

Dear Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia, Mr Miro Cerar,

As the new National Programme for Culture (NPC) 2018–2025 is being devised, I ask that you carefully consider the role and importance of certain top quality non-governmental programmes in the area of culture, and urgently take appropriate action to avoid Slovenia becoming last on the cultural scene of not only Europe but the world. Top quality non-governmental programmes are a necessary supplement of public institutes, since a country's national cultural production can only be successful—with few exceptions—provided the institutional and non-governmental sectors collaborate. If your passive, slow and poor solutions persist, you will have decapitated the elite of non-governmental production and thus cause irreparable damage to institutional culture as well.

One of such non-governmental programmes is Seviq Brežice, a festival that has had a distinctly European, entrepreneurial and international character since its beginnings 35 years ago, when I started it in 1982 in Radovljica; it has been run since 1997 by the Ars Ramovš Institute for Art, Marketing, Promotion and Investments. The festival has had a major impact on the perception of revitalising historic towns and renovating castles, and has been a driver of green tourism in the country. It is the chief initiator of the early music scene in Slovenia, which has formed and consolidated over these past decades. Nowadays it has many followers, both in the non-governmental and institutional sectors, both organisations and individuals. They were encouraged by our activity and have become successful promoters of Slovenia in the world.

We started and remained all these years without any clear or decisive support from the national cultural policy and politics, which have all along sought excuses in the old-fashioned model of cultural policy that focuses on public institutions as a matter of priority instead of adequately supporting programmes of the same importance emerging from the independent scene. Such conditions leave top achievements and most propulsive NGOs overlooked. We have only persisted due to personal sacrifices, efforts, hopes and desires, and this is spite of the fact that the seed we had sown has produced a rich crop and secured Slovenia a solid position on the European cultural map of early music. It is not fair of you to risk the abundant cultural capital we have created to miss the last chance for things to come to order, be it due to other interests or negligence. Our message that it is possible to build something out of nothing resonated strongly and encouraged many, which is of course disturbing to all those clinging to their benefits, to whom we represent nothing but a threat.

As a person active in the Slovene culture scene who has made above-average investments in the Slovene culture, I presume I have a legitimate right, as a member of the civil society, to put the following demands to my Prime Minister and expect him—on the basis of the requirements posed by his elected office—to read them and take action. Why am I not turning to the Minister of Culture? Because the 20-year long stalemate has pushed cultural policy to the edge of political irrelevance and can thus not be overruled without your political support. Inertia might have sufficed before the financial crisis, but now, with the national budget for culture down one quarter, we are left scraping by. I sincerely hope you recognise the problem and make a personal commitment, as a politician devoted to the rule of law, to overcoming these ominous problems.

I demand

1. Adequate respect for top quality culture programmes of the Slovene non-governmental sector, and that the programmes and projects of both the institutional and non-governmental sector receive a comparable systemic valuation depending on their actual relevance and not on their organisational or legal status.
2. Adequate co-funding or additional funds for the non-governmental sector at the national level, allowing the cultural stalemate to be overcome.
3. Co-funding at the local level, since such a small cultural space demands an active national cultural policy to build local awareness of the importance of the arts and culture for local communities.
4. Equality between institutional and non-governmental production, meaning they be comparable in terms of specific parameters although not the same.
5. That a one-stop-shop be set up for NGOs and individuals self-employed in culture, offering legal and tax assistance and information.
6. Support for programmes taking place at cultural heritage sites.
7. That tender rules be amended and the seemingly unbiased scoring be replaced with a system based on reviews, i.e. reviews of a particular programme or project as a whole.
8. Since the act amending the Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act (ZUJIK) proposes the NPC be split into a more general document and an Action Plan—the Government's chief executive document—we have to insist the Minister for Culture present his Action Plan upon the presentation of the NPC 2018–2025 so that his and the Government's priorities are made clear.

Yours sincerely,

Klemen Ramovš

Founder and Director

Ars Ramovš Institute for Art, Marketing, Promotion and Investments

Ljubljana, 23 September 2017

EXPLANATION OF DEMANDS

1. Adequate respect for top quality culture programmes of the Slovene non-governmental sector and comparable systemic valuation of the programmes and projects of both the institutional and non-governmental sector depending on their actual relevance and not on their organisational or legal status.

