

Expert Talk

Cooperation and Funding Landscapes in Southeastern Europe

Exchanging experiences - Evaluating achievements

Berlin, 7-8 December 2009

Organizer: The Cultural Manager programs of the Robert Bosch Stiftung

(Robert Bosch Cultural Managers in Central and Eastern Europe, Cultural Managers from Central and Eastern Europe)

REPORT

12/15/2009

Prepared for the Robert Bosch Stiftung

By Prof. Dr Milena Dragičević Šešić and Dr. Lidia Varbanova

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
The context	3
The expert talk concept	3
Introductory Speech “Funding Culture in Southeastern Europe”	4
Policy Making, Capacity Building and Supporting Networks	5
Supporting Individuals and Further Training	7
Project Funding, Coproduction and Cooperation	9
Institutional Funding	11
Panel Discussion “Funding Culture and EU Integration”	12
Final observations and recommendations	14
General recommendations	14
Concrete recommendations for the Robert Bosch Stiftung and other founders	15
Appendices	15
Appendix 1: List of participants.....	15
Appendix 2: Regional bibliography of the literature relevant to cultural management and to financing culture.....	15
Appendix 3: Radoslav Rasa Todosijevic – Edinburgh Charter	15

Introduction

The context

The political upheaval at the end of the 1980s introduced a period of liberal cultural policy in Southeastern Europe, which picked up again in those countries after the wars and the collapse of Yugoslavia. The independent cultural scene, which had just begun to develop, was also supported in the 1990s by foreign funders. The current multifaceted field of support initiatives in Southeastern Europe belies the clichés of a monolithic cultural production.

Though foreign support for cultural activities has greatly influenced the local cultural scene in the Western Balkan countries in the last ten years, it appears that the time for influential foreign support is now over. Since the year 2000 some of the most important funders have either entirely pulled out of Southeastern Europe or have rethought their own priorities, closed programs or restructured their cooperative cultural programs. But new funders have also joined in the last years and some existing ones have focused on new areas.

Through the current EU integration process new opportunities have arisen in the Southeastern European cultural area, and this has also brought new challenges for EU member states.

The expert talk concept

Over the past years, the Robert Bosch Stiftung has placed an emphasis on cultural exchanges with the Western Balkan countries through its scholarship programs for cultural managers in and from Central and Eastern Europe and remains interested in exchanging experiences with other funders and supported individuals and organizations in the region.

The expert talk was initiated and organized by the cultural manager programs of the Robert Bosch Stiftung (Robert Bosch Kulturmanager in Mittel- und Osteuropa¹, Kulturmanager aus Mittel- und Osteuropa²) and was held at the House of World culture (Haus der Kulturen der Welt) in Berlin on 7-8 December 2009. The first day was an expert meeting, and the second day panel was open to the general public.

The event focused on the countries that belong to the geographical area called the Western Balkans: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. This key event gathered around 50 participants – representatives of key foundations in Europe targeting the Western Balkans: cultural operators, mediators and project managers from the Western Balkans; researchers and academics, cultural policy experts and consultants engaged in the cultural sector. The expert talk was an opportunity for funders, cultural operators and foundations' grantees to openly and honestly exchange about culture.

¹ www.kulturmanager.net

² www.moe-kulturmanager.de

The expert talk's **main goals** were:

- to identify existing mechanisms, structures and instruments which support and promote culture in the countries of the Western Balkans, including: funding projects, cooperative and coproduction programs, building up capacities, supporting networks, supporting individuals through further training, as well as funding institutions;
- to map the best practices in different countries;
- to intensify the exchanges between funders primarily from German-speaking areas and culturally active individuals and organizations from Southeastern Europe;
- to reflect upon and discuss possible models for funding and promoting culture in the future.

The expert talk discussion was moderated by Dr. Lidia Varbanova.

