

Final , version 3

WP 02: Guidelines for research, workshops and symposium. Aug–Sep 2018 with P1, Interfolk as lead partner

Content

Foreword: Context of these tripartite Guidelines	2
Context	2
Aim.....	2
Period.....	2
Schedule of activities	2
Budget.....	2
Methodological approach in general	3
Aim and approach in general.....	3
Background – extended presentation.....	3
Guidelines for desk research in WP 04	6
Lead partner:	6
Aim & objectives.....	6
Specifications of deliverables	6
Target Groups	6
Outcome	6
Period:	6
Schedule of activities – who do what and when.....	7
Budget.....	7
Guidelines for local idea workshops in WP 05	8
Lead partner:	8
Aim & objectives.....	8
Specifications of deliverables	8
Target Groups	8
Outcome	9
Period.....	9
Schedule of activities – who do what and when.....	9
Budget.....	9
Guidelines for Nordic Symposium in WP 06	10
Lead partner:	10
Aim & objectives.....	10
Specifications of deliverables	10
Target Groups	10
Outcome	10
Period.....	10
Schedule of activities – who do what and when.....	11
Budget.....	11

Foreword: Context of these tripartite Guidelines

Context

These Guidelines is developed in the context of the 2-year Nordplus Adult development project, August 2018 – July 2020, entitled “Co-creative cooperation with culture volunteers and managers” (project acronym: COOP).

Aim

The aim is during the start of the project to provide integrated methodological guidelines for the subsequent tripartite compilation of good practise and innovative approaches for co-creative cooperation in respectively

- WP 04: Desk research, Sept 2018 – Jan 2019. P4, CL
- WP 05: Local idea workshops, Sept 2018 – Jan 2019. P3, VM
- WP 06: Nordic Symposium in Rumšiškės, LT, Jan – April 2019. P5, OAM

Thereby the subsequent tripartite compilation of good practise and innovative approaches can be based on a shared reference frame and it will be easier to compare and qualify the compiled outputs from the desk research, workshops and symposium to common key findings and recommendations.

The target groups for these guidelines are:

- The project consortium and their key stakeholders.

Period

Aug - Sep 2018

Schedule of activities

No	Who	Key activities	Deadlines
1	P1, IF	Provide draft of integrated guidelines, v1	20 Aug 2018
2	All	The partnership discuss and adopt the guidelines at the kick-off meeting	31 Aug 2018
3	P1, IF	Provide the final integrated guidelines, v2	6 Sept 2018
4	All	Evaluate the work package/ part of WP 18	10 Sept 2018
5	P1, IF	Coordinate the work package as lead partner	10 Sept 2018

Budget

Refunded work days – budget,v2						
Partner no	P1, IF	P2, MOF	P3, VM	P4, CL	P5, OAM	Total days
Work days	2	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	4
salary per day	250	250	250	125	125	
Salary costs	500	125	125	62,50	62,50	875

Other Costs	Euro	Comments
Travel & subsist	0	None
Other costs	0	None

Methodological approach in general

Aim and approach in general

The aim is to compile good practice and innovative approaches and develop curricula and in-service training packages for culture actors engaged in co-creative cooperation between voluntary culture associations, public culture institutions, and the culture departments of the municipalities.

The objectives for the development work will:

- be based on an understanding of co-creation with reference to New Public Governance and its understanding of co-creation as a mean of empowerment of citizens and civil society associations;
- have focus on the synergistic benefit and the so-called 'transformative potential' for active citizenship, democratic participation and community bonding;
- promote a co-creative cooperation based on equal terms, where citizens and other civil society actors are engaged not only as co-implementers, but also as co-initiators and co-designers of new welfare services;
- present forms of co-creation, where the cultural associations not only are equal partners, but also in part of the project have the role as initiators and governing actors to release the transformative potentials; their control and give room and influence for initiatives, resources and contributions from civil society associations and citizens.

Our methodological approach must emphasise:

1. That a viable agenda for co-creation must focus on the synergistic benefit and the so-called 'transformative potential', where cooperation is developed on equal terms and with reference to new public governance and the goal of empowerment.
2. That an innovative development work, in which associations and, in this context, cultural associations not only are equal partners, but also in part of the project have the role as initiators and governing actors to release the transformative potentials.

