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Overview of the seminar:

1. Cooperation in the arts and cultural sector
2. Cooperation and ecosystem thinking
3. Types of cooperation: PPPs - public-private partnerships
   - examples
4. Ecosystems and MSPs – Multi-Stakeholders Partnerships
   - examples
5. Conclusions
6. Group works and presentations
Group works

• **Group presentations**
  • Supervised group works during class
  • Presentation of the group works + discussion
Cooperation in the arts and cultural sector
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:
DEFINITIONS OF THE CULTURAL AND CREATIVE SECTOR

“Cultural and creative” sector reconciling several domains:

- “cultural sector” includes visual arts, performing arts and heritage, but also “cultural industries” (film and video, video-games broadcasting, music, book and press publishing) (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1979; Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005; Binkley, 2007)
- “creative sector”, is defined as using cultural input for the production of non-cultural goods and covers design, architecture, and advertising
- Related industries, which are dependent on the two above-mentioned, are also considered - “CCS drives many other sectors of the European economy, and in particular innovation and ICT sectors”
### Introduction: definition of culture and creative sector

**KEA - EUROPEAN AFFAIRS (2006): THE ECONOMY OF CULTURE IN EUROPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCLES</th>
<th>SECTORS</th>
<th>SUB-SECTORS</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE ARTS FIELD</td>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>Crafts, Paintings, Sculpture – Photography</td>
<td>Non-industrial activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>Theatre - Dance - Circus - Festivals.</td>
<td>Output are prototypes and &quot;potentially copyrighted works.&quot; (i.e. these works have a high density of creation that would be eligible to copyright but they are however not systematically copyrighted, as it is the case for most craft works, some performing arts productions and visual arts, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Museums, Libraries - Archaeological sites - Archives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film and Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television and radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Recorded music market – Live music performances – Revenues of collecting societies in the music sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books and press</td>
<td>Book publishing, Magazine and news publishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCLE 2: CREATIVE INDUSTRIES AND ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Fashion design, graphic design, interior design, product design</td>
<td>Activities are not necessarily industrial, and may be prototypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Although outputs are based on copyright, they may include other intellectual property inputs (trademark, for instance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of creativity (creative skills and creative people originating in the arts field and in the field of cultural industries) is essential to the performances of these non-cultural sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC manufacturers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile industry, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: the cultural sector
: the creative sector
"The cultural and creative sector is a growing sector, developing at a higher pace than the rest of the economy. The same applies to employment. Indeed this sector provides many different and often highly skilled possibilities, and again the sector’s growth in terms of jobs out-performs the rest of the economy" (KEA, 2006)
INTRODUCTION: DEFINITION OF CULTURE AND CREATIVE SECTOR


Table 1 - activities that make up the Creative Industry

| Patrimony                                      | Traditional Cultural Expressions: crafts, festivals, etc.  
|                                               | cultural sites: museums, libraries, archaeological sites |
| Arts                                          | Performing arts: live music, theater, dance, opera, circus, etc.  
|                                               | Visual arts: painting, sculpture, photography and antiques. |
| Media                                         | editing and printing: books, newspapers and other publications |
|                                               | audiovisual: cinema, radio, television and other broadcasting |
| Functional Creations                          | Design: interior design, graphic design, fashion, jewelry and toys |
|                                               | New media: software, video games and other digital content |
|                                               | creative services: architecture, advertising, recreational activities and research to create new products |

UNCTAD approach on creative economy

Creative economy is the creation cycle, production and distribution of goods and services that uses creativity and intellectual capital as primary inputs.

It constitutes a set of activities based on knowledge, focused but not limited to the arts, potentially generating trade revenue and intellectual property rights.

It includes tangible and intangible products or artistic services with creative content, economic value and market objectives;

It is at the crossroads among the sectors of craft industries, services and heavy industry.

It constitutes a new dynamic sector in world trade.
Growing importance of culture and cultural and creative industries

Approaches to "culture"

- Anglo-saxon/UK-American approach: focus on culture as creativity - cultural and creative industries, divide between For-profit – not-for-profit cultural organizations
- Southern-European: culture as focusing on the core art field, public and private cultural organizations (mainly public)

New emerging approaches

Pourous boundaries between the cultural and creative sectors, between public and private, profit and non-profit
- Hybridity and mixed governance and management models combining public, private, community
More than 6 million cultural and creative jobs in the EU: ‘cultural and creative employment’, 6.3 million people in the EU were working in a cultural sector or occupation in 2014, that is, 2.9 % of the total number of people in employment.

Cultural and creative jobs relate to activities such as: ‘creative, arts and entertainment activities’, ‘libraries, archives, museums and other cultural activities’, ‘programming and broadcasting activities’, ‘motion picture, video and television programme production, sound recording and music publishing activities’ and ‘specialised design activities’.
Main characteristic of the cultural and creative sector:

- working time (full-time versus part-time)
- multiple job-holding and, for employees, specific contractual status (temporary contracts)
- self-employment

Nearly half (49%) of all cultural and creative workforce in the EU were self-employed in 2014.

This percentage is much higher than that reported in total employment (15%).

