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As consequence of the economic crisis, public expenditures for arts and culture have decreased dramatically. Arts-cultural institutions and organisations find themselves at a turning point where new ways of managing and funding culture need to be explored.

This was the concept behind the 3rd Annual ENCATC Policy Debate organised on 5 July in Brussels in the prestigious BOZAR Centre for Fine Arts attended by over 90 participants from Europe and beyond.

Like all other sectors affected, arts and culture organisations and those who govern them are standing at a crossing. Now is the time to consider new models and funding systems. As the waves of budget cuts continue to hit, many are asking is possible to save costs while at the same time increase revenue? Can restructuring how cultural organisations operate lead to increased efficiency and better management practices? How will the role of cultural managers evolve in light of these structural changes?

This report includes summaries of the presentations given by eight experts on arts and cultural management, and representing museums, orchestras, cultural and creative industries, and heritage shared their knowledge, inspiring case studies, and suggestions for new models of governance for their sector. They engaged with debate participants on consequences of the financial crisis on the cultural sector, shared their professional experiences of impacts they've witnessed, and how cultural organisations forecast to survive when European and national subsidies are being cut.

All the experts agreed that these are challenging times, but the cultural sector is in a unique position thanks to its wealth of creativity and cultural products that it can use to come out of the crisis if cultural operators, managers, artists and stakeholders are ready to adapt their traditional models of governance to the values and behaviors of today's society. This challenging period will also be an important moment for lifelong learning and professionalizing the sector if cultural managers are to successfully execute innovative projects and new models of governance. "Especially now, this is not a time for amateurism. When the stakes are high all players, big and small, need to be on top of their game if they are to react quickly, ensure quality and performance and weather this storm," said Jean-Pierre Baeyens, holder of the Marketing Chair at the Solvay Brussels School of Economics and Management.

Many recommendations and best practices shared during the policy debate called for enlarging audiences and networks, combining resources (intellectual, financial, logistical, etc.), engaging with local communities, looking for international cooperation and partnerships, and embracing this opportunity for change and innovation. Across the board it was very clear that cultural organisations who resist change and cling to their traditional models of governance will not be important players in the future – that is if they still exist.
Culture in challenging times: towards new models of business and governance for the cultural sector

The word “crisis” gets thrown around a lot in today’s cultural sector. But what kind of crisis are we facing? Is it a global crisis? An economic cycle crisis? Or a financial crisis? Between 2000 and 2011 GDP for the G7 countries decreased from 65% to 50% of World GDP. Since the crisis began in 2008 GDP for the United States, Japan, Germany, Italy and Belgium have been slow to recover while China, India and Brazil have witnessed less important impacts on their GDPs.

How does culture fit into this crisis? Across the European continent, culture is still highly dependable on state subsidy systems, however the ongoing financial crisis brings into question current cultural policy systems. Central and Eastern European countries’ cultural policy embraces a ministerial system rather than the “Arm’s length” approach employed by their northern and western counterparts. However, as culture budgets are seeing deep cuts between 20-30% in different European countries, more and more northern and western governments are moving to towards ministerial control. Post communist European countries are also more aware of instability and are perhaps better prepared to confront the challenges presented by the ongoing economic crisis. Regardless of current cultural policy practices, the economic crisis presents an opportunity to consider new models and funding systems for all.

Traditional reactions to the crisis have been for new marketing and partnership strategies, efforts to reduce costs and increase productivity, rely on volunteers instead of professionals, and provide programming that promotes well-known artists, popular and/or traditional cultural activities. Yet, these actions are no longer financially sustainable. However, before choosing a model, cultural organizations need to ask themselves a series of important questions such as: What are the values of a cultural organisation in question? Why is the organisation implementing its activities? For whom? What kind of financial orientation? (“Cost savings” vs. “Revenue increasing”) What kind of competences? What kind of external relationships? (Stakeholders approach) What kind of role for new technologies and digitalization?

The “cultural monitor” model is a useful place to begin because it strives to be more than just collecting vast amounts of data, but looks to measure cultural values and goals as well as stakeholders management and internal management (Klamer: 2013). This model develops an evaluation system to define awards and values of high performing activities and performances within the cultural organisation.