Description of the problem:

In distributing public funds in the area of culture, the Ministry of Culture (MC) acts as an all-taxpayers agent for the entire area of culture, both institutional and non-governmental. At the same time, it is bound in respect of public institutions by its responsibilities as their founder in the same manner in which the founders of NGOs are bound by their responsibilities as founders. From a legal standpoint, a founder's responsibilities to the founded organisation are the same irrespective of its origin (country, municipality, civil society or non-governmental sector): the founder of an organisation of any of these three profiles can recall the director and appoint anyone else at will, at any time. The founder also defines the criteria of operation, again regardless of their origin, with the legal stipulations in any case being the same for all. The only liberty NGOs do have as opposed to public institutions is their independent structure of governance, which is in fact the precondition securing a pluralistic democratic society, since the existence of solely the public sector would mean a country's cultural scene is run entirely by government structures. The public sector is the pillar of stability in every country and it is therefore of paramount importance in the turbulent times we are now living—but only provided that conditions are in place for a strong independent sector that can ensure plurality.

If a State's (meaning both government structures at the national and municipal levels) only legal obligation is with public institutions—which is the way our cultural policy has been simplistically run since Slovenia became an independent country—, this implies the civil society is less important, which contradicts the principles of a modern society. The argument that public institutions must receive priority funding—as the Ministry, as the citizens' elected agent, will found a new public institutions if this prove necessary—does not hold because it negates the role of civil society. The State being the founder is a flawed mechanism in the area of culture in particular, with the cultural scene so diverse, heterogeneous and unpredictable; history shows this eloquently, with all major movements having first developed on the outskirts and taken centre stage where they became institutionalised only later—be it artistic movements or civil initiatives that gave rise to several of today's national institutions (National Gallery, National Theatre Opera and Ballet Ljubljana...). The non-governmental cultural scene is a vital element catering to the cultural needs of citizens, and it is even more important as an economic generator and as a mechanism strengthening the position of our culture internationally. Cultural programmes and projects, both institutional and non-governmental, are inherently not revenue generators. However, in addition to catering to the cultural needs of citizens, they boost economic activity in their environment and push development. It is therefore important they be co-financed from taxpayers' funds. Investing in culture is not pure spending; rather, it represents an investment yielding returns to a wide range of citizens. As a rule, countries at the highest state of overall development are those with the best developed cultural scenes, also prevalent in international terms.

The ZUJIK, adopted back in 2002, uses the term »comparable co-funding« to define the legislator's intent to distribute equal funding to programmes of equal importance irrespective of founder. However, in practice this principle has not been applied in the past 15 years since the ZUJIK came into force. Taxpayer's funds remain to be allocated depending on the organisation's status, with much less attention being devoted to its relevance, impact and its multiplicative effects on the functioning of the entire cultural scene. This is causing not only gross inequality but poor spending of public funds. Everything in the arts and culture, apart from sanctification itself, can be measured. It is a fact that the area of culture is shamelessly financially undernourished, for various reasons, and that a struggle is taking place for the crumbs. While public institutions receive priority treatment, top quality programmes by the non-governmental sector—which creates several times more programme than public institutions from one euro of work—are stigmatised, discriminated against and co-funded (irrespective of their results) in a similar manner as in authoritarian systems, thus in an utterly inappropriate manner given the ambitions of the Republic of Slovenia.

Potential solution:

- Ensuring that the comparability of co-funding laid down in the ZUJIK is applied in practice. I understand comparability as recording and comparing income and expenses of all co-funded organisations irrespective of their organisational status, and equal co-funding of organisations that have the same actual importance and that produce cultural goods in demand. Equality implies comparability and not sameness, opening the door to recognising specifics.

2. Adequate co-financing or additional funds allocated to the non-governmental sector at the national level, allowing the cultural stalemate to be overcome.

Description of problems:

- The **legally stipulated comparability¹ of co-funding** is not ensured for the non-governmental sector as opposed to public institutions, as shown in Table 1. In co-funding the non-governmental sector, including programmes in the public interest operating at the national level, the Ministry of Culture does not apply the comparability standard either in relation to national public institutions (activity relevant at the national level) nor local public institutions (as with NGOs, the MC is again not the founder).
- **Co-funding amount:** in the most elite tender for NGOs (4 annual programmes), the MC allows for the subsidy to cover 70% of the programme. In principle, this would ensure the application of the legally stipulated comparability. However, a condition is set that an individual music programme cannot be granted more than EUR 120,000, with a total of EUR 700,000 being allocated to all music programmes together. According to the most recent major study of European festivals² that surveyed 390 festivals, an average European musical festival is worth

¹ ZUJIK, Article 56: A public cultural programme is a cultural activity which by its content and scope is a complete whole and which is implemented by a cultural provider whose founder is not the State or a local community but whose work is in the public interest to the extent that the State or local community funds it in a comparable manner to a public institution.

