



## 2. WHAT NEW FUNDING POSSIBILITIES AND MODELS COULD THERE BE?

- Are there some forms of funding and collaboration which are currently not utilized enough?
- The examples of Australia and Belgium - are there certain aspects in the funding systems that could be used in Finland as well?
- What kind of sustainable funding models have been developed elsewhere and how these could be put in use in Finland?
- What kind of international funding possibilities exist for Finnish art organisations? How to get information?
- The conflict between long term funding and giving access to new organisations, how to deal with this?

Proposal for supplementary question:

- Could different funders join their forces / themes to tackle the possible tensions and (unintentional) discrimination arising from the increasing diversity in society and in art & culture sector?

### 2 Mitä uusia rahoitusmahdollisuuksia tai malleja voisi olla?

- Onko jotain rahoituksen tai yhteistyön muotoja joita ei tällä hetkellä hyödynnetä riittävästi?
  - Australian ja Belgian esimerkit, mitä näistä voisi soveltaa Suomessa?
  - Millaisia kestäväen taiderahoituksen muotoja on kehitetty muualla ja miten näitä voisi ottaa käyttöön Suomessa? - Millaisia kansainvälisiä rahoitusmahdollisuuksia suomalaisilla taideorganisaatioilla on ja voisi olla? Miten saada tietoa näistä?
  - Pitkäjänteisyyden ja uusien tulijoiden ristiriita, miten ratkaista?
- Ehdotus lisäkysymykseksi:
- Voisivatko eri rahoittajatahot yhdistää voimansa / teemansa yhteiskunnan monimuotoisuuden lisääntymisen mahdollisesti synnyttämän jännitteen ja (tahattoman) syrjinnän ratkaisemiseen taide- ja kulttuurisektorilla?

**TABLE A** (Host: Kansainvälisten suhteiden päällikkö Dirk De Wit,  
Kunstenpunt / Flanders Arts Institute, scribe: Eleni Tsitsirikou, HIAP)



### **Collaborative funding:**

The Belgian model in which granting of structural funding is based on two axes 1) art disciplines and 2) functions (e.g development, production, presentation, reflection, participation), could enable collaboration between organisations. Institutions with different kinds of expertise could apply for and receive collaborative funding by linking their functions. It is of great value to create more relations between organisations, to see things on longer terms, focus on processes, and build consortia (like the academic players do in the field of science). We can discover common grounds, themes and priorities, draw up collective strategies, group certain functions, match topics, apply for and pull resources together, build long-term relationships.

In many cases political processes are hidden behind concession building, behind decisions to support specific subjects/areas. Also, the expectations that accompany such collaborative endeavors may be higher. However, it is worth trying. Organisations should overcome the prevalent fears of losing their identity and own share of regular funding, as well as the fear of having to master complex accounting systems.

### **Sustainable growth / de-growth:**

It is indispensable to head towards a more sustainable funding without necessarily having to produce more, to develop models of growth, as an organisation, that are actually not based on growth.

It is essential to support research, openness in funding for doing less while at the same time going deeper into the subject/topic.

Funders ought to impose less pressure, show more respect and allow room for experimentation.



Further, it is crucial to support institutions that focus on finding ways of how to slow down in order to be ecologically sustainable. E.g. Casco – Working for the Commons is trying out new ways for art institutions to work by doing less but for longer periods.

**The local value / local stakeholders:**

We are talking about sustainable models for things that by definition are not sustainable to a degree, if they are measured by terms such as “profitable” or “GDP”. If you don’t work in a profit organisation, your activities will, by definition, not be profitable.

In USA the recognition of the value of culture by states and cities worked well up to a certain point. This value was obvious on the local scale, thus corporations and other stakeholders who recognised it, came on board and supported local organisations. However, such models are mostly seasonal, not sustainable for long terms.

**Philanthropist /patron - trust, respect and support without any criteria:**

Often artists / organisations try to meet the agenda of each funder, try to model themselves to fit multiple criteria and consequently are led to exhaustion. As opposed to this, one could think of a model in which the funder looks for and invites (not commissions) instead of expecting the artists and organisations to fit themselves to predefined criteria.

In this kind of support the funder does not require thorough reports, profitability, or concrete outcomes.

Trusting and believing in one’s potential and work could establish healthy, long-term relationships between funders and grantees. Such relationships enable proximity, nurture mutual respect and understanding as well as shared responsibility.

This sort of support could be supplemental to the existing system.



