

ENCOURAGING THE MOBILITY OF COLLECTIONS

European Conference

Helsinki, 20-21 July 2006



CONFERENCE REPORT

The mobility of museum collections

"The mobility of museum collections is a decisive factor in the dissemination of knowledge, experience, mutual inspiration and cooperation in the cultural sector. Mobility is an important tool for communicating the diversity of cultures in Europe and strengthening cultural cooperation. Networking, the sharing of knowledge and values, plays a key role in this work.



In order to make this common cultural area a reality for the peoples of Europe, it is important to promote the transnational mobility of cultural objects and works of art, encourage dialogue and create new ways of bringing both our cultural diversity and our common cultural heritage to the fore."

Opening words by Tanja Saarela, Minister of Culture

Enhancing the mobility of museum collections is a key means to develop a cultural area, which is shared by Europeans and based on cultural diversity and cultural dialogue. The theme arises from the concern that a major part of our common European heritage cannot be actively shared, enjoyed and visited by the public.

Mobility of museum collections has been one of the key issues of cultural action at the European level since 2002. Before Helsinki, the theme has been developed further in four major conferences during the EU Presidencies of Greece, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

During the Netherlands' Presidency, a high level expert group drew up a report Lending to Europe, which consists of a description of the central thematic areas and practical recommendations for museums, Member States and EU institutions. The Austrian Presidency chaired a team representing the six successive Presidencies of the Netherlands, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, Austria, Finland and Germany (2004 - 2007), which prepared a 'Draft Action Plan for the EU Promotion of Museum Collections' Mobility and Loan Standards' according to the guidelines stated in the Council Work Programmes for Culture 2002 - 2004 and 2005 - 2006.

Along with the Draft Action Plan working groups were established to promote and implement its six action areas.



Encouraging the Mobility of Collections Conference

"Museums and their collections are part of our common memory. They select, preserve and conserve our past and also our present. But more than that, they tell us stories and they are places to enjoy our heritage and to learn from art, culture and history. They bring the past alive, to interact with the present world and also to help us understand the future.

In this work, the collections are the museum's source of inspiration, and exhibitions their primary tool. There are thousands of museums in Europe, with millions of works of art, cultural objects and natural exhibits in their collections. Millions and millions of people visit museum exhibitions every year. Still, only a limited number of major exhibitions are organised annually and a vast part of the collections is out of reach in storages."

Tanja Saarela

To encourage the mobility of collections, Finland's EU Presidency organised a conference at the National Museum of Finland in Helsinki on July 20–21, 2006. The conference was opened by [Tanja Saarela](#), Minister of Culture of Finland, and addressed by the [Ján Figel](#), Member of the European Commission. The conference was funded with the support of the European Commission. The themes of the first day of the conference were valuation and long-term loans. Draft Action Plan for the EU Promotion of Museum Collections' Mobility and Loan Standards was discussed on the second day of the conference.

"I would like to emphasise the importance of mobility of collections for art works and to underline the support of the European Union to develop the dialogue on this issue. This issue will continue to be a concern for us, both in the Council Rolling Agenda (Work

Plan 2005-2006) as well as one of the focal issues within the new instrument of European cultural cooperation: the Community Programme "Culture 2007.

Within the current Work Programme, the Mobility of Collections is the first highly visible outcome to date. It is and will be perceived by others as an example to follow.

We must acknowledge the fact that the period of analysis is over and it is now time for the implementation of the solutions proposed last year. I have expectations vis-à-vis the conference, which should mark progress and yield concrete results (such as the highlighting of best practices and elements already implemented throughout Member States).

It is clear to us however that there are numerous obstacles to be overcome, and that progress is more advanced in some areas than in other ones, this is why the involvement not only of the Commission, the Member States, but primarily of stakeholders at various levels, such as museum directors and curators, is paramount in order to reach this common goal."