As Europe’s knowledge base society grows, cultural organizations should consider this development as an important source for economic value. Postfordism and the knowledge based economy (KBE) model are particularly interesting. With government budget cuts already implemented and perhaps more are to come in the future, this model strives to replace traditional state subsidies by looking at the four P’s: partners, projects, people and place (Völkerlink: 2013). It looks for flexible and innovative projects and highly favors sponsorship and collaboration. An excellent example of a cultural institution already employing this model is the MASS MoCA, one of the largest centers for contemporary arts in the United States.

Other models to consider include corporate governance for the cultural sector, cooperation vs. competition to share resources, and the network perspective to collaborate with other actors, both public and private. There is no one perfect solution for the cultural sector to come out of the crisis. Arts and cultural organizations need to take a look inwards to evaluate their structure, finances, mission, engagement with local communities and audiences, and relationships with public authorities to best define a management strategy that will take them into the future. It is likely that the organisation will need to adapt and combine different management methods to respond to its unique needs, but it seems that a system around knowledge and competences instead of around tools and techniques would be more efficient. It will be important to rely on measurement systems for evaluation, work on expanding collaborative opportunities, and be open to new technologies and digitzation.
New business models for artists in challenging times

In these difficult times the market has more creative people than ever while public and private resources are diminishing resulting in less income for the often “struggling artist”. Stable jobs are being rapidly replaced by intermittent short-term contracts. As they look for financial stability, many artists are being pushed to work on the black market to make a living. Yet while this may ease their financial worries, this illegal activity forces them to hide which is contrary to the need of the artist and their artwork to be seen.

These conditions do not have to continue. To bring artists to the forefront means it is not a time for isolationism or competition. Artists and creative persons need to work together to co-produce, co-organise and cooperate. This is where non-profits and networks can be of enormous value to bring people and resources together. To further these connections, it is the right time to invest in collective tools that encourage cooperation and allow it to flourish. Artists need organizations that will help them navigate the often complex legal environments, gain access to financing and sponsors, actors that will advocate on their behalf both at home and abroad, and researchers that provide usable and accurate information on developments in the cultural field.

To improve the current climate, artist and their ideas need to circulate so they can share works of art and gain new audiences, partners, and sponsors. Yet complex visa procedures and heavy administrative burdens are preventing easy circulation. This calls for a need to reduce and standardize procedures that will allow for artists and creators to work and move efficiently and freely.

It is also vital that investments are made in education and training. While both are essential at the beginning of an artist’s career, this type of career path is one where an artist never has enough knowledge coming out of school. Therefore, continuing adult education and training for artists and creators is extremely important especially during these difficult times. Investment in education at all levels, but especially lifelong education will professionalise the sector. Thanks to these efforts, artists will acquire new knowledge and skills needed to flourish in today’s art market and be better prepared to take on tomorrow’s challenges.

Taking into account the current economic and social landscape and the needs of artists, SMartBe is an example of an organisation investing in innovative solutions to help individual artists. From already taking on some of the burdensome administrative tasks (such as invoicing), to providing pre-financing and virtual meeting places, SMartBe is also looking to future possibilities to be more involved in artistic projects as co-producers and invest funds to develop new services for members.

Artists and creators need the support of organizations and policy makers that are looking to new models and new tools that will facilitate cooperation, execution and output. The work of an artist is to create however it’s not to say they should be exempt from the management and administrative responsibilities that are a part of any workforce. By providing them with knowledge, tools and support to alleviate these time consuming tasks will allow them to concentrate on their art and develop their craft for the benefit of society.
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New governance models for cultural organizations in challenging times

“In organizations of all kinds, good governance starts with the board of directors.” These words spoken by Lesley Rosenthal of the New York Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts are especially important during challenging times. Those who lead arts organizations are faced with difficult decisions as they react to the on-going crisis when they set strategy, appoint top management, oversee management performance, decide on major investments, and control financial affairs. Especially now, this is not a time for amateurism. When the stakes are high all players, big and small, need to be on top of their game if they are to react quickly, ensure quality and performance and weather this storm.