Introductory Speech “Funding Culture in Southeastern Europe”

In her introductory speech, Prof. Dr. Milena Dragičević Šešić underlined the key actors in funding culture in Southeastern Europe: public bodies (Ministries of culture and regional/local authorities), international organizations and foundations, private investors (many of whom are still not actively involved). Self-generated income still makes up only a small portion of the budgets of cultural organizations and projects (which includes detaxation schemes, copyright incomes, commercial and peripheral marketing activities, and commissions for artistic works). Volunteer work and private contributions are also an important source of income – artists are seen as major „donors“ to the cultural field, given the very low salaries and fees charged in the cultural sector compared to the amount of effort and engagement involved.

Moving away from Balkan Cultural Studies – understood as the study of the (re)construction and (re)presentation of identities implicit in public financing policies –, Prof. Dragičević Šešić explored the current overall context of the funding landscape. She looked at globalization and the impact of the world financial crisis, post-communist transitions (the ongoing process of *deetatization*³ and privatisation), European integration and the EU accession process, the region's still fragmented cultural sector, the need for developing a “participatory cultural policy” that is transparent and civil society's difficulties with advocacy. Pointing to the contributions that have been made and the remaining lacunae in each of

³ “deetatization” – decreasing the role of the state; transferring functions from the state bodies to the public and private one.”

the three cultural sectors (public, private and the non-profit), she argued that all three areas still require direct and indirect outside financial support – as a balance must be maintained between the sectors for the stability of the artistic and cultural scenes as well as the quality of artistic productions in the cultural field.

Since experimental artistic projects and important but politically provocative projects will never receive public or private local/national support, Prof. Dragičević Šešić suggested that international donors should be particularly active in this domain.

Prof. Dragičević Šešić advocated creating synergies by combining public interest, expert knowledge, socially responsible forces and financial sources from within and outside the region. She shared several positive examples of public-private partnerships through *arm's length*⁴ bodies or on a project basis, focusing especially on policy recommendations.

One of these recommendations pertained to the new administrative burdens imposed to art organizations. Recent demands that cultural policy has to be more transparent have introduced new (quantitative) types of evaluation and accountability that impose more bureaucratic tasks on art organizations, forcing them sometimes to neglect major aspects of their work (assessing budget spending, or possible social impacts, but nearly ever art achievements).

Policy Making, Capacity Building and Supporting Networks

Starting from the premise that political and structural conditions in the region are decisive factors in successfully developing a complex and rich creative cultural life, the debate further explored the function of the funding policies and practices of international organizations, focusing on the obstacles to achieving the best possible results. Some of the questions debated were: What is the cultural and political context of funding initiatives in Southeastern Europe? How can general conditions be shaped, and what are their limits? How can “cross-sector” cooperation be put in place? How can we bridge the gap between funders and recipients, as well as between civil society and governments? How can networks be established, nurtured and effectively strengthened?

Key presenters in this group gave short introductory talks. They were: Philipp Dietachmair, European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam; Doris Pack, MEP and Committee on Culture and Education of the European Parliament; Violeta Simjanovska, University of Tourism and Management, Skopje; Dimitrije Vujadinović, BalkanKult Foundation, Belgrade.

⁴ “arm's length” is the description of an agreement made by two parties freely and independently of each other, without some special relationship, such as being a relative, having another deal on the side and without one party having complete control of the other.

The emphasis was placed on several main issues that require systematic change:

- Cultural policies in the region still lack priorities and criteria. In the broad field of public policies, cultural policy is still an island, mostly isolated from other policy domains. Cultural policy has to be part of the overall development in the region, but without being just a “promotional window” for “branding” national identities. A more **coherent approach** is required, especially as concerns intercultural relations and intercultural dialog in the region.
- **Cultural policies should be *responsible, as well as open and inclusive***, in which will diminish social differences and intercultural gaps. Cultural policies and practices need to be decentralized, as there is still much to learn at the local level, even though the policy contributions from different municipalities are often neglected and less known in the wider society. Vertical links among central and municipal governments are also lacking (e.g. participative policy making, bringing together citizens with the various layers of government).
- **Regional cooperation policies** within national (also municipal and local) cultural policies, are not a priority yet. There is no stable framework for mobility and regional cross-border cooperation.
- The **development of the civil society sector in Southeastern Europe** was initially considered an “*enemy*” by policy makers, then a means of “*correcting*” faulty or insufficient cultural policies, finally becoming a “*partner*” in the overall policy making process (2000-2005). The “*partner*” position in the majority of the countries gradually disappeared as the public sector became stronger and more self-confident. It is important to note that during this short “collaborative” period many publications and much research were produced. Unfortunately, much of it is still “filed away” not having achieved wide distribution (Annex n.2). Nevertheless, through this process of researching, debating and writing, NGOs significantly increased their abilities to raise public awareness, as well as their knowledge of how cultural policy is established in the region. The civil sector’s ability to change cultural policies and the cultural landscape and its efforts in introducing new schemes and frameworks vary greatly between countries. They range from „great successes“ (Croatia), through „partial“ ones (Romania), to mostly „unsuccessful“ (Macedonia).
- **Networking, collaborative platforms and mobility schemes** are viewed as best ways to build capacity in the region, to strengthen the civil sector, to create coalitions and to lobby for key programs⁵. After the *Initial conference on reconstructing the cultural production in the Balkans*, (Sarajevo, BIH), regional networks were created, which attempt to regroup cultural actors of

⁵ Julie Manieres: RÉSEAUX CULTURELS ET BALKANS, MA thesis, Université des Arts Belgrade
http://159.84.143.239/IMG/pdf/Microsoft_Word_-_memoireMANIERE_2_.pdf

different profiles across the region: the Balkan Art Network (BAN⁶), the Balkan Association of Publishers (BAP), SEECAN (South-East European Contemporary Arts Network), etc. These groups organize ongoing collaborative projects and programs and initiate Balkan art prizes and exhibitions. Because there were no structures to support them, they reduced their levels of activity. A few systemic projects were discussed in the working group discussion, such as the Nordic-Balkan Cultural Switch, operated by BalkanKult⁷, or International Danube Conference for Art and Culture (which started in Regensburg in 2001 and has grown throughout the region since⁸) both supported by regional governments and equally important because of their wide and long term impact.

Supporting Individuals and Further Training

This group discussed questions related to past achievements, current opportunities and future ideas in training and support of individuals in the cultural and artistic sector, including training schemes for cultural managers. How has funding for individuals developed in comparison to institutional or project-based funding? What are the advantages and disadvantages of further training programs either on-site and abroad? What factors contribute to the success or failure of training programs? How are the results and the follow up after the training/placement program has finished?

Short introductions in this group were given by: Adela Demetja, Free Curator and freelance arts manager, Tirana; Jean-Pierre Deru, Fondation Marcel Hicter, Brussels; Professor Dr. Milena Dragičević Šešić, UNESCO Chair for Cultural Policy and Management, Belgrade and Otilie Bälz, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Stuttgart.

Although formal education in art management in the region had already been put in place in the sixties (in Belgrade, Rijeka, Zadar and other cities) it was only during the last ten years that many new interesting opportunities were initiated for cultural management training and education within the region and abroad. On a regional level, universities have developed new undergraduate courses (e.g. in Skopje, Tuzla, Zagreb, Cetinje, Novi Sad – mainly in theater schools), as well as Master's degrees in the English and French languages: ECUME-ECUMEST (a program in cultural management which was unfortunately closed), the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policy and Management in Belgrade⁹, and a Master in Cultural Management at the Faculty of Fine Arts, University of the West Timișoara/Romania¹⁰. A few international and regional summer schools have been organized as well (e.g. "Innovative cultural policy