Ján Figel'

The conference brought together 144 experts, representatives from museums, museums organisations and networks, cultural administrators, representatives of the European Commission and the Cultural Affairs Committee Members. All the Member States were represented in the Conference.

For the time being, it is too early to evaluate the impact of the conference. The main achievement was, however, launching of the Working Groups, setting of their targets and making the Draft Action Plan and its aims more widely known for a larger audience. It is already possible to say that the conference reached its goal. The concrete achievements are very much depending on the success of the Action Plan and its follow-up as well as the measures taken forward by the Member States, museums, museums' organisations, EU institutions and the six Working Groups.

The visibility of the conference in the media was promoted by press releases and interviews. The themes and the organisation of the conference received a positive feedback from the participants. The programme of the conference and all the background materials can be found in the conference website (http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Tapahtumakalenteri/2006/07/encouraging_mobility_collections.html?lang=en). The speeches are linked to the programme. The material is updated regularly.



Introduction to the conference themes

The first day of the Conference was chaired by [Ritva Wäre](#), Director of the National Museum of Finland and a member of the Lending to Europe expert group. It consisted of the introduction to the conference themes and two theme sessions. The keynote speakers after the opening addresses by [Tanja Saarela](#) and [Ján Figel'](#) were [Francine Mariani-Ducray](#) (Director of the Musées de France) and [Maija Tanninen-Mattila](#) (Director of the Ateneum Art Museum / Finnish National Gallery). The keynotes formed a framework for the theme discussions and highlighted the central issues and trajectories which helped the audience to tackle the challenges of the present situation.

"Concerning public collections, the concept of mobility of collections brings to mind the idea of a temporary exhibition and, thus the rather older practice of deposits on a more or less long term, generally agreed by a State or State museum to another public collection in the same country or between the museums themselves.

The history of museums in the second half of the 20th century was in fact very deeply entrenched with this idea of temporary exhibition, which is nowadays on the top level of events affecting the life of museums. However, the phenomena of an exhibition crossed a threshold about ten years ago when the first signs of saturation appeared for certain top rank collections, raising questions for professionals in the field on the type of exhibition, its frequency and its cost.

I would just like to point out three subjects that I think are particularly important in relation to the subject of this conference, even if they may seem slightly forbidding due to their legal scope:

- I/ State guarantees
- II/ Privilege from seizure
- III/ Long-term loans and deposits of works

In my opinion, there is a common trend at a European and international level, which is to tend towards avoiding works of art with financial contingences or political or commercial disputes.”

Francine Mariani-Ducray

Collection mobility is a concept created to cover a large number of actions. Many of these are on a fairly practical level. The aim is to help build trust among museums, facilitate networking between professionals and promote best practises and standardization in loan procedures.

All this helps museums to speak the same language and to know, trust and help each other.

“During this millennium, concern for the future of museums has been a central topic in museology. Resources have been discussed. The number of objects that fall under the responsibility and preservation of museums is increasing, while resources appointed for collection care have not increased. Also, the content of collections is discussed: who is collecting and what?

We must consider the means we have for acquiring and the meaningfulness of acquisitions. We must learn to see the possibilities of utilizing existing collections. We must take a stand on the concept of ownership. And we must try to see the objectives of our responsibility for documentation in a context that is wider than just our own museum.

It is essential to understand that European cultural heritage belongs to us all; it is a part of us all. We could say we are in the middle of a change in paradigm: we are moving from a time of

ownership to a time of sharing. This is based not only on seeing our common goals, but also on promoting the sense of trust between the different parties – whether big or small.”

Maija Tanninen-Mattila



Value and valuation - removing obstacles

The cultural, artistic and market value of cultural objects is diverse, and there are often contradictory angles for assessing the context and essence of cultural objects. In a broader perspective, the logic of value and valuation can be seen as one of the most essential and delicate ways of seeking new solutions to ease the mobility of collections. The speakers at the conference and the discussions following them were introducing innovative approaches to the questions of value and valuation of cultural objects.

