements which include cultural clauses. Cooperation with UNESCO or the Council of Europe is likewise sought. After two and a half years of implementation, the Commission is to submit to the European Parliament and the Council a report evaluating Raphael, making appropriate proposals for adjustments to the programme. ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13.10.1997.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 20/09/1995 - Committee of the Regions: opinion

The Committee of the Regions regarded the Raphaël programme as a welcome medium for local and regional development. It called for projects supported by the programme to show as a priority the importance of mutual interaction in the rise of local, regional and national culture in historical as well as future terms. Projects should also show the importance of the natural and built environment to people's well-being in Europe . They should also show that preservation of our cultural heritage was not just a financial burden; enlivening and utilising that heritage created, *inter alia*, new employment opportunities. The Committee of the Regions was, however, worried about the fact that environmental issues had been given very little attention in the programme and it proposed that some heritage sites, which required a great deal of protection, be excluded from tourist programmes. It also called for particular attention to be paid to keeping as much of the cultural heritage alive as possible as an everyday living environment for Europe 's citizens. Special efforts should also be made to make this heritage accessible to young people, people with physical, intellectual or sensory disabilities or impairments and other groups with special needs. The concept of access to cultural heritage should be given a wider interpretation and emphasis should be placed on making use of new communication technologies in order to inform the general public and raise their awareness. The Committee of the Regions considered that the allocations proposed in the financial statement were very small. In particular, the Action I measures and the synergies between these measures and the measures to raise awareness set out in Action III would require substantial funds.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 22/10/1996 - Text adopted by Parliament, 2nd reading

In adopting the recommendation for second reading by Mr Francisco Javier SANZ FERNANDEZ (PSE, E) concerning the adoption of a Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage - the Raphaël programme - Parliament followed the common position of the Council with regard to the reduction of the duration of the programme to four years. However, it wished to see the financial framework increased from ECU 30 million to ECU 86 million. Parliament emphasized the contribution of the preservation of the cultural heritage to the promotion of tourism and the need to improve access to the cultural heritage for the under-privileged and those living in the outlying and rural areas of the Union.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 06/07/1995 - Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report

The ESC approved the general tenor of the Community action programme in the field of cultural heritage, Raphaël. The ESC particularly endorsed the Commission's concern to ensure that the proposed programme was both consistent with and complementary to other EU actions of relevance to cultural heritage, in particular those referred to in the Council's conclusions of 17 June 1994 on drawing up a Community action plan in the field of cultural heritage (OJ C 235, 23/8/1994, p.1).

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 08/07/1996

Following the withdrawal of the UK reservation, the Council was able to adopt a common position. This was then to be referred to Parliament for a second reading under the codecision procedure.

Cultural heritage: Community action programme 1997-2000, Raphaël

1995/0078(COD) - 08/07/1996 - Council position

In its common position, the Council made certain amendments to the Commission proposal, covering most notably: - the scope of the programme: it assigned a general objective to Raphael, and specified that the programme would aim at 'the encouragement of transnational cooperation in developing new technologies and in preserving traditional cultural heritage trades and techniques' as well as the 'taking into account of the heritage dimension in other Community programmes and policies'; at the same time, it modified the structure of the Annex listing the Actions to be implemented (reducing their number from five to four, bringing in 'networks and partnerships' under Action II). In addition, the resources to be committed under Action I ('Conservation, safeguarding and development of the European cultural heritage through European cooperation') would amount to approximately 50% of the programme's allocated overall budget, Community support being intended to contribute to the added European value of the projects carried out and to the creation of conditions for the development of European know-how; - commitology: on the model of the Socrates,

Leonardo, Youth for Europe III and Kaleidoscope committees, the Council opted for the Joint Committee procedure (a committee acting as a Management Committee for certain questions and as an Advisory Committee for others); - duration of the programme and financial allocation: the Council adopted a four-year programme duration as from 1 January 1997 with a financial framework set at ECU 30 m which would be subject to review before the end of the second year in the light of the results achieved. (The Council also agreed to support the entry of an amount of ECU 10 m under the budgetary procedure for 1997 and 1998). As regards the treatment of the EP amendments, the majority of the amendments incorporated by the Commission in its amended proposal was accepted by the Council, in a more or less equivalent form. Not adopted by the Council were, in particular, the following amendments covering: - budgetary provisions, - cooperation between the authorities of the Member States inter se and between the Member States and the authorities of the CCEE to prevent illegal exports of works of art, - support for scripts for television programmes and multimedia projects on the cultural heritage, - study into the situation of restorers with a view to organizing the profession of restorer and training for restorers, - support for craft trades which are essential to the heritage by promoting an association with the industrial sectors producing advanced materials and technologies, - reference to greater use of new technologies in order to limit the damage caused to the heritage by an excessive number of visitors, - exemplary actions in the heritage field, - presentations in museums, monuments and sites, in local languages, - reference to measures to facilitate access to archives for those working in the sector and for the general public.