**Creating free space for innovation and offering resources to independent art professionals:**

Big institutions could reserve part of their funding for collaborations with independent art professionals. The latter usually lack the resources to realise certain projects/artistic interventions but are capable of developing ideas and responding to social and other topics faster than the institutions. These art professionals act as facilitators, bring in an idea/concept, curate and produce cultural content utilizing the existing structure, personnel, and the allocated funds of the institutions.

**Establishing dialogue on equal terms, breaking down power relations between funders and grantees:**

Often organisations and artists feel as if they would be begging for money. They do not receive any feedback from the funders and are required to meet a lot of criteria. Establishing dialogue and a step-by-step follow-up would be ideal. The funders would give feedback to those who they decided to support by stating what they value in the grantee's work. There would be less competition in the ecosystem and shifting of power between funders and grantees.

**Space and material "grants":**

In USA it is common for banks, companies etc. to offer own premises that stand empty for a certain period of time until a new function has been decided for them, to cultural actors that would otherwise not afford them, especially when these happen to be located in central areas of the city.

Further, opera houses and big theatres establish programmes directed to smaller organisations/producers in the field. The idea is to make available costume collections and materials from past big productions that would otherwise be disposed of.



**Other domains making culture possible:**

Other domains should recognise the potential and value of culture, artists and organisations, and direct part of their funds towards employing artists and/or collaborating with organisations. In such manner artists and organisations would not be dependent exclusively on the funds granted by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Arts Promotion Centre Finland.

**Benchmarking from other domains (incl. other domains of the government):**

It's important for people working in the cultural sector to change their way of thinking, to understand that it is possible to develop cultural content utilizing tools and strategies that are known in other sectors (Technology, Science, Economy) and benchmark those. For example the Ministry of Economic Affairs & Employment has a system and tools for supporting innovation and technology, internationalisation of enterprises etc. Models exist but they haven't been applied in the culture field. How to internationalise a theatre group? There are some tools in the music industry. For example Music Finland, a private agency that sets the promotion of Finnish music abroad as part of their strategy, "helps musicians establish connections, present their music and grow their audiences and businesses in the international market".

**Artwork tax deduction and investment in art, more funding from the private sector:**

If a tax reduction system existed in Finland for companies which buy art, the private sector could become a third good player - financier of art (such a system exists for example in France).

Companies could invest certain amount of their revenue to cultural projects.



### Other thoughts:

- Establish a new line for capacity-building, inflow of upcoming / emerging organisations and artists.
- Need for interdisciplinary, solid education and employment of artists.
- Need for basic income to avoid multiple job holding and allow time for practicing art.
- Limitations in the Belgian funding system: The open system has no boxes to be ticked, one can state what one wants to do, develop or mix different functions or fields of expertise. This offers fantastic flexibility BUT the system needs to function in a reality, in which there are far more eligible organisations than the funds available. Thus, we cannot avoid the competition.

**TABLE B** (Host: FM Leif Jakobsson, Helsingin kaupungin taide- ja kulttuurivisiotyöryhmän jäsen, scribe: Eveliina Tuulonen, HIAP)

### Group 1

In the workshop part with Group 1, the focus was on the audience's role within the art world. How can the general public become a bigger part of the funding structure? For example, a representative from Seinäjoen Taidehalli explained how they have considered a membership model in order to engage their audiences more. A representative from Teatterikeskus commented on how they have been trying figure out a Museum Card model for theater and dance to attract audiences attend performing arts both *ad hoc* and on a regular basis.

Another proceeding from Seinäjoen Taidehalli was rethinking collaboration models by working with local artist organizations to apply for funding together. As well, art clubs, common in Sweden, were discussed: having art clubs in business settings, among other regular hobby clubs, such as sports. The company invests in artists' paintings,



and the employees can win the works of art through, e.g., lotteries. This way art becomes a greater part of people's lives outside the art world.

Also discussed was how donations for art are not tax deductible; however, donations for sports are. Tax deduction would concretely make it easier for people to support art; however, it also needs to be considered that the art world has to appreciate the general public's role. In addition, even though the audience's role was discussed thoroughly, there were also comments on how pressure needs to be kept on the government and the current so called "big" funders. Even though many foundations have policies to be followed, status quo is not the law of the nature and the old rules can be rewritten.

## Group 2

In Group 2 the discussion focused more on the allocation of funding. Why are the bigger art institutions receiving secure funding every year when freelancers and the marginalized have to struggle and live in uncertainty regarding funding? One suggestion was that funders should have a quota for freelancers. In addition, once again, the audience's role came up: Why is the audience willing to pay fifty euros for a ticket to see a play at the Helsinki City Theater but only ten euros to see a more marginalized experimental group? The question comes down to what kind of art is valued in our society.