Some key countries:

- United Kingdom and the Netherlands (both 65%)
- Germany and Italy: self-employment in cultural jobs reached 55%
In the EU, cultural market-oriented enterprises made up 6.4% of all enterprises in total business economy services in 2013.

In 2013: around 675,000 cultural market-oriented enterprises in the EU (corresponded to 6.4% of all enterprises in total services).

Cultural enterprises employed close to 2.2 million people (self-employed and employees).

The cultural sectors’ turnover (the total value of market sales of goods and services) was around EUR 300 billion, which represented 5.3% of the turnover of total services.

**Smaller average size of cultural enterprises (3 persons employed, as against 5 in services as a whole).**

France and Italy: only Member States with over 100,000 cultural enterprises, each accounting for 15% of the EU total number of cultural enterprises. Together with Germany (73,000 enterprises) and Spain (68,000), these four countries represented over half of the EU total.
Entrepreneurs in the cultural and creative sector are at unease with the label "entrepreneurs" (Klamer, 2011).

Primary mission of cultural entrepreneurs is to create cultural value for both producers and consumers of cultural goods and services (Aageson, 2008; Acheson et al., 1996; Klamer, 2011; Snyder, Binder M., Mitchell, & Breeden, 2010).

They perform activities to influence shifts in attitudes, beliefs and behaviors (Martin, & Witter, 2011), further cultural values and traditions (Snyder et al., 2010), and influence changes in perceptions of aesthetics and identity (Rentschler, 2007).
CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

Key characteristics of the cultural and creative industries:

Creation of value:
- shift of focus from economic value to cultural and ethical value – artistic value, public goods, public value/s

Push for growth but not essentially in economic terms - Prevalence of SMEs and Micro-enterprises (Greffe, 2010; EC, 2011)

“For cultural entrepreneurs economics is an instrument to realize cultural value” (Klamer, 2011)

Problem of financial sustainability – difference in the financing structure of cultural and creative sector (Greffe, 2010)
- Undercapitalized: prevalence of working capital
- Higher involvement of state funding
- Problem of access to bank financing: bias from both sides (Borin, Donato and Sinapi, 2017)
Cultural and Creative Sector

CCE are usually strongly linked with the cultural context.

Strong relation between cultural capital and creative industries flourishing.

"The Rise of the Creative Class" (Florida, 2002): creativity is closely related to the city where an individual lives.

The quality of the city which a person lives, really affects the creativity index of individuals.
CULTURAL AND CREATIVE SECTOR AND TERRITORY

Strong relation between cultural capital, territory and cultural and creative industries flourishing

Cultural and creative industries enhance the cultural capital of their territory and contribute to regeneration, growth and innovation.

Cultural and creative industries tend to be established in places with high degree of cultural capital and cultural heritage (both tangible and intangible).
High resilience of the start-ups in specific creative sub-sectors (measure in terms of survival after 1 and 5 years)

On average, across the EU, survival rates for enterprises in total services were about 80% after one year, 60% after three and 45% after five.

In comparison, enterprises in the films, TV and music did quite well, with survival rates of around 85% after 1 year, 65% after 3 years and 55% after 5 years.

In contrast, enterprises involved in the sector of libraries and museums were less likely to thrive, with an average of 70% surviving after one year, falling to 45% after three years and 35% after five.

The other cultural sectors are in tune with the average of total services, with a slight reservation as regards the long-term life expectancy of enterprises in ‘creative, arts and entertainment activities’ (around 40% survival after five years)
Economic and financial crisis, decrease of public funding to culture and creative industries in the majority of EU countries due to the impact of economic crisis started in 2008 (Bertacchini et al. 2011)

TWO MAIN APPROACHES TO THE DECREASE OF FUNDING

- KulturlInfarkt (Haselbach et al., 2012): only the strongest survives

- Cooperative approach (Bonet and Donato, 2011): co-creation, co-production, crowdsourcing, alternative financing
"Heart attack" for the cultural sector: dramatic decrease of public funding

- In times of crisis there is a natural selection among the cultural organizations
- Only the "best" organizations survive while the others are destined to close
Cooperative approach (Bonet and Donato, 2011)

The decrease of funding is threatening in particular small organizations, while the majority of funding goes to big organizations.

Small cultural and creative organizations are forced to close.

Threat to innovation, need to reverse this trend.

From micro approach to meso approach.

Cultural organizations both public and private, should react by implementing cooperative approaches at the meso level (territorial level).
CULTURAL AND CREATIVE SECTOR

Importance of the cultural and creative sector in economic terms
Growing importance of Cultural and Creative Enterprises
Need to interpret it differently in order to understand its development

- increasing debate on the features of the cultural and creative sector and how to unlock its potential
Cooperation and ecosystem thinking
Need to rethink the governance systems and management models of the cultural sector (Bonet and Donato, 2011) but also to rethink the interactions between cultural and creative sector and its "environment".

Emergence of ecosystem approach to the cultural and creative sector (Holden, 2015; Borin and Donato, 2015)
Two reports in 2004, published almost simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic, employ ‘ecology’ as a metaphor for the cultural and creative sector (Holden (2004), Rand (2005)).

**Ecology of culture:** ‘the complex interdependencies that shape the demand for and production of arts and cultural offerings’.

