

The background of the entire page is a photograph of two acrobats performing on ropes. They are silhouetted against a bright, orange and red sunset sky. The acrobat on the left is hanging upside down from a rope, holding onto it with both hands. The acrobat on the right is also upside down, holding onto a rope with one hand. The ropes are vertical and extend from the top of the frame. The overall mood is artistic and dynamic.

Circostrada Network

Anne Tucker
Anne-Marie Autissier
Stéphane Simonin
Yohann Floch (coord.)

The Circulation of Street Arts
and Circus Artworks in Europe
Survey sample of artistic companies

The Circulation of Street Arts and Circus Artworks in Europe

Survey *sample of artistic companies*

Summary

“Let’s Move (more and better!)” p. 3

Stéphane Simonin

(director of HorsLesMurs)

Yohann Floch

(head of foreign affairs at HorsLesMurs and
coordinator of Circostrada Network)

“Mobility and Sharing, a Few Elements
for a New European Geography of the Performing Arts” p. 6

Anne-Marie Autissier

(lecturer at the Institute of European Studies – Université Paris VIII
and chief editor of the review Culture Europe International)

Methodology p. 9

Survey Results p. 11

Anne Tucker

(researcher and director of Manchester International Arts)

Annex p. 29

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Culture Programme



Education and Culture DG

CIRCOSTRADA NETWORK

HorsLesMurs

Acknowledgements to the artists who took time to answer our questions,
to the translators who participated in this publication (Brian Quinn and Pascale Fougère),
to Sanae Barghouthi, coordination assistant.

Covers: Cie Nö, Baignade interdite © Florence Delahaye – Graphic Design: Marine Hadjes

Let's Move (more and better)!¹

Stéphane Simonin / Yohann Floch

Collecting figures and evaluating the influence of the circus and street arts in Europe (in terms of funding, employment, impact, etc.) is a seemingly impossible feat. These sectors are still considered to be a sub-category of the theatre in a majority of countries within the European Community. How much public funding has been allocated to this sector? This is one of the many questions that remain unanswered to this day, since the circus and street arts are generally not dissociated from other sectors in the widespread, hotch potch national/European statistics on the performing arts².

Because one of our objectives is to better understand these sectors and to increase awareness of them, Circostrada Network wanted its qualitative 2007 study to paint the companies' economic portrait. Aside from simply needing to be more in touch with companies' modes of operation, we also wanted to follow up on the many works involved in 2006, European Year of Mobility. Cultural networks and operators have produced some major studies, and have proposed a series of recommendations to the European institutions so that they may allow for greater mobility for artists and greater circulation for artistic works³. Slowly but surely, and thanks to existing programmes, the institutions have been working toward harmonising legislation when possible⁴, and taking into account the special needs of creative professionals.

The results of the study "Circulation of circus and street artworks in Europe" were collected by the researcher Anne Tucker, who is also the director of Manchester International Arts (United Kingdom). The goal of this work is to better understand the current reality of companies' distribution and to assess the international portion of this distribution. Through a thorough economic analysis of 66 European companies, the study provides brute data on creative teams' budgets, show sales, the number of performances, and their presence within the country of origin, Europe and the rest of the world. This work must be seen as preparatory, as an ambitious, quantitative study is still needed to study a larger panel of artistic companies. Such a study would provide a more complete image of the circulation of street and circus shows in Europe.

The analysis of the collected data has already provided important indicators for the economy and companies' mobility.

Large diversity of companies

One characteristic of the circus and street arts is the varying sizes of its companies. Out of the studied sample, the companies' average annual budget comes to 243,065 euros. However, this average hides a very different reality. 5% of companies obtain a turnover of over one million euros, while over 20% have a budget lower than 50,000 euros. Overall,

the sector consists of many small and fragile structures. Nearly half of them do not have any permanent staff aside from that of the artists themselves, and have an annual turnover of less than 100,000 euros.

Low level of subsidies

On average, subsidies and grants represent 21% of the sampled companies' budget. If we take into account that more than a third of these companies receives no subsidy or grant whatsoever, it is important to point out that the other companies benefit from considerable public aid. This seems to go against the general perception of public funding for these sectors. However, only 17% of these companies are supported through private patronage, and they receive a marginal amount from these patrons in relation to their overall budget.