The session was chaired by [Astrid Weij](#) (Advisor on International Affairs, Netherlands' Ministry of Education, Culture and Science). The speakers in the session were [Hillary Bauer](#) (Head of Cultural Property Unit, DCMS), [Krzysztof Pomian](#) (Scientific Director, Museum of Europe, Brussels), [Jan Willem Sieburgh](#) (Business Director, Rijksbuseum, Amsterdam) commented by [Janne Vilkkuna](#) (Professor of Museology, University of Jyväskylä).

During the session "Value and valuation – removing obstacles" the speakers provided a wide perspective on the valuation of cultural objects. [Hillary Bauer](#) showed examples on how the value can be defined and argued for state indemnity schemes as a best solution for enhancing the mobility of collections.

"The dictionary definition of "Valuation" is "*the act of deciding how much money something might be sold for or the amount of money decided on*": Assessing the value of works of art (museum objects) is necessary for legal reasons, and for dealing with insurance claims. The valuer must strike a balance between how the artist values his art and how the art community in the widest sense values that art. The opinion of an expert such as a dealer or an art consultant may be necessary, in addition to that of a museum curator, to establish the value of the item in question. But this is not an exact science.

I do urge you all to think again about introducing a Government

Indemnity Scheme or, if you have one already, making it as comprehensive as possible. Because it avoids the need to pay commercial insurance premiums, this is one of the best ways to increase the mobility of collections. But of course any such scheme must be underpinned by the highest standards being maintained by everyone involved in the process, including: the borrowers, the lenders, the experts and the curators as well as the Government and its agencies and not forgetting the fine art transporters.”

Hillary Bauer

Ut became clear that many issues and aspects have to be tackled, discussed and debated, and perspectives on each issue need to be recognized, identified, questioned, and respected. Jan Sieburgh's presentation was an excellent example of describing numerous such perspectives. The presentation is linked to the conference programme http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Tapahtumakalenteri/2006/07/eu_20_2107/MobilityConferenceProgramme_en.pdf.

Krzysztof Pomian revealed the implicit, hidden mechanism: how the cultural value comes first, and is a prerequisite for the market value. The market needs museums. Quantitative value is dependable on qualitative value.

“The increased mobility of museum collections is considered as one of efficient means to create a “common [European] cultural area”. But under present circumstances there is a danger that the exchange of museum objects will be treated as an exchange of commodities and that, more generally, despite all the rhetoric of “non-commercial cultural exchange”, the common cultural area will be assimilated to some kind of a cultural common market. The great merit of recommendations presented by authors of *Lending to Europe* in their report is that they try to maintain the exchange of objects between museums in different countries inside the gift economy. Such intention is clearly legible behind their proposals concerning insurance, fees to be paid by one museum to another

and the like. The open question is whether these recommendations can be implemented without changes in national regulations currently in force.”

Krzysztof Pomian

After the critical views presented by [Janne Vilkuna](#), who stressed the importance of defining our objectives, the chair summed up the session in a following way:

“Oscar Wilde once said cynics know the price of everything and the value of nothing. With this phrase he ment that certain things should never carry dollar signs. Museum objects are such ‘things’. The value of these ‘things’ increase due to monetary value that is added to museum objects, due to the fact that this value is a reference for insurances and indemnity. Therefore, museums face increasing costs that is an obstacle for mobility of collections. Should not others values be more important than the monetary value?

During the session Value and valuation – removing obstacles the speakers provided a wide perspective on the valuation of cultural objects. The presentations varied from the tension museums face as part of the gift economy in relation to the market economy, a practical way of how to justify monetary value to an encouragement to change attitude when it comes to this subject.