Background – extended presentation

INTRODUCTION

The last years the municipal agenda for the delivery of welfare services has been characterized by the concept of "co-creation", both in Denmark and other Western European and Nordic countries. The concept "co-creation" (in Danish "samskabelse") indicates an aim to strengthening the welfare services by establishing new cooperative relations and roles between the public sector and citizens and civil society.

According to Danish researchers (Andersen, 2016) it seems like a "collaborative turn" - a turn towards a new cooperation mantra, where "co-creation" forms part of any strategy and speech from municipal employees and politicians. In Denmark, the new agenda is carried out by a number of organizations and public leaders and politicians under names, such as 'Kommune 3.0' (Skanderborg Municipality), 'Kommune Forfra' (Aarhus Municipality) and 'Future Welfare Alliances' (Local Government Denmark). In recent years, a new 'market' has emerged, in which a number of consultants, think tanks and researchers offer analyzes, competence development, counselling and dissemination to support the agenda of co-creation (Tortzen, 2016).

Although the idea of "co-creation" builds on the earlier experiences of collaborating and user involvement, it goes further by focusing on the so-called 'transformative potential' in co-creative cooperation (Needham & Carr, 2009), which involves citizens and public employees participating in an equal effort to develop innovative, sustainable and long-term welfare solutions. It is thus a collaboration that has the potential to create synergy by changing the roles and relationships of the actors.

PARADIGM SHIFTS

In the late 00s, the interest in co-creative cooperation emerged in the light of the economic financial crisis 2007-2009, both politically and scientifically. Co-creation is now seen by many as a viable alter-

native to government and market-based production of public services. The agenda tends now to shift from New Public Management to New Public Governance (Bovaird & Löffler 2012, Pestoff 2012). But the development is far from unambiguous. There are roughly said two conflicting understandings of "cocreation", respectively as a means for efficiency or for empowerment.

The first understanding with focus on efficiency has been further developed within the framework of New Public Management with emphasis on economic gains. Co-creation is seen as an answer to resource shortages in public welfare production and aims at efficient production of public services, and typically citizens are seen as relatively 'passive' co-producers of service. The goal here is to continuously quality assure, streamline and target and, if necessary, innovate public services (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013). The understanding is characterized by an economic rationale and a functional perspective, where citizens and users are seen as rational, benefit maximizing actors.

The second understanding that emphasizes empowerment has been developed with reference to New Public Governance, and it aims at giving citizens and civil society greater influence on public welfare (Osborne, 2010). It emphasizes network based collaboration between different public and private actors, working together to prioritize, plan or produce welfare. This understanding highlights the democratic potential of co-creation in the form of increased pluralism and legitimacy of prioritizing, planning and producing public welfare. The goal is empowerment, and it is emphasized that not only individual citizens, but also civil society organizations and local communities can participate in co-operation. It focuses primarily on the possible democratic and liberating potential in co-creation.

We can emphasize that the initiators of this project application and the selected partners prefer and refer to the empowerment understanding and the project's development work will not only focus on cooperation on equal footing, but also try to identify opportunities for civil society actors to be the initiators and the key executive during parts of the cooperation.

CO-CREATION IN PRACTICE

The idea of "co-creation" that has more ideational sources and represents different political agendas is also an ambiguous phenomenon in practice (Ewert & Evers, 2012) and unfortunately the many fine words will often not correspond to the reality.

Empirical research in "co-creative practices" shows that citizens and civil society are often involved late and have limited influence in the cooperation. The researchers distinguish between three types of co-creation depending on where in the process the civil society actors get influence. They can either take the role as co-initiator, co-designer or co-implementer. In practice, the most common form of cooperation is where the citizens take the role as co-implementer, that is, they first enter into cooperation when the new services are designed and shall be implemented (OECD, 2011).

A recent Danish study (Tortzen, 2016) showed that in many cases there is a gap between narrative and practice in terms of co-creation. Specific cases were investigated in three different municipalities, with particular focus on how the public management, respectively, supported or counteracted equal cooperation. The conclusion was that all three examples represented top-down initiatives that were presented as 'co-creation'.