"Culture is often discussed as an economy, but it is better to see it as an ecology, because this viewpoint offers a richer and more complete understanding of the subject" (Holden, 2015)
Starting point: the ecology of culture could be conceived as three highly interactive spheres (Holden, 2004 – 2008 - 2015)
ECOSYSTEM APPROACHES: DEVELOPMENTS

Ecology of culture as a regenerative life cycle

"An ecological approach concentrates on relationships and patterns within the overall system, showing how careers develop, ideas transfer, money flows, and product and content move, to and fro, around and between the funded, homemade and commercial subsectors"

"The cultural dynamism of today rests on a global inheritance going back thousands of years; and decisions taken now about things as various as the music in schools, and licensing and arts education will affect both the near and distant future"

(Holden, 2015)
ECOSYSTEM APPROACHES: DEVELOPMENTS

‘...the need is for a system to create spaces in which something can happen’ (Crossick, 2006).

Other interpretations of the ecosystem approaches emerged

Cultural ecosystems in relation to the broader territorial ecosystems as a way to enhance the potential of cultural and creative industries.
CULTURAL ECOSYSTEMS: DEVELOPMENT

Cultural ecosystem among the broader ecosystem to enable the flourishing of cultural and creative industries and start-up: need for coordination and common strategy among the different subjects (Borin and Donato, 2015)

Need to work on the coordination of the actors of the territorial ecosystem in order to create the sustaining environment for for-profit and non-profit organizations in the cultural and creative sector

Cultural identity of the territory as starting point for the dialogue
Micro-approach as traditional approach in the management of cultural organizations, often high reliance on public funding.

New approach based on cooperation between different actors, coming both from the public and the private sector.
CULTURAL AND CREATIVE SECTOR: HOW TO

The cultural and creative sector needs new governance systems and management models

Development of the concept of Public-Private Partnerships

Development of the concept of Multi-stakeholder-Partnerships

Governance and management models for the ecosystems
CULTURAL COOPERATION IN ECOSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE: PROBLEMS

Cultural and creative sector and its different component thrive in places where ecosystem approaches are in place, but this is not easy to implement. What are the problems?

- Need for coordination among the different actors
- Need to define shared interests and goals: potential opportunistic behaviours
- Need for well-defined governance structures
- Need to define role of public and private actors
- Problem of definition of the model of cooperation:
  - Flexible model or non-flexible models?
  - Formal or informal?
  - What are the founding criteria?
Possible solutions are related to the implementation of different models of ecosystems

- Various models of cooperation emerging
- Different dimensions, multi-level
- Different governance and management structures
- Different degrees of formalities in the arrangements between partners

Examples: public-private partnerships and multi-stakeholder partnerships
Models of cooperation: PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS
PARTNERSHIP CREATIONS

Different types of cooperation: public-public partnerships, private-private partnerships

Public-private partnerships (PPPs)

PPPs: "Long-term cooperative agreements that are established between public and private partners with the aim of planning, designing financing constructing and managing projects that would usually be implemented and delivered by the public sector" (Van Ham and Koppenjan, 2001)

Started in the USA and UK mainly for financing infrastructures and delivering of public services, but it is currently used in different sectors

Linked to the development of the NPM — New Public Management and New Public-Governance
MODELS OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Risk allocation for public and private partners in main PPP models (EC, 2003)
ADVANTAGES OF PP COLLABORATION

PPPs could bring several advantages:

- **Acceleration of infrastructure provision.**
- **Faster implementation**
- **Cost minimization**
- **Better risk allocation**
- **Better incentives to perform.** (i.e. incentives for private subjects for improved management and implementation of the project. In many PPPs, final payment to the private partner is ensured only when its service delivery meets specific quality standards)
- **Improved quality of service**
- **Generation of additional revenues**, especially by the private sector, which can reduce the cost of public sector subvention and may be able to generate additional revenues from third parties
- **Enhanced public management**
Public-private partnerships (PPPs)

- Institutionalized PPPs (creation of a special entity)
- Contractual PPPs (contract between the parties regulates the implementation of a project)

But also less formal ......
- Arrangements of different types, agreements to implement cultural projects, flexibility
PRIVATE COMPANIES AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

- Public-Private partnership
  - "narrow" interpretation
  - "broader" interpretation
    - Evolution of the sponsorship mindset
    - Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships
PARTNERSHIP CREATIONS

Public-Private Partnership in a broader sense

Collaboration between public and private is interpreted as an "alliance" at different levels

Further development of the "sponsorship" concept

- Involvement in the decision making process
- Involvement in the governance of a cultural project
PARTNERSHIP CREATIONS

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the cultural sector

- Giving more power to the different actors involved
- Involvement and creating loyalty
- Common values shared by the two partners to implement a cultural project
PPPS IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR
Increasing attention at EU and international level (Council of Europe, 2005; Council of the European Union, 2012; UNESCO, 2013) but still controversial attitudes

Positive contribution of PPPs in the cultural sector
- Financial help, flexibility, pooling of resources and competences, improved quality of services, efficiency, higher availability of modern technology, market access and visibility (UNESCO, 2013)
- PPP as a model optimizing comparative advantages for each partner (Sicca and Zan, 2005; Dubini et al., 2012)
- Broader framework of hybrid cooperation models (Skelcher 2005; Thompson, 2007)