⁶ http://www.the-mighty.com/old_web_sites/shti/intervju%20sa%20b.%20a..doc

⁷ <http://www.balkankult.org/bk/>

⁸ <http://www.documenta.de/>

⁹ <http://www.arts.bg.ac.rs/rektoraten/stud/?id=studprogrami>

¹⁰ <http://www.ceebd.co.uk/ceeed/un/rom/ro041.htm>

and management”, Central European University¹¹, Budapest; Managing Cultural Tourism, University of Arts, Belgrade¹², etc.), as well as numerous courses in informal education and training for practitioners in the cultural sector (e.g. PAC Multimedia¹³, Skopje; Center for Continuous Professional Development Belgrade¹⁴, Akcija Sarajevo¹⁵; MAMA¹⁶ and Clubture Network¹⁷; seminars organized within the framework of the Soros Foundation, the program Kultura Nova of the European Cultural Foundation¹⁸, KulturKontakt¹⁹ Austria and others). The programs on exchange and placements for cultural managers from CEE²⁰ and from Germany of Robert Bosch Stiftung²¹, as well as extra-regional programs such as the European Diploma in Cultural Project Management²² (EDCPM) are very important for the professional development of young emerging professionals and students with amateur or little experience in the cultural sector, as well as for the overall capacity building of their organizations.

- The debate stressed the importance of **value-based training** instead of *skills-oriented* training. Future cultural managers need to have intercultural sensitivity, to understand “otherness”, to be able to work with different ethnic and minority groups, to connect cultural programming with diversity and intercultural dialog.
- Emphasis was placed on the need to develop a **transcultural approach within training programs** (programs where national cultural policies and frameworks do not dominate). Such an approach certainly enables “*intercultural porosity*” and exposure to differences. It also leads to setting up of future networks of cultural managers (e.g. as a result of the European Diploma in Cultural Project Management, UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policy and Management, Belgrade and the Cultural Managers of the Robert Bosch Stiftung). It was stressed that training programs should form cultural professionals who are experts in a specific field to also be mediators, “*interfaces*”, “*multipliers*”, open to intersectorial and interdisciplinary work.
- The **selection of people** and organizations to participate in the training program was considered as crucial. The success of the training depends to a great extent on the ideas, vision, energy, project values and practical experience the participants bring with them – especially when the training is project-based and research-based. It is important to balance the need to invest in people and care for the overall organizational development. A good example in this respect is

¹¹ <http://www.ceu.hu/>

¹² <http://www.arts.bg.ac.rs/rektoraten/aktiv/?id=lus>

¹³ <http://www.multimedia.org.mk/>

¹⁴ <http://www.arts.bg.ac.rs/rektorat/centar/pr/?id=cprk>

¹⁵ <http://www.akcija.org.ba/>

¹⁶ <http://www.mi2.hr/>

¹⁷ <http://www.clubture.org/>

¹⁸ <http://www.eurocult.org/>

¹⁹ <http://www.kulturkontakt.or.at/page.aspx>

²⁰ <http://www.moe-kulturmanager.de/>

²¹ <http://kulturmanager.bosch-stiftung.de/content/language1/html/index.asp>

²² <http://www.fondation-hicter.org/uk/Forma/Diplome%20/Diplome.html>

the program *Kultura Nova*²³ – a format that has been successfully reworked and transferred to other regions: a long term organizational development for NGOs based on individual development of leaders in a transcultural setting and within the framework of a strategic plan.

- Formal and non-formal educational systems must be able to co-exist alongside one another. Both need to raise **quality standards**, to diversify and codify their formats (i.e. for on-the-job-training, placements, practical experience), and to efficiently integrate **research dimensions** into their programs' curricula. Such training will only be sustainable if it is founded on a self generated knowledge- and competence-based approach and relates to the local context in which culture and arts organizations and projects operate.
- **Follow-up after the training** should include not only setting up alumni organizations, but it should also empower the trainees with a sense of **engagement and responsibility**, along with a capacity for entrepreneurship and self-employment – spreading knowledge and know-how throughout the region.

Project Funding, Coproduction and Cooperation

Supporting projects has been a “classic” means of providing funding in Southeastern Europe. In the last few years funding for co-productions and long-term cooperation projects, even across borders within Southeastern Europe, has taken on importance. This working group's participants focused the debate around the following questions: What projects and what types of project should receive funding? What sort of relevance do local, regional or international projects have? How can we ensure projects remain sustainable when funding comes to an end? How are projects selected, assisted and evaluated? What new funding mechanisms for cultural projects do EU-programs have to offer?