Traditional management models are dying. We see this in the aviation industry, banking, television, music and others. As cultural organizations look towards new governance models in these challenging times, two are particularly interesting: the entrepreneurial model and the cellular model. The first, by taking a more internal orientation reinforces key competences and encourages entrepreneurial thinking, focuses on searching for opportunities, seeks a competitive advantage, and allows to continuously test new ideas. In this case the board serves as a stimulator to achieve these objectives and practices. The cellular model on the other hand, takes an external orientation and has the board working as a facilitator, meaning the focus is on cells working alone or in collaboration. These cells can be teams, task forces, working units or operational partners. This model also relies extensively on online networks and technology in order to work efficiently.

Those governing cultural organizations also need to evaluate their internal/external vision. Most cultural organizations today execute their activities with an internal vision by focusing on their artistic product. In museums for example this indicates management is likely run by curators and conservationists who are preoccupied first and foremost with the heritage and collection the museum houses. Those who consume the art are not the main consideration when defining how to design and implement the organisation’s activities.

Moving closer to the external vision, a cultural organisation could take on a customer orientation. Focusing on the customer who pays to have the artistic experience is taboo in some circles, especially for “purists” who think the art should always come first. Despite taboos, many organizations have shifted their focus towards making sure their paying audiences get the most out of their experience and will return wanting more.

One notch higher on the external vision is the societal orientation. Here arts organizations will focus their actions to be a real player in society and contribute to solidarity and well-being of citizens and using their art to make a difference.

Finally, the most extreme on the path to a total external vision is the wiki orientation. This is the most open of all the orientations and lets the people into the cultural organisation to voice what they want to experience and be a part of creating that experience. For this vision to be successful, technology and sharing are crucial.

The crisis has led many cultural organizations to question their governance and strategies. It is doubtful that the cultural sector can continue with its traditional governance models and should look to new models that are in tune with society’s values and consumer behaviors. In order to weather this crisis and come out stronger than before, cultural organizations must evolve from an internal to an external vision. If the focus is inward they are likely not to survive.
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New business models for museums in challenging times

When the ICOM – international council of museum – launched its call in April 2013 on “The Lisbon Declaration to Support Culture and Museums to Face the Global Crisis and Build the Future”, they asked public authorities to at least maintain subsidies for museums. They claimed these subsidies were essential considering the numerous externalities museums provide for society and especially in economic and social domains. Nevertheless, museums have to be realistic and foresee an innovative business model that will make them less dependent on the subsidies. Therefore, it is important to challenge the common idea that museums cannot be considered as a rational decision-making utilitarian – that is to say an economic agent being able to maximize efficiency – and will always rely on public subsidies and private donations.

Across Europe and around the globe, public subsidies for museums have dropped drastically. Spain has cited a 35% decrease over the past two years1, while the United States has reported a dramatic drop in state funding for 47% of its museums last year2. With this worrying decrease in public resources, many museums are soliciting private donations, but understandably these too have been impacted by the economic crisis. Private funding is not only unable to make up for the loss in public subsidies, but is in fact decreasing. What are museums to do in these challenging times?

Museums are in a unique position in that they possess some of the world’s greatest treasures, but are struggling for transforming these non-sellable assets into profitable goods and services. Internationalization may be the solution. In a recently published article3, this strategy was applied to international touring exhibitions. It presents three models of internationalization and the distortion on their cost model: coproduction, co-organization, and export with different business models resulting in an increase of revenues due to the reducing of costs production and the increase, in some case, of resources.

The first international touring model is the co-produced exhibition. This model offers a diverse catalogue, engenders intellectual resources by bringing together scientists and historians, and finally pools costs and creates economies of scale. A recent example of a co-produced exhibition is the 2012 "Matisse, Cézanne, Picasso… L’aventure des Stein" - presented in Paris, New York and San Francisco - that combined many resources, such as transportation items. The co-production allowed them to save 65% of this item in the initial budget.