Need to pay attention to:
- Opportunistic behaviors (Schuster 1997)
- Commercial aspects and potential identity/cultural value damages, meaning of culture (Settis, 2002)
EMERGING TRENDS IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR

Micro level perspectives

- PPPs for heritage regeneration and heritage management (Macdonald and Cheong; 2014; Fox et al. 2005; Guarneros-Meza, 2008; Licciardi and Amirtahmasebi, 2012; Radoslav et al. 2013; Vincente et al. 2015)
- PPPs for heritage protection and preservation are infrequent, return on investment typically negative (Dubini, Leoni and Forti, 2012): positive returns associated to economic development, tourism attractions (Boorsma et al. 1998; De Carlo and Dubini 2010; Schuster 1997)

Emerging perspectives: meso level

- From micro towards meso approaches to rethink governance and management in the cultural sector (Bonet and Donato, 2011; Pechlaner, 2010)
- Hybridity and creation of public value (Markusen, 2010; Thompson, 2007; Zan, 2015)
- MSP – (Multi-stakeholder Partnerships) governance system (Borin and Donato, 2015): multi-level, multi-stakeholder approaches at the meso level based on cultural identity
PARTNERSHIP CREATIONS IN THE CCS

Potentialities of PPPs perspectives for pooling funds and resources
Evolving relations between cultural organizations and external stakeholders

Some examples
• Stiftung fuer Konkrete Kunst und Design Ingolstadt (Foundation for Concrete Art and Design Ingolstadt)-Germany (institutionalized PPP)
• Louvre Lens and Orange – France (contractual PPP)
• FACT Liverpool - UK (hybrid characteristics, non-traditional PPP)
• Herculaneum Conservation Project – Italy (contractual to institutionalized PPP)
Importance of the context:

Germay "Kulturstaat"
Funds to culture during the 2008 crisis

Bavarian context
Need to increase the attractiveness of the territory

IRMA - Initiative Regionalmanagement Region Ingolstadt e.V.
STIFTUNG FUER KONKRETE KUNST AND DESIGN
INGOLSTADT

Need for the creative class and for different types of workers and employees

Ingolstadt and Munich
STIFTUNG FUER KONKRETE KUNST AND DESIGN
INGOLSTADT
STIFTUNG FUER KONKRETE KUNST AND DESIGN
INGOLSTADT

Stiftung fuer Konkrete Kunst und Design Ingolstadt (Germany)
- The Museum fuer Konkrete Kunst und Design
- AUDI ArtExperience
- The role of design and AUDI in Ingolstadt
2007: establishment of a Foundation for Concrete Art and Design, totally funded by AUDI (Annual Budget 65000€)

Scope and aims of the partnership

- Financial contribution
- Overcoming bureaucracy
- Easier management of private contributions and artwork donation (including Ingeborg Wilding)
- Increasing staff capacity
STIFTUNG FUER KONKRETE KUNST AND DESIGN
INGOLSTADT: GOVERNANCE

Foundation Council (4 to 9 members)

President – Mayor of Ingolstadt

Ingeborg Wilding

Members of Ingolstadt cultural department

AUDI ArtExperience

Local authorities (3)

M KK Ingolstadt (2)

Board of Directors

President (Director MKK)

Vice-President (Vice-director of MKK)

Member representing other collaborators (elected for 6 years)
 Manager (Director of the MKK)

- Exhibition and research projects (MKK staff, AUDI)
- Conservation of the collections (Stiftung)
- Marketing, communication and outreach activities (MKK)

Head of the Cultural Department (city of Ingolstadt)

- Administration (Municipality staff)
- Legal office, acquisition of artworks and collections (Municipality staff)

AUDI
communication and PR, event organizations
DEVELOPMENTS OF THE PROJECT

Intertwining Museum and Stiftung, but calling for an increasing role of AUDI

Broader stakeholders
  - Friends of MKK
  - Collaboration with local University

Project for new museum and cultural-creative quarter
LOUVRE-LENS AND REGIONAL CONTEXT

Policies of decentralization of culture

Accessibility to culture also in the periphery

Broader projects, such as Pompidou Metz

Regional context:
Nord-Pas-de-Calais: problems of economic development
Lille ECoC 2004
Louvre-Lens museum with 150M € of investments (60% of the region) opened in 2012
Mission Bassin Minier (UNESCO 2012)
Louvre-Lens museum
Brief overview of the museum Louvre-Lens
Louvre-Lens and culture-based revitalization
2011: agreement between Louvre and Orange, multi-media guide
Scope and aims of the partnership

- financial contribution plus joint implementation and management of the project
- sharing of skills, competences and staff between the private and public subjects
LOUVRE-LENS AND ORANGE: GOVERNANCE

Steering committee

Louvre Museum (Paris)
Nord-Pas-de-Calais Region
Orange

Project Team
LOUVRE-LENS AND ORANGE: MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT

**CORE** PROJECT TEAM

- Louvre/Louvre Lens
  - Content design, user/visitor research, education, outreach activities and communication developers
- Orange
  - Technical Design and implementation, App development
- Region Nord-Pas-de-Calais
  - IT skills, technological implementation