The presentations gave a boost to the discussion on valuation. They showed that there is variety of thoughts, opinions and ideas concerning the subject. The importance is that valuation is faced by museum professionals, governments and European Institutions and that they are willing to break common conventions so that the normal procedures used until now should be broken to support mobility of collections and the ‘European message’. ”

Astrid Weij

Long term loans - improving access

Long-term loans are an economic way to enrich collections, to strengthen their significance and to make the most of collection resources for the benefit of the public. Creating the necessary environment to increase long-term loan activities requires the removal of administrative, legal and practical obstacles. Measures to be taken in order to encourage long-term loans include recommendations and information services to ease cooperation between museums, re-evaluation of collection practises and policies and supplementation of collections to fill gaps through long-term loaning.

This session was chaired by [Susanna Pettersson](#) (Senior Planning Officer, Finnish National Gallery). The panelists in the session were [Pilar Barraca de Ramos](#) (Secretary of the Board for the Certification, Valuation and Export of the Property of the Spanish Historical Heritage, Spanish Ministry of Culture), [Anna Catalani](#) (Researcher, Department for Museum Studies, University of Leicester), [Peeter Mauer](#) (Adviser on Museums, Estonian Ministry of Culture) and [Norman Palmer](#) (Barrister, Chair of the Treasure Valuation Committee, UK).

In the panel the long term loan discussion raised questions around museum collections and post-colonialism and about national heritage and legislation, as builders of European identity and asking for trust. And finally, the theme was examined from a 'lawyer's perspective'. [Norman Palmer](#) tackled the issue of long term loaning from the perspective of using it as a positive, mutually satisfying solution for different types of cases, and challenged the audience with ambitious ideas on shared ownership and rotation of lending.

"A lender may have numerous reasons for bailing his works of art to a reputable museum. Bailment may relieve the lender of the burdens of storage, security and insurance, and may add value to the work itself. Lending may attract buyers, or counter-loans or fiscal advantages. It may help the lender to avoid export controls, as in the recent case of the Joshua Reynolds portrait Omai, where the proposed exporter of a painting who had been refused a permanent export licence from the United Kingdom was granted a

temporary licence to enable it to be loaned for a term of years to the National Gallery at Dublin. Loans may also help to circumvent any legal prohibition on outright disposal by the lending museum, while producing a broadly comparable practical effect. In a cross-border context a loan may earn the work protection from legal proceedings, via an anti-seizure statute in the borrowing State: in theory an object might be safer on loan than 'at home'.

In time, the act of public lending may even expunge any residual doubts as to the lender's title by assisting the expiry of a statutory limitation period.

Each of these gains may be enhanced by maximising the duration of the loan. In general, the longer the loan, the greater the gain. If the object is suitable for extended loan and the agreement is adequately drafted to cover such contingent matters as title claims, custodial duties and withdrawal of the object, long-term loans are normally in the interests of borrowing as well as lending museums."

Norman Palmer

In her conclusion, Susanna Pettersson stated the following:

"Sharing and learning from each other as well as making the good practises visible are the key issues when thinking about promoting collection mobility to grass root level.

This will link our conference theme also to the mobility of people and the importance of trust that was addressed especially from the point of view of smaller EU countries (as Peeter Mauer said). The better we know the existing practises including legislation concerning the export of cultural heritage, the better we can move forward (as Pilar Barraca de Ramos addressed). Anna Catalani convinced us on the importance of museum collections in representing people, and the role of long-term loans in this context.

Long term loans are clearly a huge possibility for the museum sector. But they are also a great challenge. We need to ensure that when put in practice the museums follow the code of practice as well as other well thought out guidelines and recommendations. And we should define, even more clearly than so far, that what is the status and definition of the long term loan compared to those temporary and more or less permanent loans that already exist.”

Susanna Pettersson



Encouraging the Mobility of Collections: the way forward

The theme sessions were followed by a concrete example of cooperation. The NEMO representatives [Mechtild Kronenberg](#) and [Birgid Pudney-Schmidt](#) gave European guidelines for administration of loans by presenting a study concerning a model of a standard loan agreement.

The challenging task of concluding the first day and giving a way forward was given to [Günther Schauerte](#) (Deputy Director General, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin).