Short presentations in this group were given by: Christiane Erharter, Cultural Program, ERSTE Foundation, Vienna; Katrin Klingan, “relations” project, Berlin; Bojana Matić-Ostojčić, Swiss Cultural Program in the Western Balkans, Sarajevo; Dušica Parezanović, REX Cultural Center, Belgrade.

²³ <http://scindeks.nb.rs/article.aspx?artid=1450-56810307311D>. Dragičević Šešić Milena D., Dragojević Sanjin: Organizacioni razvoj, podizanje kapaciteta i samoodrživost nevladinih organizacija u kulturi - primer programa Kultura Nova, Zbornik radova Fakulteta dramskih umetnosti, 2003, br. 6-7, str. 311-326

- The group participants discussed how they work on projects, especially international projects, in a collaborative mode, and what the features of a successful project are. Projects are “problem solving techniques” and as such, they need to better reflect the needs of the communities and the society where they are implemented. The situation in the region of the Western Balkans changes very often and therefore frequent **situational analysis and need assessment** is required in order to better direct local and international funding policies.
- There is no single funding structure which could respond to all needs. Therefore fundraising and other financial strategies must be **diversified**.
- Funding is more effective when given to projects with a flexible structure, working in a networking mode, and with a diverse portfolio of partners. Funders expect “**regional thinking and actions**” from the applicants and the notion of “regional cooperation” still needs to be developed in the region, especially from a practical perspective and that of meeting local needs.
- **Inter-sectorial projects** have higher chances of receiving grants from international funders. Close links between culture and social issues, local development, environment, education, etc. are important not only for the project application itself, but from the point of view of working towards sustainable communities and sustainable local resources, where culture plays an important role as one of the four main pillars of sustainability, together with political, economic and social development.
- **Small-scale projects** (workshops, small festivals, emerging initiatives), as well as **projects initiated and realized by individuals** (not by NGOs or other organizations) were mentioned as very effective ways to foster creativity and innovation in the arts. Small scale initiatives need to be part of a well elaborated strategic vision, and not just sporadic actions.
- **Advocacy and lobbying** should be an important and integral segment of the project work. Project managers need to exchange experience on successful lobbying and advocacy methods and tools. The long-term financial stability of cultural projects should come from the region itself. Which is why ongoing work with the local authorities and local stakeholders is crucial.
- **Networking** is still one of the most powerful mechanisms for initiating and realizing projects in the field of culture. Networks, coalitions and platforms have the power to change realities and influence policies. They are mainly focused on peoples’ development and capacity building through collaborative endeavors, which is more important than just investing in structures.
- A missing component in international funding is the ongoing regular exchange of information and experiences between funding organizations. **Donors must communicate and share information** (former grantees, current priorities and future plans).

Institutional Funding

Institutional funding for cultural organizations has resulted in a very diverse cultural and artistic scene in the Western Balkans. At the same time, organizations constantly compete for limited and decreasing funds. The debate was concentrated around the following questions: What are the most effective and appropriate funding mechanisms to support cultural institutions? How is funding for institutions related to sustainable cultural development in the region? What is the balance between local and foreign funding? How can the results from the funding be evaluated and how can you follow up after the funding period is over?

Short introductions in this group were given by: Thomas Laely, Pro Helvetia Foundation, Zurich; Jeton Neziraj, Multimedia Center QENDRA, Pristina; Hana Stojić, TRADUKI Regional Office in Sarajevo and Dejan Ubović, Cultural Front, Belgrade.

There is a strong connection between institutional funding and sustainability. Cultural organizations are the pillars of cultural life and achievement, but it is impossible to maintain high quality programming without local or international outside funding. It is also important that local politicians are involved in institutional development, although more effective collaborative mechanisms of lobbying and advocacy must be pursued.

