
IFACCA D'ART REPORT N^o 40

Supporting international arts activity –
issues for national arts funding
agencies

MARCH 2011

Judith Staines

Survey responses compiled by Lisa Cahill

www.ifacca.org

ISSN: 1832-3332

D'Art aims to consolidate and maximise the expertise of the world's arts councils and ministries of culture. For more information visit www.ifacca.org

Disclaimer: This report has been prepared by Judith Staines, independent cultural research consultant. Survey responses were compiled by Lisa Cahill.

Errors, omissions and opinions cannot be attributed to the respondents listed in this report or to the author or Board or members of IFACCA.

IFACCA is interested in hearing from anyone who cites this report.



This report is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 2.5 License:
www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/

You are free to copy, distribute, or display this report on condition that: you attribute the work to the author; the work is not used for commercial purposes; and you do not alter, transform, or add to this report.

Suggested reference: Staines, J 2011. 'Supporting international arts activity – issues for national arts funding agencies', D'Art Topics in Arts Policy, No. 40, International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies, Sydney, www.ifacca.org/topic/international-arts-activity

CONTENTS

Foreword	1
Summary of issues raised by survey respondents	2
1. Introduction	5
Background and context.....	5
Report structure.....	5
Methodology.....	6
2. International arts activity who is involved?.....	7
Agency responsibilities.....	7
Other national models	9
Staffing and coordination.....	10
3. International arts activity the scope and budget	12
Scope of activities	12
Budgets for international arts activity	18
4. International arts activity policy objectives.....	20
International strategies and objectives.....	20
International advocacy and promotion	22
Policy collaboration with other government agencies	23
5. International arts activity priority countries and regions.....	25
6. International arts activity evaluation.....	28
7. International touring specific issues.....	30
8. Critical issues.....	33
9. Recommendations to IFACCA and its members.....	35
Recommendations on good practice for mobility programs.....	35
Other recommendations.....	35
Ideas for future research	36
Feedback from IFACCA members' meeting	36
Appendix 1: Compilation of responses	40
Appendix 2: List of respondents.....	76
Appendix 3: Questionnaire.....	78
Appendix 4: Selected references and web links	83

FOREWORD

Supporting the international activities of artists and arts organisations is a key function for many national arts funding agencies. In order to investigate this area of arts policy and identify key issues that affect the programs and priorities of such agencies, the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) conducted a worldwide survey in English, French and Spanish, the results of which have been analysed and supplemented by other research and presented in this report.

The report describes the agencies involved in supporting international arts activities, the scope of and budgets for this support, and the range of policy objectives, priorities and evaluation processes evident in the research. The report also details – in Sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 – a wide range of issues identified by arts funding agencies and these are summarised over.

A preliminary version of this report was circulated as a ‘Discussion Paper’ to IFACCA members in September 2010. Following this consultation phase, which included two meetings of members, feedback and additional materials were incorporated into this report.

This report was researched and written by Judith Staines, independent cultural research consultant. Lisa Cahill, IFACCA’s former Research and Project Manager, collected and compiled the main survey responses and made a preliminary analysis. IFACCA would like to thank them both and all the respondents for their contributions.

We note that as the survey specifically targeted national arts councils and ministries of culture, the report does not include detailed information about the international activities of other government bodies, agencies and programs, nor those of independent foundations. More detail for European countries is contained in the Council of Europe/ERICarts, Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, 11th edition, 2010 www.culturalpolicies.net/web/index.php

Updates on the project and links to online resources can be found at a dedicated page on the IFACCA website: www.ifacca.org/topic/international-arts-activity/. The website also has information and resources about artists’ mobility, and international cultural networking. IFACCA is interested in expanding on the base of information contained in this report and would welcome input on any issues related to national arts agency support for international arts activity. If you would like to contribute, please contact us at info@ifacca.org.

Sarah Gardner
Executive Director IFACCA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Advocacy

Government agencies supporting the arts face the competing policy priorities of cultural diplomacy, artistic practice and market development. Several were interested in how to argue for the value of arts and culture in foreign relations without losing track of art's own inherent value.

Evaluation

There appears to be a significant deficit of evaluation and analysis in relation to international arts activities, with a clear need to define outcomes for international activity; capture information on international activity; undertake longitudinal research; measure success and the impact of artists' development in an international context; and implement grant management systems for tracking investment and activity. Better, more systematic, evaluation is needed, in particular at the institutional level (full overview of organisational activity) and at the inter-agency level (full overview of a country's international activity). More widespread dissemination of project and programme evaluations, in translation where necessary, would be beneficial.

Policy

There is considerable interest in how objectives and priorities for international activities are determined, including target regions/countries for these activities; whether an international strategy is required/beneficial/better placed in the wider strategic plan of an agency; and what models exist for collaboration with other government agencies.

Related to these issues is the question of how national cultural policy and international arts strategies intersect with global policy commitments, such as the UN Millennium Development Goals, the Copenhagen Accord on climate change, and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

Mobility

There is ongoing interest in the role that agencies could have in advocacy to overcome obstacles to mobility; in trouble-shooting issues, both in individual project situations and in influencing long term policy; and in improving the knowledge base of mobility issues in agencies.

Key issues impacting on mobility include difficulties with visas, taxation, work permits and fee structures; the high cost of international touring and, increasingly, its environmental impact; professional development training needs in relation to managing international touring and market development; artistic practice and the development of reciprocity in programs; and the role of 'presenter/curator/programmer' in any successful mobility program.

Funding

The global financial crisis and funding cuts have had, and will continue to have, a significant impact on international activity.

The key focus for agencies is on investigating better and innovative funding models for supporting international arts activities, including models for non-government funding. Access to sources of non-government funding, such as foundations and international agencies, is particularly critical for developing countries.

It is often difficult for arts professionals to establish cooperation between different countries when there are marked variations in the programs, administrative processes and budgets of arts funding agencies. One suggestion was to harmonise funding in different countries and to develop an overview about the different methods of funding and supporting cultural activities.

In relation to market development strategies, issues raised include how/whether to balance an export-driven, protectionist approach with a more networked, co-operative attitude; and whether market development is too closely aligned to financially successful economies and environmental laissez-faire and thus potentially a risky investment strategy in the current climate.

Audience

While a strong component of several national cultural policies and programs, audience development and engagement seems strikingly absent from the international arts debate. It is suggested that the notion of 'audience' needs to be central to the discussion if the result of investment in market development is to be sustainable.

Networking for artists and cultural managers

Funding agencies have a mixed understanding of the relevance of networking and few clear avenues of support for artists and cultural managers to participate in international networking. It is suggested that there needs to be greater clarity about the possible role of national arts funding agencies in supporting international cultural networking and networks, with a more strategic developmental approach in partnership with clients and networks.

Networking for agencies

There were suggestions that areas of collaboration between agencies could include sharing research; reciprocal arrangements and artists exchange; collaboration on R&D; collective advocacy; sharing information on innovative partnerships and program models that use social media and high profile successful projects/initiatives; and the development of artists programs and artist directories to facilitate connections between artists.

Research

The recommendations relating to research suggest that what is required is a focus on demonstrating/identifying:

- the value of international activity to government, including arguments for the value of arts and culture in foreign relations without losing track of art's own inherent value;
- the economic benefits for artists and arts organisations from international market development
- best practice case studies of international projects that have been completed and evaluated;
- models for innovative approaches to addressing the financial crisis, budget cuts, environmental policy impacts, social media networking, etc;
- models of collaboration between other government agencies;
- development and trends in international touring, including the impact of the digital era, fee structures, permits, visas and taxation;
- non-government avenues for supporting international activities; and
- funding avenues for international culture/artistic exchanges, including a central pool of resources to support for artists' exchange and international touring.

A related recommendation was to update *IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, Artists' International Mobility Programs* (December 2004) to take account of the current issues around mobility for artists.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

Many artists seek opportunities to showcase their work internationally and to travel and experience different cultures in order to develop their work in new directions. Globalisation and advances in technology have increased opportunities for artists to present their work internationally although current economic and environmental pressures are having an impact.

National arts funding agencies play a critical role in supporting artists to work internationally, primarily through direct support for individual artists and organisations, and support for touring and arts market development initiatives. Many national arts funding agencies actively foster partnerships with other government departments, such as foreign affairs and trade, in order to extend the international reach and impact of their country's artists and arts companies. However, there can be inherent tensions in aligning the objectives for achieving artistic development (or vibrancy) and arts market development opportunities for artists and their work, with broader government imperatives that use artistic activity to promote national identity, culture and trade.

The International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) has been interested for some time in exploring how national arts funding agencies manage their support for international arts activities. For the purposes of this research we have defined 'international arts activity' to cover market development (export and sales of artworks, national promotions at expos and art fairs, touring, markets, festivals and biennales); artistic development (artist-to-artist networks, cultural exchange, residencies, networking); cultural diplomacy; and arts activity as part of foreign aid programs.

The aims of this research were to:

- identify the critical issues for national arts funding agencies in terms of their support for international arts activity
- identify internal and external factors that affect the success of taking art to the world stage
- gather information from national arts funding agencies about their programs and priorities for international arts activities and how these are determined and evaluated.

IFACCA has published some research reports related to this topic, the most recent being *IFACCA D'Art Report No. 39, Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programs, Practices*, December 2009 and *IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004. In this research we have not attempted to repeat this work but rather to identify areas of overlap where we may be able to add value by referencing and refreshing the previous studies.

Report structure

The Report analyses the responses to a questionnaire distributed by IFACCA in June 2010. Further research by the author has supplemented these contributions, pointing out other models, examples of activity and dissemination, policy initiatives and other relevant information. The core content remains that provided by IFACCA members and others who responded to the research call.

In order to structure the content and clarify issues for further discussion, a basic 'who – where – what – why – when' format has been adapted as follows:

Who	Government agencies involved in international arts activity
What	Scope of international arts activity and budgets allocated
Why	Policy objectives and motivations
Where	Priority countries and regions
When	Evaluation of policy and activity

The research also covers the role national arts agencies have in raising the profile for the arts within the overall context of their governments' international promotion of the country. Agencies identified specific issues related to international touring and listed critical issues. Finally, they made suggestions for further research and raised aspects of government support for international arts activity that IFACCA could help to facilitate at a global level. Further feedback and analysis of key issues from the discussions at the IFACCA European Chapter meeting in September 2010 complete the final section.

Methodology

The survey questionnaire was sent to all national arts funding agencies on 18 June 2010 (in English) and on 24 June 2010 (in French and Spanish). Announcements appeared in ACORNS on 24 June and 9 July 2010. The deadline was 9 July and this was extended to 30 July 2010. A reminder was sent by email to selected agencies on 20 July 2010.

A total of 15 responses were received from national arts agencies in: Australia, Burundi, Canada, Denmark, England, Germany, Ireland, New Zealand (Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Creative New Zealand), Scotland, South Korea, Spain, Sweden (Swedish Arts Council and The Swedish Arts Grants Committee) and the United States. Within the report, activity and comment attributed to a country relate to the particular national art funding agency that answered the survey.

The analysis of survey results has been supplemented with additional desk research in order to present some other national models and open up the discussion.

The responses received are compiled in **Appendix 1**. A list of respondents is in **Appendix 2**. The questionnaire is reproduced in **Appendix 3**. A list of selected references and web links to international arts policies on national arts agency websites is at **Appendix 4**.

2. INTERNATIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY | WHO IS INVOLVED?

Agency responsibilities

Question 1 asked respondents to identify the government agencies in their country that are involved in policy development and program administration for international activities. The table below summarises the type of agency and/or government body in each country.

Appendix 1 contains the detailed information and a list of respondents is in **Appendix 2**.

Country	National arts funding agency (Arts Council):	Arts or Culture Ministry	Foreign Affairs Ministry	Embassies or High Commissions	Joint committee of government agencies	Separate body for international arts and culture
Australia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Burundi		✓				
Canada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Denmark	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
England	✓	✓				✓
Germany	✓	✓				
Ireland	✓	✓				
New Zealand	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Scotland	✓	✓				✓
South Korea	✓	✓				
Spain		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Sweden	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
United States	✓		✓	✓		

The separate bodies for international arts and culture named by respondents are:

- **Denmark:** The Danish Cultural Institute & Music Export Denmark
- **England:** British Council
- **New Zealand:** Toi Maori Aotearoa (a government-funded charitable trust promoting Maori arts)
- **Scotland:** British Council & Visiting Arts
- **Sweden:** The Swedish Arts Grants Committee (Konstnärnsnamnden) – was added in a separate response to the discussion paper by Arts Grants Committee.

For **Ireland**, Culture Ireland (working under the aegis of the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport) was listed under the Arts or Culture Ministry section, rather than as a separated body. This initial research indicates a clear pattern of multiple responsibilities in almost every country. There are up to six types of national government bodies playing a role in the support and delivery of international arts activity (in Denmark, 12 separate organisations are named, plus the Danish embassies abroad). This provides early evidence of the level of complexity for the agencies, their partners, grant applicants and audiences in terms of policy objectives, key messages, responsibility for evaluation and follow up as well as the potential for duplication of activity. Several countries reported one or more joint committees of government agencies.

It is vital that countries with a multi-agency, multi-policy, multi-programme system consider the position of the users and the overriding need for clear communication to artists and cultural organisations of who does what, how, where, when and why. National efforts to provide an integrated online platform of national opportunities and responsibilities are commended, notably the Danish Arts Agency website¹ and LatitudeFrance².

¹ www.kunst.dk/english/

² www.latitudefrance.org/

With such a crowded field, it should be noted at the start that responses to the IFACCA survey have, apart from New Zealand and Sweden, come from just *one* of the responsible agencies and therefore invariably present a partial view of the 'who – where – what – why – when' of international arts activity. Although the survey set out various options for respondents to identify the key government agencies involved in international arts activity, there appear to be some omissions. These may be due to different perceptions and models of the 'arm's length principle' and what constitutes a government agency. For example:

- **England:** Visiting Arts is referenced as an organisation funded by Arts Council England, in connection with its information resources work in signposting flow of artists, but is listed as a body involved in international arts activities by Scotland. Also, the Cultural Diplomacy Group (see 4.2. & 4.3.) is not mentioned as a joint committee of government agencies.
- **Germany:** there is no mention of the Goethe-Institut³ ("acting on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Goethe-Institut promotes various issues of foreign cultural and educational policy"); or IFA – Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen⁴ / Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations ("an organisation operating worldwide to promote artistic exchange and dialogue between civil societies and to provide information about foreign cultural policy"), which is funded by the German Foreign Office and other partners; or Deutsche Kultur International⁵ (information resources provided by IFA).
- **Ireland:** Foreign Affairs Ministry and embassies are not listed; however, the Cultural Section of the Promoting Ireland Abroad Division in the Department of Foreign Affairs⁶ states that it "works primarily through the Department's network of Embassies abroad and in co-operation with other government departments, state bodies and individuals".
- **South Korea:** the Korean Cultural Centre⁷ in London is described on its website as "under the jurisdiction of the Embassy of the Republic of Korea, London". Also, the Korea Foundation⁸ was established by the government in 1991 in order to enhance the image of Korea in the world; it aims to be an "institution for public diplomacy", with offices in China, Germany, Japan, Russia, the USA and Vietnam and an international cultural exchange centre⁹ in Seoul. KF supports many cultural exchange events and programs, including establishment of Korean galleries in major museums abroad. Neither the embassy level nor the Korea Foundation is mentioned.
- **Sweden:** an additional submission from The Swedish Arts Grants Committee supplements information provided by The Swedish Arts Council and points out that The Arts Council deals with cultural institutions and independent groups while The Arts Grants Committee is responsible for support to individual artists. Both are state agencies on the same level. A large international programme for visual artists (IASPIS) has been run by The Arts Grants Committee since 1996, and there is a smaller, more recent, International Dance Programme.

³ www.goethe.de/

⁴ www.ifa.de/

⁵ www.deutsche-kultur-international.de/en.html

⁶ www.dfa.ie/home/index.aspx?id=3031

⁷ www.london.korean-culture.org/

⁸ www.kf.or.kr/

⁹ www.kfcenter.or.kr/

Other national models

Different models of government agencies with responsibility for international arts activity are found in some countries which did not respond to the survey (or gave a partial response).

For example:

- **Finland:** In 2003, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Trade and Industry initiated a joint review of cultural exports. The report *Staying Power to Finnish Cultural Exportation* came out in 2004 and *Proposal for Finland's Cultural Exports Promotion Programme* in 2007. Issues related to Cultural Export are dealt with at the Cultural Export and Exchange Unit under the Division for Art Policy. A 2009 *Strategy for Cultural Policy*¹⁰, presents the cultural policy for Finland up to 2020 and includes a focus on cultural export in order to “enhance the international visibility of Finnish culture and boost cultural economy”, as well as active participation in international organisations and cultural exchange activities.
- **France:** in 2010 a new online communication platform LatitudeFrance¹¹ was launched by the Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs to enhance the visibility of the activities of its network of French operators and partners abroad. For the first time, it brings together the fields of culture and arts, economy and development, French language, education and research.
- **Japan:** the Japan Foundation¹² was established in 1972 as a special legal entity supervised by the Foreign Ministry to undertake international cultural exchange. It carries out arts and cultural exchange programs to enhance mutual understanding between Japan and countries throughout the world.
- **Netherlands:** SICA¹³ is the Dutch Centre for International Cultural Activities. As the centre for international cultural policy, SICA stimulates the international activities and ambitions of the Dutch cultural sector and provides a platform for opinion on international cultural policy. It also provides information and advice on funding possibilities, networks, regions and visas for all artistic disciplines. SICA acts as the implementing body for the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW), the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (BZ), and the European Union. It has a two-way function, as the gateway to the Dutch cultural sector for Dutch embassies and cultural organisations abroad and as a portal for Dutch culture professionals to the international cultural sector. In the visual arts, the Mondriaan Foundation supports international presentation of visual art and design from the Netherlands and manages a visitors programme to the country (a useful online map¹⁴ illustrates the activities). At diplomatic level, the Netherlands has an Ambassador for International Cultural Cooperation¹⁵ within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- **Switzerland:** Pro Helvetia (the Arts Council) is Switzerland's foremost institution for the distribution and promotion of Swiss culture abroad¹⁶. It commits around two thirds of its funds to making Swiss culture more widely known beyond the country's borders. Pro Helvetia also actively promotes cultural exchange. Together with local partners and Switzerland's diplomatic representations, Pro Helvetia is responsible for

¹⁰ Published 2009, www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/Kulttuuripolitiikan_strategia_2020?lang=en

¹¹ www.latitudefrance.org/

¹² www.jpff.go.jp/e/index.html

¹³ www.sica.nl

¹⁴ www.mondriaanfoundation.nl/internationalactivities/

¹⁵ www.minbuza.nl/en/Key_Topics/International_Cultural_Policy/Ambassador_for_International_Cultural_Cooperation

¹⁶ www.prohelvetia.ch/OFFICES-ABROAD.36.0.html?&L=4

supporting Switzerland's culture throughout the world and for encouraging the process of cultural exchange. A network of liaison offices and partner institutes abroad enable artists from Switzerland to gain access to other cultural arenas.

Further research could help build this diverse picture and expose an even more complex and wide-ranging pattern of responsibility, raising additional issues for national arts funding agencies.

Staffing and coordination

Question 3 asked whether national arts agencies had dedicated staff to manage support for international arts activities and how the overall coordination was managed. The full responses are in **Appendix 1** – main details as follows:

- **Australia:** Eight dedicated staff at the Australia Council (including Director and Executive Director who are part of Market Development team). Approximately three to four additional staff members work on specific grant programs.
- **Canada:** Up to 21 staff (11%) work on international programs, as follows :
 - 15-17 Canada Council for the Arts program officers have responsibility for international programs, and are also responsible for other work.
 - 3 full-time staff members work at the Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO), which is responsible for international market development.
 - The Coordinator for Partnership & Networks supports the Director and CEO's role as a Board member of IFACCA and liaises with IFACCA Secretariat.
- **Denmark:** The Danish Arts Agency has allocated the equivalent of 23 full-time posts ('man-years') to administrate and operate funds for international activities for the Arts Council and the Collaboration agreement between the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry for Culture. In total, the staffing allocated to international activities is equal to 40% of total agency staff numbers.
- **England:** No staff members work solely on international programs. Two Executive Directors have responsibility for leading international work, supported by the Director of Literature. All Directors within the Arts Department Head Office have a remit to include international in their policy, strategy and arts development work. Regional offices have (or will have) a member of staff with specific responsibility for international on top of regular responsibilities. Relationship Managers manage relationships with many arts organisations working internationally.
- **Germany:** all members of the General Project Funding Department of the Program Department¹⁷ work on international activities: i.e. about half total staff.
- **Ireland:** three staff members work on international programs, all with responsibilities in other areas as well, and are organised within one unit in the Arts Council.
- **New Zealand:** two staff members work on international activities and are located in one unit of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. Creative New Zealand has one team of four people (out of a total of 51 staff). This does not include staff who manage contestable funding processes, residencies or recurrently funded organisations; all of which have an international element.

¹⁷ According to KdB website, the General Project Funding Department has 3 staff and the Program Department has 11 staff.

- **Scotland:** there will be staff with specific responsibility for international work in Creative Scotland but numbers and seniority level are not yet determined.
- **South Korea:** three staff members (c. 4% of workforce) are in charge of international affairs. No independent unit but they form a strong section within a Division.
- **Sweden:** approximately three people work full-time in the Arts Council on international programs (Coordinator, Officer for Swedish literature abroad & EU Cultural Contact Point). In addition, the secretariat for Astrid Lindgren Memorial Award¹⁸ comprises three people. Artform officers are involved in supporting international cooperation in their fields and research/analysis staff are involved in international projects. Thus, international issues are spread throughout the organisation under one overall Coordinator. The Swedish Arts Grants Committee has seven full-time staff working on international activities (the remaining 11 staff also work part-time on international activity). Staff deal with applications (38% of all those received are for international exchange: in visual arts, design, music, theatre, dance and film) and manage specialist international programmes for visual arts and dance. The IASPIS programme manages visual artists' studios in Sweden and abroad.
- **United States:** three people work solely on international work (2% of total staff), organised in one unit within the Office of the Chief of Staff.