High level of distribution

In 2006, surveyed companies put on an average of 64 performances, showing a high distribution level (10% of companies held over 100 performance dates within the year). These companies generally offer several shows for commission, and more than half have an ongoing repertoire of between 3 and 6 shows. These sectors are certainly unique in the longevity of sales for their shows (10 years per show on average, with a few extreme cases of shows touring for over 20 years!). This longevity explains the sometimes impressive number of performances for one show, which could come to over 500 dates by the time the show closes for good.

Predominance of small forms

Over 200 shows were studied in this survey, and, for the most part, they were small-form shows with a low sales price. 80% of these shows are sold for less than 5,000 euros per contract, under which we find a large number of small forms (28%) selling for less than 1,000 euros per performance. And only 9% of shows have a sales price above 10,000 euros.

Effective mobility

The study seems to confirm the importance of circus and street shows circulating throughout Europe and, to a lesser extent, throughout the world. 27% of the companies' dates are outside of its borders, representing an average of 17 performances per company in 2006 (15 in Europe and 2 outside the continent). The disparities are also great in this statistic. One quarter of companies did not leave their home country, 75% circulated throughout Europe, and only 35% travelled outside of Europe. Certain companies (8% of the total) show an impressive level of mobility, with over

50 purchased performance dates abroad in 2006. With the exception of small-form performances (sales price of less than 500 euros), it is important to point out that all kinds of shows enjoy this level of mobility (performance dates abroad represent an average of 30-34% of total performances).

Various motivating reasons

We collected fascinating and passionate accounts of circus and street artists who all defend mobility as an intrinsic factor of their life choices and artistic forms. They also stand behind their feeling of belonging to the European space. So one finds little scepticism in the ranks of contemporary creation!

There are numerous motivations for performing outside a company's country of operation, such as:

- > to enjoy additional exposure, and receive professional recognition;
- > to learn about other cultures and new territories in order to use them as a source of inspiration (their relationship with art, the population, traditions and aesthetic principles);
- > to create artistic exchange (with other artists, but also with co-producers and co-distributors, etc.);
- > to present new audiences with accessible and innovative artistic forms;
- > to gain access to a larger distribution market as a source of revenue (which is not always possible within the national markets).

Impediments to free circulation

In theory, circulation is, therefore, beneficial from all points of view, and all artists in Europe should be taking to the road. This is, however, only in theory, for the study's panel of artistic companies has shown that the investment return remains limited. The income generated by this activity is still low. Moreover, it seems obvious that proximity, both geographic and cultural⁵, has a strong influence on choices regarding circulation. The opportunities to leave and work abroad are first available within countries that have a special link with a company's country of operation. A common language, former colonial ties or link to a common regime, neighbouring countries, or a similar sense of humour are all determining factors in the circulation of artistic works.

However, circus and street artists have the advantage of generally offering a non-textual form of writing wherein the language barrier disappears. The study has shown that shows using text are often created in several languages. On the other hand, companies often have a repertoire and are able to offer many different shows "à la carte". On top of having their sales material translated for some, companies are also willing to perform in "off" programmes, that is to say, ones that are generally unpaid, in order to "break in" the production and invite programmers to discover and perhaps buy their work. The effort put out is therefore a great one.

European sentiment

Just as important is the feeling that the circus and street arts contribute to the creation of a rich and diversified European cultural identity. When artists are asked the question, they answer that:

- > these forms reach an audience of all ages, social levels and cultures, but also reach people who generally do not attend performing arts events or consume, as it were, cultural products;
- > these forms meet the audience where it is (art in public spaces, and travelling circus companies performing under tents);
- > these forms are visual and are, for the most part, not based on language, which allows for a universal reach and international appeal;
- > these 'popular' forms take root in the idea of celebration and sharing;
- > the circus and street arts help fill a need for social cohesion by transmitting democratic values, all the while fighting against the nationalistic, isolationist, and individualistic tendencies of modern society.

What's more, circus and street artists have a strong sense of European identity:

- > they feel they belong to a community that shares common values;
- > they feel that Europe can help find solutions to local problems;
- > they hope that Europe will be able to come to agreements on regulations ("health & safety regulations"), fiscal matters and customs, so as to allow easier mobility for artists and greater circulation of their work;
- > their artistic forms contribute, by definition, to the European objectives of social cohesion, creativity and innovation, creation of wealth (both material and immaterial) and employment, all of which contribute to Europe's vitality;
- > their forms are very European in that they are unique to a kind creative work on this continent that one does not necessarily find in other areas of the world.