Another successful model is the co-organised exhibition that is a collaboration between several museums, but unlike co-production there is an identified technical producer and only one museum is financially responsible. This model is also economically advantageous because it pools costs and allows the technical producer to sell the scientific creation. The Victoria and Albert Museum of art and design has been a pioneer of this model. This museum has a range of exhibitions available for hire that have successfully travelled across Europe and all over the world to North America, the Middle East, Asia and Oceania. The last of the international touring models is the export exhibition. This model involves one museum producer with several “clients”. These exhibitions are often called “pocket filling” exhibitions by professionals, as there are little or no production costs, only revenues. Some of these turn-key sales now generate revenues of several million Euros. This kind of exhibition allows internalizing the maximum of items – curator, transport, conservation, scenography, derivative products – ensuring a maximum of economies of scale. The Musée National Picasso, Paris was very successful with the touring exhibition of Picasso masterpieces that had renowned international success.

By combining financial and intellectual resources museums don’t need to face the crisis standing alone. Overall, internationalization strategies have a positive influence on a museum’s business models as it increases their own resources and makes them more financially sustainable. The goal is not to make an apology for public cuts in culture, but to have a long-term perspective. Public authorities can help and accompany museums to be less dependable on public and private subsidies.

1 Maurot, Elodie, En Espagne, la crise frappe durement la culture, La Croix, 2 June 2013
2 American Association of Museums
New business models for the music sector

The Brussels Philharmonic has a history of looking towards innovative models and practices; long before many other cultural organizations were forced to reflect on their practices in reaction to the recent financial crisis. **Brussels Philharmonic** was established in 1935 under the aegis of the public broadcasting network. When the orchestra was cut loose in 1998 to be an independent cultural organisation, this independence meant the Philharmonic was left to survive with a small inexperienced staff and no official rehearsal space. Seeing a lack in Brussels’ cultural scene, the organisation seized this opportunity to position itself as the Brussels Philharmonic and has since successfully carved out a distinct image thanks to innovative practices and risk taking marketing strategies. Success and stability rose to where the orchestra today rehearses in two of Brussels' most prestigious and sought after performance halls: Flagey's Studio 4, which ranks among the best in the world in terms of acoustics, and in BOZAR, the Centre for Fine Arts.

Today while others are struggling under the pressures of the crisis, panic and stress are not present in the Brussels Philharmonic office. Of course, the organisation is aware of the circumstances and impact of the financial crisis, but this is not the first time the orchestra has had to surmount a difficult period. Thanks to some luck from a little independent film called “The Artist”, the Brussels Philharmonic rose to world-wide fame when the film won the 2012 Oscar for Best Musical Score which the orchestra had recorded in Flagey's Studio 4 in Brussels. This recognition has brought great international visibility to the orchestra, but it has by no means halted the organisation’s thirst for innovative ideas to advance with technology and society’s behaviors. Brussels Philharmonic is always looking to set itself apart on the international scene. Good music, wonderful concerts, and excellent recordings are all vital, but it is not enough. It is looking to preserve the traditions of classical music, with a twist of creativity, innovation and sustainability. The orchestra caused quite a stir in November 2012 when they performed without the traditional paper scores. Instead, the musical scores sheets were on individual Samsung GALAXY Note 10.1 tablets equipped with the “NeoScores” software. While there are still some improvements to be made before Brussels Philharmonic could potentially make the switch from paper to digital, this initiative demonstrates the orchestra’s appetite for new and innovative ideas.

With the aim to spread classical music actively among as broad a public as possible, in 2012 Brussels Philharmonic, in collaboration with Leo Burnett Brussels, developed classical music ringtones to promote the classical orchestra's own record label. 12 initial ringtones were created based upon recordings from the major symphonic repertoire. In the first three days of the ringtone launch, Brussels Philharmonic had over 10,000 downloads making for quite a successful initiative.

More recently, the orchestra embarked on an innovative project to provide musicians with the best sounding instruments. The sound quality of string instruments greatly enhances the quality of the entire orchestra; however a top quality violin for example can cost about 70,000 Euros, an amount that would be difficult for most professional musicians to afford. In 2013 Brussels Philharmonic set up an investment fund in order to help its musicians play on the highest quality instruments possible. This is also beneficial for the instrument's original owner or investor since an instrument that is played increases in value. The aim is to bring in investors who love music and who can wait until their investment pays off. After five years, investors can choose to sell the instruments on the market (likely at a higher price, since in the meanwhile instruments increase their monetary value) or to reinvest in the instrument for other five years. And there’s no risk to the investors either since the instruments are insured.