As well, dialogue between art sectors and sharing came up: Many theaters stand empty in the summer – why aren't these spaces used more? How can the art world better support each other through in-kind donations? It was highlighted how resources are not just money but also materials and spaces. This also touched on the subject of sustainability in producing art: not always creating new but also reusing in a creative way. International funding was discussed briefly by mentioning that in case



Finnish operators are interested in receiving funding from abroad, then they also need to be willing to go up against fierce international competition.

### **Group 3**

In Group 3 the beginning of the discussion focused again on the general public. How can we get art on people's walls instead of leaving art to gather dust in the basements of foundation's collections? A lot of emphasis was again placed on tax deduction for art donations: If people are willing to fight for gender equality in Finland, why can't they fight for equality between sports and arts? In addition, as one group member represented the more business side of the art world, there was a discussion around what firms need from the art world. Are they ready to invest in it to learn something from it? According to this attendee, firms are always willing to try new things in order to separate themselves from their competition. As a result, one suggestion was an artist-in-residence format for firms or a "buy an artist a life for two months" – i.e., the artist would receive funding and materials from the company; and then again, the artist in return is present at the company to help with problem-solving and offering new, creative ways of thinking, i.e., making the invisible visible. This was considered a win-win situation. However, it was also brought up that not all artists are willing to serve as a commodity for the business world and its well-being.

Last but not least, it was suggested that a combined culture budget for the Helsinki Metropolitan area, instead of all of cities separately, would benefit all.

#### **A summary of concrete suggestions for new models and possibilities:**

- More membership models for museums
- A museum card model for performing arts





- Establishing art club culture
- Art donations tax deductible, equal to that of sports
- Rethinking and rewriting the rules in the large funding organizations
- A quota on funding for freelancers and marginalized groups
- In-kind possibilities in the field
- Aiming for international funding courageously
- An in-house artist model for businesses
- A combined Helsinki Metropolitan area culture budget

**Questions and ideas to contemplate:**

- Rethinking collaboration partners
- What kind of art is valued in our society?
- The art world seeing the importance of audience engagement, which leads to value for the arts from the audience and possibly leads to more willingness from the public to support art, if not by funding it, then by demanding the funding to continue

**TABLE C** (Host: Ylitarkastaja Hanna Koskimies, opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, Leena Kela, Saaren kartano, Koneen Säätiö)

International funding should be utilised more than ever, but receiving basic funding in this way is challenging, as international forms of funding mostly consist of project funding. It is a laborious task for Finnish organisations to find international bodies that would be suitable partners for their activities. A great deal of focus is placed in Finland on exporting Finnish artists and art abroad. It would be good to develop the sector so that artists would also be imported here. There are, however, fewer funding models and less funding for imports. Internationality must be bilateral and focus also on activities in Finland.



Could corporate financing be the solution to increasing funding in the art sector? This works poorly in the free art sector but is a key issue if we want to increase funding. It would be a good idea to focus on partnerships and sponsorship cooperation in the development work. Traditionally, support has often taken the form of receiving equipment and instruments. Art is already being transferred to new contexts and new audiences, such as the health and social services sector and, with percent-for-art programmes, also to public spaces. Could this help us find models or modes of operation for building cooperation? The challenge is providing individual artists access to private money. At present, you often need to be a big player for a company to be interested in cooperation. On the other hand, it is important to consider ethical issues to ensure that cooperation is possible and that there are shared values in the cooperation. Business cooperation should be mutually beneficial. This cooperation should be created and developed together with the companies involved. In Finland there is a prevailing notion that collecting funds takes place spontaneously, while internationally fundraising is seen as a key profession in organisations. Organisations should develop this know-how and achieve expertise in it. There are already companies that support art, festivals or other events. Various residencies have also tried new forms of operation, such as residency activities within enterprises. In Finland there is a strong perception that public money creates freedom, but this does not apply to private funding opportunities. Companies seem far away and there is no shared channel or connection for communication. In the art sector, people do not know which door to knock on. How can we better bring companies and artists or art organisations around the same table in future? Who could act as the mediator?