“Now that the basic idea of “collection mobility” has been confirmed by the EU Council of Ministers and the associated instructions have been given to draw up an “action plan”, we have achieved for the first time a concrete link between the “museum professionals”, all levels of the members states and the EU institutions at the conferences in The Hague, Manchester and Helsinki, as demanded programmatically in *Lending to Europe*. With NEMO we have added a further level, that of the museum networks, of the governing officials. This is a vital addition, through which we can gain overall presence. Otherwise we shall be confronted with precisely those negative aspects which I said I was afraid of. We shall be making a highly intelligent plan for European cultural integration which cannot work. The German writer Bertolt Brecht wrote fifty years ago of a vision, which I would like to quote as a quite deliberate provocation: “Imagine there’s a war – and nobody goes to it.”

To ensure things don’t get that far, the Cultural Ministers Council has asked all of us assembled here to undertake what is necessary. That is to make a deepening consideration and development of proposals and tools to improve this cultural exchange on a

sustained basis. Today we have been talking about two central issues, “Value and valuation” and “Long-term loans” and we have heard reasonable suggestions as to how we can overcome resistance and improve workflows.

I will not repeat our discussions in detail, but I will point out that we ourselves produce major problems through our ignorance or our egotism. If framework conditions for “collection mobility for European museums” are to be improved, the improvement must start among ourselves. Above all this means approaching each other in a spirit of confidence, and an insight that culture does not have always to be merely a culture of self interest, but must also be a culture of mutual sharing.”

Günther Schauerte

The Draft Action Plan: presentations & exchange of views

The second day of the conference, chaired by [Risto Ruuhonen](#) (Special Government Advisor, Finnish Ministry of Education), aimed at fostering dialogue on the *Draft Action Plan for the EU Promotion of Museum Collections' Mobility and Loan Standards* and the future actions based upon it at the national and European level.

The Draft Action Plan draws together the themes discussed during the previous EU Presidencies of Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom and Austria, guidelines stated in the Council Resolutions on Work Plans for Culture 2002–2004 and 2005–2006 and the recommendations included in the *Lending to Europe* report.

The Draft Action Plan in its present status was drawn up under the Austrian Presidency as a common effort of six succeeding presidencies chaired by [Armin Mahr](#) from Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. [Armin Mahr](#) presented the draft action plan in the conference, and described briefly the creation of the working groups responsible for carrying the torch.

The mission of the draft action plan is to encourage the mobility of collections while fully taking into account the characteristics in legal and administrative framework at the national level: "The lending and borrowing of cultural objects and works of art – the mobility of collections – are essential activities of museums. Best practices, commonly applied loan standards and guarantee schemes provided by EU Member States, encourage museums of various sizes and in all parts of the European Union to share a wider scope of cultural objects and thus help citizens in Europe to understand and enjoy the diversity of their common European cultural heritage. The aim of this Action Plan is to facilitate the access to Europe's cultural heritage, make it available for all citizens and find new ways to improve co-operation, trust and good practice for lending between museums. The necessary environment for increased mobility of museum collections should be created in conformity with the principle of subsidiarity and while fully respecting the Member States' legal framework to protect national treasures possessing artistic, historic or archaeological value."

Draft Action Plan

Risto Ruohonen's presentation on the implementation of the Draft Action Plan during the Finnish Presidency focused on the coordination of the Working Groups' activities, on dialogue between the stakeholders both at the national level and at European level, and on raising the visibility of the theme by making the best use of the communication channels.

According to Risto Ruohonen, the coordination of the Working Groups' activities requires:

- A clear vision of the roles of the Working Groups in the European and national context
- Feasible division of labour between the stakeholders
- Dialogue & cooperation between the stakeholders
- Work Plans for the Working Groups
- Support services to enable efficient dissemination of the results and smooth cooperation of the working groups, and
- Mechanisms for the follow-up.