There is great variation in the staffing details reported. The highest numbers, proportionate to population, appear to be in Australia (mostly focused on market development), Denmark and Canada, as well as Germany, where the foundation's work is almost exclusively dedicated to international work. The Swedish Arts Grants Committee has a high level of staff dedicated to international work to support individual artists. Note that Ireland, Sweden (Arts Council) and Denmark staffing includes the in-house EU Cultural Contact Point¹⁹ (in many European countries the EU CCP is outsourced or located in another agency and is not included).

A common pattern reported by agencies is for international support to be part of other work responsibilities. This has potential benefits (maximising ownership, knowledge, contacts, networking in international work) but also carries the risk of dissipated or uneven focus and great difficulty in calculating the total staff allocation. Where there are dedicated staff members for international work, they tend to be organised within one unit or section.

The Swedish Arts Council model appears to be a good approach to organisation and coordination: it has dedicated staff for international work as well as other members with delegated responsibilities, all under one overall Coordinator. The coordination model in England appears particularly decentralised with a very wide dissemination/delegation of responsibility for international work across many staff members and seniority levels within the Arts Council, both centrally and regionally; overall leadership is by two Executive Directors and an Arts Director, with other work responsibilities.

¹⁸ World Children's Literature Award, administered by the Swedish Arts Council: www.alma.se/en/

¹⁹ This position is part-funded by the European Commission to promote the EU Culture Program within the country.

3. INTERNATIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY | THE SCOPE AND BUDGET

Scope of activities

National arts funding agencies were asked what types of cultural activities they supported and to give examples. The following table shows the scope of activities reported by each country as defined in Question 5. **Appendix 1** contains the detailed responses.

Country	Market development	Artistic development	Cultural diplomacy	Aid and cultural development	International networking of artists or arts	Representation in overseas countries
Australia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Burundi	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Canada	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	No
Denmark	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
England	-	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
Germany	-	✓	-	✓	✓	-
Ireland	-	✓	-	-	✓	-
New Zealand - Ministry	None	None	✓	None	None	✓
New Zealand – CNZ	✓	✓	None	None	✓	None
Scotland	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-
South Korea	-	✓	✓	-	✓	-
Spain	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
Sweden – Arts Council	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A
United States	-	✓	✓	-	-	-

The question was intended to give a picture of the national arts funding agencies' activities only, not the wider scope of international arts activity supported by all the government agencies listed above. However, it seems that some respondents may have replied more broadly about the overall international arts activity in their country, as managed by agencies beyond their own.

The activity areas are analysed in detail below and incorporate selected comments:

Market development

This covers market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of art product.

- **Australia:** supports tours, exhibitions, author readings, tour development/pre-planning, showcases, trade fairs, websites, co-productions, 'brands' and visits by incoming buyers. Several examples are given.
- **Canada:** the Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) runs a CAD \$2m international activity grants program with travel grants and annual/multi-annual grants for agents and managers. A further CAD \$250,000 is administered in services for education, activity, networking, promotion on international scene.
- **Denmark:** showcases are organised by the Danish Arts Council in fields of Literature, Visual Arts, Performing Arts & Music. E.g. showcases of Danish Literature at international book fairs; grants to galleries to showcase Danish visual artists at international biennales.

- **New Zealand:** Creative New Zealand supports international tours, exhibitions and author readings, art markets, fairs and showcases, an incoming visitor program and sourcing international representation for artists. Several examples are given.
- **Scotland:** music showcases at international showcases in US and other European countries. Support for creating and showcasing work at Edinburgh Festivals. Market development represents 85% of international activity budget.
- **Spain:** support to facilitate cultural industries.
- **Sweden:** support for literary translations, book fairs, Export Music Sweden.

Given the different funding patterns and responsibilities in the countries surveyed, it appears that the responses only give part of the picture. Again, other models of market support exist.

For example, in **South Korea**, the Korea Arts Management Service²⁰ (KAMS) is funded by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism and runs an extensive international market development program that enables performing arts companies in Korea to broaden their horizons and presence by evaluating their management strategy and expanding their market capability through innovative distribution networks in domestic and overseas markets. A joint project with Visiting Arts UK in 2010 took Korean producers to Edinburgh Festival and UK producers to Seoul Performing Arts Market. Similar larger scale producer exchange programs are organised between Korea and Finland (dance field) and Korea and the USA. Since KAMS is not funded by the Arts Council, it was not mentioned in the responses but forms part of the larger picture.

In **Finland**, the TAIVEX²¹ training programme for art exchange runs from 2009 to 2011. It is run by the Finnish Theatre Information Centre and Aalto University's School of Economics, Small Business Center in cooperation with information centre partners (dance, circus, literature and visual arts) and city authorities. It aims to contribute to the export and internationalisation of Finnish art by improving the international expertise of cultural intermediaries in cultural exportation and business know-how. It will give training to almost 100 managers, agents, producers, curators, gallerists, editors and foreign rights coordinators in art and creative industries. The programme is part of the national Development programme for the growth and internationalisation of creative industries, organised by the Ministry of Education and funded by the European Social Fund, as well as a part of the Creative Industries Finland project.

Artistic development

This includes, for example, exchanges and residencies.

- **Australia:** mostly dedicated to outgoing mobility of artists from Australia travelling abroad for residencies, research and mentorship opportunities. There are relatively few reciprocal programs²² that cover both outgoing and incoming mobility.
- **Canada:** Visiting Foreign Artist Program (residency-type program for multi-disciplinary artists coming to Canada): c. CAD \$130,000; Aboriginal Peoples Collaborative Exchange: c. CAD \$235,000; International Residencies Program in Visual Arts: c. CAD \$270,000 in grants + CAD \$270,000 in services. (2009-10 figures)

²⁰ www.gokams.or.kr/kams_eng/?sub_num=13

²¹ www.taivex.fi

²² The need for two-way mobility in international programs is highlighted in *Mobility Matters*, ERICarts, 2008 www.mobility-matters.eu/

- **Denmark:** Several programs for residencies, both incoming and outgoing: e.g. DIVA²³ (Danish International Visiting Artist program – covering all artistic areas).
- **England:** previous investment in artistic development, exchanges and residencies; international activity carried out as part of general programs of Regularly Funded Organisations; and some project activity. Recent example: Artists Links England-Brazil program run 2006-2010 in partnership with British Council (£450,000 from Arts Council).
- **Germany:** 'Wanderlust Fund' provides grants for partnerships between municipal and state theatres in Germany and theatres overseas.
- **Ireland:** Travel and Training Award for artists; artists residency in New York; Venice Biennale participation for visual arts and architecture. The majority of the Arts Council's funding goes to the professional development of artists abroad (Travel & Training Awards).
- **Creative New Zealand:** international residencies and internships, international Indigenous and cultural exchange programs and international artists to work with New Zealand companies. Examples are given. Also runs information programs and creates resources for industry on visas, tax and development of marketing materials to assist touring.
- **Scotland:** fellowships, residencies in New York & Banff, translation. Artistic development represents 12% of budget allocation for international activity.
- **South Korea:** grants for individual international activities of artists and arts companies; grants for artists participating in residencies abroad.
- **Spain:** grants for cultural management training and other specific artistic training abroad.
- **Sweden:** support for international projects such as co-productions, tours, exchanges (Arts Council). The Swedish Arts Grants Committee is responsible for support to individual artists and all its activity is focused on areas of artistic development (exchange, residencies, studio provision for international artists, collaboration, lectures, exhibitions in Sweden and abroad etc.).
- **United States:** Japan artists' residency program; USArtists International presentation of US performing arts at festivals abroad [NB: this is listed as artistic development rather than market development]; ArtsLink residencies in US for artists and arts managers from Central Europe, Russia & Eurasia; Open World Cultural Leaders Program for Russian artists and arts managers (professional development). Grants for these programs are awarded by the partner organisation rather than the NEA itself.

The examples given are mainly those directly managed or initiated by the respondent. National arts funding agencies often support many more international arts projects indirectly, through their grants to arts companies, festivals and venues. For example, in the **United States**, the NEA estimates that 7% of general arts grants (2009: Access to Artistic

²³ www.kunst.dk/english/funding/allavailablefunding/tilskud/diva-danish-international-visiting-artists-programme/

Excellence program) had an international element. Several agencies comment that it is difficult to quantify the proportion of international activity carried out by regularly funded organisations.

It is important to note whether countries focus their support on opportunities to go abroad (outgoing mobility: e.g. residencies, mobility grants), grants for visiting foreign artists and cultural managers (incoming mobility: e.g. Foreign visitor programmes in Denmark & Netherlands, residencies) or both. The need for a better balance between incoming and outgoing mobility was highlighted in the 2008 EU study of cultural mobility programmes, *Mobility Matters*²⁴.

Cultural diplomacy

- **Australia:** mainly associated with partnerships with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and related to their country profile priorities, e.g. China 2010 partnership between Australia Council and DFAT supported facilitation of touring in regions of China and publicity for Australian artists there.
- **Burundi:** support for travel costs of artists invited to international events to represent the country.
- **Canada:** no mandate for cultural diplomacy (this is the responsibility of embassies) but the Council partners Canadian embassies on mutually beneficial projects that support international activity by Canadian artists.
- **Denmark:** the collaboration between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry for Culture supports concrete projects for cultural diplomacy.
- **England:** this is the remit of the British Council but Arts Council, England works with them on strategy for international showcasing.
- **New Zealand:** response from Ministry for Culture and Heritage which is solely engaged in cultural diplomacy activity.
- **South Korea:** collaborative projects with Foreign Affairs Ministry, e.g. cultural event for Climate Change Conference COP15 in Copenhagen.
- **Spain:** the Ministry of Foreign Affairs manages this.
- **United States:** NEA International Literary Exchange develops cross-cultural dialogue about literature (translation and publication program) as bilateral programs with government cultural agencies and embassies abroad. Current/planned publications with Mexico, Northern Ireland, Russia, China, Pakistan. Through the Federal Leadership strand, the NEA International Activities office provides cultural expertise and liaison with U.S. Department of State, international organisations and other governments (particularly in relation to bilateral relationships).

Aid and cultural development

- **Australia:** little activity – mostly community partnerships, e.g. between Australian and African community arts practitioner based on a mentoring relationship which led to artistic collaboration.

²⁴ ERICarts, www.mobility-matters.eu

- **Denmark:** The Center for Culture and Development (DCCD) is part of the Ministry for Culture with funding allocated by the Danish Arts Agency. DCCD presents arts and culture from developing countries in cooperation with partners in Denmark and abroad; it allocates funds for Danish cultural cooperation with developing countries (e.g. Cultural Development and Exchange Fund²⁵ - Danish collaboration and exchange with Vietnam); coordinates festivals in Denmark featuring arts from developing countries; facilitates capacity building in cultural sector in developing countries; and delivers other information and advisory roles.
- **Germany:** the Federal Cultural Foundation's general project fund supports various projects and is open to different themes and artistic fields. According to the Foundation's charter, federal funding can only be applied to larger projects with an international scope. However, no specific examples of aid and cultural development projects were given.
- **Spain:** through AECID²⁶ Agency (International Cooperation for Development) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- **Sweden:** program for cooperation between Sweden and South Africa, supported by the development budget (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency - SIDA, under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

International networking of artists and arts professionals

The examples given below cover national representation on international bodies, projects, professional development and some market development activity. International networking appears to be viewed as a rather flexible concept, with a mixed understanding among national arts funding agencies of its value and potential to meet various policy and program objectives.

- **Australia:** One example is the support for the placement of an Australian performing arts producer with IETM for one year to develop skills and enhance partnerships/collaborations between Australia and IETM member producers. Support is given for Australian delegations of artists/producers to attend IETM meetings each year.
- **Canada:** the Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) runs a CAD \$2m international activity grants program with travel grants and annual/multi-annual grants for agents and managers. A further CAD \$250,000 is administered in services for education, activity, networking, promotion on international scene. [note: see above – Market Development]
- **Denmark:** funds for visitor programs, travel and accommodation grants, which support networking, both incoming and outgoing.
- **England:** some direct investment, networking is also an area of activity for some Regularly Funded Organisations.
- **Germany:** bilateral cultural programs with neighbouring countries in Central and Eastern Europe (e.g. Zipp German-Czech cultural projects 2007-09), covering all arts fields and examining important issues in Europe such as memory of totalitarianism

²⁵ www.kunst.dk/english/funding/allavailablefunding/tilskud/cultural-development-and-exchange-fund-cdef/

²⁶ www.aecid.es/web/es/aecid/

and immigration issues. 'Über Lebenskunst'²⁷ in Berlin is a 2-year initiative project of the Federal Cultural Foundation with the House of World Cultures looking at sustainability as a cultural tool and experimenting different global approaches.

- **Ireland:** networking support through grants for professional development to artists [mentioned above under Artistic Development].
- **Creative New Zealand:** supports informal and planned networking/relationship development opportunities such as ConverAsians for artists/arts organisations and managers, plus attending meetings of associations such IFACCA, AAPAF, meetings with other arts councils (e.g. Australia Council).
- **Scotland:** support for IETM plenary meeting in Glasgow 2010, various networking opportunities. Networking represents 3% of overall budget for international work.
- **South Korea:** joint projects with other national arts agencies such as Singapore Arts Council, Arts Council of Mongolia.
- **Sweden:** Support from the Arts Council for Swedish representation on international committees, e.g. ICOM, IAA, ASSITEJ, PEN etc. Individual artists are supported through The Swedish Arts Grants Committee and IASPIS programme for exchange and collaboration (i.e. focus on artistic development, not networking per se).

Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries

- **Australia:** currently two offices in Europe – one in IETM network, one linked to Berlin Embassy with overview of literature and visual arts fields.
- **England:** Arts Council England does not have any overseas offices. ACE states that it sends Arts Council representatives to various international and European conferences; also that the majority share of its central office budget for international activity (£144k) is spent on international subscriptions.
- **Denmark:** Danish Cultural Institute has representations in 10 countries – this is funded by the Ministry for Culture.
- **New Zealand:** the Ministry has no overseas representatives. Offshore interests are represented to some extent by other government agencies that are members of the Cultural Diplomacy International Program (CDIP) steering group, i.e. Ministry for Foreign Affairs & Trade, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise & Tourism New Zealand.
- **Spain:** Cultural centres abroad (under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and Instituto Cervantes for promotion of Spanish language and culture. [Note: these centres are not directly funded by the Ministry of Culture and are part of a wider picture]
- **Sweden:** the IASPIS programme of the Swedish Arts Grants Committee has residential studios for visual artists in Berlin, Cairo, London, New York, Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo and Tokyo.

A further example of support for international arts activity from the NEA in the **United States** might be placed under several of the above categories: the administration of the U.S.

²⁷ www.ueber-lebenskunst.org/

Government Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program²⁸ which provides guarantees for exhibitions and loans of museum objects and artworks abroad, in order to minimise the costs of insuring international exhibitions, both incoming and outgoing.

Budgets for international arts activity

Question 4 asked agencies for the budget level/proportion for international arts activity and to comment on comparisons to past years and future projections. Full results are in **Appendix 1**.

Budget level and proportion

It is particularly difficult to make useful comparisons and comments on the results for this since many agencies found it difficult to put exact figures on expenditure. This is mainly because international support is often an unquantified proportion of general grants, as well as an imprecise percentage of staff activity (where it is integrated with other responsibilities).

Huge variations in budget levels are reported and, where it has been given, the percentage of the overall agency budget dedicated to support for international activities is:

0.8%	Burundi
1%	Ireland
1%	United States
3%	Sweden (Arts Council)
3.5%	Denmark (Danish Arts Foundation)
5%	New Zealand (Creative New Zealand)
5.25%	Scotland ²⁹
7.1%	South Korea
7%	Australia
8.1%	Canada ³⁰
10.9%	New Zealand (Ministry)
13.5%	Denmark (Arts Council)
nearly 100%	Germany
100%	Denmark (Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Ministry of Culture Collaboration)

The German Federal Cultural Foundation's central function is to support arts projects with an international context and the collaboration between the two Danish Ministries is also a special case. Setting these two aside, the range of 1-10% of overall expenditure on international activity can be considered broadly representative for IFACCA national arts agency members, although a wider survey response is required to confirm this.

Other key points on budget levels from respondents:

- **Australia:** approx. AUD \$11.9m annual expenditure on international activities – around 43% for the international element of key organisations' work, 34% for international market development and 23% to art form specific residencies, mentorship and research.
- **Canada:** reports an annual investment in market development by AMDO of approx. CAD \$250,000. Such activities were designed to be complementary to international programs of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH); however, these two agencies have cancelled their international programs leaving the Canada Council for the Arts without the capacity or mandate to fill the gap.

²⁸ www.arts.endow.gov/grants/APPLY/Indemnity/indemnityInternational.html

²⁹ Government and Lottery sources

³⁰ Includes dedicated international programs plus part of funds spend on international work within non-dedicated programs, with some exclusions (see Appendix 1).

- **Denmark:** a number of agencies deliver international arts activity, several with specific artform remits. Within the Danish Arts Council around 8.5% of funding goes to international activities plus a further 6% to international cultural exchange (total: DKK 40.3m). The Danish Arts Foundation allocates some 3.5% of funding to international activities. The Collaboration between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry for Culture allocates 100% of the funding to international activities (total: DKK 10m).
- **England:** over £2m per annum Lottery funds are allocated to international activity (£2.8m in 2009/10) but the Arts Council does not give any percentage of overall budget expenditure. The internal budget at Head Office for international work and subscriptions is £144k in 2010/11.
- **Germany:** nearly the total budget is allocated to support international activities, i.e. around € 35m.
- **New Zealand:** Creative NZ figure includes both contestable (i.e. competitive funding stream) and directly allocated funding (including Venice Biennale). However, it does not include the international spend of recurrently funded organisations.
- **Sweden:** The Swedish Arts Grants Committee allocates SEK 28m for international exchange (around SEK 21m is for the IASPIS visual arts programme and 4.4m SEK for the international dance programme).
- **United States:** allocated \$ 825,000 for international activities in 2010.

In relation to the ability to monitor expenditure on international work:

- **Australia:** The Australia Council does not have a system in place to monitor the level of international activity or financial investment by the key organisations or major performing arts organisations that it funds.
- **England:** Arts Council does not hold data on the international work of Regularly Funded Organisations, or on international aspects of work funded by other programs.

Budget comparisons: past and future

In comparison to recent years, **Canada** and **Sweden**³¹ have achieved higher budgets to support international arts activity. In **South Korea** and **Denmark** budgets have remained stable while there have been reductions for **England** and **Ireland**.

When asked to anticipate the next 3-5 years, **South Korea** projects a rise in budget, while **Scotland** expects the level of investment in international arts activity to increase as a proportion of total expenditure, **Canada**, **Denmark** and Creative **New Zealand** project stable funding levels, while **England** and **Ireland** expect a further decrease in budgets. **Sweden** says that budgets could fluctuate either way and that it works to integrate international cooperation into the general support: Sweden's strategy is to develop beyond simple travel grants to a more dynamic project support, with priority to different forms of long-term cooperation, hence the rise in funding against previous years. **Australia** and **Canada** comment that funding fluctuates from year to year, depending on the level and type of activity.

³¹ Arts Council: due to a new assignment in 2008 to promote Swedish literature abroad, as well as other overall increases.

4. INTERNATIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY | POLICY OBJECTIVES

International strategies and objectives

One of the important areas of interest of D'Art research papers is to examine and compare policy objectives between national arts agencies. Question 2 asked respondents to outline their current objectives for the support of international arts activity and if they had an international strategy. Full results can be found in **Appendix 1**.

The results of the survey in terms of policy objectives were somewhat mixed. In general, many respondents described *what* they supported rather than *why* they supported it.

Several agencies stated that they do not have a formal international strategy (**Australia** and **Canada**), although Australia Council for the Arts has an international market development strategy. In **New Zealand** (where responses were received from two organisations), Creative New Zealand has an international strategy 2009-2013³² but the Ministry for Culture and Heritage does not have an international strategy. Some agencies reported that they were in the process of developing one or revising an earlier plan: **Scotland** developing an international cultural strategy for the newly formed Creative Scotland, **England** drawing up a new international plan and **Sweden** revising its 2007-2010 Arts Council international strategy. In **Denmark**, the international strategies³³ of The Danish Arts Council and The Danish Arts Agency are being translated into English and the common principles agreed between all agencies for support of international arts activity are listed below. In other countries, objectives for international work are included as part of an overall strategic plan or cultural policy: e.g. **Canada**, **Burundi** and the **United States** (the U.S. is developing its strategic plan for 2012-16, to include strategies for international activities). In conclusion, only Creative New Zealand presented an overall international strategy adopted for the next 3-5 years, although several examples from non-respondents are listed in the References section (Appendix 4).

An overview of international policy activity reported by respondents:

- **Australia** has an international market development strategy (2008-2011).
- **Burundi's** new cultural policy urges the government to pay serious attention to the development of international exchanges of artists.
- **Canada's** strategic plan *Moving Forward 2008-2011*³⁴ states that CCA "should accord a high priority to the national and international mobility of its artists ... and increase budgets for international dissemination in collaboration with other federal funders". International activities are guided by senior management of CCA. The Canadian Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) has objectives for supporting international activity including strengthening partnerships.
- **Denmark:** given there are a number of agencies and other players in delivering international arts activity, it is noted that the strategies and objectives of the different organisations are formulated in relation to their general duties and thus the objectives, focus and timeframe differ between them. However, they all share a set of five common principles which are used to assess international activity (listed below).