On the one hand, the municipal leaders use an empowerment tale of co-creation, emphasizing equal cooperation, where citizens and other civil society actors get influence on how welfare is to be designed and produced. On the other hand, it becomes in reality a practice in which relevant and affected groups of citizens are kept out and where public actors do not seriously provide room for the problem understandings, solutions or resources that citizens wish to bring. This means that it contrary to the fine words in reality is a practice of instrumental efficiency.

The same picture is drawn from a major study, which CISC (Center for Research in Sports, Health and Civil Society, University of Southern Denmark) has carried out. It shows that even though the municipalities want to strengthen democracy in public services, they cooperate with volunteers on specific tasks in the implementation, rather than involving them in identifying challenges and developing new

possible solutions (Ibsen & Espersen, 2016). In practice, the instrumental efficiency approach to co-operation often prevails in governance.

The conclusion of these two key surveys is that the municipalities are constantly failing to act as facilitators in the co-creative cooperation, by laying down the framework and objectives of the cooperation in advance, and by assuming a dominant role in the cooperation, so there is no room for the resources and ideas the citizens and civil society can bring. Such 'top-down' partnerships, where the municipality takes the role of defining rather than facilitating, do not allow space for all parties' resources and knowledge to come into play.

NEED FOR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The culture and leisure associations represent more than a quarter of all associations in the Nordic countries, while for example the welfare associations, active in the social, humanitarian and health areas, account for less than one fifth (Ibsen & Espersen, 2016). The culture associations also have the highest growth in the number of new associations and new members compared to other types of associations.

Not least outside the larger cities, cultural associations are crucial to ensuring a wide range of culture and leisure facilities for the citizens. But still, we see a need for the culture associations to be more proactive and agenda setting in new development projects for the co-creative cooperation.

REFERENCE LIST

Andersen, Linda Lundgaard (2016) Keynote: "Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber – forskellige forståelser". Konference: "Nye velfærdsscenerier-muligheder for inklusion og deltagelse? Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber". Center for socialt entreprenørskab, Roskilde Universitet, 25. januar 2016.

Andersen, L. L., & Espersen, H. H. (2017). Samskabelse, samproduktion og partnerskaber - teoretiske perspektiver. In *Partnerskaber og samarbejder mellem det offentlige og civilsamfundet. Støtte til mennesker med psykiske vanskeligheder* (pp. 107–136). København: Socialstyrelsen.

Bovaird, T., & Löffler, E. (2012). From Engagement to Co-production: The Contribution of Users and Communities to Outcomes and Public Value. *Voluntas*, 23(4), 1119–1138. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9309-6>

Ewert, B., & Evers, A. (2012). An Ambiguous Concept: On the Meanings of Co-production for Health Care Users and User Organizations? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(2), 425–442. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9345-2>

Ibsen, B., & Espersen, H. H. (2016). *Kommunernes samarbejde med civile aktører*. Center for forskning i Idræt, Sundhed og Civilsamfund, Syddansk Universitet.

Jakobsen, M., & Andersen, S. C. (2013). Coproduction and Equity in Public Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review*, 73(5), 704–713. <http://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12094>

Needham, C., & Carr, S. (2009). Co-production: An emerging evidence base for adult social care transformation. SCIE Reserch Briefing 31, March 2009.

OECD(2011) *OECD Public Governance Reviews : Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society - 4211131e*. pdf.

Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The New Public Governance - emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. London: Routledge.

Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production and Third Sector Social Services in Europe: Some Concepts and Evidence. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(4), 1102–1118. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9308-7>

Tortzen, A. (2016). *Samskabelse i kommunale rammer - hvordan kan ledelse understøtte samskabelse?* Roskilde Universitet.

Guidelines for desk research in WP 04

Lead partner:

P4, Culturelab (LV)

Aim & objectives

The aim is to provide inspiring knowledge and viewpoints on the subject of co-creation.

The objectives are:

- To clarify the main challenges for a successful co-creative cooperation.
- To present key theories and positions regarding good and appropriate forms of cross-sector cooperation.
- To compile examples of good practise and innovative approaches.

To present recommendations for high quality co-creative cooperation.

Specifications of deliverables

An English Survey Summary Report of 20 standard pages, published as PDF-edition.