But once again, this effort has been hindered by a series of obstacles and inconveniences, of which cultural operators and policymakers of all levels are already aware⁶. The artists seem to answer these hindrances with greater versatility, and it is indeed surprising to see to what great extent artists' mobility has fully contributed to their life-long training. This informal education, often acquired in the midst of adversity, leads them to develop very specific skills. Some of these skills are "measurable", such as the acquisition of a language, the use of computer aides and legal and fiscal regulations. Others are not measurable, such as those regarding the audience, humour, traditions and competence in dealing with a foreign culture. We believe it is a pity that these skills are not being passed on, or are being passed on very little, to the younger generation of artists, and that tools are not developed so that they might be.

Equipping the artists

The respondents of our study have also identified several aides that would make working outside of their country of operation a bit easier:

- > an increase of co-production and co-distribution platforms working for the mobility of artists and the circulation of their work;
- > places and times for professional get-togethers as a part of festivals so that artists can meet programmers;
- > a European legal guide that lists current legislation (tent regulations, taxes, etc.) as well as administrative steps to be taken for each country, and sometimes for each region of the European Community;
- > an increase of websites that keep track of available opportunities such as tour grants, calls for candidates, and so on;
- > a European distribution guide, holding detailed information on locations and festivals that host the circus and street arts, including complete contact information, the kind of programming, touring conditions – “in” and “off”, etc.;
- > an increase of individual and collective grants to promote greater mobility for artists and technical directors.

Of course, this list is not exhaustive. It is up to us to spread awareness of these tools once they exist, or to create them in order to contribute to the proper development of cultural exchange in and out of the European Community. Circostrada Network has worked to that effect, offering a free, online database listing artistic agents, artists and companies, schools and training programmes, events and festivals, institutions and networks, centres of distribution, residency, resources, and technical service. The network's website offers a series of tools, such as a current events section for sectors and European institutions, or examples of good practice. The answers to our study have also exposed a low level of awareness regarding the operation of European institutions, the Commission's programmes and the current stakes regarding the sector. We must all work to mediate and inform so that circus and street artists may fully appropriate the European territory and enjoy the same opportunities as other professionals within the creative sector.

1) We are borrowing this title from the former cross-border, cooperative project, “CIRCULONS!, About the circus arts”, put in place between 2002 and 2007 (supported by Interreg III) by le Prato (France) and the Maison de la culture de Tournai (Belgium).

2) See, for example, the data gathered by ERICarts, Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (www.ericarts.org).

3) There are numerous studies, such as that of Judith Staines, Suzanne Capiou and Judith Neisse... carried out by platforms such as l'IETM, l'ÉFAH, the Roberto Cimetta fund, etc. See the bibliographies on www.circostrada.org.

4) Read the initiative report of Claire Gibault, adopted in May 2007 by the Culture and Education Commission of the European Parliament on The status of artists in the European Union.

5) See the report, The flux of international exchange in cultural goods and services: determining factors and risks, written by François Rouet, based on a study carried out in the CEPPII by Thierry Mayer (CEPII, université Paris I, Paris School of Economics et CEPR), Anne-Celia Disdier (INRA, UMR public economy), Silvio Tai (université Paris I and Paris School of Economics) and Lionel Fontagné (université Paris I, Paris School of Economics et CEPPII), 2007-2 / September 2007, download online at www.culture.gouv.fr/deps.

6) Read the numerous studies pointing out problems of double taxation, visas and work permits, complicated customs regulations, etc., particularly the study carried out by Pearle and mobile.home in 2006: *Study on impediments to mobility in the EU live performance sector and on possible solutions*.

Mobility and Sharing

A Few Elements for a New European Geography of the Performing Arts

Anne-Marie Autissier

Mobility and circulation are two words that have become near obsessions in most national and community texts and documents. It is quizzical to note that after two centuries spent fetishizing over attachment to one's homeland, we are now celebrating a new form of professional and personal existence, all the while assuming that we have resolved a certain number of questions.