³² www.creativenz.govt.nz/international/what_the_international_strategy_means_for_you

³³ www.kunst.dk/international/internationalestrategier/ (in Danish)

³⁴ www.canadacouncil.ca/NR/rdonlyres/06782D43-21B4-4B26-BD60-1B4D96A00921/0/MovingforwardStrategicPlan200811.pdf

- **England** is in the process of devising a new four-year plan for international work. It works within a 10-year strategic framework³⁵ published in November 2010 that has broader goals which will inform any international plan.
- **Germany:** the Federal Cultural Foundation works under its statutes – “The purpose of the Foundation is to promote and fund art and culture within the framework of federal responsibility. A central emphasis is to be placed on the promotion of innovative programs and projects in an international context.” The definition of international context is fairly broad and encompasses partners and events outside Germany, involvement of artists from other countries, international cooperation etc.
- **Ireland:** international work falls into distinct areas, mostly focused on artistic and professional development. One key area is the relationship with the Arts Council of Northern Ireland involving joint policy objectives and exchange of information on jointly funded organisations and arts matters with a North-South dimension.
- **New Zealand:** the Ministry’s objectives focus on market development and national promotion while Creative New Zealand pursues a wide-ranging international strategy.
- **South Korea:** encourages communication between national and international artists and arts organisations; sees international networking as the base for collaboration and mutual understanding; wants to contribute and share its arts with wider international community.
- **Sweden:** international work fits under overall objectives for the Arts Council, i.e. promoting a prosperous, high quality cultural life for everyone in the country. The Arts Council also works to strengthen the role of arts and culture in all of Sweden’s international relations.
- **United States:** The NEA is in the process of developing its strategic plan for Fiscal Years 2012-2016 which will include strategies for international activities. The document currently is in draft form for internal review.

Denmark has formulated a set of five principles for international exchange³⁶ which are agreed and shared by the different bodies that support international activity:

- Artistic quality, originality and relevance
- Collaboration and reciprocity
- Long-term, flexible and proactive
- Knowledge sharing, education and debate
- Evaluation, documentation and follow-up

This is notable as a rare example of good practice in integrated policy collaboration between all the national agencies involved in delivering international arts activity. The principles are clearly set out (with further details on the website) and expressed in a way that meets both the needs of the users (artists and cultural organisations who might apply for funding) and the institutions (a commitment to common values and a shared framework for assessment and evaluation).

Some respondents also stated general objectives for supporting international activity:

³⁵ www.artscouncil.org.uk/about-us/a-strategic-framework-for-the-arts/

³⁶ www.kunst.dk/english/howweworkinternationally/principles/

- Artistic practice (creative development)
- Mobility for artists
- Professional development
- Market development (export/trade)
- National promotion/branding (of country, culture, creativity, distinctiveness)
- Sharing the value of arts internationally
- Developing mutual understanding and benefit (through international networking)
- Encouraging communication between national and international artists/organisations
- Promotion of high quality, prosperous cultural life for all
- Strengthening the role of arts and culture in international relations

International advocacy and promotion

Question 6 asked national arts funding agencies whether they have a role in raising the profile for the arts in how their government promote the country internationally and, if so, how this is achieved.

Most respondents reported that they do not have a direct role in international promotion. However, some of the national arts agencies work cooperatively and proactively with other government agencies to ensure a place for the arts in international promotion.

In **Australia**, the Department of Foreign Affairs is responsible for setting international priorities and the Australia Council is primarily concerned with enabling artists and companies to generate international opportunities to benefit sustainability and artistic practice. The **Canada** Council for the Arts partners other government departments on mutually beneficial projects and participates in inter-governmental committees but it does not have a mandate to raise the profile of the arts internationally.

In **Denmark**, The Danish Arts Agency and The Ministry for Culture are active partners in the intergovernmental secretariat for Branding Denmark and take part in several of its initiatives. For example, an initiative was launched to promote Denmark through the international press, where The Danish Arts Agency had responsibility for Danish Arts.

In **England**, the British Council has the primary role to advocate and promote the arts internationally but Arts Council England (ACE) is a member of the Cultural Diplomacy Group, which “determines policy for British Council expenditure on showcasing work internationally”.³⁷ ACE works alongside other government agencies to ensure the arts are included in government strategies that support creative industries abroad, as well as involvement in specific projects to develop markets for music and visual arts.

Sweden takes a more direct approach with one of its key aims of the Arts Council’s international strategy being to promote the role of arts and culture in all Sweden’s international relations. It is working to increase the role of arts and culture within development cooperation, trade/export and nation branding, through cooperation with the relevant government agencies.

³⁷ The full description of the work of the Cultural Diplomacy Group in the 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between the British Council and Arts Council England (which set it up) is to “set strategy for UK’s representation at the major ‘showcasing events’ globally, to ensure that the very best of the UK’s culture can be presented on the world stage. The group will make shared decisions about resource allocation between some of the major cultural events (such as biennales and festivals) and at other major events which offer a potential platform for culture (such as expos and sporting events).”

In the **United States**, the NEA's role in raising the profile for the arts is related to the Federal Leadership programs set up by the International Activities office. The agency looks for opportunities that can advance the profile of the U.S. and its artists internationally. Several of its programs promote the arts from the U.S. abroad and the NEA plays a role alongside other national cultural agencies in bilateral cultural relations.

National policy initiatives often use high profile individuals to act as Cultural Ambassadors. This is frequently seen with government-level initiatives. For example, the U.S. Government announced a \$1m program in 2010 to expand its cultural diplomacy programs to include visual artists, as well as the performing arts professionals most often seen fronting such actions. The initiative was reported in the *New York Times* article 'U.S. to send Visual Artists as Cultural Ambassadors'³⁸. The 2011 Culture Ireland 'Imagine Ireland' initiative in the United States was prominently reported³⁹ as having been unveiled by Ireland's Cultural Ambassador, Gabriel Byrne.

In addition to the information provided by respondents, it is noted that Literature Promotion and translation are currently a prominent area of cultural promotion for many countries. The NEA reported above on its bilateral translation and publication programs in various countries of the world (3.1.3.). The Ministry of Culture in **Georgia** launched a Program in Support of Georgian Book and Literature⁴⁰ in 2010, seen as a model for other countries in the region. A 2011 article in the *New York Times*⁴¹ 'Translation as Literary Ambassador' focused on campaigns to promote literature from Romania, Slovenia, Catalonia and Korea, as well as recent initiatives in the United States.

Policy collaboration with other government agencies

Apart from the geographical priorities (see Section 5), respondents were not asked specifically whether or how their objectives integrate with those of other government agencies that support international arts activity. This is, however, an important area for future research, given the number of government agencies responsible for international arts activity in many countries and some understandable lack of clarity about who does what, both among users and sometimes even from agencies themselves.

In this context, the 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between the British Council and Arts Council England⁴² is an interesting example of policy collaboration with other agencies. It defines areas in which Arts Council England and the British Council can work more closely to help artists build links internationally, establishes a framework within which the two agencies can jointly develop and create programs that are strategic and coherent and sets up a Cultural Diplomacy Group comprising the four UK Arts Councils, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and other statutory representatives.

The set of five common principles agreed in **Denmark** (see 4.1.) which are applied by all the different national agencies, committees and bodies involved in international arts activity to assess funding applications is a good model⁴³.

³⁸ www.nytimes.com/2010/10/26/arts/design/26friends.html?_r=2&sudsredirect=true

³⁹ E.g. www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/local-national/republic-of-ireland/actor-byrne-launches-us-arts-event-15048767.html and www.cineuropa.org/newsdetail.aspx?lang=en&documentID=194377

⁴⁰ www.book.gov.ge/index.php?option=com_content&view=frontpage&Itemid=77&lang=en

⁴¹ www.nytimes.com/2010/12/08/books/08translate.html?pagewanted=1&_r=3&ref=larry_rohter and follow up article: www.nytimes.com/2010/12/30/books/30book.html?_r=1

⁴² www.artscouncil.org.uk/news/arts-council-england-and-british-council/

⁴³ www.kunst.dk/english/howweworkinternationally/principles/

It is noted that no respondents mentioned bilateral cultural agreements, apart from the United States where the NEA plays a role in bilateral cultural relations along with other government cultural agencies. Although in a few countries, bilateral cultural agreements are seen as an older, less flexible form of international cultural diplomacy policy, they remain the cornerstone of cultural cooperation between many countries in the world. A 2010 study for the Asia-Europe Foundation⁴⁴ found more than 150 agreements between ASEM partners of Asia and Europe, many with current executive programs.

Generally, these bilateral government-to-government agreements are negotiated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, often in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture, who may take the executive role for program delivery. However, in some countries, the national arts agency is involved in this type of international arts activity, negotiating international cultural cooperation agreements and coordinating their activity programs. For example, **Denmark** has an International Coordination team in The Danish Arts Agency which negotiates cultural agreements and programs, as authorised by the Danish Ministry of Culture and Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The National Arts Council **Singapore**⁴⁵ also has an International Relations function and has established cultural agreements (Memoranda of Understanding) with various Arts Councils and other bodies around the world to promote cultural exchanges and foster market development.

An integrated model of collaboration between Ministries of Culture and Foreign Affairs is found in **Slovenia**, where an International Cultural Relations Division⁴⁶ within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs covers most policy areas in the field and liaises with the Directorate for Cultural Development and International Affairs in the Ministry of Culture in the promotion of Slovenian culture abroad.

In **Spain**, a Directorate-General for Cultural Industries and Policy was formed in 2008 within the Ministry of Culture (through the Sub Directorate-General for International Cultural Cooperation) and is responsible for bilateral and multilateral programs and treaties that promote cultural exchange. For example, cultural relations were integrated as a key element into Spain's Asia-Pacific Plan of Action⁴⁷.

A debate was held in Brussels in 2010, initiated by EUNIC⁴⁸ (European Union Network of Institutes of Culture) and ENCATC⁴⁹ (European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres) on 'The Power of Cultural Relations'⁵⁰. EUNIC organised a policy conference in 2010 on 'Europe's Foreign Cultural Relations'⁵¹ in Brussels with a wide range of experts, including staff from national Institutes of Culture in Europe.

In 2011 UNESCO launched a new technical assistance project, funded by the European Union, 'Strengthening the System of Governance for Culture in Developing Countries'. A pool of top specialists in the field of cultural policies has been selected and will be appointed to technical assistance missions in response to a call to eligible beneficiary countries⁵².

⁴⁴ Judith Staines, *Mapping Asia-Europe Cultural Cooperation*, July 2010, Culture360.org
www.culture360.org/asef-news/mapping-asia-europe-cultural-cooperation-report-launched/

⁴⁵ www.nac.gov.sg/int/int01.asp

⁴⁶ www.culture.si/en/Division_for_International_Cultural_Relations_Ministry_of_Foreign_Affairs

⁴⁷ 2005-2008 and 2008-2012:

www.maec.es/es/Home/Documents/PLAN%20ASIA%20PAC%C3%8DFICO%203.pdf

⁴⁸ www.eunic-online.eu/

⁴⁹ www.encatc.org/

⁵⁰ www.eunic-online.eu/node/290

⁵¹ www.eunic-online.eu/node/319

⁵² www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/themes/2005-convention/technical-assistance/

5. INTERNATIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY | PRIORITY COUNTRIES AND REGIONS

Question 7 asked whether agencies prioritise particular countries or regions when selecting arts activities to support. If so, how these countries are selected and whether the selection is negotiated with other levels of government. Apart from an interesting examination of cultural diplomacy and so-called 'soft power' influences on where international arts activity takes place, this raises questions about:

- **Government policy:** is there any 'joined-up' policy agreement on priority countries and regions with other government agencies? If so, what informs this (politics, economics, history, language, existing relationships, security issues etc.)?
- **Market orientation:** for agencies with a focus on market development, is there a consensus on which countries and regions represent good investment potential? If so, how do they address supply and demand issues? Do they invest in market intelligence research - if so, how?
- **Artistic development:** for those agencies whose programs focus on artistic development, have they evolved programs targeting priority countries and regions? If so, why? And how does this benefit artists and their creative development?

Many agencies assert their independence of other government influences and champion a demand-driven process, i.e. a more open framework which allows the cultural sector to determine its own geographical priorities, usually incorporating peer assessment of applications. Nevertheless, resources often gravitate towards certain global artistic hotspots. Geo-cultural, if not geo-political and market influences, seem to play a role in decision-making, even within the open, demand-driven framework.

Most respondents said they were not influenced by government geo-political priorities:

- **Burundi** does not prioritise countries. As a non-aligned country it accepts invitations from all parts of the world.
- The **Canada** Council for the Arts is a member of the interdepartmental committee on International Strategic Framework and thus aware of current priority countries for the Canadian government – China, India, Colombia & France. However, this does not have a direct influence on its own priorities since most grants are awarded by peer juries. Geo-political criteria do not form part of the assessment process.
- **Denmark's** Danish Arts Agency does not prioritise particular countries.
- Arts Council **England** reports that its position is at arm's length from government and as such its activity is not politically motivated. It points out that the British Council holds the cultural diplomacy remit for the UK and may concentrate on particular countries and regions connected to wider foreign policy.⁵³ Nevertheless, in 2010 the Secretary of State for Culture wrote an open letter⁵⁴ to the Chair of the Arts Council

⁵³ Note that Arts Council England International Policy, June 2005, states: *Our international policy will be grounded in an understanding of the international work of other bodies. We will work with key partners – including the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the British Council – to ensure that our own international policy complements theirs.*

www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/international-policy/

A new ACE international plan is currently in development.

⁵⁴ www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/Forgan_ACE.pdf

to announce budget reductions and appears to disregard the arm's length principle: "The Foreign Secretary and I are keen to ensure that the UK reinforces its international reputation for artistic excellence, and hope the Arts Council will support international cultural exchange through its funded organisations and other activities. The Government's priorities will be the emerging powers of China, India, Brazil, the Gulf States, Russia and Japan, and we would particularly welcome your support for artistic engagement in these countries, working in partnership with the Government, the British Council and UKTI. We hope there will be opportunities to unlock additional funding from the private sector to support those activities."

- **Ireland:** the Arts Council states that it does not prioritise particular countries or regions. [Note: support for Ireland's participation in the Venice Biennales for visual arts and architecture is part of the program, as is the relationship with Arts Council of Northern Ireland.] In January 2011 Culture Ireland (working under the aegis of the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport) announced a major new initiative for 2011 - *Imagine Ireland*⁵⁵, a year-long celebration of Irish arts in the United States. Describing the € 4m Culture Ireland programme, the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport Ireland said: "The Government has invested in this initiative because arts and culture are vital to Ireland's recovery, and to the relationship between our two countries." Other statements demonstrate the close links between the economic and cultural objectives of the *Imagine Ireland* initiative.
- **South Korea:** ARKO is very open and welcomes any country that wishes to work with them, basically working on the principle of mutual contribution and benefit.
- **Sweden:** Arts Council reports that support for artists' mobility is demand-driven with no special country priorities. The Swedish Arts Grants Committee's IASPIS programme has visual arts studios for residencies abroad: Berlin, Cairo, London, New York, Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo and Tokyo (i.e. hotspot world cultural cities).

Cultural diplomacy policy

- **New Zealand:** the Cultural Diplomacy International Program (CDIP) run by the Ministry is seen as a useful tool to maintain and develop a network of strong relationships to achieve the Government's diplomatic and economic priorities in targeted regions. The current focus is the Asia-Pacific region, with some initiatives targeted in the United States.

Market development

- Priority countries and regions for **Australia** (to 2011) are:
 - Asia (South Korea and China, including Macau, Hong Kong and Taiwan)
 - South America (Mexico and Brazil)
 - European Union (Spain, Italy, Denmark, Finland, Sweden)
 - North America (market consolidation through key networks & presenter circuits)
 Selection is based on existing relationships and sustainability issues (infrastructure, professional networks, venues, circuits, fee structures and exchange rates, aesthetic values and interests in contemporary work, new markets and rising economies). Relationships have been developed with the priority countries through professional networks, agencies and festivals rather than through formal MOUs or government department negotiation.
- **Canada's** priorities for audience and market development activity are based on an analysis of overseas markets in the context of the current needs of and opportunities

⁵⁵ www.imagineireland.ie/

for artists. For example, a Canadian festival might receive funding to invite buyers/presenters from countries that are priority markets for the type of artists showcased there. Developing a strategy based on new and emerging markets has been considered but remains to be realised.

- **Scotland** prioritises according to drivers for the creative industries market place (as well as artistic priorities).
- **Spain** is so far determined by the export volume of cultural goods and also areas which are considered to be potential markets where they intend to improve contacts. In the new plan, it hopes to list priority areas. Current priorities are:
 - European Union (France, Portugal, UK, Germany, Italy)
 - Latin America (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Colombia)
 - North Africa (Morocco, Egypt)
 - Asia-Pacific (China, Japan, South Korea)
- **United States:** although the NEA does not have a market development function, international work is under-resourced and dependent on funding partnerships. Therefore the selection of countries or regions can be affected by the confluence of interests of NEA and potential partners, in particular the ability to leverage funds.

Artistic development

- **England:** the Arts Council has to date prioritised particular countries and regions (notably Brazil and China), and this has been based more on artistic criteria. However, its general policy is to respect the artists' right to determine their own geographical interests.
- **New Zealand:** Creative New Zealand has three targeted areas for strategic initiatives: Australia and the Pacific; Asia (especially Singapore, Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan), and the west coast of North America. The selection was made according to what is most cost effective, will have the most impact, distance and reception and interest in New Zealand arts.
- **Germany:** the Federal Cultural Foundation established the program area for Central and Eastern Europe to encourage European artists to work together and establish permanent structures of cultural cooperation in Europe.
- **Scotland** prioritises according to artistic priorities (as well as market drivers)

Analysis by SICA⁵⁶ on the geographical distribution of cultural presentations from the **Netherlands** in 2009 is particularly interesting in this context. The study provides a world map of distribution of cultural events and examines the outcomes of the Netherlands' international cultural policy attention on the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China). Dutch international cultural policy⁵⁷ is concentrated in a number of countries and regions with some Dutch embassies having an "enhanced cultural function" (more staff and budgets for cultural cooperation with the Netherlands), for example Beijing, New Delhi, Jakarta and Tokyo in Asia. The Mondriaan Foundation also provides an excellent world map⁵⁸ of distribution of visual arts activity by and with the Netherlands.

⁵⁶ *Looking outward in uncertain times, 2009 Offshore Analysis*, Yvette Gieles, SICA
www.sica.nl/sites/default/files/EN_SICA_Offshore_Buitengaats_2009_DEF.pdf

⁵⁷ www.minbuza.nl/en/Key_Topics/International_Cultural_Policy

⁵⁸ www.mondriaanfoundation.nl/internationalactivities/

6. INTERNATIONAL ARTS ACTIVITY | EVALUATION

Question 8 asked agencies how they measure the effectiveness of their support for international activities and what criteria they have developed. See **Appendix 1** for full details.

Based on responses, there has been little specific evaluation undertaken of overall international activity. Several agencies commented that they always require individual project reports (self-evaluation by grant clients) but evaluation of the overall programs had not taken place. Another aspect is the lack of examination (quantitative and qualitative) of the international activity of regularly funded/key organisations: here, a collective evaluation might be interesting and beneficial for all parties. Where responsibility for international activity is distributed throughout an agency as one of many work priorities for staff members, assessment of levels of international activity and evaluation of its benefits seems particularly challenging.

A further issue for a broader evaluation of international arts activity relates to the distribution of responsibility for international arts activity across several government agencies, each with its own policy, programs, staffing structures, timetables and reporting requirements. The responses gave no evidence that such an evaluation of broader international arts activity had taken place, or was planned, in any country.

Several agencies made useful comments on evaluation:

- **Canada:** some evaluation aspects are complicated by the fact that the CCA programs were intended to be complementary to those of other government departments. With cutbacks in the other programs, there are fewer partners (a key objective) and less support to leverage. CCA uses an Annual Report Corporate Scorecard to give visibility to the quantitative aspects of international work.
- **Denmark:** external evaluation is done for all larger projects/activities, using success-criteria set up in the project plan. An example is a report in Danish (see References) on the DaNY Denmark-New York collaborative arts and network project.
- **England:** the Arts Council has not systematically evaluated the impact of its international work collectively. However, it has undertaken evaluations of some of its larger programs. For example, an external evaluation was published in 2010 of the 2006-2010 Artists Links England-Brazil exchange programme and included lessons learned on improvements in how the evaluation was carried out. This should assist the management of future programs.
- **New Zealand:** the *Ministry for Culture and Heritage* has a 7-part evaluation process for its Cultural Diplomacy International Program (CDIP) activities including qualitative and quantitative aspects. CDIP criteria relate to diplomatic, tourism, trade and cultural objectives. Artistic excellence is not enough to fulfil CDIP criteria – projects must also offer leverage opportunities to further broader NZ interests, including business, tourism and foreign affairs.

Creative New Zealand is currently developing assessment criteria for all targeted international programs. At the end of 2011 all programs will be assessed to gauge their impact on:

- Development in artists work
- The capability of the sector, artists and management to engage internationally

- The economic return to the artists/sector (more tours, more sales, international agent etc.)
- **Sweden:** there has been no systematic evaluation made of the effectiveness of the Arts Council's support for international activities. Nevertheless, the annual report 2009 includes a chapter outlining the rationale for the Arts Council's work integrating an international perspective in all funding. The Swedish Arts Grants Committee, in response to the Discussion Paper that preceded this final Report, concludes that they are not the only country without a national evaluation of international arts activity, and that it would be of great value to discuss methods of how to handle this.
- **United States:** each program of the NEA Funding Partnerships has final report requirements to assess aspects of the particular program. None of the partnership programs has been formally evaluated in recent years.

In general, project evaluation is undertaken by most agencies, through reports from grant clients. This uses quantitative criteria such as income/fees and repeat bookings/future commissions; and qualitative criteria such as media reviews and feedback from agents and artists.

Evaluation of overall program activity, where it does take place, mostly uses quantitative criteria such as number of beneficiaries (incoming and outgoing artists/organisations), number of countries visited/represented and number of activities/projects.

7. INTERNATIONAL TOURING | SPECIFIC ISSUES

Question 9 asked about specific issues that affect international touring for the country's artists. These were reported in some detail by some respondents - see **Appendix 1**.

The issues vary from country to country, although some are common to a number of respondents. The most significant are the cost of international touring, reduced funding and market opportunities – due to shifts in priority by some governments, as well as other cuts in grants and programs in response to the financial crisis. Regulatory barriers for outgoing artists were mentioned by three countries, although it is perhaps surprising that agencies in the two countries particularly associated with increased mobility obstacles for incoming artists in recent years, namely the United Kingdom and the United States, did not raise the issue. Professional development training needs, to deal with the complexity of managing international touring and market development, were also highlighted.