These are just some examples of how an organisation in the music sector can safeguard tradition all while being innovative and ensuring its sustainability – through this crisis or the next.
New business and governance models for the cultural sector: Case studies from the USA

The United States’ art sector has a long tradition of interest in funding the arts and culture. Unlike their European counterparts, an American art organization cannot rely on the little public funding that exists. In this context, arts organizations across the states are often on the lookout for new models for governance and fundraising opportunities.

There are some good examples of federal public funding opportunities – many that link the arts to community development and cultural economic development – such as the Federal Creative Placemaking grants from the National Endowment for the Arts. Communities across the United States are leveraging the arts and engaging design to make their communities more livable with enhanced quality of life, increased creative activity, a distinct sense of place, and vibrant local economies that together capitalize on their existing assets. These grants award $25,000 to $200,000 to arts organizations for their projects that contribute to the livability of communities and place the arts at their core.

At the local or state level there are also cultural economic grants. One such example is the Adams Art Programme that supports projects that revitalize communities, create jobs, grow creative industries, and increase engagement in cultural activities by Massachusetts residents and visitors. Since its launch in 2005, the Adams Arts Program has invested $9.4 million in more than 100 projects statewide, from Pittsfield to Provincetown, involving more than 950 nonprofit organizations, businesses, and local governments.

Another popular policy in the US is “One percent for art”. This policy will vary from state to state or by city, but in general some percentage of a public works project cost (at least one percent), is reserved to fund and install public art. However, is it not uncommon for this one percent be reduced or redirected entirely to another budget line if the project is facing delays or unforeseen costs that threaten the project’s overall budget and execution.

There has been some success in arts advocacy thanks to online technologies that bring together the power of individuals. It is common to see online campaigns that call for individuals to directly email their elected officials in order to swiftly influence policy and budget allocations for arts and culture. These can be either individual campaigns or led by local advocacy organizations such as MASS Creative in Massachusetts. This organization works with creative leaders, artists, arts educators and arts and cultural supporters to “empower creative organizations and the public with a powerful voice to advocate for the resources and attention necessary to build vibrant, connected, and creative communities.”

The American cultural sector also has tradition of individual donations, big and small. However with the economic crisis citizens aren’t able to reach as deeply into their pockets as before to support the artistic programs and activities they enjoy. As such arts organizations are looking to new models to earn needed revenue through such initiatives as new ticket pricing, membership and VIP programs, new partnerships to share expenses (production, operating costs, etc.) and renting of space.

Overall there has not been much change in the federal money being poured into the arts sector. State budgets however go up and down with the economy and while there may be important local interest, there is perhaps no money available. Some of the bigger donations from either large foundations or corporations are also dwindling. Their interests are shifting to larger, more global social problems and corporate social responsibility.

What is clear is that arts organizations need to look externally. So much of what they do can and impacts their local communities and many grant opportunities are awarding cultural organizations that reinforce this connection. This means building sustainable local partnerships of leaders in the nonprofit, public and private sectors, engaging with volunteers (but not replacing staff) and finally looking for ways to connect their art to the community can lead to new opportunities and sustainable outcomes.
Redesigning the business model of cultural organizations in a time of economic crisis

What is crisis? Is this something to fear or an opportunity? In fact in the Chinese symbol for crisis it is both. Crisis is made with two characters put side by side: danger and opportunity. This period may be a disruptive one, shaking up how the cultural sector is managed, and while failure is always a risk there are many new opportunities to be had as well.

Over the last years the economic crisis has deeply affected cultural organizations. It is well known that there have been big cuts in governmental budgets for culture all around Europe having a direct impact on cultural organizations. However, while on one hand the crisis can be seen as a danger for the survival of those organizations, on the other hand it is also a possible starting point to redesign the business model of cultural organizations and to generate new opportunities.