In developing forms of funding, it is important to ensure the longevity of funding both for individual artists and organisations. An operating grant is needed as the basis for applying for other funding. This is complicated



by the fact that the operating grant has to be applied for every year (Arts Promotion Centre Finland, Ministry of Education and Culture). Would it be possible to change this period to five years, for example? Should we consider a closer reconciliation of funding from private foundations and public funding? In the long-term model for grants, updates about activities could be submitted to the sponsor once a year, as in the multi-year funding from foundations. And how can new players receive funding when there is no more money? On the other hand, organisations tend to force individual artists out of the picture because larger players have more volume and skills for applying. And how can someone raise their level of professionalism so that they are ready for bigger and longer-term funding if they keep applying for the smallest amounts all the time? What would be the best way to organise long-term funding?

The art sector hopes for more dialogue with sponsors, while public sponsors, in particular, appear non-transparent. However, more human resources are needed to make dialogue possible. The number of applicants complicates the organisation of dialogue opportunities. Should the criteria be made more restrictive in order to receive fewer applications? How can dialogue be promoted? The problem with peer reviews is that they are perceived as secretive, based on genre-thinking and the sector or artists are not necessarily known. There is great demand for dialogue. There are many people in the field with a lot of competence, but they no longer want to create art works every year. Competition for resources, funding and presentation opportunities is very tough. Peer review is extremely important. It should be considered a paid specialist task. If there were paid experts, they would have better resources and motivation to follow what is happening in the field.

Funding coming to an end or being cut off is a part of art funding. However, this must be taken into account in order to be able to determine the moment when the project ends or "the work is done". For



the ending of funding, it would be useful to take into account the facilities and their use in the future, or to introduce funding for the finishing stages, which would allow the activities to be wound down or the player to transfer from operating grants to specific grants.

Falling outside the sphere of public funding is a signal that the person or organisation has messed up somehow. It is also challenging to operate in all the areas as the artist's or organisation's activities grow. It would be great if there was the possibility of building a profile as a specific type of player. The sponsor could support the player in finding their own voice and role, and strengthening these would be encouraged. Could funding be compared to the way a curator works with an artist: the curator creates the circumstances that allow the artist to do exactly what they are good at. The relationship between a sponsor and those funded should be based on this kind of thinking.

**Suomeksi:**

*Kansainvälistä rahoitusta tulisi hyödyntää entistä enemmän, mutta perusrahoituksen saaminen on tätä kautta haastavaa, sillä kansainväliset rahoitusmuodot ovat useimmiten projektirahoitusta. Suomalaisille organisaatioille on työlästä löytää ne kansainväliset tahot, jotka sopisivat oman toiminnan kumppaniksi. Suomessa keskitytään paljon suomalaisten tekijöiden ja taiteen viemiseen ulkomaille. Olisi hyvä kehittää kenttää tuomaan tekijöitä myös tänne. Rahoitusmalleja ja tuontirahoitusta on kuitenkin vähemmän. Kansainvälisyyden tulee olla kahdenvälistä ja keskittyä myös Suomessa tapahtuvaan toimintaan.*

*Voisiko yritysrahoitus olla ratkaisu lisätä rahoitusta taiteen kentällä? Tämä toimii taiteen vapaalla kentällä heikosti, mutta on keskeinen kysymys, jos rahoitusta halutaan lisätä. Kehittämisessä olisi hyvä keskittyä kumppanuuksiin ja sponsoriyhteistyöhön. Perinteisesti tuki on ollut usein laitteiden ja välineiden saamista. Taidetta viedään jo nyt uusiin konteksteihin ja uusille yleisöille kuten sote-sektorille ja prosenttitaiteen myötä julkiseen tilaan. Voisiko tätä kautta löytyä malleja tai toimintatapoja yritysyritysten rakentamiseen? Haasteena on yksittäisten tekijöiden pääseminen yksityisen rahan pariin. Nykyisellään tulee usein olla iso toimija, jotta yritys voisi olla kiinnostunut yhteistyöstä. Toisaalta eettiset kysymykset ovat tärkeää huomioida, jotta yhteistyö on mahdollista ja yhteistyössä on yhteiset arvot. Yritysyritysten tulisi hyödyttää molempia osapuolia. Yhteistyötä pitäisi luoda ja kehittää yhdessä yritysten kanssa. Suomessa on vallalla ajatus, että*