Other external collaborations
- On-situ (Project management)
- Polymorph
- Mazédia
- Art Graphique et Patrimoine
- Antenna international
- Sycomore
Overcoming of the traditional sponsorship scheme

Positive spillover effect – variety of collaborations with other private companies

Increasing interest in active involvement of the users in the development of the digital platform

Louvre-Lens and the territory – Louvre Lens Vallée, Euralens

PIC Platform d’Intelligence collective
DEVELOPMENTS OF THE PROJECT

Participatory approach in the project

New criteria for implementing the PSC - Projet Scientifique et Culturel

« Faire participer les habitants au futur PSC d’un musée est inédit » (Marie Lavandier, Louvre-Lens)


« Notre dernière étude de publics, - Qualitest, menée à l’automne 2017-, a montré que les visiteurs n’étaient pas prêts à payer un tarif susceptible de modifier l’économie du musée. Il faut, par ailleurs, bien s’imaginer que la mise en place d’un ticket aurait un coût en termes de personnel, de douanes, etc. Elle nous obligerait à ne pas baisser le tarif d’entrée pour les expositions temporaires, sous peine d’une perte de visiteurs importante. Par conséquent, il n’est pas certain que le gain financier soit à la hauteur des espérances. Toutes ces données ont été présentées au CA qui a voté une nouvelle fois la gratuité pour l’année 2018 le 08/12/2017. Mais je compte aller plus loin et envisager ce programme de gratuité de façon pluriannuelle en l’inscrivant dans le futur PSC », Indique Marie Lavandier.
FACT FOUNDATION FOR ART AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIVERPOOL

Liverpool context

ECoC 2008 (nominated 2003) project implemented by city council

In 2004, private investors agreed to invest an additional £1 billion in the regeneration project of the city center, creating the project Liverpool One

Two projects were catalysts for rebranding of the city in the long term
Shift towards the creative industries

Spontaneous development of networks:
• LARC-Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium, Small and Medium Arts Collective, Arts and Culture Network

By the end of 2008, growth of 8% of enterprises in the CCS compared to 2004
FACT - FOUNDATION FOR ART AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIVERPOOL

FACT – FOUNDATION FOR ARTS AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIVERPOOL
1997: Registered charity and a company limited by guarantee

• Flagship in redevelopment project of the Ropewalks district of Liverpool

• Creating a permanent centre for the development of cinema, art and technology related project for the city of Liverpool

• FACT is a member of LARC (Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium) and chairs the Ropewalks CIC
FACT - FOUNDATION FOR ART AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIVERPOOL

Initially mixed resources of funding:

- Funding from ACE – Arts Council England (FACT as NPO-National Portfolio Organization)
- Liverpool city council with 3 year grant scheme renewable

Through time FACT was able to diversify its sources of income, generating its own revenues both by commercial and cultural activities and grants (NHS)
FACT - FOUNDATION FOR ART AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIVERPOOL

ACE
ARTS COUNCIL
ENGLAND

LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

Board of Trustees

Independent experts

Trustees nominated by members

Local authorities
Informal cooperation and intermixing of staff implemented on a project base, including public actors

Collaboration with specific staff for each project (with local authorities, NHS, representatives of non-profits and local communities)
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT

Authonomy of the PPP project: limited company, high risk transferred to the private partner

Public authorities: financing (initially) and «supervising» PPP development

Ecosystem perspectives at the territorial level: integration in multi-level MSP projects
THE HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT

- Ercolano (Italy)
- The Herculaneum conservation project
HERCULANEUL ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE
Herculaneum - archeological site, eruption of Vesuvio in 79 AD, UNESCO WHS since 1997

At the end of the last century it was under threat, problems of preservation and maintenance works

In the 1990s Herculaneum was deemed the «worst example of archeological conservation in a non-war torn country»
In 2001: the non-profit foundation Packard Humanities Institute showed interest in helping Herculaneum

FIRST PHASE
2001 – 2004: Memorandum of Understandings between PHI and the local heritage authority (Soprintendenza speciale di Napoli and Pompei)
- Refund of preservation works (725000 €)
- Start up of a new research project on the maintenance needs of the archeological site (865000 €)

Collaboration was unsatisfactory

Not just a problem of resources but a problem of lack of managerial planning and links with the territory
SECOND PHASE and THIRD PHASE:

2004-2009/2009-2013: Sponsorship agreement between PHI, Soprintendenza and a third partner, British School at Rome

- BSR could plan, conduct and pay for the conservation works on the site
- New governance and management of the project that implied real collaboration between public and private partners

Introduction of a Project manager and creation of an interdisciplinary, mixed team

ECOSYSTEM PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH FOR DELIVERING CHANGE
THE HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT

Outcomes:
• Clear definition of individual players’s responsibilities
• Timing, Resource allocation criteria
• Bottom-up approach for the individuation of the maintenance and development programme

Results: HCP often cited as a best-practice case of preservation, management and enhancement of built cultural heritage as well as cultural ecosystem - The flourishing of the archeological site created positive spillover effects on the local community

RECOGNIZING THE INTERDEPENDENT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HERITAGE AND ITS WIDER CONTEXT

Building bridges and creating forum for dialogue among stakeholders, including local creative industries and local community
HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT: STAKEHOLDERS