² Music Festivals, a Changing World, 2013 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303565760_Music_festivals_a_changing_world. The study surveyed 390 festivals from Finland (20), Flanders (18), France (92), Ireland (21), Norway (10), Quebec (43), Spain (97), Switzerland

EUR 860,000³. According to required financial input, the average festival (ranked at 195th place) costs EUR 273,000. Even if we managed to score the most points and thus received 70% co-funding under the scheme of comparability with public institutions—which is in fact the ceiling amount of EUR 120,000—our festival could not be worth more than EUR 171,429, assuming we invested 30% of our own funds. What kind of a festival we could produce with these funds while running the sideshow of all the necessary support and ancillary activities, is hard to imagine.

- **Staffing deficit:** In order to operate at full capacity, the Seviqc Brežice festival would need, according to a professional estimate, at least 8 full-time staff members. Instead, it is run by a substantially smaller team, causing overly increased workload in trying to meet the set objectives. We have a programme including international engagement and thus entailing close collaboration with international integrations and associations, resulting in similar costs to those incurred in any other activity (membership fees, travel and accommodation costs, etc.). With such a low starting point it is difficult to develop an effective and recognisable programme.
- **Overlooked development needs:** It is one thing to organise a few superb concerts; the European music market abounds in supply and demand, making this relatively easy even without important personal ties and connections. It is an entirely different matter to develop the early music scene, actively form ties with the local environment and contribute to its vision of development, connect with project partners and colleagues in rank, and contribute to culture tourism and push its development. Our objective is not only to stage events for consumers but rather to raise the living standard of citizens; this entails development needs that need to be recognised as such at the inter-ministerial level and treated as a government category and not merely a narrow dimension of cultural policy.
- **Obtaining additional funds** (other tenders, sponsorships, donations) requires adequate staffing, which a financially undernourished organisation cannot afford no matter its reputation and results.
- **Poor awareness of the importance of NGOs:** The Ministry of Culture is poorly aware of the fact that a well-functioning and successful non-governmental sector strengthens the positive functioning of public institutions and that in the context of a developed society it is a necessary counterpart and co-creator. As already mentioned, countries at the highest overall state of development are the most developed in the cultural sense as well and their cultures well established in international terms; the same comparison applies to the institutional and non-governmental sectors. Institutional culture is always more propulsive if supported by a strong non-governmental sector; this is the case for all areas, not only culture.

(7), Sweden (23), Wallonia (52), and one each from Bulgaria, Denmark, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland and Portugal

³ This might not be an entirely realistic portrayal, since some of the surveyed festivals are extremely big, with budgets of up to EUR 15 million. There are of course also other European festivals, not captured by this study, with budgets several times bigger than this figure.

Table 1	State public institutions	Local public institutions	NGOs	Comment
State's responsibility as founder	YES	NO	NO	As to its obligation to provide co-funding within its responsibility as founder, the MC only has an obligation to State public institutions. The MC has no responsibility as founder to local public institutions or the non-governmental sector, and therefore it has no a priori obligation to co-fund them. This conflicts with the perception of cultural space as a single unit, which in a small country represents a threat to its longevity.
Co-funding by the MC	As founder	In part with tenders, in part by agreement ⁴	With tenders	To ensure the implementation of the legally stipulated comparability, the MC would have to co-fund NGOs in the public interest that operate at the national level in a comparable way to funding received by State public institutions (level of operation aspect) or local public institutions (responsibility as founder aspect).
Amount of co-funding by the MC	77.25% ⁵ 78.44% ⁶	57.66% (61.62%)	31.5% ⁷	
Amount of co-funding by municipalities	0.28% (0.66%)	24.24% (20.43%)	26.7%	
Other public funds	2.89% (1.77%)	2.40% 2.07%)		
Amount of co-funding from public funds	80.42% (80.86%)	84.30% (84.12%)	58.2%	Funds received by NGOs are nowhere close to those received by State and local public institutions. The first issue is the overall share of public funds allocated to NGOs, and the second one, the ceiling amount allocated to a single programme, which prevents the organisation of demanding projects and encourages the dispersion of public funds, rendering cultural policy a social measure applied in all the wrong places.