Specific issues related to international touring are organised by theme:

Funding and global economic crisis

- The Global Financial Crisis in the US and EU has a severe impact on those companies which have a business model tied to international activity. (Australia)
- Issue of cultural diplomacy versus artistic practice versus market development – new funds have not been allocated to international activity over the last 3 years. It is not a current government priority. With stagnant funding levels and a lack of priority for public funds, new models are under discussion (e.g. expat fund in major centres, such as New York), priorities for funding are under discussion (is there more value in developing artistic practice or supporting arts organisations to generate income?) and the value of a cultural diplomacy agenda is heavily disputed (how does a multi-million dollar investment in China over a year impact artists in Australia and their longer-term career?) (Australia)
- Recent cuts to Government funding programs that directly supported international touring and cultural industries. Our inability to meet the demand of foreign presenters threatens to create some reluctance on the part of international community to 'buy Canadian' for fear that the basic travel subsidy often required to support an international invitation is denied due to lack of funds. (Canada)
- There is high competition for funds in the CCA international touring programs, and even more so now that the Government has ceased its funding programs. (Canada)
- The U.S. government does not provide direct subsidy specifically for artists touring internationally as some countries do. Issues related to international touring are different, depending on the artistic discipline. (United States)
- The major problem is funding: many artists are invited but we have no money to fund. (Burundi)
- Global economic and political situation. (Creative New Zealand)

High cost of international work (production and touring)

- The costs of producing work that is suitable for an international market – very difficult without significant international co-commissioning funds, which only come when you have a track record of presenting work internationally. (England)
- Cost of touring is the number one factor and the ability of the local promoter to pay. (Scotland)
- Cost versus income. (Creative New Zealand)

Regulatory obstacles

- There can be significant difficulties obtaining visas for non EU citizens to travel to the US as part of an artistic company. (Scotland)
- Visas and taxation – most arts organisations do not have the knowledge or skill to navigate complicated structures in the US and France. Increasing security issues to access visas are adding substantial costs and delays. (Australia)
- Visa regulations and tax issues, particularly for UK companies that may have a multi-national cast. Small producing companies may have to deal with loads of different countries' laws in order to tour their work. (England)

Professional development

- Skills and Succession – the skills of arts professionals vary between arts organisations. There is no training or support mechanism to develop international market development or tour management. Most learn by mistake. The generation that developed international relations for Australia are retiring with no clear succession plan in place. Most of the young talent heads overseas to the UK for work as a result of low salaries and remuneration packages in Australia. (Australia)
- Many companies need market preparedness training and education on how to successfully tour internationally. The CCA conducts international touring workshops. (Canada)

Logistical & cultural obstacles (demands of international market)

- Lack of translation support for text-based work (e.g. performing arts) – this is not an area of priority for grants programs in Australia which limits international market potential, particularly within Asia and South America. (Australia)
- Making international tours work, both from a financial and ecological perspective – international festivals etc. will often have clauses that militate against any other presentation of work in any other venue across their region, or even country. Timelines can mean that work needs to remain within the repertoire for a long period in order to have a really sustained international life – theatre in the UK in particular doesn't do this; we tend to create a work then tour it, with little extended life. International touring works best with extensive back catalogues. (England)
- The ability to coordinate the showcasing of work with the timing of the demand from promoters for the work to tour. Artists lack the finance to re-mount the work for this purpose. (Scotland)
- International expectations/perception of New Zealand arts – exotica or wanting work to be like theirs, or even perhaps expecting it to be the same as Australian art. (Creative New Zealand)
- Market fit – what works at home doesn't always work overseas (Creative New Zealand)
- Unrealistic expectations of New Zealand artists – lack of knowledge and benchmarking. (Creative New Zealand)

Lack of reciprocity: one-way mobility mindset

- Reciprocity – Australia is not well known for extensive reciprocal relationships. It is perceived as protectionist within its own borders and heavily export oriented in all partnership brokering schemes. As most countries and regions move into co-production models or look for reciprocal agreements, funding models and attitudes toward reciprocity will need to be tackled. (Australia)

Environmental issues

- Green issue – while not a top priority for most countries, in Australia, any emissions tax scheme applied either in Australia or overseas will impact severely the current business model for international touring. (Australia)
- Environmental issues. (Creative New Zealand)

Networking and geographical isolation

- Finding international promoters, co-commissioners, co-producers – getting your work seen at the right international showcases. International promoters don't tend to travel to the UK as often as they travel to other places – other European promoters are always crossing borders between France, Italy, Germany etc., but won't 'cross the channel'. We are still a bit isolated. (England)
- Distance (Creative New Zealand)

8. CRITICAL ISSUES

Question 12 invited respondents to identify the critical issues for international arts activity in their organisation that they would like to know more about from other national arts funding agencies. The issues raised are grouped by theme.

NOTE: it is important to read this section in conjunction with Section 7. Many agencies raised issues specific to international touring which are also critical issues for their international arts activity.

Advocacy for international arts activity

- How do we argue for the value of arts and culture in foreign relations without losing track of arts own value? (Sweden)
- Ensuring artistic exchange in the context of decreasing resources. (Canada)
- How they demonstrate the value of their work to government and government agencies who generally measure everything in economic terms without trying to do the same. (Creative New Zealand)

Evaluation issues

- How do they measure success in this area? Do they undertake longitudinal research? (Australia)
- Any evaluation on the impact of artist development in an international context? (England)
- How they measure success, especially the qualitative impact of their programs. (Creative New Zealand)
- How do members capture information on international activity and how is the activity evaluated? (Scotland)
- What outcomes do members seek from international activity? (Scotland)

Policy issues for support of international activity

- Do they invest in dedicated studios/residencies? How do they support residencies? Are they tied to public presentation? (Australia)
- Strategies and programs of other arts councils. (Creative New Zealand)
- If and how members prioritise artforms or areas of activity? (Scotland)
- If and how members prioritise countries? (Scotland)
- Are all arts organisations in members' countries expected to engage on an international level or only a few specialists? (Scotland)

Policy in relation to other government agencies

- What is their relationship to government? Arm's length or heavily contingent? (Australia)
- Models of collaboration with other government agencies – giving the arts a profile in other sectors. (England)
- How they engage with other government agencies, particularly in regard to the value of cultural diplomacy or cultural tourism. (Creative New Zealand)

Mobility issues and obstacles

- Keeping borders open. (Canada)
- Tax issues and work permits. (Canada)
- The role of arts agencies in trouble-shooting tax issues and work permits, both in individual project situations and in influencing long term policy. (Canada)

Funding/financial management issues

- What grant management system do they have in place to track activity & investment? (Australia)
- Have they done any research on better models to support international activities? (i.e. not supported through funding agencies) (Australia)
- How do we invite international NGOs to support cultural activities? (Burundi)
- Developing philanthropy. (England)
- Research on innovative funding mechanisms. (England)
- It would be a good idea to harmonise funding in different countries and to get an overview about the different methods of funding and supporting cultural activities. It is often difficult for arts professionals to establish cooperation between different countries when there are administrative problems and/or differences in the budget of arts funding agencies. (Germany)
- Information on funding models (United States)

Networking IFACCA members' knowledge base & developing collaborative projects

- Do they produce an events calendar of offshore activity? (Australia)
- Indigenous artists programs and artist directories to facilitate connections with Canadian artists. (Canada)
- Is there an NGO that supports the international mobility of artists? (Burundi)
- R&D collaboration, sharing research to advocate. (England)
- Artists exchange program with member nations of IFACCA. (South Korea)
- Sharing information on residency programs and not-for-profit arts. (South Korea)
- Reciprocal arrangements between member organisations re-international exchange. (Scotland)
- Information on innovative partnerships, program models that use social media and high profile successful projects/initiatives. (United States)

9. RECOMMENDATIONS TO IFACCA AND ITS MEMBERS

Recommendations on good practice for mobility programs

IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, *Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004⁵⁹, contained a list of good practices that should apply to artists' mobility programs in general. Respondents were asked in Question 10 to relate this to mobility programs for touring and most agreed that the list is still relevant today. A few additions were suggested which could be taken into account in an updated version of the report.

- The role of 'presenter/curator/programmer' needs to be reflected in any successful mobility program. Artists cannot work offshore without a champion who often risks their own money to support that artist within their community. Their role should be part of the selection process. The notion of 'audience' needs to be central to the discussion if the result of this investment in mobility is to be sustainable. (Australia)
- Promoting programs that support individual artist performance as an alternative to the more expensive process of touring full companies e.g., movement of choreographers and directors. (Canada)
- Engagement with audiences is important at some point. Even if the primary motive is R&D our evaluation shows that artists wanted some idea of follow up of how the work they created might be distributed/connect with audiences. (England)
- Climate change is a factor that should be considered. (England)
- Digital connection/exchange/mobility and reach should come into play. (England)
- CNZ as a development funding agency also believes that it is our job to assist in the development of artists, their work and their infrastructure. That we are part of a process where choices need to be made by both artists and ourselves, as to what are the priorities. (Creative New Zealand)
- The definition of Open/Responsive/Flexible above, we think, does not allow for a developmental approach but rather an on-demand funding approach, which is not always applicable, possible or responsible. As an arts council we can offer much more of value as well as funding. (Creative New Zealand)
- Community development contribution: cultural contribution for the region and host organisation. (South Korea)
- Adding the benefit to the host institution/artist could be a consideration – "learning experience" incorporates some of the notion of mutual benefit (United States)
- The Danish Arts Council has formulated a shared set of principles for supporting international work – some of these are very equal to those proposed for mobility programs: Artistic quality, originality and relevance; Cooperation and reciprocity: Long-term, flexible and proactive; Knowledge sharing, education and debate; Evaluation, documentation and follow-up. (Denmark)

Other recommendations

Question 13 asked whether there were any aspects of government support for international arts activities that IFACCA could help facilitate at a global level. Suggestions were:

- Research on economic benefits for arts organisations touring internationally. (Australia)
- Research/tools to manage visas and taxation issues across countries. (Australia)

⁵⁹IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, *Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004
www.ifacca.org/media/files/artistsmobilityreport.pdf

- Propose a project of international donors to support the management of international transport for artists and enable organisers of major international events to invite more artists. (Burundi)
- Encourage NGOs to work in poor countries to identify the needs of artists and to advocate for them. (Burundi)
- Funding for Aboriginal international culture/artistic exchanges or cultural ambassadors, e.g. Polar Institute in London. (Canada)
- We are particularly interested in the potential of forming a European Chapter and the usefulness this could have in forming more effective collective lobbying at that level. (England)
- We also think that R&D is a key area where international work can really help us. (England)
- Digital and climate change are also areas of policy that are affecting all countries at a global level and collaboration on this is helpful. (England)
- How we can demonstrate the value of our work to our government and government agencies. (Creative New Zealand)
- Visa restrictions for artists. (Scotland)
- IFACCA could be the best international network to share and initiate the co-working and collaborating of member countries, e.g. a mini-summit on international arts activities. (South Korea)
- It would be of great value to discuss methods of how to handle a national evaluation of international arts activity. (Swedish Arts Grants Committee)

Ideas for future research

Question 14 asked for ideas for future IFACCA research in this area but this seemed to have been covered by most respondents in earlier sections. Canada suggested information on trends in touring: fee structures, permits, visas, taxation, and how to ensure that international exchange opportunities remain rich and diverse. South Korea made suggestions about surveying member countries (research and festivals).

Feedback from IFACCA members' meeting

The draft Discussion Paper (which preceded this final Report) was debated by the board members of IFACCA, and by European members of IFACCA, on 28-29 September 2010 in Madrid. Board members represented views from Australia, Canada, Denmark, England, Kenya. European members and observers included delegates from: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium: Flemish Community, Bulgaria, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Wales.

Members gave feedback on the draft Discussion Paper and raised the following issues:

1. ***Tensions between the need to foster international engagement and market development for the work of artists, and the agendas of foreign agencies/external affairs' departments***

Members noted that:

- a) The arts are important for culture and important for foreign diplomacy. Members expressed a desire to find the middle ground between policy objectives.
- b) Diplomatic budgets are generally considered to be more difficult to win with arts arguments. However, one participant argued that it is the job of arts support agencies to support and educate diplomatic staff in terms of the arts.

- c) Concerns were expressed by some that artistic criteria were becoming secondary to the criteria set by foreign affairs agencies. Others were less concerned and saw working with foreign affairs (as with other sectors of government) as a form of diversification and opportunity.

Example initiatives:

- Cross-country strategies (i.e. **Nordic** cooperation⁶⁰) were cited as an interesting and cost-effective approach.
- In **Malta**, the foreign affairs ambassador invites the Malta Council for Culture and the Arts to attend the signing of bilateral agreements and to meet counterparts with whom they would be expected to work and this approach had been constructive and successful.
- In **Lithuania**, cultural attachés are assigned by the Ministry of Culture.

2. *Facilitating and providing assistance towards artists working internationally*

Members raised the following issues:

- a) The hurdles for artists in obtaining permission to work internationally are sometimes insurmountable.
- b) Lack of residency programmes for artists who need to travel with children.
- c) New visa regulations for Europe put into place in April 2010 are unfair for artists as the cost is too high. Members hoped to share ideas on how to help artists overcome such visa problems.
- d) Taxation problems and pension plans make it difficult for artists to travel.
- e) Measures to encourage artists to apply for EU money were discussed briefly, e.g. providing support for the preparation of applications for EU projects. There was a perception that there is some fear about the process of applying for EU funding and projects. Members felt they could have a role in guiding and helping artists with the process.⁶¹

3. *Opportunities to work collaboratively between members*

Some measures suggested were:

- a) Possibility of signing MOUs between members to support touring of artists⁶²;

⁶⁰ E.g. Kulturkontakt Nord: www.kknord.org/ and Nordic Culture Fund: www.nordiskkulturfond.org/

⁶¹ AUTHOR'S NOTE: this comment may illustrate a problem in knowledge- and information-sharing about European programmes. The current EU Culture Programme (2007-2013) is not open to applications from individuals, whether artists or not. The responsibility for dissemination of information on the EU Culture Programme lies with the Cultural Contact Points (CCPs) which exist in every EU Member State and other European countries eligible to apply, and are funded by the European Commission and national level. Some CCPs assist with applications and provide training. In general, EU programmes are only open to applications from legally established organisations of different types. The 2010 EuropeAid programme (first of its type in the cultural field) 'Strengthening Capacities in the Cultural Sector' was open to applications from organisations, either in the EU, the ENPI (Eastern European neighbourhood countries) or in developing countries worldwide. Some small EU mobility grants for individuals exist with specific conditions, and require an organisation in the management/delivery/application process (e.g. young volunteers through the European Voluntary Service, lifelong learning – adult education specialists through GRUNDTVIG, pilot for European entrepreneur mobility) and some of these programmes have been used with success by arts organisations in Europe.

⁶² Examples include those initiated by the National Arts Council, Singapore and Korea Arts Management Service, South Korea.

- b) Combining or sharing resources to provide guides for artists travelling abroad with the question raised about whether information systems could be networked amongst members;
- c) Help desk information needed both for artists going abroad and those who are incoming⁶³.

Example initiative:

- On-the-move⁶⁴ cited as a good example

4. *The impact of cultural imperialism (lack of reciprocal action) on cultural diversity*

Members noted a concern about:

- a) The emerging issues related to authenticity.
- b) The enormous difficulties for non-European artists trying to enter Europe.
- c) The changing role of the arts in aid and development agendas.

The members also noted that:

- a) These impacts were being addressed by the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity and that IFACCA has circulated a Briefing Note⁶⁵ for National Arts Agencies to provide members with information on this Convention.
- b) Culture is now specifically mentioned in Article 16 of the Millennium Development Goals⁶⁶.

Example initiative:

- The 'Cultural Routes'⁶⁷ initiative of the Council of Europe linking the Baltic and Caucasus States is a good practice model for providing sustainable development, cooperation and integration.

5. *The impact of funding cuts and pressures on international arts activity*

Members noted that:

- a) Funding cuts in some countries are having, and will have, a severe impact on international work.
- b) A decline in government funding for arts diplomacy is leaving the field more open for the arts sector.
- c) Programmes of support for individual artists (rather than arts companies) to work internationally, including overseas studio programmes, are cost-effective and create wider audiences, networks and longer-term economic and creative benefits for them.

6. *Need to identify arguments to convince ministers and decision-makers of the benefits of supporting international work*

Most members agreed that a systematic way of collecting information or evaluating programmes needed to be found.

Some methods of evaluation of international arts activities considered useful included:

- proof that the extent of international audiences had widened
- proof that income was raised

⁶³ E.g. PRACTICS project: an EU funded mobility information pilot programme 2008-2011 connecting Belgium, Netherlands, Spain and Wales, with other EU partners, www.practics.eu

⁶⁴ www.on-the-move.org

⁶⁵ www.ifacca.org/announcements/2010/07/23/release-ifacca-briefing-note-2005-unesco-conventio/

⁶⁶ www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

⁶⁷ www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/routes/default_en.asp

- visitor numbers
- national and international press coverage
- comparing events with previous years in terms of statistics
- tangible measurable results (no. of titles translated, published etc.)

Members also noted that:

- a) Cultural export and cultural cooperation should be evaluated differently.
- b) Longitudinal studies were considered a need as the benefits to international working are mostly evident in the long-term.
- c) It would be useful to initiate systems for future generations to benefit from.
- d) Recognition of international work should not be at the cost of domestic work.

Example initiative:

- Denmark has recently announced a joint strategy with the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, and of Business and Industry. The Arts Council played a strong role in devising the strategy. A summary in English will be available shortly.

7. *The concept of the audience and 'demand' side of the equation*

Members noted that:

- Increasing pressure for artists to be validated through international work is undermining the value of local recognition and achievement, and raises issues around the need to encourage authenticity and pride in local outcomes.
- The urban-based, sophisticated 25-35 age range is the new target market for some international promotion agencies, potentially at the cost of other segments of the community.
- As not all international activities for artists focus on developing audiences for their work, such as artists-in-residency projects, there is a need for different criteria for measuring impact for different activities.

8. *Funding of Networks*

In terms of policies for supporting international arts networking, there were various perspectives noted:

- **Azerbaijan:** the *Artists in Dialogue* initiative supported by the Council of Europe is in place, and unions for different artist groups are funded directly from government.
- **Belgium:** the Flemish Government supports a number of international networks as they are based in Belgium (and it felt that Belgian artists can therefore benefit from their presence there). They do not support lobbying organisations.
- **Denmark:** in general, networks are encouraged to manage on their membership fees – with a few modest exceptions (i.e. visual arts associations).
- **Ireland:** funding and international projects are devolved to member organisations, providing that their services are open for everyone to apply to.
- **Sweden:** generally funds participation in international networks.

APPENDIX 1: COMPILATION OF RESPONSES

Policy development and program administration for international arts activities

Question 1: Which government agencies in your country are involved in policy development and program administration for international arts activities?

Australia

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Australia Council for the Arts Arts Victoria Other state and territory governments to a much lesser degree	www.australiacouncil.gov.au www.arts.vic.gov.au
Arts or culture ministry	Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts	www.environment.gov.au
Foreign Affairs ministry	Department of Foreign Affairs – Public Diplomacy Branch	www.dfat.gov.au
Embassies or High Commissions	Various embassies generally determined by the ambassador	
Joint committee of government agencies	Australian International Cultural Council chaired by both the minister for the Arts and the Minister for Foreign Affairs	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	None	

Burundi

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Not specified	
Arts or culture ministry	Ministry for Youth, Sports and Culture	www.burundi.gov.bi
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

Canada

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Canada Council for the Arts	www.canadacouncil.ca
Arts or culture ministry	Department of Canadian Heritage	www.pch.gc.ca
Foreign Affairs ministry	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT)	www.international.gc.ca
Embassies or High Commissions	Network of cultural representatives abroad at embassies, consulates, high commissions, including the Canadian Cultural Centre in Paris	www.international.gc.ca
Joint committee of government agencies	Led by the Department of Canadian Heritage, the International Strategic Framework Directors General Working Group	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	None	

Denmark

National arts funding agency (arts council):	The Danish Arts Council	www.kunst.dk/staatenskunstraad
	The Danish Arts Foundation	www.kunst.dk/staatenskunstfond
Arts or culture ministry	The Danish Arts Agency	www.kunst.dk/kunststyrelsen
	Danish Center for Culture and Development (DCCD)	www.dccd.dk
	The Danish Film Institute	www.dfi.dk
	Danish Crafts	www.danishcrafts.dk
	Danish Architecture Center	www.dac.dk
Foreign Affairs ministry	Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	www.um.dk
Embassies or High Commissions	Danish embassies have 30 man-years involved in international cultural exchange	
Joint committee of government agencies	The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Danish Ministry of Culture have through a collaboration agreement to promote Denmark's international cultural exchange. The Danish Arts Agency is the secretariat.	www.kunst.dk
	Branding Denmark secretariat	www.kunst.dk
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	The Danish Cultural Institute	www.dankultur.dk
	Music Export Denmark	www.mxd.dk

National arts funding agency (arts council)

1) The Danish Arts Council: the role of the Danish Arts Council is to promote artistic development in Denmark and Danish art abroad. The Council task is to provide support for artistic endeavours within the fields of literature, the performing arts, the visual arts, and music.

2) The Danish Arts Foundation: the role of the Foundation is to promote Danish creative arts. The Foundation's area of activity includes the visual arts, literature, music, crafts and design, architecture, cinema, and theatre, as well as other comparable forms of creative art that do not have other avenues for state support.

Arts or culture ministry

1) The Danish Arts Agency: the Agency has as primary duties to act as secretariat for the Danish Arts Foundation and the Danish Arts Council and their committees and boards of representatives and to administer a number of other grant schemes in the artistic and cultural arena. There are a number of independent administrative duties that the Danish Ministry of Culture has delegated to the Danish Arts Agency, including the management of Cultural Contact Point Denmark and the presentation of Denmark as a cultural nation.

2) Danish Center for Culture and Development (DCCD) promotes cultural co-operation between Denmark and developing countries in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America and the Middle East.

3) The Danish Film Institute: operations extend from participation in the development and production of feature films, short and documentary films, distribution and marketing, to managing the national film archive and the cinematheque.

- 4) Danish Crafts: responsibilities are aimed at branding Danish craft and design at an international level and helping professional craft artists and designers gain a foothold in the international market.
- 5) Danish Architecture Center: It has the mission to initiate partnerships that develop and disseminate Danish architecture and construction with a view to creating cultural and commercial value.