In the cultural field “value” can’t be identified just by monetary value. The main dimensions of value comprehend also aesthetics and social values. The final value delivered by an organization can be understood by better analyzing its business model which is “the rationale of how an organization creates, delivers, and captures value” (A. Osterwalder & Y. Pigneur, 2010).

The creative and cultural industries and the publishing industry in particular, have perhaps seen a greater and more rapid change than other cultural sectors. Looking to publishing, the traditional players were the publisher, the printer, the distribution company and the bookseller. With the arrival of e-books new players have come onto the scene: digital warehouses, online stores, telecom companies and producers of electronic devices. There are some interesting new business models that are being developed more recently. For example, the introduction of eBooks has ushered in new activities (digitalization, electronic distribution, etc.) and consequently players in the publishing value chain. A smart example of a company using an innovative business model is Lulu.com, a multi-sided platform that serves and connects authors and readers with a long tail of user-generated niche content. Over 1.1 million authors from 200 countries use Lulu.com to publish and sell their books. This business model works because books are printed only to fill actual orders. Therefore the failure of a particular title to sell is irrelevant to Lulu.com and it incurs no financial loss.

An innovative business model that is becoming more and more popular for the funding of cultural projects is crowd funding. The rationale behind this model is to put together small financial contributions from lots of people to achieve the financial capital required to successfully implement a project. Successful examples of crowd funding projects include Kickstarter and KissKiss BankBank. Since the launch in 2009, Kickstarter has had more than 45,000 creative projects. Kickstarter claims in fact that its business model is based on tradition – it has just been amped up for the 21st century: “Mozart, Beethoven, Whitman, Twain, and other artists funded works in similar ways — not just with help from large patrons, but by soliciting money from smaller patrons, often called subscribers. In return for their support, these subscribers might have received an early copy or special edition of the work. Kickstarter is an extension of this model, turbocharged by the web.”

To conclude, it is clear that there is not one single innovative model for the cultural sector. There are many of opportunities and options and we just have to have the will and curiosity and fearlessness to discover them.
**New business models for the Heritage sector: A case study of the IMC**

How can the heritage sector achieve greater financial sustainability especially in times of crisis? Heritage preservation and conservation are extremely costly and demand millions of Euros. Taking a closer look at the case of the Institute of Museums and Conservation (IMC) may provide some good practices and insight into how Portugal’s largest public body for the management of museums and built heritage takes on this challenge.

The IMC is responsible for the financial oversight of 28 museums and 4 national palaces. Even before the current crisis, financial health of the organisation was worrisome to say the least. In Portugal since 2003 there has been a consecutive reduction in the national budget for the Ministry of Culture. Then following these years of budget cuts, in 2010 the IMC had an outstanding debt of around 1,837,008 Euros due primarily to the service providers for security and cleaning. The government funding that was available and any earned incomes were used exclusively to pay running costs and staff salaries.

After six months of research into the IMC’s finances and management and looking closely at the workings of the organization, this research sought out measures that could be taken to improve the Institute’s financial stability. Consequently, the following topics were addressed: ticketing models; how to improve the flow of money within the organization; on-line branding and content; the tourism industry as a source of revenue; museum shop management; stakeholder participation and transparency. Despite being organization specific, the results address broader deliberations regarding the sustainability of museums and built heritage, touching on possible benchmarks when considering European-wide debates on the subject.

The main potential source of revenue for the IMC was seen to be ticketing that represented 58% of the total income earned in 2010. To this end, the research looked at the diverse set of ticketing management models and the possible benefits these could bring. The study also looked at broader key debates regarding ticketing and culture such as price-elasticity and the number of free admission days.

As a public organism, the IMC suffers from certain restrictions regarding the flow of money within the organization that affects the running of Portugal’s public museums and heritage. It was important to look at models developed in Portugal and elsewhere to overcome these obstacles, providing such examples as: public-private partnerships, friends of the museum and fiduciary agreements amongst others.

Regarding on-line content and branding, the IMC homogenized its image to be easily recognisable. Actions and updates were taken to make the website user-friends and to embrace new media and the possibilities it opened for engaging with audiences in different ways.