⁴ The MC co-funds the labour costs of more than 40 local public institutions in a value that substantially exceeds 10% of the overall budget for culture, and it has no say in appointing their director.

⁵ In 2015; source: Ministry of Culture, Analysis in support of NPC. The same applies to the information below.

⁶ 2008–2015 average. The same applies to the information below.

⁷ 2007–2009 average, the only available data; source: Analysis of the Operation, Organisation and Funding of Production in the Arts and Culture among NGOs in the period 2007–2009 (Petra Hazabent, Andreja Kopač, Jernej Jurc, Aldo Milohnič, Vesna Čopič), Društvo Asociacija, 2011. The same applies to the information below.

Potential solutions:

- Implementing legally stipulated co-funding of the non-governmental sector comparable to that of public institutions, by taking into account the bill of costs drawn up according to programme/project objectives.
- In the event of the State budget⁸ increasing, the MC allocates additional funds to the non-governmental sector and its highest-profile programmes. In this way, the public sector do not lose anything, and the non-governmental sector and individuals self-employed in culture get a chance to work beyond the harsh precarious working conditions.
- The MC forms a special fund for the most prestigious programmes; content as well as scope and manner of implementing the programme are agreed between the MC and the producer of the programme.
- The MC also ought to analyse other, conceptually less straightforward solutions: revenues from the national lottery; corporate tax reliefs and incentives granted for investments into culture; establishment of foundations; establishment of co-funding at the regional level; different (lower) employment contributions; VAT collected from within culture and its reallocation to subsidising cultural production in the public interest, etc.

3. Co-funding at the local level since such a small cultural space demands an active national cultural policy to build local awareness of the importance of the arts and culture for local communities.

Main problems:

- Poor funding of non-governmental culture⁹, with the same tenders intended for NGOs with both a professional and amateur organisation, which does not allow events to be implemented adequately.
- The municipal tenders require a local residence.
- Fears faced by the local production that a festival of international renown will strip them of the little they might otherwise receive.

Potential solutions:

- Reciprocity between the State and municipalities, ensuring systemic co-funding of national-level NGOs in the public interest without a local residence in a particular municipality. The reasoning is that State funds for local public institutions are twice the amount of those granted by the founder municipality, and municipalities should support whatever the MC recognises as being most important at the national level even if it takes place outside the capital.

⁸ The budget for culture is increasing: EUR 146,826 thousand in 2016, EUR 155,222 thousand in 2017, EUR 157,181 thousand in 2018.

⁹ At local tenders, Seviqč Brežice was granted the following funds for scoring good reviews: EUR 204.43, EUR 300.00, EUR 400.00, EUR 500.00, EUR 681.27, EUR 800.00, EUR 826.45, etc.

- The status of an organisation in the public interest awarded by the State should imply having residence in all Slovene municipalities, because the administrative seat of the organisation is irrelevant—what is important is where it operates.
- The State should reintroduce financing fixed non-programme related costs for NGOs important at the national level and thus allow their existence as a precondition for their being able to apply for funding of culture projects at the State or local level.
- The State should introduce structural funding for the most important NGOs: multi-annual programme funding, which is provided in the ZUJIK in force, i.e. funding of activities with all the relevant components. It has degenerated into a form of multi-project funding. Structural funding should be related to periods long enough to ensure proper conditions for undisturbed planned operations but short enough to prevent inertia that we are witnessing in the public sector today.

4. Equality between institutional and non-governmental production, meaning they are comparable in terms of specific parameters although not the same.