Foreign Affairs ministry (within country)

- 1) Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Department for Public Diplomacy and Press – have allocated 3 man-year to cultural/press work.

Embassies or High Commissions (Foreign affairs ministry internationally)

- 1) Danish embassies have 30 man-years involved in international cultural exchange.

Joint committee of government agencies

- 1) The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Danish Ministry of Culture have a collaboration agreement to promote Denmark's international cultural exchange. The Danish Arts Agency is the secretariat. The objectives of the collaboration are:
- a) the qualitative development of Danish art and culture, for example, through encounters with the artists, the audiences, and the cultural life of other countries
 - b) familiarity with Danish art and culture in other countries
 - c) the familiarity of Danish artists and cultural institutions with the art and culture of other countries
 - d) familiarity with Denmark, with Denmark as a cultural nation and society, and with prominent Danish political issues
 - e) Denmark's efforts at public diplomacy.
- 2) Branding Denmark secretariat: intergovernmental secretariat promoting Danish core-values and being secretariat for a Branding Fund, which supports international activities (mainly in Denmark) that attracts international attention to Denmark.

Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities

- 1) The Danish Cultural Institute. The Danish Cultural Institute is an independent institution under the Ministry for Culture. They initiate and support cultural projects through their 10 institutes abroad.
- 2) Music Export Denmark: MXD was founded in January 2004 as a joint initiative of Denmark's Radio, The Roskilde Festival/ the Venue Foundation, and ROSA – The Danish Rock Council to create a more effective exposure of Danish music abroad. The idea was to unite the experience, the networks etc. that each of the three parties have in this field and a substantial financial backing.

England

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Arts Council, England	www.artscouncil.org.uk
Arts or culture ministry	Department of Media, Culture and Sport	www.dcms.gov.uk
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	British Council	www.britishcouncil.org

The British Council, which is funded through the Foreign and the Commonwealth Office and has other responsibilities besides arts and culture.

Germany

National arts funding agency (arts council):	German Federal Cultural Foundation	www.kulturstiftung-bund.de
Arts or culture ministry	Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media	www.bundesregierung.de
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

Ireland

National arts funding agency (arts council):	The Arts Council	www.artscouncil.ie
Arts or culture ministry	Culture Ireland	www.cultureireland.gov.ie
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

The Arts Council is the national agency for funding, developing and promoting the arts in Ireland. Its role in an international context is chiefly concerned with:

- the professional development of artists as they deepen and extend their practice through opportunities abroad; and
- audience development and the enrichment of practice at home through support for international work touring into Ireland (largely through support of Irish venues and festivals).

Culture Ireland is the state agency for the promotion of Irish arts worldwide, working under the aegis of the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport. The role of Culture Ireland is chiefly concerned with:

- international presentation by Irish artists of their work (through tours, performances and exhibitions), and
- promoting future presentation of Irish arts work abroad through contact with international presenters and promoters (through showcases, promotional missions and other strategic initiatives)

New Zealand

National arts funding agency (arts council):	The Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa known as 'Creative New Zealand'	www.creativenz.govt.nz
Arts or culture ministry	Ministry for Culture and Heritage	www.mch.govt.nz/
Foreign Affairs ministry	Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade	www.mfat.govt.nz/
Embassies or High Commissions	Various as identified through the Cultural Diplomacy International Program	

Joint committee of government agencies	Cultural Diplomacy International Program – supported by an inter-agency steering group including the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise and Tourism New Zealand	
Separate service organisations funded by CNZ to support both domestic and international arts and cultural activities	<p>Toi Maori Aotearoa promotes the uniqueness, quality and cultural expression of Maori art, covering the visual, performing and literary arts.</p> <p>SOUNZ is a music information centre which provides, fosters and promotes music by New Zealand composers.</p> <p>Tautai supports the development of contemporary Pacific art through fostering and maintaining links between contemporary Pacific visual artists.</p>	<p>www.maoriart.org.nz</p> <p>sounz.org.nz</p> <p>www.tautaipacific.com</p>

National arts funding agency (arts council) – Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa (trading name, “Creative New Zealand”) is the national agency for the development of the arts in New Zealand.

Creative New Zealand’s statutory purpose is to encourage, promote and support the arts in New Zealand for the benefit of all New Zealanders. (Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa Act 1994 – the Act)

Creative New Zealand’s mandate (set out in the Act) is to support community and professional arts. In doing so, Creative New Zealand must uphold the following principles:

- participation, by supporting initiatives that encourage participation in the arts
- access, by supporting the availability of projects of merit to communities or sections of the population that would otherwise not have access to them
- excellence and innovation, by supporting activities of artistic and cultural significance that develop the creative potential of artists and artforms
- professionalism, by maintaining and developing a professional arts infrastructure, both at national and community levels
- advocacy, by promoting New Zealand’s arts and artists locally, nationally and internationally.

Creative New Zealand must also:

- recognise the cultural diversity of the people of New Zealand
- recognise in the arts the role of Māori as tāngata whenua
- recognise the arts of the Pacific Islands’ peoples of New Zealand.

Creative New Zealand’s strategic plan for the period 2010-13 is available at www.creativenz.govt.nz/what_we_do/strategic_plan.

The strategic plan sets out Creative New Zealand’s:

- Vision
- Purpose
- Guiding principles
- Strategic outcomes

Information on Creative New Zealand’s International Strategy and activities can be found at www.creativenz.govt.nz/international.

Arts or culture ministry - The Ministry for Culture and Heritage's services include: policy advice to Government on funding, legislation and programs; producing high-quality history, heritage and reference products and service for New Zealanders, visitors and international audiences; research, development, advice and advocacy for the cultural sector; supporting the board appointment process, and developing government and operational capability within the sector; and administering government funding and monitoring the performance of funded cultural organisations.

The Ministry runs the New Zealand Government's Cultural Diplomacy International Program (CDIP). The CDIP's aim is to help establish and/or maintain a New Zealand cultural presence in key overseas regions or countries in order to boost New Zealand's profile and economic, trade, diplomatic and cultural interests.

The CDIP is administered by the Ministry and supported by an inter-agency Steering group made up of representatives from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (equivalent in Australia to AusTrade) and Tourism New Zealand (equivalent in Australia to Australia Tourism).

Foreign Affairs ministry (within country) - The Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade works closely with the Ministry for Culture and Heritage in assisting with the promotion and management of overseas artists and cultural groups funded through the CDIP program.

In addition, New Zealand's creativity and ingenuity are displayed through the Ministry's works of art holdings at overseas posts. The current program focuses on installing vibrant, high-quality, low-cost New Zealand art at new posts, and improving holdings at other posts as funds allow. Recent acquisitions include photographs, prints, paintings, kete, carvings and glass.

Separate service organisations funded by Creative NZ to support both domestic and international arts and cultural activities – Toi Maori Aotearoa is a charitable trust which promotes the uniqueness, quality and cultural expression of Maori art, covering the visual, performing and literary arts. Toi Maori organises international exchanges with other indigenous peoples, including artists from the Pacific, Europe, Canada, the USA, Australia and Asia.

SOUNZ is a music information centre which provides, fosters and promotes music by New Zealand composers through services and projects which encourage its creation, performance, publication, recording and broadcast

Tautai Contemporary Pacific Arts Trust supports the development of contemporary Pacific art through fostering and maintaining links between contemporary Pacific visual artists.

Scotland

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Creative Scotland	www.creativescotland.com
Arts or culture ministry	Scottish Government	www.scotland.gov.uk
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	British Council Visiting Arts	

Creative Scotland is the new national leader for Scotland's arts, screen and creative industries. It's our job to help Scotland's creativity shine at home and abroad. Creative Scotland inherits the investment commitment of The Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen with the majority of our budget committed for 2010/11. The board will meet for the first time in August.

The Scottish Government's international activities make crucial contributions, both directly and indirectly, to the key purpose of this government, namely to focus the Government and public services on creating a more successful country, with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth. By supporting Scottish businesses looking to trade abroad; by attracting foreign direct investment; through the work we do to ensure that European legislation takes account of Scottish interests; and by placing Scotland as a great place to live, learn, visit, work, do business and invest, the international work of the Scottish Government and its associated bodies makes a direct contribution to The Government Economic Strategy. The Scottish Government supports the activities of VisitScotland and EventScotland in seeking to attract people to come to Scotland as a tourist destination and site of world class events and the evolving role of Creative Scotland in promoting Scotland's cultural excellence and identity.

The British Council seeks to enhance Scotland's reputation in the arts and creative industries to contribute to an international and outward looking focus. The British Council shares Scotland's most innovative creative output with the rest of the world by facilitating partnerships between international organisations and Scottish artists.

Visiting Arts promotes the inward flow of arts and artists to the countries of the UK, with an emphasis on exchanges and networking.

South Korea

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Arts Council Korea	www.arko.or.kr
Arts or culture ministry	Ministry of Culture and Tourism	www.mcst.go.kr
Foreign Affairs ministry	Not specified	
Embassies or High Commissions	Not specified	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

Arts Council Korea - Grant giving for artists and arts companies that have plans to initiate their arts-related international activities.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism - They review the plan of Arts Council Korea including the policy of international arts activities.

Spain

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Not specified	
Arts or culture ministry	Ministry of Culture – together with the autonomous communities in their respective geographical areas.	www.mcu.es
Foreign Affairs ministry	Spanish Agency of International Cooperation and Development (AECID)	www.aecid.es www.maec.es
Embassies or High	Yes	

Commissions		
Joint committee of government agencies	State Society for Cultural Action (SEAC) State Society of international Expositions (SEI) Society for Culture in the Exterior (SEACEX) Society for Cultural Commemorations (SECC)	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

Sweden

National arts funding agency (arts council):	Swedish Arts Council	www.kulturradet.se
Arts or culture ministry	Ministry of Culture, Sweden	www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/8371
Foreign Affairs ministry	Swedish Institute (SI) Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)	www.si.se www.sida.se
Embassies or High Commissions	Through SI or SIDA	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified The Swedish Arts Grants Committee (additional submission to clarify their position and activities)	www.konstnarsnamnden.se

Swedish Arts Council

- increase internationalisation/intercultural dialogue within the field of arts and culture
- support for cultural infrastructure, including institutions' international work
- support for touring etc
- statistics. EU-information Arts Grants Committee: Support for individual artists' mobility. Residencies, expert exchanges.

Arts or culture ministry - Policy development. EU agenda for culture. Cultural counsellors working at the Embassies in eight countries.

Foreign Affairs ministry - SI (Swedish Institute): promotes Sweden, sometimes with the help of arts & culture; and Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency): development cooperation, sometimes through arts & culture.

Separate body responsible for international arts and culture – a 2nd submission was made for Sweden from The Swedish Arts Grants Committee (Konstnarsnamnden) – to supplement information already provided, not full questionnaire responses. The Swedish Arts Grants Committee is a state agency on the same level as the Arts Council with responsibility for support to individual artists. Since 1996 it has an international programme for visual artists (runs studios in Sweden and abroad, offers grants for international exchange, exhibition, collaboration etc.). It has an International Dance Programme with similar opportunities to develop long-term international collaborations between dancers and choreographers.

United States

National arts funding agency (arts council):	National Endowment for the Arts	www.arts.gov
---	---------------------------------	--

Arts or culture ministry	None (decentralised support for arts)	
Foreign Affairs ministry	U.S. Department of State	www.state.gov/r/ www.exchanges.state.gov
Embassies or High Commissions	Yes	
Joint committee of government agencies	Not specified	
Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities	Not specified	

National Endowment for the Arts

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is a public agency dedicated to supporting excellence in the arts - both new and established - bringing the arts to all Americans, and providing leadership in arts education. Established by Congress in 1965 as an independent agency of the federal government, the NEA is the nation's largest annual funder of the arts, bringing great art to all 50 states, including rural areas, inner cities and military bases.

The NEA supports international activities in two ways.

- 1) Projects with international arts activities are eligible under the broad funding category of "Access to Artistic Excellence" for every arts discipline. We estimate that 7% of grants awarded in FY 09 had an international element.

These applications are responsive to field activity and therefore not tied to an agency goal related specifically to international activity. The project funding relates to the goal of providing access to a broad range of artistic work. The "international" descriptive is self-identified by the applicant. Only an aspect of project activity need be international for the use of this descriptor. Our analysis of these projects indicates that very few are focused exclusively on international exchange/activity.

- 2) The NEA has an International Activities Office, under the Office of the Chief of Staff. The work of this office falls into the two areas of Federal Leadership and Funding Partnerships.

Federal Leadership: The International Activities Office provides cultural expertise and does extensive liaison with the U.S. Department of State, international organizations such as the Organization of American States, UNESCO, IFACCA, and with other governments (particularly if there is a bilateral relationship, for example, the U.S. Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission). In these efforts, the NEA usually works in partnership with other U.S. government cultural agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Museum and Library Services and others.

Funding Partnerships: Through cooperative initiatives with other funders the NEA brings the benefits of international exchange to arts organizations, artists and audiences. NEA's international activities increase recognition of the excellence of U.S. arts around the world and broaden the scope of experience of American artists. Through partnerships with other government agencies and the private sector, the NEA fosters international creative exchange by strengthening residency programs of foreign artists in U.S. communities. Local citizens as well as the arts community benefit from the lasting international ties that result.

Foreign Affairs ministry - Through the office of the Undersecretary of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, the U.S. Department of State supports international cultural exchange as it relates to U.S. foreign policy goals. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs is the primary office with responsibility for international exchange.

Embassies – U.S. Embassies and Consulates abroad have funding for cultural programming.

Support for international arts activities

Question 2: If your organisation supports international arts activities, what are your current objectives for that support over the next three to five years? Do you have an international strategy? If so, please attach a copy.

Australia

- The Australia Council supports international activity across two primary areas – artistic practice and market development.
- There isn't any international strategy for the artistic practice. Support is provided through mentorships, residencies and research. The Australia Council has a series of dedicated studios for residencies but provide grants to the sector beyond the list of studios.
- There is an international market development strategy (2008-2011) to support tours, exhibitions, pre tour activity, showcases and trade fair representation. The strategy was tied to two artform priorities: music and literature and it was equally tied to geographical priorities that were established based on existing relationships and the regions capacity to sustain lasting relationships with Australia artists. *See attached.*
- Very little support is provided under the rubric of cultural diplomacy. Generally, support of this nature is tied to Indigenous art and artists and country profiles initiated by the Department of Foreign Affairs where there is a shared interest (i.e. South Korea in 2011).

Burundi

- Our ministry provides payments related to the journey of out folk groups participating in international festivals, or when they are invited by foreign producers. Unfortunately our department never pays their international transport which limits outputs. The new cultural policy of Burundi urged the government to pay serious attention to the development of international exchanges of artists.

Canada

- In its strategic plan [Moving Forward 2008-2011](#), the CCA writes that it *should accord a high priority to the national and international mobility of its artists...and increase budgets for international dissemination in collaboration with other federal funders.* It also states that it will *make partnerships a key element in its operations.*
- Over the next 3-5 years, the CCA will continue to offer a similar level of support for international arts activities such as international travel and touring.
- While there is no formal international strategy, all international activities by the disciplinary sections and strategic offices are guided by senior management. Additionally, the Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) has objectives for supporting international arts activities over the next 2 years. (e.g., strengthening partnerships)

Denmark

The strategies/objective of above mentioned actors in international arts activities are formulated in relation to their general duties and thus differs in objectives, focus and timeframe.

The Strategies/objectives for The Danish Arts Council and The Danish Arts Agency is currently being translated and will be uploaded on English version of www.kunst.dk

England

- Our Policy is attached. www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/international-policy/

- We are currently in the process of producing our next four year plan for international activity and therefore our objectives for that period will not be published until the autumn. However, we are working with a 10 year framework which will inform our funding. This has the following goals which will inform our international work:
 1. Talent and artistic excellence are thriving and celebrated.
 2. The arts leadership and workforce are diverse and highly skilled.
 3. More people value and enjoy the arts.
 4. Every child and young person has the opportunity to experience the richness of the arts.
 5. The arts sector is sustainable, resilient and innovative.

Germany

- The Federal Cultural Foundation supports artistic productions and grants project funding for thematic areas which fall within the scope of the federal government's cultural and artistic funding activities. Funding can be awarded to all non-commercial areas and fields of creative activity: the fine arts, performing arts, literature, music, film, photography, architecture, cultural-historic exhibitions, new media, applied and cross-disciplinary artistic and cultural endeavours.
- The Federal Cultural Foundation considers projects to have an international context if they are coordinated in cooperation with at least one partner located outside Federal Republic of Germany, or at least one of the important project events takes place outside the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany, or they require the significant involvement of artists from different countries, or international cooperation is necessary for their preparation and research, or they bring together a large number of participants or constituent projects, or necessitate the involvement of internationally renowned institutions.

Ireland

The Arts Council's work in the area of international arts can be seen in terms of five distinct areas:

1. The Travel & Training Award to support the professional development and training of the artist internationally.
2. The provision of an artist residency at Location One in New York City
3. The Venice Biennales for visual arts and architecture
4. The provision of information and advice through the European Cultural Contact Point which is hosted by the Arts Council.
5. The Arts Council's relationship with the Arts Council of Northern Ireland. This involves specifying joint policy objectives and exchanging information on jointly funded organisations and arts matters with a North/South dimension.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

- The objectives are to: contribute to growing NZ economic prosperity by presenting NZ culture to key audiences; and project in targeted settings a distinctive profile of NZ as a creative and diverse society with a unique contemporary culture.
- There is no international strategy.

Creative New Zealand

We have an International Strategy.

www.creativenz.govt.nz/international/what_the_international_strategy_means_for_you

Strategic Priority Four - New Zealand Arts Gain International Success.**Goals**

1. Support the development and presentation of distinctive, high quality 'international ready' art.

Objectives

 - *To enrich the art practice of and offer artistic stimulus to individual artists by exposing them the practice and work of international artists.*
 - *To support artists in the development of their work for offshore markets*
 - *Support the international presentation of distinctive, high quality work*
 - *To support international success for the artist*

2. Develop international markets and audiences.

Objectives

 - *To develop international markets and audiences for NZ work*
 - *To develop and increase connectivity for NZ artists in identified international markets*

3. Build the skills and capabilities of the arts sector for engaging internationally.

Objectives

 - *To develop skills to produce/curate/market New Zealand work internationally*
 - *To develop best practise in representing New Zealand artists internationally*
 - *To develop skills in evaluating markets for New Zealand artists and their work*
 - *To strengthen inter-cultural engagement and understanding*

Scotland

- Creative Scotland is newly formed and its international culture strategy is in development.

South Korea

- Encouraging artists and arts organization to communicate with international artists and arts organizations to increase and widen their future visions and creativities.
- Founding the international base for networking and collaborating with international partners for mutual benefit and understanding
- Contributing and sharing the value of arts with international community.

Spain

- No response.

Sweden

- The objectives for the Arts Council's international works takes its starting point in the overall objective for the Arts Council, which is to promote a prosperous, high-quality cultural life for everyone throughout the country. International and intercultural cooperation is a necessity for arts and culture to develop. The Arts Council supports mobility for artists, access to international arts and culture for audiences in Sweden, as well as development of arts and culture through cooperation between artists/practitioners of arts and culture. The Arts Council also works to strengthen the role of arts and culture in all of Sweden's international relations.
- The Arts Council's international strategy (2007-2010) is currently being revised.

United States

- The agency is in the process of developing its strategic plan for Fiscal Years 2012-2016 which will include strategies for international activities. The document currently is in draft form for internal review.

Question 3: Are there staff in your organisation who have specific responsibility for managing support for international arts activities? If yes, how many or what proportion of the overall agency staff numbers work solely on international programs and how many or what proportion of staff work on international programs as well as having other responsibilities? Are the staff located in one unit or spread throughout the organisation?

Australia

- Dedicated staff at the Australia Council – 8 people, including Director and Executive Director that are part of the Market Development team
- Additional artform staff are involved in specific grant programs (i.e. visual arts studios, international touring programs) – approx. 3-4 staff members

Burundi

- Burundi's participation in international programs often go by UNESCO or the OIF in terms of multilateral engagement strategies on internationally agreed strategies.

Canada

- Out of approximately 233 staff, 15-17 program officers in the disciplinary sections have responsibility for international programs. These officers are also responsible for other programs.
- The Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) is the primary office responsible for international market development with 3 full-time staff.
- The Coordinator for Partnership and Networks is responsible for supporting the Director and CEO's role as a Board member of the IFACCA and is the primary liaison for IFACCA's Secretariat.
- In total, up to 21 staff (or 11% of total staff) work on international programs.

Denmark

Yes. The Danish Arts Agency has allocated 23 man-years to administrate and operate funds for international activities for the Arts Council and the Collaboration agreement between The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and The Ministry for Culture. In total the Man-year allocated to international activities equals 40% of total agency staff numbers.

England

- There are no staff who solely work on international programmes. However, two of our Executive Directors have responsibility for leading our international work, supported by a Director in Arts Department (Literature).
- In addition all Directors working within Arts Department (Music, Theatre, Dance, Visual Arts, Learning (Children and Young People), Participation, Broadcast and Digital, Strategic Partnerships) have a remit to include international in policy, strategy and Arts Development in their areas.
- Our regional offices (x9) also have, or will have a member of staff with a specific responsibility for international in addition to their regular responsibilities.
- Our Relationship Managers will be managing relationships with a large number of arts organisations working internationally.

Germany

- All members of the General Project Funding Department of the Program Department work on international activities. It is about one half of the total staff number.

Ireland

- Three staff members work in international programs and all have responsibilities in other areas also. For their international responsibilities, they are all located in one unit.

New Zealand*Ministry for Culture and Heritage*

- Two staff work on international activities. They are located in one unit of the organisation.

Creative New Zealand

- One team. Four people from a total of 51 staff. This does not include staff who manage contestable funding processes, residencies or recurrently funded organisations; all of which have an international element.

Scotland

- Yes. There will be staff with specific responsibilities in this area but the numbers and the level of seniority have not yet been determined.

South Korea

- Three staff (around 3.8%) are in charge of the international affairs. Even though there is no independent unit now, but the separated unit are strongly constructed as a section within one Division.

Spain

- Yes.