Source: Dubini, Leone and Forti, 2012
HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT: GOVERNANCE

Scientific Committee (11 people)

- President (BSR and University of Cambridge)
  - PHI (2 people)
  - BSR
  - Soprintendenza a Speciale
  - Direzione per i Beni Archeologici
  - ICCROM
  - Italian Universities (2 people)
  - University of Leiden
  - Expert consultant

Executive Committee

- Packard Humanities Institute (2 people)
- British School at Rome (2 people)
- Soprintendenza (2 people)

Herculanum Conservation Project Team
HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT: MANAGEMENT

Herculaneum Conservation Project Team

- Soprintendenza Speciale di Napoli e Pompei
- Site Director and SANP coordinator for HCP
- Head of SANP technical office
- SANP conservator coordinator
- Project Manager
- Communication Officer
- Team Assistant
- HCP Client team
- Project Director

Architects (3 people)
Procurement advisor
Conservators/restorers (3 people)
Information manager/survey archeologist
Archeologists (2 people)
Consultant for scientific research with external partners
Technical Assistant/Specialists (3 people)
Structural engineer

External Consultants for specific issues or research project
THE HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT: NEW ROLE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

LONG-TERM STRATEGY:
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AT THE HEART

Cultural heritage as a start for local regeneration

New relationship with the community

Role of cultural heritage in community building

1. Urban Herculaneum
2. Herculaneum Centre
THE HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT: NEW ROLE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

URBAN HERCULANEUM project (2003)
- Socio-economic problems of the area
- Regeneration of the modern city of Ercolano carried out in symbiosis with the ancient Herculaneum
- Creation of social and cultural identity through heritage
- Sustainable tourism: creation of links with natural heritage (costiera Amalfitana and villas of the 18th and 19t century)
"The philosophy at the basis of the involvement of the local and international community in the preservation of cultural heritage relies on the following principles:

Preservation of cultural heritage has a meaning only if it creates meaning for citizens;

Cultural goods has multiple meanings, different for each people;

Cultural heritage is a powerful means that can contribute to the development of sustainable communities.

The increased sensibility of the local and international community towards this archeological site will contribute to its preservation and to the sustainable development of the area"

(Annual Report HCP, Bigggi and Court, 2010)
NEW ROLE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

2007: International Centre for the Study of Herculaneum (Herculaneum centre)

Objective: increasing participation of local and international stakeholders

Governance: HCP, Local heritage authorities and local public authorities to bridge the gap between ancient Herculaneum and modern Ercolano

Multi-stakeholder partnership development
Aims of the Centre:

Participation of the CH professionals' community

Education and training
- Workshops and training for professionals of the local and international communities

Research
- Grants and research programmes for academia and researches

Think tank and information sharing
- Through articles, studies, documentaries, etc. at national and international level
Aims of the Centre:

Participation of the local citizens

- School programme (young ambassadors): 5 schools, 10 teachers and 100 “young ambassadors”
Participation of the local citizens:

**Identity building**
- Oral heritage project, citizens involved in the digital archive project
  - inclusiveness and local identity

**Inclusion**
- special programmes for visually impaired visitors

**Participation of economic stakeholders**
- Links with tourism and local economic stakeholders:
  - private IT company involved in the design and implementation of GSI systems
Cultural heritage and culture as a means to overcome traditional boundaries between public, private sector and civic sector

- Public-Private partnership but holistic/ecosystem approach in management of cultural heritage

Private partners: not just funding but participating in the activities of the project, long-term capacity building project

Civic partners: Cultural heritage as creating sense of identity: from the past to the present

THE HERCULANEUM CONSERVATION PROJECT
SOME OVERALL REFLECTIONS ON THE CASE STUDIES IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES....

Differences

- Role of ‘promoters’ of the project and paths toward the PPP
- Difference in the role of public and private partners

Similarities

- Overcoming of the traditional sponsorship or funding schemes: combining competences of the public and private partner
- Public sector as supervisor
- Culture interpreted in its broader context
- Potential for broader multi-stakeholder engagement
SOME REFLECTIONS

Aggregated results show a different attitude towards PPP on a national basis

**Germany**: formalized, top-down approach to PPP

**France**: Role of public authorities, but enhancing dynamism of the private and civic partners

**Italy**: PPP trying to overcome the «sponsor» perspective, enhancement of the role of private partner

**UK**: enhancement of the role of CCIs; PPPs as supporting governance structures for the entrepreneurial development of the territory based on culture and creativity

All the case studies are creating broader partnerships and connections....