- Cultural operators in the Western Balkans need to develop **better links between the local landscape and European agendas**. It is important to understand European issues and to carefully consider ways to deal with them in this vulnerable and ethically divided region. On the other hand, European colleagues need to better understand the situation in the region and to find appropriate ways to deal with it in terms of supporting culture and arts, and taking into account local needs. The situation differs from country to country, and cultural institutions thus face different types of problems. Any regional strategy for supporting the region should reflect this diversity.
- Culture is not only a field for spending money, but for earning money as well. Investing in cultural professionals' abilities to elaborate **strategic business plans** and incorporating self-generated resources is an important step towards sustainability.
- For cultural institutions to function successfully in the region in the long term, **innovative financial mechanisms** must be explored, including social entrepreneurship schemes, more efficient use of the available local resources, as well as better links between culture and tourism industry.
- Culture is still not considered, either globally or in this region, as an element of **corporate social responsibility** (CSR). CSR could be one way to help with the sustainable development of key institutions in the cultural sector in the Western Balkans.

- **Creating “hybridity”** in the models, actions and programs is important, especially:
 - hybrid models of public-private partnership in the institutional set up;
 - hybrid sets of activities – diversifying the programming and reaching diverse communities;
 - balancing offline events with online ways of working, especially using the power of online platforms, social networking tools and other Web 2.0 tools.
- Institutional development in the cultural sector is closely connected with **urban planning and local architectural development**. Artists and cultural operators must contribute more efficiently to opening new public spaces, making the arts more accessible to wider audiences, using non-conventional spaces and places to organize cultural events.
- Cultural policies must also be better linked to **educational and youth policies**. Improving young people’s access to culture and the arts (both online and offline) is an important aspect that requires collaborative policies and actions at all levels (international, regional and local).

Participants emphasized that any institutional long-term sustainability is closely tied to the development of the peoples’ capacity and that commitment on the part of individuals is crucial to the prosperity of institutions.

Panel Discussion “Funding Culture and EU Integration”

(Open to the public)

The two hour long panel focused on the following questions: What is the role of foreign cultural institutes, and especially the Goethe-Institut, in supporting culture in the region within the framework of the EU integration process? How do the funding mechanisms of foreign funders contribute to establishing a sustainable cultural scene in these countries? What kind of challenges do they face? How could cultural projects act as mediators between different communities in the conflict zones? In such a culturally deregulated region dependent on foreign funds, is there any room for artistic projects that ignore the political function of art, and how could artists create without necessarily fitting into the funders’ agendas? What does the flow of artists and cultural professionals look like for the region of the Western Balkans?

The panelists were: Dr. Rudolf Bartsch, Goethe-Institut Sofia; Prof. Dr. Sanjin Dragojević, University of Zagreb; Bujar Luma, Center for Balkan Cooperation - LOJA, Tetovo; and Rarița Zbranca, A Soul for Europe, Cluj-Napoca.

Highlights from the panelists' presentations

Dr. Bartsch emphasized the differences between the Goethe-Institut's goals and those of other foundations and funders. He stressed the importance of collaboration in catalyzing cultural processes. In Bulgaria, the Goethe-Institut is developing intercultural projects and does not only provide support for projects related to German culture and language.

Dr. Dragojević raised the issue of the decline of foreign funding for the region, which began in the year 2000, and which has resulted in instability in the cultural sector. He pointed out that one of the key tasks for local cultural policy creation is to connect the civil, public and private sectors, which still often fail to work together. Public authorities at the national, regional and local levels must also learn to coordinate their efforts. Another key problem is the lack of skills and competences in strategic and business planning.

Bujar Luma emphasized the need for cultural organizations and artists to understand social aspects and policy issues. The societies in the Western Balkans are divided and culture can often be used to promote nationalism and foster nationalistic agendas. Culture needs to be turned into an effective tool for integration and co-operation. It is especially important that innovative and creative ideas be generated, then funders will be attracted to the projects and will join them.

Rarița Zbranca shared her experience in developing skills in lobbying and advocacy, together with establishing programming and managing projects. Ongoing connections with decision-makers are efficient only when cultural professionals talk with a coherent voice and form coalitions. Investing in the capacity of people to learn the "*language of lobbying*" is crucial. She emphasized that culture is a "working force" for regional development. Cultural projects and organizations can hardly benefit from the European Union's programs because of the high level of bureaucracy involved in applying for and reporting about projects. Artists need flexible mechanisms and a better format for applying with small-scale projects to EU institutions.