Sweden*Swedish Arts Council*

- Approx. three people working full time on international programs (coordinator, officer for Swedish literature abroad, EU Contact Point)
- The secretariat for the Astrid Lindgren Memorial Award (three people)
- Officers for different art fields (theatre, dance, music etc.) involved in support for international cooperation within the respective field. Research/analysis personnel involved in international projects.
- The international issues are spread throughout the organisation, one coordinator oversees all international affairs

Swedish Arts Grants Committee

- Seven employees work full-time on international arts activity and the remaining 11 staff work part-time on this area.
- Around 38% of all applications received are for international exchange (of an annual total of 6,500 applications).

United States

- Of the NEA staff of approximately 170, three staff members work solely on international work. They are in one unit within the Office of the Chief of Staff.

Question 4: In the current year, what proportion of the agency's budget is allocated to support international arts activity? How does this compare with the situation in the previous three to five years? In the next three to five years do you expect this amount will increase or decrease?

Australia

- Approximately \$11.9 m per annum is allocated to international activities of which \$5.05 m is allocated to key organisations through their triennial support related to international activities. Of the remaining \$6.85 m, \$4.07 m is allocated through international market development with the remaining \$2.78 m allocated through artform boards associated with residencies, mentorships and research.
- The figures fluctuate from year to year based on level of activity.
- Note: The Australia Council does not have a system in place to monitor the level of activity or financial investment through key organisations or major performing arts organisations.

Burundi

- 0.8% of 350.000 dollars allocated to cultural activities.

Canada

- In 2009-10, the overall investment in international activities in dedicated programs was \$4.8 million, representing approx. 3.3% of the overall grants support. Overall investment in dedicated (i.e., all program funds are for international activities) and non-dedicated programs (i.e., partial funds are for international activities) was \$11.9 million, representing 8.1% of the overall grants support. These levels were achieved with some changes in program priorities. These figures do not include the Art Bank, Public Lending Right Commission, special funds, Canadian Commission for UNESCO, and administration.
- Over the past four fiscal years, funding for work in an international context through dedicated programs has increased. Funding allocated through non-dedicated programs fluctuates, depending on the nature of applications. For 2009-10, the budgets for dedicated programs remained stable. For the next three years, it is projected that the funding will remain stable.
- The Audience and Market Development Office invests approximately \$250,000 per year in services such as touring workshops and delegations at trade fairs. These international activities were designed to be complementary to international programs at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and the Department of Canadian Heritage (PCH). However, the programs at DFAIT and PCH have been cancelled and the Canada Council for the Arts does not have the capacity nor mandate to fill the gap.
- *Note that data is subject to change.*

Denmark

- The Danish Arts Council: approximately 8.5% of fixed funds for the visual arts, performing arts, literature and music are allocated to international activities (23.8 mio Danish Kroner) and another app. 6 % are allocated to international cultural exchange (16.5 mio Danish Kroner). All together it makes app. 13.5 % of total budget allocated to international activities and strategies. There has been no decrease (maybe even a small increase since use of 'free funds' has been directed towards international activities)
- The Danish Arts Foundation: App 3.5 % of available funds are used for international activities. The priority of international activities is new to The Danish Arts Foundation.
- The Collaboration between Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry for Culture: 100 % of funds are allocated to international activities (app. 10 mio. Danish kroner) Amount is stable and is expected to rest the same in near future.

England

- Our Head Office has a small dedicated budget to manage our International work, including International subscriptions. This amounted to £213,000 in 09/10 and we now have £144,000 for 2010/11. This does not include international work supported

through our regularly funded organisations, and there is also other activity across our programs that might also have an International aspect. We do not hold data on the aspects of this activity that has been international, although we know that it would account for a larger proportion of the Arts Council budget than the Head Office budget line.

- The Arts Council has also spent the following lottery funds on International activity in the following years: 2008/09 £2,003,695; 2009/10 £2,817,935; 2010/11 1st quarter £76,662.
- The Arts Council is expecting funding reductions more generally as part of its next funding settlement for Government. This is part of the Government's wider program to reduce the deficit. This is likely to have an impact in all of the areas that we currently invest.

Germany

- Nearly the total budget is allocated to support international activities, which means around 35 million Euros.

Ireland

- In the region of 1% of the agency's overall budget is allocated to directly support international arts activity. The Arts Council's overall funding from Government has been subject to significant reductions in the last two years and consequently its own budgets have been reduced. Further decreases are expected.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

- In the current year the proportion of the ministry's budget allocated to international activities is 10.9%.

Creative New Zealand

- Funding for International engagement on an annual basis, including contestable funding, international initiatives, residencies, NZ's presence at Venice Biennale, NZ's presence at the Festival of Pacific Arts. (Please note this does not include if a recurrently funded organisation tours internationally.)
- The proportion of the agency's overall budget is allocated to support international arts activity is 5%
- There has been a slight increase in international expenditure over the last few years. The total budget of the Arts Council remains static, with any additional funding coming from special lotteries grants. We do not expect any increase over the next 3 years.

Scotland

- The level of investment in the current year amount to £3.2m, or 5.25% of our total income from Government and lottery sources. We would expect this to increase as a proportion of total expenditure in the coming years. However many of our regularly funded organisations are involved in working internationally and their spend would not show up in the above figures.

South Korea

- The proportion of it is around 7.1% in 2009.
- Comparing with previous year, ARKO is maintaining same level, but ARKO is expecting and trying to increase the proportion within 3 years.

Spain

- No response.

Sweden

Swedish Arts Council

- Approx. 50 million SEK are earmarked for international cooperation in our budget 2010. Since 2007, this is an increase of approx. 20 million, due to a new assignment to promote Swedish literature (since 2008) as well as increases in support for international/intercultural cooperation. This is, however, still a very small part of the Arts Council's budget of approx. 1.7 billion SEK.
- Within the next few years there might be a fluctuation either way. The Arts Council is working to increase the way general support for arts and culture is used, and to integrate international cooperation into the general support. We are also working to ensure that artists and cultural practitioners are involved in other aspects of Swedish foreign relations, such as development cooperation, export/trade or nation branding.

Swedish Arts Grants Committee

- The total budget for international exchange is 28 million SEK. The international programme for visual arts (IASPIS) has a budget of 21m SEK; the International Dance Programme has an annual budget of 4.4m SEK.

United States

- In Financial Year 2010, the allocation for international activities is approximately \$825,000. This represents 1% of the NEA's program budget appropriated in FY 2010 (excluding funds provided for State and Regional Partnerships).

Question 5: As a national arts funding agency, which of the following international cultural activities do you support? Please give examples of your grant programs or other programs of support for each activity. Please also indicate the level of funding associated with each of these categories as a proportion of the agency's international arts support budget.

Australia

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – This covers tours, exhibitions, author readings, pre tour activity, tour development, showcases, trade fairs, websites, 'brands', coproductions and incoming buyers. Example, Sounds Australia brand developed to represent the Australian music industry at key music markets, such as The Great Escape and SXSW. This support included a dedicated export music producer, Millie Millegate, showcasing support for bands, 2-year funding for music managers and support for incoming buyers to 3 music markets in Australia.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – This covers predominantly Australia artists travelling overseas for residencies, research and mentorship opportunities. There are relatively few reciprocal programs in place. Example, La Cite residency program that supports 2-3 Australia artists in music, literature and the visual arts each year.
- *Cultural diplomacy* - This is largely associated with partnerships with the Department of Foreign Affairs around country profiles. Example, China 2010 the Australia Council partnered with DFAT to support a dedicated role in Beijing to facilitate touring in the regions and support great publicity for the Australian artists in the region.
- *Aid and cultural development* - Very little support in this area and it generally relates to community partnerships. Example, Community based arts practitioner mentored an African community based arts practitioner which lead to an artistic collaboration.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - Predominantly around arts professionals .Example, support to place an Australian with the IETM for one year to develop skills and enhance partnerships/collaborations between Australia and this network of IETM producers. Delegations of Australian artists/producers attend their plenary sessions each year.

- Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries - Currently, 2 offices in Europe. One is tied to the performing arts and linked with IETM. The other office is linked to the Berlin Embassy with oversight in the area of literature and visual arts.

Burundi

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response
- *Artistic development e.g. exchanges, residencies* – No response
- *Cultural diplomacy* - support in terms of transit fees to artists who were invited in international events to represent and speak our pays.
- *Aid and cultural development* - No response
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - No response
- Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries - No response

Canada

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* - The Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) administers \$2M in grants—a travel grants program and an annual/multi-year funding program for agents and managers in the performing arts—to directly support international activity. AMDO also administers \$250k in services to directly support education and activity on the international scene, networking and promoting Canadian art to the international community.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* - Examples: Visiting foreign Artists Program, a residency type program for multi-disciplinary artists, amounted to \$128,906 in 2009-10. Aboriginal Peoples Collaborative Exchange amounted to \$234,800 in 2009-10. International Residencies Program in Visual Arts provided \$272,000 in grants in 2009-10, plus \$270,000 in services (e.g., rental of studio space)
- *Cultural diplomacy* - The CCA does not have a mandate for cultural diplomacy, but will partner with Canadian embassies (who have a cultural diplomacy mandate) on mutually beneficial projects that support international activity by Canadian artists.
- *Aid and cultural development* – Not applicable.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - The Audience and Market Development Office (AMDO) administers \$2M in grants—a travel grants program and an annual/multi-year funding program for agents and managers in the performing arts—to directly support international activity which includes networking. AMDO also administers \$250,000 in services to directly support education and activity on the international scene, and networking and promoting Canadian art to the international community.
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* - No.

Denmark

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* - The Danish Arts Council operates showcases in Literature, Visual Arts, Performing Arts and Music. Example: Committee for Literature showcases Danish Literature at international book fairs. Visual Arts Committee gives grants to galleries to showcase Danish visual artists at international biennales.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* - The Danish Arts Council have several programmes for residencies: DIVA (Danish International visiting artist programme – covering all artistic areas) as well as there are funds for international residencies. Visiting programmes for international curators etc. is an important tool too.
- *Cultural diplomacy* - The Collaboration between Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry for Culture support concrete projects for cultural diplomacy.

- *Aid and cultural development* - The Center for Culture and Development is part of the Ministry for Culture and funds are allocated by the Danish Arts Agency:
 - They present art and culture from the developing countries in co-operation with partners in Denmark and abroad
 - They provide information and advice about cultural exchange and co-operation
 - They allocate funds for Danish cultural co-operation with developing countries
 - They co-ordinate and implement festivals in Denmark for the developing world's cultures
 - They facilitate capacity building within the cultural sector in the developing countries as well as present Danish art and culture
 - The center provides the framework for large initiatives such as the Images festivals and information projects.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - The Danish Arts Council provides funds for visiting programmes, travel-grants, accommodation-grants, transport of work.
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* - The Danish Cultural institute (Funded by the Ministry for Culture) has representations in 10 different countries.

England

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – We have in the past invested in artistic development, exchanges and residencies, as do our Regularly Funded Organisations directly. The Arts Council itself does not have a rolling annual program of activity and has invested previously on a project by project basis. Our most recent investment in this area was the Brazil Artists Links program which we invested in partnership with the British Council. The Arts Council invested £450,000 in this program.
- *Cultural diplomacy* - This is dealt with under the British Council's remit.
- *Aid and cultural development* – No response.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - We have invested in this area, as do a number of our Regularly Funded Organisations
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* - We do not have any overseas offices, but do send Arts Council representatives on an ad hoc basis to various International and European conferences. A majority share of our £144,000 central office budget is spent on International subscriptions.

Germany

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – “Fonds Wanderlust” – funding partnerships between municipal and state theatres and foreign theatres.
- *Cultural diplomacy* – No response.
- *Aid and cultural development* – The Foundation's General Project fund supports a variety of projects irrespective of their particular topic or artistic field. The funding competence must clearly lie at the federal level. According to the Foundation's charter, federal funding can only be applied to larger projects with an international scope.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - The Foundation continued the series of bilateral cultural programs with neighbouring countries in Central and Eastern Europe with its program "Zipp – German-Czech Cultural Projects" (2007-2009). These bilateral projects include all artistic areas – theatre, dance, music, film, media art, etc. – and examine the important issues in Europe today, such as the memory of totalitarianism and issues of immigration.

- “Über Lebenskunst” intends to transform the city of Berlin into a showcase for projects which combine culture and sustainability and dare to apply new approaches for solving global problems.
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – No response.

Ireland

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – Yes see below.
- *Cultural diplomacy* – No response.
- *Aid and cultural development* - No response
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* – Yes see below.
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* - No response

As outlined in Q1 above, the Arts Council's role is in the area of the professional development of artists as they develop their practice abroad. The majority of the Arts Council's funding for international arts is allocated to this area of activity. As outlined in Q1 above, the Arts Council's role is in the area of the professional development of artists as they develop their practice abroad. The majority of the Arts Council's funding for international arts is allocated to this area of activity.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – None
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – None
- *Cultural diplomacy* - The ministry is solely engaged in cultural diplomacy activity.
- *Aid and cultural development* - None
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - None
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – The ministry has no representatives posted overseas. Its offshore interests are represented to some extent by those government agencies which are members of the CDIP steering group. These agencies all for offshore representation.

Creative New Zealand

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* –
 - Attend arts markets and fairs such as APAM, WOMAX, WAA, Melbourne Arts Fair, Frankfurt Book Fair, Talente, Venice Biennale (38%)
 - Te Manu Ka Tau, our incoming visitor programme across all art forms, including *Aussies to View* (8%)
 - International Touring Grants and Contestable project funding (39%)
 - Sourcing International Representation (< 1%)
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* –
 - International Residencies – visual art, literature, indigenous,
 - International Internships – theatre, dance (1%)
 - International Indigenous Exchange Programmes (4%)
 - International artists to work with NZ Companies (1%)
 - Art form and area of the world exchanges to learn more. E.g. ConversAsians and Curators to Asia programme (2%)
 - We also run capability programmes for producers/managers/gallerists/publishers including on contract negotiation, logistics, visas and taxes, IP, Marketing, etc (4%)
 - We create web based resources for the industry on visas and taxes (1%)
 - Assist with development of marketing materials (1%)
- *Cultural diplomacy* - No.

- *Aid and cultural development* – No.
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - Yes. All of the above offer support for both informal and planned networking/relationship development opportunities such as ConverAsians for artists/arts organisations and managers. Plus attending meetings of associations such IFACCA, AAPAF, meetings and with other arts councils (eg Australia Council).
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – No.

Scotland

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – Yes- Showcases for music at international showcases in U.S. and other parts of Europe. Also support for the creation of work and its showcasing at the Edinburgh Festivals (85%)
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – Fellowships; residency in NYC and Banff. Translation (12%)
- *Cultural diplomacy* – No response.
- *Aid and cultural development* – No response
- *International networking of artists or arts* – IETM plenary in Glasgow 2010, various networking opportunities (3%)
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – No response.

South Korea

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – Grant for individual international activities of artists and arts companies; Grant for artists who will participate in the residencies overseas.
- *Cultural diplomacy* - Collaboration project with Foreign Affairs Ministry, such as initiating the cultural event for Global Warming International Conference in Copenhagen.
- *Aid and cultural development* - No response
- *International networking of artists or arts professionals* - Co-project with other national arts agencies such as Singapore Arts Council, Arts Council of Mongolia and so on.
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* - No response

Spain

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – Yes, through support to facilitate cultural industries.
- *Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies* – Yes – grants are available for cultural management training in artistic activities (such as the College of Spain in Rome) and for training in the world for specific projects.
- *Cultural diplomacy* – Yes through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- *Aid and cultural development* – Yes through the AECID Agency under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- *International networking of artists or arts* – N/A
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – Cultural Centros Abroad Spain (under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and the Instituto Cervantes, dedicated to the dissemination of Spanish culture and language.

Sweden

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – support for literary translations, book fairs, support for Export Music Sweden.

- *Artistic development e.g., exchanges, residencies* – Swedish Arts Council offers support for international projects (such as co-productions, tours, exchanges). The Swedish Arts Grants Committee manages 12 studios in Sweden and 7 abroad for visual artists as part of the IASPIS programme. Grants are provided to individual artists (visual arts, design, dance) for international exchange, residencies, collaboration etc.
- *Cultural diplomacy* – N/A
- *Aid and cultural development* – Program for cooperation between Sweden and South Africa, supported from the development budget.
- *International networking of artists or arts* – Support for Swedish representation in international committees (such as ICOM, IAA, ASSITEJ, PEN etc)
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – N/A.

United States

- *Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product* – No response.
- *Artistic development e.g. exchanges, residencies* – international performing arts festival presentations, residencies in Japan, ArtsLink residencies (hosting artists/managers from Central Europe, Russia, Eurasia), cultural leaders program for Russian artists and arts managers.
- *Cultural diplomacy* – literature program of translation and publication, in partnership with government agencies/embassies abroad.
- *Aid and cultural development* – No response.
- *International networking of artists or arts* – No response
- *Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries* – No response.

International advocacy and promotion

Question 6: As a national arts funding agency, do you have a role in raising the profile for the arts in the way your government promotes your country internationally and, if so, how do you achieve this?

Australia

Not directly. This is determined by DFAT in relations to government's priorities in areas of security, water, technology, etc. Our primary goal is not tied to promoting the broader country overseas – it is a by product. Our primary goal is tied to 1) sustainability – fees generated overseas have a significant impact on a company's ability to keep artists employed and continue creating work and 2) artistic practice – access to the international arts sector has an impact on the continual growth and development of the practices within Australia.

Burundi

The Burundian Drum is our ambassador to the world.

Canada

As an arm's-length arts funding agency, CCA does not have a mandate to raise the profile of the arts internationally under the direction of the Canadian government. However, CCA partners with other government departments, such as the Department of Canadian Heritage (responsible for arts policy, programs and international relations) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and its embassies (responsible for cultural diplomacy), on mutually beneficially projects. CCA also participates on inter-governmental committees.

Denmark

The Danish Arts Agency and The Ministry for Culture are active partners in the intergovernmental secretariat for Branding Denmark and partakes in several of the initiatives

under the secretariat, eg. An initiative for promoting Denmark towards the international press, where The Danish Arts Agency has the responsibility for promoting Danish Arts. We do this by inviting journalists to Denmark on visiting programmes as well as creating work tools for art institutions to communicate effectively with international press.

England

This mainly falls into the British Council's remit. We work closely with the British Council and other leading arts organisations through a Cultural Diplomacy Group which determines policy for British Council expenditure on showcasing work internationally. We work with UKTI on the UKTI marketing board to ensure that arts are included in government strategies that support our creative industries abroad and there is specific work in the music and visual arts sectors developing markets for artists internationally. We are currently responding to the EU paper on Creative Industries with a view to influencing possibilities for future provision for the arts through EU instruments supporting creative industries. Our Regularly Funded organisations work to promote the profile of the arts in very many ways but not through a dedicated program. In 2012 we will support the cultural program for the Olympics which will showcase both British and international art.

Germany

The Foundation supports art and culture within the scope of federal competence. One of its main objectives is to promote innovative programs and projects in an international context.

Ireland

As outlined in Q1 above, this is the role of Culture Ireland.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

CDIP is concerned with economic outcomes for New Zealand. CDIP proposals are judged therefore not only on their artistic or cultural merit, but also on the potential leveraging possibilities for New Zealand business, tourism and foreign affairs (among others). That a CDIP event should be artistically or culturally excellent is not enough to fulfil current CDIP criteria – it must also present leverage opportunities for other public or private entities to further New Zealand's broader interests.

Creative New Zealand

Yes in a limited way. We work with other agencies such as MFAT, Tourism NZ, NZ Trade & Enterprise, Ministry of Culture & Heritage, Asia NZ and provide and share information with them, do international functions with them, give advice when requested and in the case of Asia, NZ co-funded activities.

In general terms, internationally we promote high quality distinctive NZ art through our programs. At markets fairs or any occasion possible we brand ourselves as from NZ through Maori cultural practices. (The way we run functions for example always includes mihi and waiata (speech and song)).

Scotland

We are asked for advice re artists to include in cultural diplomacy events and, on occasion, we have managed artistic events in to support governmental initiatives in other countries. We have worked in partnership with the government to develop such programs for specific purposes.

South Korea

Yes, we support artists who will present his/her works internationally, such as at Venice Biennale and so on. We also support arts companies that will participate in the famous arts

festivals internationally. Some time, we do collaborate with other country's organization to conduct mutual artists exchange programs, too.

Spain

No response.

Sweden

One of the aims of the Arts Council's international strategy is to promote the role of arts and culture in all Sweden's international relations. We are working to increase the role of arts & culture within the development cooperation, trade/export and nation branding, through cooperation with government agencies in charge of these issues.

United States

The NEA's role in raising the profile for the arts is related to the Federal Leadership activities of the International Activities office. The agency looks for opportunities that can advance the profile of the U.S. and its artists internationally. For example, in 2010 the NEA helped direct the spotlight on the United States by supporting the Executive Director of Documentary Arts, to offer six discussions related to his photo exhibition, *Recognizing Our Cultural Heritage: An American and Flemish Dialogue*. The exhibition was presented at UNESCO headquarters in Paris and featured 24 life-sized portraits of NEA National Heritage Fellows and 16 similar portraits of tradition bearers from Flanders. Support also covered two performances by NEA Heritage Fellow Michael Doucet, a Cajun fiddler and bandleader.

Question 7: When selecting arts activities to support, does your agency prioritise particular countries or regions? If so, in which countries and regions will you focus your support for international arts activity over the next three to five years? How do you select these countries? Is the selection of countries and regions negotiated in collaboration with other government departments – federal or state/local?

Australia

For the period to 2011, we will focus on the following priorities in the area of market development –

- i) **Asia** with a priority on South Korea and China (including Macau, Hong Kong and Taiwan).
- ii) **South America** with a priority on Mexico and Brazil.
- iii) **European Union** with a priority on the Spain, Italy, Denmark, Finland and Sweden.
- iv) Consolidation of **North American** market through key networks and circuits of presenters in Canada and the US.

These countries were selected based on –

- Existing relationships (particularly true of EU and US)
- Sustainable relationships tied to a country's
 - infrastructure, professional networks, venues and circuits
 - fee structures and currency value
 - links with their artistic aesthetic and interests (particularly contemporary work)
 - new market importance (particularly for rising economies such as Brazil)

These countries were not negotiated with government departments or through formal MOUs. Where appropriate partnerships were sought with international arts agencies, such as the IETM in EU or festivals, such as Cervantes for South America.