Expected outcomes of the Working Groups are:

- A compendium of relevant international treaty obligations, the related international legal framework & other documents on collection mobility
- Collecting and disseminating best practices & benchmarking
- Proposals (concerning e.g. development of the legal and administrative framework at the national and European level)
- Recommendations for e.g. loan standards and for introducing immunity from seizure, and
- Inquiries and surveys.

In his presentation Risto Ruohonen emphasised the need for dialogue between the Working Groups, the Member States, the Commission, the Council, museums and museums' organisations.

Promotion of collection mobility should be seen as a joint effort of all the stakeholders. The Working Groups should present both their work and the overall aims and activities of the Action Plan in the meetings and workshops organised by or in cooperation with museums and museums' organisations. The feasible division of labour and good cooperation between the Working Groups and museums' organisations active at the European level such as NEMO and ICOM-Europe is needed.

The Council of the European Union should be informed on the results of the Working Groups and on the implementation of the Action Plan at large. The dialogue between the Presidency, the Working Groups and the European Commission is a prerequisite for success. The implementation of the Action Plan should also be presented to the European Parliament.

To achieve a common goal of strengthened collection mobility in Europe, existing channels of communication such as European museums' conferences, meetings and journals should be actively used. One single information point for the collection mobility theme, a website, should be established.

Harald Hartung (Head of Unit Culture, Education and Culture DG, European Commission) encouraged the audience to seize the momentum. He asked, what we should do in order to spread the message? According to Harald Hartung, we need to cover all levels and we should speak to the key persons in museums, to decision makers, and to people working in the national administration.

Mobility of collections should be communicated and advertised in an active way, and we should reach out for a wider public. Harald Hartung stressed that we need to make a best possible use of a network of the PR persons of museums to spread the message. Last, but not least, he said: we need time. Facilitating and encouraging is a long process, but it is important that we are doing our very best to follow the path by setting milestones on it.

Furthermore, Harald Hartung stated that when it comes to the process of collection mobility promotion, the essential thing is to work and proceed in a transparent way, and keep the process open for new members to join later on. Some issues of the collection mobility could be developed into the projects that could apply for funding from the future Culture Programme (2007 – 2013).

Werner Weber, the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media of Germany, focused on the idea of setting up a website that would act as a permanent information point for the collection mobility theme. The content, structure and maintenance of the website would be developed in the working group of Germany, the Netherlands, Finland and NEMO. The first draft for the content of the website includes:

- Definitions (terminology)
- Recommendations and guidelines
- Presentation of best practices
- Discussion papers & articles

- Studies
- Information on national loan procedures and forms (links to the web sites that are nationally maintained)
- Key legal documents
- Calendar of major events
- Contacts.

The six working groups to promote the collection mobility

During the Austrian Presidency, six working groups were established to encourage the implementation of the future Action Plan. At the beginning of the Finland's EU Presidency, the focus was on coordinating their work and finding ways to ensure the implementation of their recommendations and findings.

The chairs and co-chairs had their first joint meeting on 19 July in Helsinki. In this meeting it was decided that the coordination of the Working Groups' activities required that the troika of the Presidencies, and the chairs and the co-chairs of the Working Groups would:

- define the roles of the Working Groups (including a feasible division of labour between the stakeholders)
- draw up work plans for the Working Groups
- build a consensus between the chairs, co-chairs and the Presidency troika on common issues:
 - o expected results: the "nature" of expected results and the support
 - o structure / services needed to disseminate the results
 - o dialogue & cooperation between the stakeholders
 - o shared activities of the Working Groups.

In the conference, the chairpersons of the Working Groups presented the draft work plans consisting of expected impact, output and the preliminary timeframe.

Working Group 1 - Loan administration and loan standards

(Anna Janistinova, Czech National Gallery & Carl Aigner, ICOM Austria)

Impact

Museums and owners will loan their cultural objects only when their partners guarantee at least similar standards of care in all aspects of the loans process. Transparent and compatible processes facilitate collections mobility through predictability and trust.

Two concrete documents should be proposed for EU good practice and steps should be taken to make them accepted.