Highlights from the audience's interventions

The discussion between the panelists and the audience primarily concerned the panelists' presentations. A few other highlights can be mentioned:

- It is important that cultural managers also concentrate on programming and the quality of artistic work, and not just on funding. An important aspect of project management is how it can foster intercultural dialog, how it can influence the life of the local communities. The purpose of every project in culture goes beyond mere institutional development and extends to social aims. A "matrix" approach to project development and institutional planning is important – balancing programming and creativity, with social issues and financial aspects.

- Cultural projects are always connected with developing human capital. The motivation and inspiration of the people working at a project (teams, volunteers, board members, staff) is a basic vector for development of a long-term collaborative approach.
- One of the ways for German funders to help the region of the Western Balkans is for them to invest in German language courses for graduate students (in culture, arts and cultural management programs), as well as to facilitate regional cultural network meetings.
- Culture is slowly but surely finding its way into the European Union agenda through key documents, programs and statements, especially as relates to creative industries, cultural diversity, intercultural dialog, creativity and innovation, as well as involvement of youth. There is a long way to go before the citizens and people living in the region understand well the consequences of the EU integration process, and what exactly it means for their daily life. “EU integration” doesn’t only mean political integration but also cultural – and even emotional – integration.

Final observations and recommendations

General recommendations

- New intersectorial policy schemes, programs and projects need to be established. This also means ongoing cooperation among different funders, including those who are more oriented toward issues outside of culture (such as public health, the economy, social issues, the environment, education, science, etc.) as well as creating programs that will stimulate intersectorial cooperation.
- The regional schemes for regional collaborative projects have to be created locally – by the governments within region. Active advocacy can stimulate governments to action, but so can seed money from international donors when it is conditioned on initial support to be provided by local governments.
- Cultural management development requires regional training programs and regional internships that connect cultural operators from the region and raise the quality of internship coaching in the region.
- Supporting European networking and local (regional) networks is crucial. To stimulate networking it would be necessary to set up a specific fund for cultural organizations which might cover the following costs: the network “fees” for newcomers, the expense of attending the annual general assembly and initiating and realizing a project idea within the network.
- An important trend for further development to fund for networks within a country, and not only for civil society organizations, but also for private and public cultural institutions and artists

(an example is Vojvodina, where several networks have recently been created – private museums, municipal cultural centers, etc.).

Concrete recommendations for the Robert Bosch Stiftung and other founders

- To support the organization of the 2nd regional *Sarajevo conference* – 10 years after, regrouping art managers, artists and cultural policy researchers and policy makers. The aim would be to assess the effects of changes and to plan further joint actions.
- To foster European competences and intercultural sensitivity by providing German language education at art management at undergraduate and graduate programs in the region (at the moment there is only English and French language teaching) – which would later enable young graduates to go on to internships or further education in German speaking countries.
- Considering the current predominance of Anglo-American literature and approaches in the field: helping to translate relevant literature in the field of cultural policy and management (from the languages of the region into German, or from German into the local languages).
- To support a Regional Meeting of Cultural Management students and Robert Bosch Stiftung's grantees in Belgrade in conjunction with celebrating 50 years of Cultural Management education in the Region in 2011 (students from: Tuzla, Zagreb, Cetinje (Montenegro), Skopje, Novi Sad, Timișoara and Sofia) with students from corresponding departments from Potsdam, Hildesheim, Munich, Hamburg, Ludwigsburg, etc.
- To encourage German art managers to be involved in European networks, such as ENCATC²⁴, ORACLE (<http://www.oracleculturalnetwork.site40.net/ohrid/seminar.html>), etc., where only few German institutions and individuals are represented.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of participants

Appendix 2: Regional bibliography of the literature relevant to cultural management and to financing culture

Appendix 3: Radoslav Rasa Todosijevic – Edinburgh Charter

²⁴ <http://www.encatc.org/pages/index.php>