As a major source of revenue linked primarily to heritage, the tourism industry was looked at and broken down. The research identified a variety of key factors to consider when regarding the structure of the industry and how greater bonds can be developed between the cultural heritage sector and tourism.

Museum shops also play an essential role in the branding of the site, and it is essential to pay attention to issues such as the didactic qualities of museum shops, how they are sight, mission and location specific and the need to understand the museum shop client demographic.

Finally, this case study has a list of measures to be considered when working to ensure the financial stability of museums and built heritage. It can provide heritage operators with insightful examples to apply to their own museum or heritage site.
BOZAR is a cultural hub that imports the greatest artists to the heart of the capital of Europe and exports its own productions to places as far away as China! Its commitment, accordingly, is not only to the provision of a range of artistic activities, but also to achieving a “total experience”. Whether with friends, as a family, alone, as a couple, in a group, or with a class, whether young or old, fans of video or of string quartets, you are all invited to feel, to breathe, to view and to check out the atmosphere of the Centre for Fine Arts. To let yourselves be seduced by the strange beauty of a building that is at once imposing and intimate. To appreciate, day after day, the remarkable quality of the events programmed here. To discover that, when it comes to art, “total experiences” are the most intense and the most precious, that they cannot be repeated, that they represent, each time, a unique experience… Cinema, theatre, dance, literature, architecture and arts education are all part of this exciting activity, further enriched by some 250 partners a year, such as the brand new CINEMATEK and its collection of foreign films. [www.bozar.be](http://www.bozar.be)

The Cultural Contact Point (CCP) Wallonie-Bruxelles supports and informs cultural actors on the Culture Programme and the European issues in this field. Counseling and information center on Europe and its cultural funding, it offers advice and technical assistance tailored to cultural operators. The CCP supports cultural operators in their efforts and European projects through: promotion of open culture (mainly Culture 2007-2013) programmes, technical assistance for the preparation of applications, and dissemination of information on cultural events and community programs. Since 1999, the mission of Cultural Contact Point has been entrusted by the Federation Wallonia-Brussels and the European Commission to the Agency Wallonia-Brussels Theatre / Dance, co-managed agency of the Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels and Wallonia-Brussels International (WBI), and supported by the Walloon Export Agency (AWEX) and Brussels Export. [www.pcc-europe.be](http://www.pcc-europe.be)

The Cultural Contact Point (CCP) Vlaanderen is issued on behalf of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture. With the newsletter, the website and the information sessions, the CCP Vlaanderen informs the Flemish cultural sector about the objectives and rules of the European Culture Programme (2007-2013). The Cultural Contact Point gives Flemish cultural organizations advice when submitting their application to the European Commission. The CCP also refers to other Flemish and European funding opportunities for Flemish cultural organizations through grant opportunities. Culture is a Community competence in Belgium, so there was both a Flemish Cultural Contact Point as a CCP for the Walloon and German-speaking Community was founded. [www.cjsm.vlaanderen.be/ccp/index.shtml](http://www.cjsm.vlaanderen.be/ccp/index.shtml)

The University of Antwerp (UA) was founded in 2003 after the merger of the three universities that were previously known as RUCA, UFSIA and UIA. The university has approximately 15,000 students, which makes it the third largest university in Flanders. Foreign students from all over the world make up 12% of the total student population. At any one time, there are around 100 foreign researchers working as part of UA research teams. The University of Antwerp participates in all European educational programmes. Student and staff mobility, both inside and outside Europe, is very important, which is why strategic partnerships have been established with universities around the world. The UA is proud to be one of the institutions of higher education in Europe which were given in the past the European Credit Transfer System-label by the European Commission.[www.ua.ac.be](http://www.ua.ac.be)
ENCATC is the leading **European network on Arts & Cultural Management and Cultural Policy Education**. It is an independent membership organization gathering over 100 higher education institutions and cultural organization in over 40 countries. ENCATC was founded in 1992 to represent, advocate and promote cultural management and cultural policy in higher education and to create platforms of discussion and exchange at the European and international level.

ENCATC is supported by the European Commission.
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