Description of problems:

- Another reason why co-funding is not comparable, is the poor monitoring of expenditure: in recording expenses for operations, work, programme and equipment, as provided by the ZUJIK in Article 27, operating expenses (office) or costs of equipment (procurement according to needs and possibilities), an important factor is economy of operation, while another relevant indicator is definitely a comparison of labour costs and programme value, i.e. how many EUR of programme an organisation creates with EUR 1 of work input. NGOs produce better results but receive less co-funding. Comparisons are rendered impossible, since
 - **public institutions**, which implement their programme with employees, account for costs of the artistic ensemble under labour costs, which pushes labour costs up and programme costs down;
 - **municipalities** do not abide by the systematisation of costs under Article 27 of the ZUJIK in their tender documentation or in statutory reporting;
 - **non-governmental sector**: in its tenders, the MC does not abide by the systematisation of labour costs under the ZUJIK¹⁰ and SURS¹¹. The only labour costs it co-funds are regular employments, while other labour costs as recognised by the ZUJIK (albeit not as »labour costs« but as »labour costs in accordance with the staffing plan«) are categorised as programme material costs; by comparison, NGOs produce more programme with the same labour costs as public institutions.
- By reporting all costs of regularly employed staff—including those that implement the programme—as labour costs, and material programme costs only as the costs of visiting artists (conductor, director, etc.), the public sector is fostering, on the one hand, precariat, and on the other it is discriminating against work in culture which should receive equal treatment.

¹⁰ Labour costs under the ZUJIK are »labour costs in accordance with the staffing plan«, meaning all costs of labour that the programme provider deems necessary, and not only the costs of regularly employed staff.

¹¹ The SURS asks that annual reports disclose all labour costs: regular employments, work contracts, fee for independent work, student work service.

- Another reason why comparable co-funding is not exercised in practice is the poor monitoring of income and the detrimental attitude to the non-governmental sector in culture; the NGO sector is underestimated in the recently published Analysis of Funding in Culture¹², which compares only public institutions in tables 35–39, completely ignoring the non-governmental sector as if it did not exist.
- Being financially malnourished, NGOs are prone to all types of business risks. The slightest error or a case of bad business judgement can lead to insurmountable financial trouble, irrespective of top programme results delivered.

Potential solutions:

- Ensure that all subsidy beneficiaries record expenditure in a comparable manner, under Article 27 of the ZUJIK.
- Ensure that expenditure is reported in relation to the overall value of the programme and not only to the section covered by the subsidy.
- Implementation of sanctions for infringements of legal provisions.
- Ensure that the public has an insight into the expenditure and revenues, presented in a comparable manner, of all three major groups of beneficiaries: State public institutions, local public institutions and NGOs.
- Granting financial assistance to NGOs in distress, compensating for the prior non-comparable co-funding, or granting guarantees on loans so that they climb out of red numbers alone provided comparable funding—that they are entitled to under the law—is introduced in the future.

5. Setting up a one-stop-shop for NGOs and individuals self-employed in culture, offering legal and tax assistance, and information.

Description of the problem:

- Municipal governments and other investors breach the notice of competition far too frequently for NGOs to be able to afford legal assistance in each case. In addition, we operate in a strictly regulated environment, including the taxation aspect. If an NGO decides to push forward with legal action in such an event, it will only be in case of a serious violation or a most pressing tax matter, because this represents a major business risk for the NGO, even with justice on its side. A focal point for the exchange of information also ought to be set up, as the non-governmental sector does not have the resources to cater for this itself.

Potential solution:

- The Ministry of Public Administration should provide full funding for a group of legal experts to represent NGOs whose rights are being violated in applying to tenders. If municipalities and other investors were adequately sanctioned for infringements of legal provisions, they would act more wisely. In the long-term, this would increase the importance and lift the level of local cultural

¹² Analysis of Funding in Culture, 23 August 2017 upon the presentation of the Draft National Programme for Culture 2018–2025; source: http://www.mk.gov.si/si/zakonodaja_in_dokumenti/predpisi_v_pripravi/predpisi_v_pripravi_2017/.

policies. In addition, we should be granted tax advisory and, if required, accounting services to relieve us of duties we are not qualified for.

6. Support for programmes taking place at cultural heritage sites

Description of the problem:

- Renovations of cultural heritage sites are usually very costly, whereupon it is expected the non-governmental sector will accommodate programmes in them practically for free—even though these programmes make a major contribution to promoting cultural heritage sites and thus justify the costly renovations.
- Many cultural heritage sites are located in rural environments, often characterised by a poor understanding of the need to co-fund and promote cultural programmes and a lack of awareness of the importance of cultural heritage sites themselves.

Potential solutions:

All this could be solved with the previously mentioned measures addressing the proper funding of non-governmental sector programmes, especially at the local level, and particularly

- by ensuring the non-governmental sector—especially organisations with the status of being in the public interest at the national level—has better access to local co-funding options;
- with additional incentives for such programmes, for revitalising cultural heritage, both at the national and local level;
- with the State providing additional incentives to municipalities for co-funding programmes of national importance in the area of cultural heritage;
- by ensuring special-purpose assets for such programmes at State level.