Are we moving to a meso level?
DEVELOPMENTS: MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIPS
PARTNERSHIPS IN AN ECOSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Starting with Public-Private Partnership there is increasing need to involve the citizens and the community when developing cultural activities

Citizens

- Philantropist or Donors/Volunteers/Crowdfunding
- Involvement as active actors in the governance and management of cultural projects and initiatives

Involvement often through Multi-Stakeholder Partnership schemes
Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) in the cultural sector

MSPs are long-term cooperation between different stakeholders of a project

- Similar to PPP but different categories of actors involved
- Often implemented at a territorial scale
- Governance of the project includes all the different categories of actors
PARTNERSHIPS IN A ECOSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) in the cultural sector

MSPs are a new trend, which reflect the current debate on cultural ecosystems

- Involvement of civic stakeholders (citizens and communities)
- Citizens involved in the governance of the cultural initiative

More developed participatory approach
PARTNERSHIPS IN AN ECOSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Multi-stakeholder partnerships are disclosing even more potentialities for the evolution of citizens' engagement

- Pooling funds and resources
- Civic action: enhancing the potentialities of a territory
- Policy implementation instrument

Bottom-up approaches to the management of the territory

Shared decision-making process

Increased sense of belonging and enhancement of the cultural resources of the territory
PARTNERSHIPS IN AN ECOSYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Different models of implementation of MSPs, often context-dependent good and "not-so-good" practices….

- France: The Climats du Vignoble de Bourgogne
- Germany: The eCulture Service PPP project
- UK: Birmingham Creative City Partnership
LES CLIMATS DU VIGNOBLE DE BOURGOGNE
Selected project: candidature to the UNESCO WHS list of the site of the «Climats du Vignoble de Bourgogne»

Site located in the Burgundy region
- 2 Departments: Côte-d'Or and Saône-et-Loire
- 5 intercommunalities
- 60 km length, 5 km wide

Started as a project promoted by local authorities (2006)

2011: Territorial charter
Mission Climats to implement the project

WHS list in 2015
Mission Climats

«Citizen» branch

Members’ Committee
Wine growers and local authorities Forum of discussion with citizens and communities

Board of Directors
Local authorities, Regional authorities, Trade associations, Chambers of commerce, Representative of Local Cultural Institutions

Scientific Committee
36 independent experts

Policy and technical branch

Territorial conference
3 Co-presidents
9 Vice-presidents

Technical Committee

Thematic committees:
Committee 1: Architecture, Urbanism, Paysage
Committee 2: Environment
Committee 3: Tourism and Mediation
Committee 4: Economy and Local Development

Permanent staff
LES CLIMATS DU VIGNOBLE DE BOURGOGNE

«flexible type» of PPP at the meso level

- Successful candidature: 4 July 2015 inscribed in UNESCO WHS list
- Role of public authorities
- Involving the community: local identity development and public value
- MSP – ecosystem perspective
HAMBURG CULTURAL AGENDA

Rich context also in cultural terms

Hamburg Cultural Agenda
- Digitization of cultural assets
- Tourism services

Pilot projects
E-Culture Service PPP
ECULTURE SERVICE PPP - PROJECT
ECULTURE SERVICE PPP - PROJECT
ECULTURE SERVICE PPP - PROJECT

Promoted by the Ministry of Culture of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg
- Involving Hamburg 7 districts
- In particular cultural heritage of Hamburg Mitte, Harburg and Altona

Part of Hamburg Cultural Agenda
- Digitization of cultural assets
- Tourism services

Competitive dialogue procedure (art.29, 2004/18/CE)
Competitive Dialogue is indicated as useful for implementing “particularly complex” PPP projects, for which other procurement options do not allow for the necessary flexibility and degree of negotiation.

**Multi-stage approach, 1-2 years**

Public partners invites multiple private partners to identify project’s needs and requirements

Creation of teams among privates is encouraged

Main idea: increased level of communication between the bidders and the public authorities, within a formal and accountable framework
ECULTURE SERVICE PPP - GOVERNANCE
ECULTURE SERVICE PPP

Main characteristic of case study:

- Highly formalized MSP project
  - Top-down approach
  - Relevant role of the public authorities in steering, implementing and defining the partnership model
  - Lack of attention to the creation of an authorizing environment: higher resistance to the project by cultural managers
  - Main cultural stakeholders "excluded from the project"

Started in November 2014 and still in progress (estimated start in 2016 ....)

Resistance: the project is still in the implementation phase
BIRMINGHAM CREATIVE CITY PARTNERSHIP

Subgroup of the Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership

Interventions to develop, grow and promote culture and creative sector in Birmingham and Solihull area

Public, private and academic spheres
Established in 2012 but continuing the regeneration strategy of Birmingham Area through culture
BIRMINGHAM CREATIVE CITY PARTNERSHIP

Board of directors

- Birmingham City Council
- Birmingham Universities
- Local Enterprises (MoU – BBC and other private companies in Bham and Solihull)

Director

- Secretary and coordinator (Bham City Council)
- Staff of the GBS LEP to support running of the partnership

Intertwining of staff of the different members on a project-base
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT

Flexible approach

MSP for strategic development - strategic partnership

Support to entrepreneurship and local entrepreneurial development
SOME REFLECTIONS

Different models and different degrees of formality
Differences in the involvement of the stakeholders

Similarities in meso partnerships
- MSPs in the long run, part of strategical socio-economic development
- Redefinition of the criteria for PPPs and MSPs ecosystems: specific for cultural sector: the application of traditional formalized models doesn't work
- Need for flexibility and identification of unifying criteria
Conclusions: cooperation and ecosystem thinking in the arts and cultural sector
What are the basis for creating successful PPPs and MSPs in the cultural sector?