Impact Assessment: A third (brief) document should advise on EU canon of loan administration / loan ethics documents, and reflect working progress and the state of discussion with (acceptance/non acceptance, recommendations for further proceeding) by mid 2007.

Output

Two content categories:

- 1) Existing documents and standards: Working Group should generally support their promotion (e.g. ICOM Code of Ethics).
- 2) New standard documents: Working Group should create a tangible output.

General Working Group focus:

- Developing two European standard documents:
 - Standard Condition report
 - Standard Facilities Report
- Assessing existing standard forms and ongoing standard forms debates for best loan practice in the light of the ICOM Code of Ethics.

Time frame

Spring / 2007

Working Group 2: State indemnity schemes

(Agnes Kiss, the Ministry of Education and Culture of Hungary)

Impact

- Ensuring the cognition and comparability of national schemes.
- Encouraging Member States and museums to accept other Member States' indemnity, increasing trust.
- Raising awareness and interest among Member States to introduce and improve indemnity schemes.
- Member States are encouraged to establish and use comprehensive government indemnity schemes as an alternative to commercial insurance, covering all works of art and cultural objects which are loaned for public benefit.

Output

- Determination of key components of state indemnity schemes.
- Common website for introducing indemnity schemes (legal framework



- and procedures for loans, documentation, translations).
- Determination of fields where standardization is welcomed (e.g. facility report), recommendation for standards on such field.
- Inquiries to the Member States on
 - Updating the survey of June 2004
 - Functioning of national indemnity schemes
 - Acceptance of their schemes
- Recommendations for other stakeholders (guidelines for members without indemnity scheme or with a scheme that needs to be reviewed – with attention to the best practise).
- Designating contact points in Member States.

Working Group 3: Valuation, self-insurance and non-insurance of cultural objects

(Astrid Weij, the Netherlands' Ministry of Education, Culture and Science)

Impact

- Reducing valuation (agreed value) might decrease cost of insurance premiums.
- Non-insurance and self-insurance can be used in addition to state indemnity (the preferred solution) in order to reduce the costs of loans (and therefore the exhibition costs) by agreements which are based on the principles of trust and shared standards of collections care between lending and borrowing institutions.
- Lending and borrowing objects without a compulsory insurance raise attention of security and surroundings of objects (humidity, light etc.) which are of utmost importance.

Output

- Raising awareness among professionals concerning valuation and non-insurance.
- Decision on action plan on valuation / non-insurance.
- Discussion with European registrars on valuation and non-insurance.
- Provide a tool (proposal) on how lenders might substantiate insurance value.
- Brief study of those MS where lending based on self-insurance / non-insurance is in operation.
- Inquiries and dialogue (esp. governments).
- Discussion papers on on both subjects in professional journals and www.museumcollectionsonthemove.org, museum associations via NEMO, BIZOT.
- Helsinki Conference July 2006 (a theme).

Working Group 4: Immunity from seizure

(Hillary Bauer, the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sports)

Impact

- A member state gives a legal guarantee that cultural objects on temporary loan from another country will be protected against any form of seizure during the loan period.
- This will enable more countries to participate in borrowing and lending because lenders will have much greater certainty that objects will be returned at the end of the loan.

Output

- Aim to stimulate discussion of this area and encourage research for example by museum bodies 2006-2007.
- Discussion to include ways of ensuring due diligence is carried out.
- Designate of single information points in cooperation with NEMO.
- Prepare a compendium of relevant international treaty obligations and the related international legal background (EC law) to be available electronically (June 2007).
- Prepare Recommendations on introducing Immunity from Seizure legislation (based on Action Plan) before German Presidency Conference (March 2007).
- Prepare a short report giving summary of key issues for introducing or improving immunity from seizure legislation, including promotion of good practices and benchmarking (June 2007).