The Report can have the following disposition and division of work:

1. Foreword on background and aims for the project and this mini desk survey (1 page).
 - By Ilona
2. Introduction on how co-creative cooperation has come on the agenda for a renewal of the Nordic welfare societies and Baltic societies, in general and for the cultural field (3-4 pages).
 - By Hans (Nordic) and Ilona (Baltic) with input from Justina about Lithuania
3. Present key positions (with theoretical references) regarding co-creative cooperation (6-8 pages).
 - By Ilona and Hans
4. Present examples of good practise and innovative approaches, where voluntary associations and public authorities in varied degree have the initiative (6-8 pages).
 - By all partners – each partner present an example from own country (1-2 pages per country + a photo) Ilona make a small guide / lead question and partners can respond.
5. Present risks and recommendations for high quality co-creative cooperation (3-4 pages).
 - By all in a dialogue – Ilona and Hans present draft and partners comments and elaborate.

The layout must use the adopted visual identity of the project. Possible paper editions and translated editions imply extra funding from other funders.

Target Groups

All planned direct and indirect target groups.

Outcome

Help the project team and key stakeholders and others with an interest for the topic to get an elaborated and more problem consciousness understanding of the possibilities and challenges for a successful co-creative cooperation, especially in the field of arts and culture.

Period:

Sep 2018 - Jan 2019.

Schedule of activities – who do what and when

No	Who	Key activities	Deadlines
1	P1, IF	IF present methodological Guidelines for research, workshops and symposium	20 Aug 2018
2	P4, CL	Comments and possible elaborate the Guidelines for the Desk Research	27 Aug 2018
3	All	The partnership discuss and adopt the guidelines at the kick-off meeting	31 Aug 2018
4	P4, CL	Lead partner specifies the task and the disposition of the Summary Report.	15 Sept 2018
5	P4, CL	Ilona present small guide with lead questions on how to structure the articles of good practise (see below point 10)	15 Nov 2018
5a	All	Partners can comment and propose changes of the small guide	22 Nov
5b	P4, CL	Ilona provide the final small guide for articles with examples of good practise	25 Nov
6	P4, CL P1, IF P5, OAM	Present draft on how co-creation has come on the agenda in partners countries	10 Dec
7	P4, CL P1, IF	Present draft with key positions of co-creation (with theoretical reference)	10 Dec
8	All	Partners can comment drafts about section 1) co-creation on the agenda and 2) key positions with theoretical references	15 Dec
9	P4, CL P1, IF	Present final versions of section 1 and section 2	5 Jan 2019
10	All	Present draft of good practise and innovative approaches with reference to goal of empowerment (1 article of 1-2 pages per country + photo)	10 Jan
10a	All	All can comment the draft articles	15 Jan
10b	All	The final versions of articles are delivered	20 Jan
11	P4, CL P1, IF	Present recommendations and risks for high quality co-creative cooperation.	20 Jan
11a	All	All can comments the section with recommendations and risks	25 Jan
11b	P4, CL P1, IF	The final version of the section with recommendations is delivered	1 Feb
12	All	Edit, proof-read, layout and publish the Summary Report, English version	5 Feb
13	All	Evaluate the work package/ part of WP 18	5 Feb 2019
14	P4, CL	Coordinate the work package as lead partner	5 Feb 2019

Budget

Refunded work days – budget,v2						
Partner no	P1, IF	P2, MOF	P3, VM	P4, CL	P5, OAM	Total
Work days	4	2	2	6	2	16
salary per day	250	250	250	125	125	
Salary costs	1000	500	500	750	250	3000

Guidelines for local idea workshops in WP 05

Lead partner:

P3, Vestvågøy Municipality (NO)

Aim & objectives

The aim is to provide critical view-points on good practise and new approaches from key actors in the field.

The shared objectives for the local workshops, with one in each partner countries, are:

- To compile examples of good practise and innovative approaches from the participants local community;
- To present inappropriate ways to handle co-creative cooperation;
- To present prioritised tips on how to promote successful co-creative cooperation;
- To present needs and key issues for possible in-service training courses.