Burundi

Does not provide funding for cultural activities organised in these countries. As a non-aligned country accept invitations no matter where they come from.

Canada

As a member of the inter-departmental committee on International Strategic Framework, the CCA is aware of the Government's priority countries—China, India, Colombia, France. However, the Government's focus on these countries does not influence CCA in a direct way since most grants are awarded to artists by peer juries. Additionally, geo-political criteria are not part of the assessment process.

When supporting audience and market development activities, there is analysis on markets but in the context of the current needs of and opportunities for artists. For example, priority funding may be given to a Canadian festival that plans to invite presenters/buyers from countries that are priority markets (a good match) for the type of artists showcasing at the festival. Some consideration has been given to developing a strategy on new and emerging markets, but work in this area has not yet been realized.

Denmark

No.

England

The Arts Council is at arm's length from Government and as such its activity is not politically motivated. The British Council who hold a cultural diplomacy remit and may concentrate efforts in particular countries and regions connected to wider UK foreign policy. The Arts Council has prioritised endeavours with particular countries and regions based more on artistic criteria to date.

Germany

The Federal Cultural Foundation established the program area Central and Eastern Europe to encourage European artists to work together and establish permanent structures of cultural cooperation in Europe.

Ireland

No, the Arts Council does not prioritise particular countries or regions.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

CDIP is regarded as a useful tool to maintain and develop a network of strong relationships to achieve the Government's diplomatic and economic priorities in the above priority region. To obtain the greatest value from the program a strategic, planned and collaborative approach is taken to increase the pool of resources available to promote New Zealand's interests. The current focus is the Asia-Pacific region while also including some targeting initiatives in the United States. The above decision is taken in collaboration with the other CDIP partner agencies.

Creative New Zealand

Yes, we currently have three targeted areas for strategic initiatives. (Note, however, artists can always apply for activity in area of the world through contestable funding and even through our targeted programs we work with those artists whose work achieves success in other markets.)

December 2008 to June 2012

1. Australia and the Pacific
2. Asia –especially Singapore/Korea/HK (and adding Taiwan)

3. West Coast North America

The selection was made for NZ art and artists/organisations considering:

- what is most cost effective/distance
- where the work will have the most impact for NZ artists and arts organisations now and in the future where the majority of NZ art fits (we always look favourably on artists whose work achieves success)
- the reception we are given
- historical ties /language/similar colonial histories,

We did not negotiate or agree these with other agencies but noted where they could support our artists.

From 2012, we are looking at broadening our market base to include the UK and Germany.

Scotland

No - we prioritise according to the artistic priorities or the drivers for the creative industries market- place.

South Korea

ARKO is very open. We welcome any country that wish to work with us, but basically we work on the principle of mutual contribution and benefit.

Spain

- European Union (France, Portugal, United Kingdom, Germany and Italy)
- Latin America (Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile and Colombia)
- North America (U.S. and Canada)
- North Africa (Morocco and Egypt)
- Pacific (China, Japan and Korea)

Have so far been determined by the volume of export of cultural goods, and also areas that are considered potential markets with which it is intended to improve the contacts.

In the new plan, we hope, has a list of priority areas.

Sweden

Arts Council states: support for artists' mobility is demand driven, with no special priorities in regards to countries.

The Swedish Arts Grants Committee has studios for residencies by visual artists in Berlin, Cairo, London, New York, Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo and Tokyo.

United States

Funding partnerships are key to the work of the International Activities office as they leverage funds for this under-resourced area of activity. The selection of countries or regions can be affected by the confluence of interests of NEA and potential partners.

Evaluating International arts activities

Question 8: How do you measure the effectiveness of your agency's support for international arts activities? What criteria have you developed to undertake this assessment? If possible, please provide examples of recent evaluation reports.

Australia

Generally, assessment is undertaken project by project. It is linked to 1) fees/income generated, 2) future commissions/co-productions 3) repeat relationships 4) media reviews. *Attached is a report prepared following the Australia Council's investment and management of the Venice Biennale.*

Burundi

We have no way to measure the effectiveness except images and the reports of heads of mission.

Canada

CCA's international arts activities were created to be complimentary to programs in government departments. This strategy was based on the CCA's emphasis on partnerships as a way to be more effective in its program delivery and support to artists. However, in recent years there have been significant cuts to the government programs that the CCA had aimed to partner with. As a result, there are less partners and less support to leverage. All grant recipients submit final reports—a tool used to measure effectiveness of international activities. From final reports the following numbers are reported in the CCA Annual Report Corporate Scorecard for 2008-09: countries visited by artists (74); grants given to artists (722) and arts organizations (566) for work in an international context; support to visiting foreign artists including number of recipients (68) and number of countries represented (21).

Denmark

External evaluations are provided on all bigger projects/activities according to success-criteria set up in project plan. See example from DaNY Arts project, a collaborative arts and network project for the arts in NYC and in Denmark.

www.kunst.dk/danyartsnetvaerkknowhowogsynlighed/ (in Danish only)

England

The Arts Council has not systematically evaluated the impact of its international work collectively. However, where individual projects have been undertaken, they have been evaluated. The most recent example is the Brazil Artists Links program (soon to be published). We have learned a number of lessons from this project including some improvements that can be made to the way that the evaluation was carried out that may assist us in future similar programs.

Germany

The foundation uses in-house reports and documentations to evaluate its international activities. Sometimes monitoring issues are used to evaluate grant programs.

Ireland

Artists report on their activities and the Arts Council's funding programs are evaluated annually.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

After each CDIP activity the post (that is, NZ Embassy or High Commission) as required to complete and evaluation of the project. There are seven parts to the Evaluation and includes the following:

1. Quality of activities and process: satisfaction of attendees with the quality of performances and cultural activities; timeliness; were the performances excellent, distinctive and suited to promoting the broader interest of New Zealand?
2. Audience: how many each event and activity
3. Quality of targeting of and attendance of key contacts: who was invited? Of those invited, who attended?
4. Extent and quality of media profile of the performers
5. Meeting of CDIP criteria: how did the project contribute to the meeting of the following objectives – diplomatic; tourism; trade and cultural
6. Lessons learnt – what worked and what did not
7. Budget report

Creative New Zealand

We have not systematically evaluated the impact of our international work. However, we are currently developing assessment criteria for all our targeted international programmes to find ways to assess the impact of our work.

Each artist is asked in their acquittals to comment how the programme/project met their objectives as outlined in their grant proposals and our objectives (some of which are as outlined in question one), depending on the particular project.

The International team started in 2008 and developed the strategy. At the end of 2011 we will be looking at all our programmes to gauge their impact on:

- Development in artists' work
- The capability of the sector, artists and management, to engage internationally
- The economic return to artists/sector (more tours, more sales, international agent etc).

Scotland

Feedback from agents and artists. Currently working on an audit of what happens and what the outcomes are.

South Korea

We measure the effectiveness by counting the level of activities, such as the number of collaborate and networking activities, the number of artists and arts organizations that conducted successfully their plans.

Spain

No response.

Sweden

There has been no systematic evaluation made of the effectiveness of our support for international arts activities. But, for example, in the annual report for 2009, there is a chapter reasoning about the Arts Council's current work integrating an international perspective in all the Council's funding.

The amount of applied funding is increasing every year. This depends partly on the aim from the Arts Council to develop the international support from strictly travel grants, to a more dynamic project support, and to give priority to long term cooperation in different forms.

United States

Each program of the Funding Partnerships has final report requirements to assess aspects of the particular program. None of the partnership programs has been formally evaluated in recent years.

International touring

Question 9: Are there specific issues that affect international touring for your country's artists? If so, what are these issues?

Australia

There are a few issues affecting international touring for Australia at the moment –

1. The GFC in the US and EU have a severe impact on those companies which have a business model tied to international activity.
2. Visas and taxation – most arts organisations do not have the knowledge or skill to navigate complicated structures in the US and France. Increasing security issues to access visas are adding substantial costs and delays.
3. Green issue – while not a top priority for most in Australia, any emissions tax scheme applied either in Australia or overseas will impact severely the current business model for international touring.
4. Lack of translation support – this is not an area of priority for grants programs in Australia which limits market potential, particularly within Asia and South America.
5. Skills and Succession – the skills of arts professionals varies from arts organisation to arts organisations. There isn't any training or support mechanism to develop international market development or tour management. Most learn by mistake. The generation that developed international relations for Australia are retiring with no clear succession plan in place. Most of the young talent heads overseas to the UK for work as a result of low salaries and remuneration packages in Australia.
6. Reciprocity – Australia is not well known for extensive reciprocal relationships. It is perceived as protectionist within its own borders and heavily export oriented in all partnership brokering schemes. As most communities move into coproduction models or look for reciprocal agreements, funding models and attitudes toward reciprocity will need to be tackled.
7. Issue of cultural diplomacy versus artistic practice versus market development – new funds have not been allocated to international activity over the last 3 years. It is not a current government priority. With stagnant funding levels and a lack of priority for public funds, new models are under discussion (e.g. expat fund in major centres, such as New York), priorities for funding are under discussion (is there more value in developing the artistic practice or supporting arts organisations to generate income?) and the value of a cultural diplomacy agenda is heavily disputed (how does multi-million dollar investment in China over a year impact artists in Australia? Their longer-term career?)

Burundi

The major problem is funding. Several artists are invited but we have no money to fund.

Canada

1. Recent cuts to Government funding programs that directly supported international touring and cultural industries. Our inability to meet the demand of foreign presenters threatens to create some reluctance on the part of international community to 'buy

Canadian' for fear that the basic travel subsidy often required to support an international invitation is denied due to lack of funds.

2. There is high competition for funds in the international touring programs of the CCA, and even more so now that the Government has ceased its funding programs.
3. Many companies need market preparedness training and education on how to successfully tour internationally. The CCA conducts international touring workshops.

Denmark

The Danish Arts Council plans to make a survey on already existing qualifying initiatives that helps Danish artists to work internationally. According to the results of the survey the arts council will provide qualifying initiatives for the artists.

England

- The costs of producing work that is suitable for an international market – very difficult without significant international co-commissioning funds, which only come when you have a track record of presenting work internationally
- Finding international promoters, co-commissioners, co-producers – getting your work seen at the right international showcases. International promoters don't tend to travel to the UK as often as they travel to other places – other European promoters are always crossing borders between France, Italy, Germany, etc, but won't 'cross the channel'. We are still a bit isolated
- Making international tours work, both from a financial and ecological perspective – international festivals etc will often have clauses that mitigate against any other presentation of work in any other venue across their region, or even country. Timelines can mean that work needs to remain within the repertoire for a long period in order to have a really sustained international life – theatre in the UK in particular doesn't do this; we tend to create a work then tour it, with little extended life. International touring works best with extensive back catalogues
- Visa regulations and tax issues, particularly for UK companies that may have a multi-national cast. Small producing companies may have to deal with loads of different countries' laws in order to tour their work

Germany

Wanderlust is an application-based fund that finances theatre partnership and exchange for two to three seasons. In the first year, the theatres could exchange artistic personnel. In the second year they might choose to host a guest production from their partner theatre. And in the third year, the theatres could organise a co-production to be performed at both locations.

Ireland

As outlined in Q1 above, this area of activity falls within the remit of Culture Ireland.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

None.

Creative New Zealand

- Distance, environmental issues, cost vs. income.
- International expectations/perception of NZ Arts – exotica or want work to be like theirs, or even perhaps seen as being the same as Australian art.
- Market Fit – what works at home doesn't always work overseas.
- Unrealistic expectations of NZ artists (lack of knowledge and benchmarking).
- Global economic and political situation.

Scotland

- Cost of touring is the number one factor and the ability of the local promoter to pay.
- Secondly the ability to coordinate the showcasing of work with the timing of the demand from promoters for the work to tour. Artists lack the finance to re-mount the work for this purpose.
- Thirdly there can be significant difficulties obtaining visas for non EU citizens to travel to the US as part of an artistic company.

South Korea

We consider that the exchange condition and project quality of invited and inviting projects.

Spain

No response.

Sweden

No response.

United States

The U.S. government does not provide direct subsidy specifically for artists touring internationally as some countries do. Issues related to international touring are different, depending on the artistic discipline. In the field of dance, Dance USA recently completed a study, supported by the private sector, of U.S. international touring for dance companies. It is available online at: www.danceusa.org/internationalstrategy

Question 10: IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, Artists' International Mobility Programs, December 2004, contained a list of good practices that should apply to artists' mobility (touring) programs. Do you think the following list is relevant today? Do you have anything to add or change in this list of principles?

Australia

The role of 'presenter/curator/programmer' needs to be reflected in any successful mobility program. Artists cannot work offshore without a champion who often risks their own money to support that artist within their community. Their role should be part of the selection process. The notion of 'audience' needs to be central to the discussion if the result of this investment in mobility is to be sustainable.

Burundi

I think it is timely.

Canada

Agree with the above list of practices as they are implicit in our current programs and working principles.

To be added:

- promoting programs that support individual artist performance as an alternative to the more expensive process of touring full companies e.g., movement of choreographers and directors

Denmark

The Danish Arts Council has formulated a set of principles for supporting international work. Some of them are very equal to the mobility programme good practices outlined:

- 1) Artistic quality, originality and relevance
- 2) Cooperation and reciprocity
- 3) Long-term planning, flexibility and pro-activity

- 4) Exchange of knowledge on international activities, educational support and public debate on art to include international aspects
- 5) Documentation and evaluation

England

Would agree with the above, but we would add the following:

- Engagement with audiences is important at some point. Even if the primary motive is R&D our evaluation shows that artists wanted some idea of follow up of how the work they created might be distributed/connect with audiences
- Climate change is a factor that should be considered
- Digital connection/exchange/mobility and reach should come into play.

Germany

The list above seems to be relevant for artists' mobility, but it is important not to forget practice: The Foundation tries to connect theory and practice, therefore the foundation consults experts of practice. This method is especially used while developing new programs.

Ireland

Yes, the list is appropriate to artists' mobility programs such as the Arts Council's Travel and Training Award.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage

We are supportive of the above

Creative New Zealand

We agree with all of the above. However:

- CNZ as a development funding agency also believes that it is our job to assist in the development of artists, their work and their infrastructure. That we are part of a process where choices need to be made by both artists and ourselves, as to what are the priorities.
- The definition of Open/Responsive/Flexible above, we think, does not allow for a developmental approach but rather is an on-demand funding approach, which is not always applicable, possible or responsible. As an arts council we can offer much more of value as well as funding

Scotland

No response.

South Korea

Community development contribution: Cultural contribution for the region, local that host artists and conduct the programs, such as mutual understanding of culture and arts of each nation.

Spain

No response.

Sweden

No response.

United States

These seem relevant still. Adding the benefit to the host institution/artist could be a consideration, or would that impinge on the 'unselfish motivation' of the program? "Learning experience" incorporates a bit of the notion of mutual benefit.

Information resources

Question 11: Do you have any information resources relating to your international arts activity that would be useful models for other national arts funding agencies? If so, please provide references below, including weblinks where possible, or attach resources to your email response.

Australia

A report on international funding from states and territories in Australia is provided.

Burundi

Some links provided.

Canada

The CCA strategic plan, *Moving Forward 2008-2011*

www.canadacouncil.ca/NR/rdonlyres/06782D43-21B4-4B26-BD60-1B4D96A00921/0/MovingforwardStrategicPlan200811.pdf

1. *On the Road*: an on-line learning tool for presenters and touring artists in dance, music, theatre, young audience and spoken word.
www.canadacouncil.ca/CanadaCouncil/Templates/OnTheRoad.aspx?NRMODE=Published&NRNODEGUID=%7b63B50901-EF1A-48AD-ADB8-003CC3EBF1A5%7d&NRORIGINALURL=%2fdevelopment%2fontheroad%2fyw127729164835727962%2ehtm&NRCACHEHINT=NoModifyGuest&bhcp=1
2. CCA Annual Report Corporate Scorecard
www.canadacouncil.ca/aboutus/organization/annualreports/default.htm
3. A summary of funding for work in an international context, on the CCA website/
www.canadacouncil.ca/publications_e/statistics/re128843829604681503.htm
4. Guidelines for grants for international touring and travel, residencies, exchanges and studio programs: music, inter-arts, dance, theatre, media arts, aboriginal arts, visual arts, writing and publishing. See www.canadacouncil.ca/
5. Guidelines for travel grants from the Audience and Market Development that support the travel for foreign presenters invited to Canadian festivals
www.canadacouncil.ca/grants/outreach/lv127222180330468750.htm
6. Online summary of Canada Council funding for work in an international context
www.canadacouncil.ca/publications_e/statistics/re128843829604681503.htm

Denmark

Relevant material (documentation, evaluation and strategies) to be uploaded on website:
www.kunst.dk

England

An organisation called Visiting Arts signposts flow of artistic artists in to the UK and UK artists internationally and helps promote networking and exchange. They receive funding from the Arts Council as a Regularly Funded Organisation.

We have also been considering a proposal for an independent Trip Advisor site, which could have benefits for developing an information base for artists planning to work abroad. This idea is currently unfunded, however.

Germany

See question 10.

Ireland

No response.

New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage
Some references provided.

Creative New Zealand

Creative New Zealand is happy to discuss any of its programs or strategies with other arts councils or individuals who may be interested. Our website is www.creativenz.govt.nz

Scotland

The Made in Scotland Showcase at the Edinburgh Fringe promotes Scottish theatre.

www.scottishtheatres.com/madeinscotland/

This is part of the Scottish Government's wider Expo Fund that covers all of the Edinburgh Festivals. www.scottisharts.org.uk/1/funding/expofund.aspx

South Korea

I hope IFACCA could play that role in near future through regional chapter meeting, or mini-summit, or project forum. Member of IFACCA could share their interests with others and develop the new projects.

Spain

No response.

Sweden

Our web based resource for promotion of Swedish literature abroad is still in development, but will hopefully be a good resource for news, information and funding opportunities:

www.kulturradet.se/swedishliterature

Critical issues

Question 12: What are the critical issues for your organisation regarding international arts activity that you would like to know more about from other national arts funding agencies?

- What grant management system do they have in place to track activity, investment? (Australia)
- Do they produce an events calendar of offshore activity? (Australia)
- Are they investigating new business models outside of public funds to support international activities? (Australia)
- Do they invest in dedicated studios/residencies? How do they support residencies? Are they tied to public presentation? (Australia)
- How do they measure success in this area? Do they undertake longitudinal research? (Australia)
- What is their relationship to government? Arms length or heavily contingent? (Australia)
- Have they done any research on better models to support international activities (i.e. not supported through funding agencies) (Australia)
- How do we invite international NGOs to support cultural activities? (Burundi)
- Is there an NGO that supports the international mobility of artists? (Burundi)
- Ensuring artistic exchange in the context of decreasing resources. (Canada)
- Keeping borders open. (Canada)
- Tax issues and work permits (Canada)

- The role of arts agencies in trouble shooting these above mentioned issues, both in individual project situations and in influencing long term policy. (Canada)
- Indigenous artists programs and artist directories to facilitate connections with Canadian artists. (Canada)
- Developing philanthropy. (England)
- Innovative funding mechanisms, R&D collaboration, sharing research to advocate. (England)
- Any evaluation on the impact of artist development in an international context. (England)
- Models of collaboration with other government agencies – giving the arts a profile in other sectors. (England)
- It would be a good idea to harmonise funding in different countries and to get an overview about the different methods of funding and supporting cultural activities. It is often difficult for arts professionals to establish cooperation between different countries when there are administrative problems and/or differences in the budget of arts funding agencies. (Germany)
- Strategies and programs of other arts councils. (Creative New Zealand)
- How they engage with other government agencies, particularly in regard to the value of cultural diplomacy or cultural tourism. (Creative New Zealand)
- How they measure success, especially the qualitative impact of their programs. (Creative New Zealand)
- How they demonstrate the value of their work to government and government agencies who generally measure everything in economic terms without trying to do the same. (Creative New Zealand)
- Reciprocal arrangements between member organisation re international exchange (Scotland)
- How members prioritise countries, if they do. (Scotland)
- How do members priorities artforms or areas of activity, if they do. (Scotland)
- What outcomes do members seek from international activity? (Scotland)
- How do members capture information on international activity and how is the activity evaluated? (Scotland)
- Are all arts organisations in the members' countries expected to engage on an international level or only a few specialists? (Scotland)
- Artists exchange program with member nations of IFACCA. (South Korea)
- Sharing information on residency programs and non-for-profit arts (South Korea)
- How do we argue for the value of arts and culture in foreign relations without losing track of arts own value? (Sweden)
- Information on funding models, innovative partnerships, program models that use social media and high profile successful projects/initiatives would be helpful. (United States)

IFACCA support

Question 13: Do you think there are any aspects of government support for international arts activities that IFACCA could help facilitate at a global level? If so, please describe how IFACCA may be able to assist.

- Research on economic benefits for arts organisations touring internationally. (Australia)
- Research/tools to manage visas and taxation issues across countries. (Australia)
- Propose a project of international donors to support the management of international transport for artists and enable organisers of major international events to invite more artists. (Burundi)

- Encourage NGOs to work in poor countries to identify the needs of artists and to advocate for them. (Burundi)
- Funding for Aboriginal international culture/artistic exchanges or cultural ambassadors, i.e. Polar Institute in London. (Canada)
- We are particularly interested in the potential of forming a European Chapter and the usefulness this could have in forming more effective collective lobbying at that level. (England)
- We also think that R&D is a key area where international work can really help us. (England)
- Digital and climate change are also areas of policy that are affecting all countries at a global level and collaboration on this is helpful. (England)
- How can we demonstrate the value of our work to our government and government agencies (Creative New Zealand)
- Visa Restrictions for artists (Scotland)
- IFACCA could be the best international network to share and initiate the co-working and collaborating of member countries, e.g. a mini-summit on international arts activities. (South Korea)

Future research

Question 14: Are there any comments or ideas you may have about this questionnaire or future research in this area?