- Research of 3 years in EU (2013-2016) (Borin, Donato, Pechlaner, Sinapi, Skelcher)
- Comparative perspective in 4 EU countries: France, Germany, Italy and the UK
- 8 case studies of PPPs and MSPs in the cultural sector
- Investigating the perception of the project by the main categories of stakeholders involved
CASE STUDIES: **MICRO AND MESO LEVEL**

**France**
- Micro: Louvre Lens and Orange Project (Lens)
- Meso: Climats du Vignoble de Bourgogne – Burgundy Area

**Germany**
- Micro: Foundation for Concrete Art and Design (Ingolstadt)
- Meso: eCulture Service PPP – Hamburg area

**Italy**
- Micro: Herculaneum Conservation Project (Ercolano)
- Meso: Po Delta area – Rovigo, Ferrara, Ravenna

**UK**
- Micro: FACT – Foundation for Art and Creative Technology (Liverpool)
- Meso: Birmingham Creative City Partnership – Birmingham and Solihull area
• Overcoming of the traditional sponsorship scheme
• Micro projects in a meso perspective
• Governance and management reflecting territorial cultural ecosystem

File: PPP for autonomy and flexibility
• High level of control by the public authority: limited contribution of the private partners
• Lack of citizens’ involvement and community engagement

Italy
• PPP based on a philanthropic aim: evolution of the PPP
• Capacity building, autonomous preservation and enhancement of site
• Creating authorizing environment around the PPP project as exit strategy

UK
• Autonomy of the PPP project
• Public authorities: partial financing and «permanent observers»
• Ecosystem perspectives: integration in multi-level MSP projects for the regeneration of the city based on culture and creativity

COMMON CHARACTERISTICS:
• Overcoming of traditional sponsorship cooperation schemes: higher involvement of the private partners at a governance and management level
• Integration of micro PPPs in multi-level, multi-stakeholder partnership: broader strategies of cultural and local development
RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS AT THE *MESO* LEVEL

**France**
- MSP – ecosystem perspective
- Role of public authorities
- Perception: local cultural identity and stakeholders' participation

**Germany**
- Top-down approach: relevant role of the public authorities
- Lack of the flexibility and stakeholder participation
- Perception: Resistance, need to involve the citizens and the relevant stakeholders to create consensus on the base of common cultural identity

**Italy**
- Potential of the MSP at the meso level
- Multi-level, multi-stakeholder, cross-sectorial approach
- Perception: development and participation, no ecosystem thinking, need to work on intangibles (relations and cultural identity)

**UK**
- Flexible approach and agreements between the partners
- MSP for strategic development - strategic partnership, support to entrepreneurship and local entrepreneurial development
- Perception: integrated cultural strategy based on cultural identity and participation

**COMMON CHARACTERISTICS:**
- MSPs in the long run, part of strategical socio-economic development
- Redefinition of the criteria for PPPs and MSPs ecosystems: specific for cultural sector and based on cultural identity and participation
CONCLUSIONS

The analysis provides insights in the changes of the traditional relationship between cultural organizations, private company and citizens and communities also in relation to cooperation in its different dimensions

Development of multi-level MSP models is related to the meso, ecosystem approaches for CCS

Peculiarities of the criteria for the creation of successful MSPs or PPPs in the cultural sector:

- cultural identity
- Intangibles
- supporting environment

MSPs considered as drivers to unlock the potential of the cultural and creative sector and potentially deal with traditional and current challenges
CONCLUSIONS

Current trends of research on the cultural and creative sector reinterpret it as a dynamic ecosystem of collaborations and interactions.

But we can also think of ecosystem thinking in terms of development of the cultural institutions in terms of

- Partnership between the cultural institution and other public/private organizations
- Cooperation with the citizens and communities
CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE SEMINAR
COOPERATION AND ECOSYSTEM THINKING IN THE ARTS AND CULTURAL SECTOR

What we learnt during the seminar

- Characteristics of the cultural and creative sectors: current challenges
- Ecosystems approach to the sector
- Examples of PPPs and MSPs

HOW CAN WE USE THIS "KNOWLEDGE"?
SOME CONSIDERATIONS...

M. Bawens (2015): Exponential growth in civic initiatives replacing traditional economic relations with circular and sharing economies

Awakening among stakeholders

People increasingly question "the dominant way of doing things"

Strength of cooperative forms of innovations
SOME CONSIDERATIONS...

This will bring new models of governance and management in the cultural sector that will not only impact the cultural sector

- Policy implementation
- Strategy at the micro-level
- Tourism development
- Integrating culture in local development, culture-led development
Group works
GROUP WORKS

1. Select a territory

2. Analyze the characteristics of the territory in terms of cultural and creative sector but also of related sectors:
   a) What are the main cultural assets of the territory?
   b) Are there cultural and creative industries? If so, which ones (examples)?
   c) Are there initiatives for cooperation within the cultural and creative sector? And in the other sector?
   d) Are there initiatives to involve the citizens and the communities?

3. Do you think it will be possible to create an ecosystem structure (PPPs or MSPs) in the territory to enhance the potential of the cultural and creative sector? If so, could you design a potential governance structure?
Do not hesitate to contact me!

Email: elena.borin@bsb-education.com
Skype: elena.borin80
Phone: +33 (0) 380 725 892