7. Amendment of tender rules and replacing the seemingly unbiased scoring with a system based on reviews, i.e. reviews of a particular programme or project as a whole

Main problems:

- A score system as a method is inappropriate for the arts, experience showing it only *appears* unbiased; instead, a method based on taking responsibility for one's decisions would be better suited. Transparent public decision-making procedures should be set up, based on reviews of proposed programmes and projects. Funding amounts with a floor and ceiling should be secured so as to allow the implementation of demanding programmes and projects, and yet clearly demonstrate this is not social but cultural policy of supporting programmes and projects of national importance.
- The scoring system of the MC awards 1/100 point for the status of organisation in the public interest, while the latter is given up to 10/100 points for financial stability (blockades, slow payments), degrading the relevance of this status.

- It is not fair for an NGO to lose points because it has financial difficulties (caused by systemically inappropriate co-funding) that it has to solve alone, while delivering the set programme successfully despite the troublesome and weak support environment.
- For funds granted under certain European tenders (CLLD, Interreg), project partners must ensure advance funds themselves for at least six months or more, which represents a major, sometimes insurmountable challenge for an NGO.
- Many tenders come out too late for the NGO to be able to withdraw or change its programme in case it is not selected for funding or does not receive enough funds.
- There is no option of appeal regarding the scoring of the content and programme to another, independent committee—appeals are reviewed by the same committee of experts. The Administrative Court only rules on the validity of the procedure.

Potential solutions:

- An NGO that has operated successfully for several years should receive better scoring not only in terms of references and content descriptions but the status of being in public interest.
- The possibility of a multi-level appeal should be introduced, so that opinions of expert groups and other decision-making bodies may be appealed successfully. This is especially important at the local level, where due to small municipal governments and lack of expert staff, decision-making is often unprofessional and not based on arguments. Such a measure would eliminate all pressure exerted by corrupt local politics whose actions bypass the interests of the local community.
- Decisions should have to be adopted at an early stage, particularly for programmes and projects with a time schedule (events).

8. Since the act amending the ZUJIK proposes the NPC be split into a more general document and an Action Plan—the Government’s chief executive document—we have to insist the Minister of Culture present his Action Plan upon the presentation of the NPC 2018–2025 so that his and the Government’s priorities are made clear.

Main problems:

- When reviewing the Report on the Implementation of the NPC 2014–2017 for 2015, both politics and the professional public voiced their objections to the practice of adopting unrealistic NPCs that are mere wish lists and reflect no responsibility to the state of culture (transcript of the session of the National Assembly Committee on Culture as of 6 October 2016). President of the Committee on Culture demanded a new approach.
- All previous NPCs have recognised the problem of independent culture having an inadequate position and receiving inappropriate treatment but this did not help change anything, because the impact of this structural discord was completely lost in the flood of objectives (a hundred and more) and measures (hundreds).
- For every NPC, only annual reports are ever reviewed, and after they expire the Programme as a whole is never evaluated as to whether its key targets were reached. This has completely defeated the purpose of this most important cultural policy document.

- The act amending the ZUJIK has changed the format of the NPC. It now spans a longer period and reports on its implementation are only reviewed bi-annually. All stakes are now on the Government Action Plan, which could cause an additional disqualification of the arts and culture on the political agenda of the National Assembly.

Potential solutions:

- The Minister of Culture submits an evaluation of the NPC 2014–2017 to the National Assembly Committee on Culture along with the proposed new NPC 2018–2025.
- Along with the NPC 2018–2025, the Minister of Culture submits an Action Plan »defining, for a period of four years, the measures (scope and type of cultural activities), objective, funds, timeline for their implementation, and indicators measuring the results« laying down the NPC priorities that he himself and the Government of the RS will pursue. Only in this way can the Minister prove he is introducing a new approach, taking account of the position expressed both by politics and professionals that future NPCs should never again be merely wish lists.
- To illustrate this new approach, the Action Plan must clearly show the attitude of the present Government to the issues and solutions brought forward in this petition.

Abbreviations used

CLLD	Community-led local development
MC	Ministry of Culture
NPC	National Programme for Culture
NGO	non-governmental organisation
SURS	Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia
ZUJIK	Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act