*varojen kerääminen tapahtuu itsestään, kun taas kansainvälisesti ajatellaan, että fundraising on keskeinen ammattinimike organisaatioissa. Organisaatioiden tulisi kehittää tätä osaamista ja saavuttaa ammattitaitoa. On jo nyt olemassa yrityksiä, jotka tukevat taidetta, festivaaleja tai muita tapahtumia. Myös residenssitoiminnassa on kokeiltu uusia muotoja kuten yrityksissä tapahtuvaa residenssitoimintaa. Suomessa on vahvana käsitys julkisen rahan tuomasta vapaudesta, joka ei päde yksityisiin rahoitusmahdollisuuksiin. Yritykset tuntevat olevan etäällä eikä yhteistä kanavaa tai keskusteluyhteyttä ole. Taiteen kentällä ei tiedetä mihin oveen koputtaa. Miten yritykset ja taiteilijat tai taideorganisaatiot saataisiin saman pöydän äärelle jatkossa paremmin? Kuka voisi toimia tässä välittäjänä?*

*Rahoitusmuotoja kehittäessä on tärkeää turvata rahoituksen pitkäaikaisuus, sekä yksittäisille taiteilijoille, että organisaatioille. Toiminta-avustus tarvitaan pohjana, jotta voidaan hakea muuta rahoitusta. Tätä hankaloittaa se, että toiminta-avustusta joudutaan hakemaan joka vuosi (Taite, OKM). Olisiko mahdollista muuttaa kausi esimerkiksi viisivuotiseksi? Olisiko syytä miettiä yksityisten säätiörahoitusten ja julkisen rahoituksen tiiviimpää yhteensovittamista? Pitkäaikaisessa avustusmallissa toimintaa voisi päivittää rahoittajalle aina vuoden välein, kuten monivuotisessa säätiörahoituksessa. Entä miten uudet toimijat voisivat päästä mukaan rahoituksen pariin, kun rahaa ei tule lisää? Toisaalta organisaatiot helposti jyräävät yksittäiset taiteilijat, koska hakemiseen on enemmän volyymin ja taitoa. Entä miten voi saada ammattimaisuuden tason sille asteelle, jotta on valmis isompiin ja pidempikestoisiin rahoituksiin, jos koko ajan hakee vain niitä pienimpiä? Miten pitkäkestoinen rahoitus olisi järkevää järjestää?*

*Dialogia rahoittajien kanssa toivotaan enemmän ja etenkin julkisen puolen rahoittajat näyttäytyvät läpinäkymättöminä. Tarvitaan kuitenkin lisää henkilötyöresursseja, jotta dialogiin olisi mahdollisuuksia. Hakijamäärät hankaloittavat keskustelumahdollisuuden järjestämistä. Onko tarvetta tiukentaa kriteerejä, jotta saadaan vähemmän hakemuksia? Miten dialogisuutta voisi edesauttaa? Vertaisarvioinnissa koetaan ongelmaksi sen salamyhkäisyys, genreajattelu ja se, että kenttää tai tekijöitä ei välttämättä tunneta. Keskustelulle olisi suuri kysyntä. Kentällä on paljon ihmisiä, joilla on paljon kompetenssia, mutta he eivät enää halua olla tekemässä teoksia joka vuosi. Kilpailu resursseista, rahoista ja esitysmahdollisuuksista on todella tiukkaa. Vertaisarviointi on todella tärkeää. Se tulisi ottaa asiantuntijatehtävänä, josta maksettaisiin palkkaa. Jos olisi palkattuja asiantuntijoita, heillä olisi paremmat resurssit ja motivaatio seurata mitä kentällä tapahtuu.*

*Rahoituksen päättyminen tai katkeaminen kuuluu taiteen rahoitukseen. Tämä pitää kuitenkin huomioida, jotta osataan määritellä hetki, jolloin projekti päättyy tai "työ on tehty". Päätymisessä olisi hyvä huomioida fasilitetit ja niiden käyttö jatkossa tai ottaa käyttöön viimeistelyrahoitus, jolla toiminta on mahdollista ajaa alas tai siirtyä toiminta-avustukselta erityisavustuksen piiriin.*

*Putoaminen julkisen tuen piiristä viestii, että on mogannut jotenkin. On myös haastavaa toimia kaikilla osa-alueilla toiminnan kasvaessa. Olisi hienoa, jos mahdollisuus profiloitumiseen olisi mahdollista. Rahoittajalta voisi saada tukea oman äänen ja roolin löytämiseen, jonka vahvistamiseen kannustettaisiin. Voisiko rahoittamista verrata siihen, miten kuraattori*



**KONEEN SÄÄTIÖ**  
**KONE FOUNDATION**

*työskentelee taiteilijan kanssa: kuraattori luo olosuhteita, jotta taiteilija voisi tehdä juuri sitä missä hän on hyvä. Rahoittajan ja rahoitettavan suhteen tulisi perustua tälle ajattelulle.*