Specifications of deliverables

Key Activities and deliverables:

1. The local workshop programmes are planned in accordance with the proposed methodological guidelines (WP 2) that were adjusted and approved at the first partner meeting (WP3).
2. The project partners select in dialogue with stakeholders a municipality for the workshop, where co-creative cooperation has priority and been tried in different forms.
3. Each workshop has 8 – 12 key representatives from the local voluntary culture associations, the local public culture institutions, and the municipality's culture council and culture department.
4. The workshop can have three 2-3 hours (afternoon or evening) sessions that include
 - a. A session with presentations and group discussions to clarify the essentials of co-creation and present examples of good practice from the local communities.
 - b. A session with idea compilation (innovation group session or brain-writing or brain-storming session) on warnings and tips for a successful co-creative cooperation in the field of arts, culture and heritage.
 - c. A session with idea compilation of needs and key issues for further education /in-service training.
5. The moderator and reporter make Notes from the sessions and may ask some participants to send elaborated notes on their proposals. The reporter provides final Summary Notes from the thematic sessions.
6. The Notes per workshop is approx. 5 standard pages and include examples of good practice, warnings and tips for improved practise, and recommendations for further education of the culture actors + photo
7. The lead partners / editors from the project team collect the four Summary Notes and edit them to be the main text in a Summary Report that also includes an introduction and a concluding section with recommendations and perspectives.
8. The editors proof-read and layout the report using the adopted visual identity of the project, and publish the Summary Reports as an English PDF-edition.

In total approx. 25 pages.

NB: Possible paper editions and translated editions imply extra funding from other funders.

Target Groups

- Project team - to be used as feeds for the subsequent development work.
- Main direct and indirect target groups - to be used as awareness-rising and inspiration for project issues.

Outcome

Help the project team and key stakeholders and others with an interest for the topic to get an elaborated and more problem consciousness understanding of the possibilities and challenges for a successful co-creative cooperation as well as guidelines for the needs and topic of further education of culture actors involved in co-creative cooperation.

Period

Sep 2018 - Jan 2019.

Schedule of activities – who do what and when

No	Who	Key activities	Deadlines
1	P1, IF	IF present methodological Guidelines for research, workshops and symposium	20 Aug 2018
2	P3, VM	Comments and possible elaborate the Guidelines for the local workshops	27 Aug 2018
3	All	The partnership discuss and adopt the guidelines at the kick-off meeting	31 Aug 2018
4	P3, VM	Lead partner provide a common frame for the workshops with reference to methodological guidelines (WP 2) and discussions at first meeting (WP 3)	15 Sept 2018
5	All	Partners select the municipality where the local workshop can take place	25 Sept 2018
6	All	Partners plan the workshop programme in dialogue with local stakeholders	1 Oct 2018
7	All	Partners inform about their work to other partners	1 Nov
8	All	Partners inform about their work to other partners	15 Dec
9	All	The series of 3 short afternoon workshop sessions are completed	30 Jan 2019
10	All	The workshop leaders provide final Summary Notes from the thematic sessions.	1 Feb 2019
11	P3, VM	The lead partner collects the four Summary Notes and prepare the draft multi-lateral Workshop report	15 Feb 2019
12	All	The partners comment the draft report	23 Feb 2019
13	P3, VM	The lead partner provides the final Workshop report, English PDF-edition.	1 March 2019
14	All	Evaluate the work package/ part of WP 18	5 March 2019
15	P3, VM	Coordinate the work package as lead partner	5 March 2019

Budget

Refunded work days – budget,v2						
Partner no	P1, IF	P2, MOF	P3, VM	P4, CL	P5, OAM	Total days
Work days	1	3	6	3	3	15,5
salary per day	250	250	250	125	125	
Salary costs	250	750	1500	375	375	3250

Other Costs	Euro	Comments
Travel & subsist	0	Local travel costs must be paid by the management unit support of 100 euro
Other costs	0	Possible cost for rent of venue and coffee breaks etc. must be paid by the management unit support or local funding.

Guidelines for Nordic Symposium in WP 06

Lead partner:

P5, Open Air Museum (LT)

Aim & objectives

The aim is to provide state of the arts knowledge and viewpoints from researchers and key actors in the field.

The objectives are:

- To present key positions (with theoretical references) on co-creative cooperation in the field of arts, culture and heritage.
- To compile examples of good practise and innovative approaches of co-creative cooperation.
- To clarify needs and key issues for further education /in-service training.