Working Group 5: Loan fees and long term loans

(Susanna Pettersson, the Finnish National Gallery)

Impact

- Enabling access to little known or underused collections for the benefit of the public.
- Linking larger and smaller museums and making visible the diversity of European cultures.
- Long term loans have long term benefits compared to exhibition loans. Long term loans will create lasting relationships between museums.
- Clarifying loan costs will create an atmosphere of greater cooperation and reciprocity. Removing loan fees will relieve museum budgets for other purposes and thus benefits both the European museum community and Europe's citizens.

Output

Promote long term loan standards as well as guidelines for good practices between museums:

- Create definition and status of long term loans (how they differ from exhibition loans).
- Provide the toolkit for long term loans to include standards, contracts, good practise and benchmarking.
- Promote the benefits of long term loans.

Working Group 6: Building up trust / networking

(Günther Schauerte, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin)

Impact

- A sustainable basis for the whole range of cultural objects is the creation of a common European cultural area that relies on trust.
- Building up trust and increasing contacts between stakeholders at all levels will help to enlarge the small number of lenders and borrowers, and to promote the exchange of cultural objects.

Output

- Helsinki Conference July 2006 (a theme) + other conferences.
- Analyze which networks already exist and encourage them to contribute

to the mobility of collections.

- Workshops during the German Presidency in the first half of 2007.
- Set up communication between existing networks.
- Establish cooperation between existing and upcoming networks.
- Develop standards, guidelines.



Conclusions

- by Risto Ruohonen, chair of the conference

In our common and shared European “structured” cooperation, we have now luckily come to the point where the daily life and the core activities of museums are in the focus.

Much has been already done – collection mobility is no news to the museums, but it has not been emphasized this strongly in the European context before. In *Günther Schauerte’s* words, the links between the different stakeholders – museums, governments, museums’ organisations, and European Institutions - have been created for the first time.

Harald Hartung stressed the importance of long-term commitment, proactive measures, closer follow-up actions from the EU Member States and monitoring of the results at the European level.

Now, from my point of view, we should reassure that the right people are talking together. We should test our ideas in practice. The working groups are one channel for this practical cooperation. One of their most important tasks is to find the right people representing the stakeholders, and to identify and promote best practices of museums and administration.

We are building on continuation, and see our Presidency as one link in the chain. Our Presidency, and future Presidencies, are building their efforts on the corner stones that have been established in previous conferences, in the Council recommendations, the drawing up of the future Culture Programme of the EU, and on the expertise

that produced the Lending to Europe Report and the documents connected to it.

I see one aspect as being of uttermost importance. It is trust. Trust is a prerequisite for collection mobility, and, at the same time, trust grows from getting to know each other. We should give trusting a chance. Trust is both a mental and social phenomenon and an outcome of appropriate and transparent processes.

When looking for practical reasons to support the collection mobility, loaning can be seen as an alternative for owning. It is always cheaper to lend than to buy, as Günther Schauerte said. He also described how overcoming egoism by strengthening the culture of mutual share is an opportunity for the whole museum field.

Organising Committee

The Conference was hosted by the Ministry of Education as part of the Finnish EU Presidency and organised together with the National Board of Antiquities in cooperation with the European Commission. The Conference venue was the National Museum of Finland. The Organising Committee was chaired by Risto Ruohonen, Special Government Advisor, the Ministry of Education. The members of the Committee and the contact information of the Secretariat can be found at the Conference web site http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Tapahtumakalenteri/2006/07/eu_20_2107/MobilityConferenceCommittee.pdf.

This report is produced by the Secretariat. Please don't hesitate to give us any feedback concerning both the Conference, its content and arrangements as well as this report and its content. The feedback can be sent to the Secretariat by emailing to Pirjo Hamari, pirjo.hamari@nba.fi.

Selected photos from Suomenlinna















MINISTRY OF
EDUCATION



NATIONAL BOARD
OF ANTIQUITIES



Education and Culture

Culture 2000

This conference has been funded with support from the European Commission, the framework programme Culture 2000 within the budget line: Measures in favour of civil society. This conference reflects the views only of the organisers, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.