- Information on trends in touring; fee structures, permits, visas, taxation, and how to ensure international exchange opportunities remain rich and diverse. (Canada)
- Information on Aboriginal programs of other arts councils and art administration curriculum. (Canada)
- IFACCA D'Art report is very helpful to introduce IFACCA's activities to Korea. (South Korea)
- A survey of member countries on the demand for research. (South Korea)
- Survey each nation's most influential festivals. (South Korea)

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF RESPONDENTS

It should be noted that not all of these respondents completed the survey – some provided supplementary information, references and amendments.

Country	Respondent
Australia	Sandra Bender Executive Director Arts Development Australia Council for the Arts
Burundi	Jean Gahungu Ministerial Advisor Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture
Canada	Stacey Atkinson Coordinator, Audience and Market Development Canada Council for the Arts
Denmark	Poul Bache CEO, The Danish Arts Agency
England	Antonia Byatt Director, Literature Arts Council England
Finland	Kirsi Väkiparta Senior Advisor Arts Council of Finland
Germany	Kirsten Hass Head of Funding/Program Department German Federal Cultural Foundation
Ireland	Fionnuala Sweeney Head of Film and International Arts The Arts Council
New Zealand	Brendan Quinlivan Senior Policy Advisor Ministry for Culture and Heritage Carla van Zon Manager International Creative New Zealand
Scotland	David Taylor Portfolio Manager Creative Scotland
South Korea	Jinsoo Hwang Research Fellow Arts Council Korea
Spain	Fernando Gomez Riesco General Deputy Director International Cultural Cooperation Ministry of Culture
Sweden	Ellen Wettmark Coordinator, International Affairs Swedish Arts Council Bitte Jarl The Swedish Arts Grants Committee ⁶⁸

⁶⁸ An additional submission was received from The Swedish Arts Grants Committee, in response to the discussion paper and to supplement information provided by the Swedish Arts Council. This was not in the form of a full questionnaire. The relevant points have been added under sections above.

United States	<p>Pennie Ojeda Director, International Activities National Endowment for the Arts</p> <p>Margaret Wyszomirski Director, Arts Policy & Administration Program and Professor, Department of Art Education Ohio State University</p>
---------------	--

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE

IFACCA D'ART RESEARCH QUESTION No. 40 **Supporting international arts activity – issues for national arts funding agencies** **18 June 2010**

CONTEXT

Artists have always sought opportunities to showcase their work internationally and to travel and experience different cultures in order to develop their work in new directions.

Globalisation and advances in technology have increased opportunities for artists to present their work in the international marketplace although current environmental pressures are having an impact.

National arts funding agencies play a role in supporting artists to work internationally. There is a perception by some, that in recent times the focus on cultural diplomacy may have shifted the priorities for some countries away from direct support for individual artists and market development towards supporting artistic activity to promote national identity and culture.

IFACCA has been interested for some time in exploring how national arts funding agencies manage their support for international arts activities in the current environment. We are circulating the following questionnaire to help us to understand the background and critical issues.

For the purposes of this research we have defined 'international arts activity' to cover the whole range of activity such as market development (export and sales of artworks, national promotions at expos and art fairs, touring, markets, festivals and biennales); artistic development (artist-to-artist networks, cultural exchange, residencies, networking); cultural diplomacy; and arts activity as part of foreign aid programs.

The aims of this background research are to:

- identify the critical issues for national arts funding agencies in terms of their engagement on the international stage; and
- gather information from national arts funding agencies about their priorities for international activities in other countries and how these priorities are determined and evaluated.

IFACCA has published some research reports related to this topic, the most recent being IFACCA D'Art Report No. 39, *Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programs, Practices*, December 2009 and IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, *Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004. Some other references are listed at the end of the questionnaire. While it is not our intention to repeat this work there may be some areas of overlap where we can reference and refresh the previous studies. The IFACCA website contains a list of our D'Art research topics. We welcome suggestions for additional resources at info@ifacca.org

ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

- We are distributing this questionnaire to all national arts funding agencies as part of an initial information gathering exercise to identify the critical issues of interest.
- A discussion paper will be prepared for a special forum to be held in September this year to coincide with the IFACCA Board meeting in Madrid, Spain, as well as for other IFACCA member meetings.
- Following these discussions the IFACCA secretariat will identify any further research requirements and publish a summary of the responses to this questionnaire.
- We have already collected some references as outlined in this document. We are very keen to know of any additional references that would add to the body of knowledge on this topic.

WHAT TO DO?

- Please answer the questions below and email your responses to IFACCA at l.cahill@ifacca.org or fax to +61 2 9215 9111.
- If there is insufficient space to answer any of the questions, please attach further information on a separate sheet.
- If you know of someone else in your agency who is better placed to respond, please forward this questionnaire to them.
- The deadline for responses is **9 July 2010**.
- A summary of responses will be sent to respondents prior to publication of the discussion paper.

MORE INFORMATION?

We hope that this area of research will be of interest to all national arts agencies working to create international opportunities for artists.

If you have any questions about this survey please contact Lisa Cahill, Research Project Manager, at l.cahill@ifacca.org.

IFACCA D'ART RESEARCH QUESTION No. 40
Supporting international arts activity – issues for national arts funding agencies
18 June 2010

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please email responses to l.cahill@ifacca.org or
FAX TO: Lisa Cahill, Research Project Manager, IFACCA
Fax No: +61 2 9215 9111

Country:

Organisation:

Website:

Contact details: Name: _____

Position: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Question 1:

Which government agencies in your country are involved in policy development and program administration for international arts activities? Please tick the agencies involved.

For each one please write the name of the agency and their website URL. Please provide a brief overview of each agency's responsibilities.

- National arts funding agency (arts council)
- Arts or culture ministry
- Foreign Affairs ministry (within country)
- Embassies or High Commissions (Foreign affairs ministry internationally)
- Joint committee of government agencies
- Separate body responsible for supporting international arts and culture activities

Question 2:

If your organisation supports international arts activities, what are your current objectives for that support over the next three to five years? Do you have an international strategy? If so, please attach a copy.

Question 3:

Are there staff in your organisation who have specific responsibility for managing support for international arts activities?

- Yes

No

If yes, how many or what proportion of the overall agency staff numbers work solely on international programs, and how many or what proportion of staff work on international programs as well as other having other responsibilities? Are the staff located in one unit or spread throughout the organisation?

Question 4:

In the current year, what proportion of the agency's overall budget is allocated to support international arts activity? How does this compare with the situation in the previous three to five years? In the next three to five years do you expect this amount will increase or decrease?

(NB: Unless otherwise agreed, this information will only be used in an aggregated form so individual responses will remain confidential.)

Question 5:

As a national arts funding agency, which of the following international cultural activities do you support? Please give examples of your grant programs or other programs of support for each activity. Please also indicate the level of funding associated with each of these categories as a proportion of the agency's international arts support budget.

- Market development driven by export, fees generated or sales of arts product
- Artistic development eg, exchanges, residencies
- Cultural diplomacy
- Aid and cultural development
- International networking of artists or arts professionals
- Representation (or agency office) in overseas countries

Question 6:

As a national arts funding agency, do you have a role in raising the profile for the arts in the way your government promotes your country internationally and, if so, how do you achieve this?

Question 7:

When selecting arts activities to support, does your agency prioritise particular countries or regions? If so, in which countries and regions will you focus your support for international arts activity over the next three to five years? How do you select these countries? Is the selection of countries and regions negotiated in collaboration with other government departments – federal or state/local?

(NB: Unless otherwise agreed, this information will only be used in an aggregated form so individual responses will remain confidential.)

Question 8:

How do you measure the effectiveness of your agency's support for international arts activities? What criteria have you developed to undertake this assessment? If possible, please provide examples of recent evaluation reports.

Question 9:

Are there specific issues that affect international touring for your country's artists? If so, what are these issues?

Question 10:

IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, *Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004, contained a list of good practices that should apply to artists' mobility (touring) programs. Do

you think the following list is relevant today? Do you have anything to add to or change in this list of principles?

A mobility (touring) program that has the primary objective of the artistic development of an artist and their work, and which aspires to be 'unselfish' in its motivation and execution, might embody all or some of the following qualities:

- **Transparent:** *an open, visible, widely advertised program with clearly established deadlines, application guidelines and selection procedures.*
- **Professional:** *a selection process that is respected by artists, hosts and the cultural sector. Published selection criteria and a professional jury that includes artists are both recommended.*
- **Process/Project oriented:** *this places the artist-directed creative process at the centre of the program.*
- **Open / Responsive / Flexible:** *the program offers the artist a degree of autonomy to propose where to go, when to go, who to meet and how to organize their visit. For programs with an open application policy, rather than an annual deadline, it is important to implement a quick guaranteed turnaround time for applicants.*
- **Learning experience:** *a program should provide this for all partners (artist, host, funding body) and seek to feed this learning back into the program development.*

Most of the good practices listed above should be applicable to all funding programs for international artists' mobility, whatever the overall objective.

Question 11:

Do you have any information resources relating to your international arts activity that would be useful models for other national arts funding agencies? If so, please provide references below, including weblinks where possible, or attach resources to your email response.

Question 12:

What are the critical issues for your organisation regarding international arts activity that you would like to know more about from other national arts funding agencies?

Question 13:

Do you think there are any aspects of government support for international arts activities that IFACCA could help facilitate at a global level? If so, please describe how IFACCA may be able to assist.

Question 14:

Are there any other comments or ideas you have about this questionnaire or future research in this area?

Thank you very much for completing this survey.

APPENDIX 4: SELECTED REFERENCES AND WEB LINKS

References

IFACCA Reports

IFACCA D'Art Report No. 17, *Artists' International Mobility Programs*, December 2004, www.ifacca.org

IFACCA D'Art Report No. 39, *Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture? Concepts, Policies, Programs, Practices*, December 2009, www.ifacca.org

The IFACCA website contains a list of our D'Art research topics. The topics are grouped into four themes: Artists, Arts Policies, Operational Policies and Statistics. Each topic has its own page where you can find the D'Art report (or the topic description) and resources 'tagged' by the IFACCA team. We welcome suggestions for additional resources at info@ifacca.org

Cultural Policy

Council of Europe/ERICarts, *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, 11th edition*, 2010 www.culturalpolicies.net/web/comparisons-tables.php?aid=27&cid=44&lid=en

Culture360.org, web portal of the Asia-Europe Foundation publishes articles on cultural policy in Asia, www.culture360.org/opportunity/call-for-articles-on-cultural-policy/

Dodd, D., Lyklema, M., Dittrich-van Weringh, K., *A Cultural Component as an Integral Part of the EU's Foreign Policy*, Amsterdam, 2006
www.labforculture.org/en/resources-for-research/contents/research-in-focus/a-cultural-component-as-an-integral-part-of-the-eu-s-foreign-policy

Ernst & Young, *Study of external cooperation of the European Union and its Member States in the culture and audiovisual sectors*, European Commission - DG Education and Culture, 2004

www.ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/library/studies/finalised/5770_barbier/58_02_sum_en.pdf

Full report (in French):

www.ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/info_centre/library/studies/index_en.htm#finalised

European Commission, *Work Plan for Culture 2011-2014*, 2010,

www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/117795.pdf

European Parliament, *Draft Report on the cultural dimensions of the EU's external actions*, 2010 (rapporteur: Marietje Schaake), www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+COMPARL+PE-450.904+04+DOC+PDF+V0//EN&language=EN

Staines, Judith, *Mapping Asia-Europe cultural cooperation*, July 2010, Culture360.org

www.culture360.org/asef-news/mapping-asia-europe-cultural-cooperation-report-launched/

Cultural Diplomacy

Ayers, M.C., *Promoting Public and Private Reinvestment in Cultural Exchange- Based Diplomacy*, New York: Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, April 16, 2010 (Available at www.rsclark.org)

Bound, K., Briggs, R., Holden, J., Jones, S., *Cultural Diplomacy*, Demos, 2007
www.demos.co.uk/files/Cultural%20diplomacy%20-%20web.pdf?1240939425

Brown, J., *Arts diplomacy: The Neglected Aspect of Cultural Diplomacy*, in Snow, N., and Taylor, P. (eds.), 2009, *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*.

John Brademas Center for the Study of Congress, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service New York University, *Moving forward: A Renewed Role for American Arts and Artists in the Global Age, A Report to the President and the Congress of the United States of America*, October 2009.

McClory, J., *The new persuaders: An international ranking of soft power*, Institute for Government, 2010, www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/20/the-new-persuaders
 This report, and the development of the Soft Power Index, was in partnership with Monocle magazine, where a different version can be found with information on 20 countries: *The New Soft Cell*, Monocle, vol. 4, issue 39, 2010, www.monocle.com/sections/affairs/Magazine-Articles/The-new-soft-sell---Global/

Schneider, Cynthia P., 2003, *Diplomacy that Works: 'Best Practices' in Cultural Diplomacy*, Center for Arts and Culture, Georgetown University http://ccges.apps01.yorku.ca/old-site/IMG/pdf/03_Schneider.pdf

Wyszomirski, M. J., with Ch. Burgess, C. Peila, *International Cultural Relations: A Multi-Country Comparison*, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 2003
www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/globalization.pdf

International cultural project management, advocacy & other reports

GPS, Global Positional Strategy for the Arts: Recommitting American to International Cultural Exchange, a Report to the Obama Administration from the U.S. Regional Arts Organizations, January 2009, (Available at www.artsmidwest.org/publications)

Inter-agency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training Annual Report 2008, Washington, DC: IAWG (available at www.iawg.gov)

Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter 2009) issue is devoted to "Repositioning Culture in U.S. International Relations" and contains eight articles.

Lawson, W.P. and Wyszomirski, M.J. (eds.), *Going Global: Negotiating the Maze of Cultural Interactions*, Columbus, OH: Proceedings of the 2000 Barnett Symposium on the Arts and Public Policy, (available at www.osu.edu/art_education/arts_policy_&_administration/outreach/conferences/2000_going_global)

Sikes, M., Campbell-Zopf, M., Goldstein, J. & Lawson, W. P., *The Appreciative Journey: A Guide to Developing International Cultural Exchanges*, Columbus, OH: Ohio Arts Council, 2008

Staines, J., Travers, S. & Chung, M.J., *International Co-production Manual*, IETM & Korea Arts Management Service, 2010, www.ietm.org

Wyszomirski, M.J. & Lawson, W.P. (eds.), *International Cultural Connections: The Times, They are A'Changing*, report on the 2010 Barnett Symposium on the Arts and Public Policy (publication due Spring 2011)

Mobility

ERICarts Institute, *Mobility Matters: Programs and Schemes to Support the Mobility of Artists and Cultural Professionals*, October 2008, www.ericarts.org

Polacek, R., Staines, J., *In Transit: a study on international law and the mobility of artists, artworks, cultural goods and service*, UNESCO, February 2009 (scheduled to be published online: portal.unesco.org/culture)

Staines, J. & Travers, S., with M J Chung, *International Co-Production Manual - the journey which is full of surprises*, IETM & Korea Arts Management Service, April 2011, www.ietm.org

Travers, S. & Sastradiprajda, L., *International Visas and Taxation: a guide for performing arts organisations in Australia and New Zealand*, Australia Council for the Arts & Creative New Zealand, 2010,
www.australiacouncil.gov.au/the_arts/arts_development/projects/performing_arts

Evaluation reports

Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut, *Netvaerk, Knowhow og synlighed* (Evaluation of DaNY Denmark-New York Arts Project – in Danish), 2008, Danish Arts Council,
www.kunst.dk/danyartsnetvaerkknowhowogsynlighed/

Momentum Associates and New Media Networks, *External Evaluation of Artist Links England-Brazil*, 2010, Arts Council England,
www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/external-evaluation-artist-links-england-brazil/

Evaluation of Strategy for Norway's culture and sports cooperation with countries in the South: the contract for this evaluation report covering activities 2006-2010 was awarded December 2010 to Nordic Consulting Group:
www.norad.no/en/Evaluation/Notification+of+award%3A+Evaluation+of+Strategy+for+Norway%E2%80%99s+culture+and+sports+cooperation+with+countries+in+the+South.208087.cms

National agencies and policies**Australia**

Australia Council for the Arts www.australiacouncil.gov.au

Belgium

Flemish Community www.vlaanderen.be/

French Community www.culture.be/

Wallonie-Bruxelles International www.wbi.be/

Bulgaria

Institute for Culture sic.mfa.government.bg/

Burundi

Ministry for Youth, Sports and Culture www.burundi.gov.bi

Canada

Canada Council for the Arts: funding for work in an international context
www.canadacouncil.ca/publications_e/statistics/re128843829604681503.htm

Canada Council for the Arts, *Moving Forward 2008-2011*, October 2007,

www.canadacouncil.ca/NR/rdonlyres/06782D43-21B4-4B26-BD60-1B4D96A00921/0/MovingforwardStrategicPlan200811.pdf

See also consultation on Strategic Plan 2011-2014: www.canadacouncil.ca/cgi-bin/MsmGo.exe?grab_id=0&page_id=6939&query=moving%20forward&hiword=FORWARD&ED%20MOVINGLY%20forward%20moving

China

Confucius Institute www.chinese.cn/cn/

Colombia

Instituto Caro y Cuervo www.caroycuervo.gov.co

Czech Republic

Czech Centres www.czechcentres.cz/scc/novinky.asp

Denmark

The Danish Arts Agency www.kunst.dk

The Danish Arts Council www.kunst.dk/english/culturalpolicy/council/

Danish Cultural Institute www.dankultur.dk

Danish Center for Culture and Development (DCCD) www.dccd.dk/

International strategies & policy documents (in Danish – due to be translated and published in English) www.kunst.dk/international/internationalestrategier/

England

Arts Council England www.artscouncil.org.uk

British Council www.britishcouncil.org/new/arts/

Visiting Arts www.visitingarts.org.uk/

Arts Council England, *Grants for the arts – international activity*, 2008

www.artscouncil.org.uk/information-sheet/international-activity-grants-for-the-arts/

Arts Council England, *International Policy*, June 2005

www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/international-policy/

Arts Council, *Internationalism: from policy to delivery*, June 2006

www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/internationalism-from-policy-to-delivery/

Arts Council England & British Council, *Agreement between Arts Council England and the British Council*, December 2009 www.artscouncil.org.uk/news/arts-council-england-and-british-council/

Estonia

Estonian Institute www.einst.ee/

Finland

Ministry of Education, *Strategy for Cultural Policy*, 2009

www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/Kulttuuripolitiikan_strategia_2020?lang=en

Finnish cultural and academic institutes www.institute.fi/en/index.php

France

Latitude France www.latitudefrance.org

Alliance Française www.fondation-alliancefr.org

Institut Français www.institutfrancais.com/

Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie www.francophonie.org

Germany

Kulturstiftung des Bundes – German Federal Cultural Foundation www.kulturstiftung-des-bundes.de/

Goethe-Institut www.goethe.de/

ifa – Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen – Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations www.ifa.de/

Deutsche Kultur International www.deutsche-kultur-international.de/en.html

Greece

Hellenic Foundation for Culture www.hfc.gr/

Ireland

Culture Ireland www.cultureireland.gov.ie/

Arts Council, *International Arts Summary Policy Paper*

www.artscouncil.ie/Publications/InternationalArts_250705.pdf

Arts Council, *Touring Policy 2010 to 2015*

www.artscouncil.ie/en/areas-of-work/feed/international_arts_publications.aspx

Japan

Japan Foundation www.jpf.go.jp/e/index.html

Agency for Cultural Affairs www.bunka.go.jp/english/index.html

Netherlands

Felix Meritis Foundation www.felix.meritis.nl

SICA www.sica.nl/en/content/en-international-cultural-policy

SICA, *Looking outward in uncertain times, 2009 Offshore Analysis*

www.sica.nl/sites/default/files/EN_SICA_Offshore_Buitengaats_2009_DEF.pdf

Netherlands Minister for European Affairs & Minister of Education, Culture and Science, *Art without Borders*, policy letter 2009-2012 (Letter on international cultural policy to the President of the House of Representatives)

www.minbuza.nl/dsresource?objectid=buzabeheer:59745&type=pdf

New Zealand

Creative New Zealand www.creativenz.govt.nz

Ministry for Culture & Heritage www.mch.govt.nz/

Creative New Zealand International Strategy February 2009 – June 2013

www.creativenz.govt.nz/international/what_the_international_strategy_means_for_you

Northern Ireland

Art form and Specialist Area Policy 2009-2012 International Arts

www.artscouncil-ni.org/artforms/international_arts.htm

Norway

Arts Council Norway www.kulturrad.no/toppmeny/english/

Ministry of Culture www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/kkd.html?id=545

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Strategy for Norway's culture and sports cooperation with countries in the South*, 2005,

www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/ud/rap/2005/0022/ddd/pdfv/265661-culture.pdf

Poland

Adam Mickiewicz Institute www.iam.pl/pl/site/

Portugal

Directorate-General for the Arts (DGArces) www.dgarc.es
Camões Institute www.instituto-camoes.pt

Romania

Romanian Cultural Institute www.icr.ro/bucharest/about-us/about-rci.html

Scotland

Creative Scotland www.creativescotland.com

Singapore

National Arts Council Singapore International Relations www.nac.gov.sg/int/int01.asp

South Korea

Arts Council of Korea www.arko.or.kr
Korea Foundation www.kf.or.kr/
Korean Cultural Centre, London london.korean-culture.org
Korea Arts Management Service (KAMS) www.gokams.or.kr

Spain

Ministry of Culture www.mcu.es
Spanish Agency of International Cooperation and Development (AECID) www.aecid.es
Instituto Cervantes www.cervantes.es/

Sweden

Swedish Arts Council www.kulturradet.se/en/In-English/International-activities/
Swedish Arts Council: Swedish literature www.kulturradet.se/en/swedishliterature
Swedish Institute www.si.se/English/
Swedish Arts Grants Committee www.konstnarsnamnden.se/

Switzerland

Pro Helvetia (Arts Council) www.prohelvetia.ch/OFFICES-ABROAD.36.0.html?&L=4

United States

National Endowment for the Arts - International Activities
www.nea.gov/partner/international/index.html
U.S. Department of State www.state.gov/
Dance USA, *An International Strategy for American Dance*, May 2010
www.danceusa.org/internationalstrategy

Wales

Arts Council of Wales www.artswales.org.uk
Wales Arts International (WAI) www.wai.org.uk/