Specifications of deliverables

Key features of the event:

- The 2-day Nordic Symposium will take place in Rumšiškės at the Open-Air Museum of Lithuania, April 2019.
- The programme will be planned in accordance with the methodological guidelines (WP 2) that were discussed and approved at the first partner meeting (WP3).
- The project partners select and send per project country 4 participants (3 VIPS + project leader), in total 16.
- Some of the participants will be researchers and experts that are invited to deliver talks on core issues and reviews of the project. A plenary session with round table debate as well as two sessions with parallel workshops on main issues will be part of the programme.
- A guided tour at the Rumšiškės at the Open-Air Museum of Lithuania will help the participants to experience “good practice” of culture volunteering and co-creative cooperation.
- The lectures, plenary debates and selected workshops **will be video recorded and broadcasted live, and later uploaded to the project’s communication portal** * together with articles, power-points and other presentation materials from the conference.
**) We can cancel the broadcasts.*

Target Groups

The primary target groups are key stakeholders including the VIPS that are invited to participate.

Furthermore, the symposium can provide feeds to the project team for the subsequent development work; and it can be used for awareness-rising and inspiration to the main direct and indirect target groups.

for LT: other museums managers, NGOs and artist

Outcome

Help the project team and key stakeholders and others with an interest for the topic

- to get an elaborated and more problem consciousness understanding of the possibilities and challenges for a successful co-creative cooperation in the field of arts and culture; and
- to provide guidelines for the needs and topic of further education of culture actors involved in co-creative cooperation.

Period

Jan - April 2019.

Schedule of activities – who do what and when

No	Who	Key activities	Deadlines
1	P1, IF	IF present methodological Guidelines for research, workshops and symposium	20 Aug 2018
2	P5, OAM	Comments and possible elaborate the Guidelines for the Symposium	27 Aug 2018
3	All	The partnership discuss and adopt the guidelines at the kick-off meeting	31 Aug 2018
4	All	Time of the Nordic symposium, April 2019 in Rumšiškės must be decided at the first partner meeting	31 Aug 2018
5	P5, OAM	Lead partner present the symposium draft programme with reference to the methodological guidelines (WP 2), discussions at first partner meeting (WP 3), the desk research (WP 4) and the local workshops (WP 5).	1 Feb 2019
6	All	Partners comment the draft programme	7 Feb 2019
7	P5, OAM	Lead partner prepare the final programme	15 Feb 2019
8	All	The partners select and send per project country 4 participants (3 VIPS + 1 project leader), in total 16.	1 March 2019
9	P5, OAM	The final programme including list of participants and symposium papers are distributed to the participants	15 March 2019
10	All	The symposium is completed	25 – 26 April 2019
11	P2, MOF	Presentations, notes from workshops discussions, proposals etc are collected and send to participants and uploaded to the website	Primo May 2019
12	All	Evaluate the work package/ part of WP 18	Medio May 2019
13	P5, OAM	Coordinate the work package as lead partner	Medio May 2019

Budget

Refunded work days – budget,v2						
Partner no	P1, IF	P2, MOF	P3, VM	P4, CL	P5, OAM	Total days
Work days	4	4	4	4	6	22
salary per day	250	250	250	125	125	
Salary costs	1000	1000	1000	500	750	4250

Other Costs	Euro	Comments
Travel & subsist	9 foreign vips x 630 = 5670 + 3 leaders x 630	Each visiting country can send 3 participant (plus 1 project leader paid by partner meeting support in the subsequent WP 7), in total 9 vips + 3 pl, each with 630 euro in unit support. The 9 vips shall stay in 2 days, while the 3 leaders must stay 3 days (2 day symposium + 1 day partner meeting). The total support is 3 visiting countries x 4 persons of 630 euro, like 7.560 euro. NB: the group of 4 Lithuanians don't get unit support, so their cost must be shared by the visiting partners. Possible cost is 1 night at hotel, 2 days meals and maybe local transport. NB: The Open Air Museum in Rumšiškės is near Kaunas that has an airport with very cheap flights from Copenhagen and other western airport, where we can get a return ticket for maybe less than 75 euro.
Other costs	0	Possible extra costs for rent of venue, course materials, etc must be shared by the partner organisations.