The first question of course deals with the relationship between mobility and our sense of anchoring. Although studies agree that artists, cultural professionals and researchers are the most mobile of groups, we have yet to look into the motivations of this readily accepted mobility. We find employment of Bulgarian orchestras over their French counterparts for the sole reason that they cost a third of the price. There are Eastern European musicians who, during one tour in Germany, will make enough to support their families for a few months. We also find young Spanish and Portuguese musicians studying in French or German conservatories because they could not find the adequate conditions of a proper musical training course in their own country. The examples are endless.

Furthermore, the artists' participation in a certain handful of international events as well as their presence at the larger European hallmark occasions (Avignon, Edinburgh, Salzburg, Berlin, Venice, etc.) now serve as important notches on their creative resume. These distinguished places are just as cut off from their immediate environment as they are closely linked to each other. Their ability to stand out is rooted in their high exposure to the media, relaying them kilometres away from their actual place of physical implantation, pulling them away from the territory where they have been rooted, if only for concerns of public financing, a decisive factor in the performing arts. This global nomadic tendency can deprive artists of their territorial and social anchoring.

European disparities

The first obstacle to a readily accepted European mobility concerns societal and professional disparities. A company's standing is linked to two parameters, its employees' status and right to work on one hand, and the level of public support on the other. In other words, the fate of professional companies depends just as much on social administrations and offices where visa are distributed, as it does on cultural administrations. The European landscape of the performing arts consists mostly of autonomous entities, with very few permanent employees. However, the tradition in Germany and Austria, for example, as well as the policies in practice up until now in Central and Eastern Europe, allow for a certain number of artists to be taken on as long-term, salaried employees. This is the first noticeable difference. The second difference has to do with professional conditions.

For example, Spain is currently experiencing a surge of so-called 'amateur' companies. In Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom, one's level of activity is determined by one's ability to obtain a theatre or performance space. We should also point out that throughout Europe the existence of a private, commercialised show that pulls in high numbers at the box office with comedies and musical comedies, responds to certain well-established codes. As such, the large grant provided in 2005 to the Akropolis club of popular music by the city of Prague set the Czech milieu of the performing arts ablaze, as did the remarks of this establishment's owner when he complained publicly that experimental performances such as Ponec or Archa receive as much government funding as his club, which has proven to be "so attractive for young people".

Generally speaking, there is a growing split between performing arts professionals of the "established" repertoire and those of the "experimental" repertoire. Options seem even more limited for young companies. Outside of the salaried functionaries, the general prevailing sentiment is that of insecurity and vulnerability, with the exception of the countries equipped with a specific legislation (France and Belgium) as well as those where representative unions are able to negotiate through collective accords (Sweden, Finland, Denmark). Yet, the decrease in confidence that began with the revision of the intermittents' status in France in 2003 shows the fragility of the shrinking category of professionals concerned when we speak of a "presumption towards a salaried position". The German salary system has been in crisis for about ten years, and the troupes have visibly shrunk. The members of the 2000 "alternative" German companies, the very same individuals who participate in international exchanges, do not necessarily obtain the status of "partially employed", which would allow them to benefit from certain collective agreements. Most of them are caught in a cycle of short-term contracts. In Spain and Italy the most established companies have no choice but to spend a good part of their year performing abroad, as obligations to written contracts are often reneged upon in all impunity. In the United Kingdom, aside from authors, most artists work as freelancers and receive no social coverage or paid vacation time. There is no legal restriction to the build-up of short-term contracts. Since 1929 the Equity organisation has federated those performance professionals meeting its criteria (recognised professional training, minimum number of performances per year, etc.). It sets a minimum rate for its members. From 2003-2006, the Arts Council's main priority was bringing individual support to artists.

Although the profusion of creativity in Central and Eastern Europe is unanimously recognised, narrow budget margins and the weight of its institutional heritage lead the states to favour financing national institutions, equipped with permanent, salaried troupes which are themselves in a state of crisis. Furthermore, in order to be considered independent, as is required in order to receive and increasingly diversified form of public financing, the artists must satisfy certain conditions. They must have studied at a recognised school, whose training is often along traditional lines. They must have been active for a certain number of years, and they must be recognised by the critics. A third category of artists, therefore, does not benefit from being called "recognised" by any sort of label. In a report put out March 31, 2003, ZASP (the Association of Polish Stage Artists) showed how in 2001 the theatre of Rzeszów, Plock or Olsztyn had counted more spectators than the National Theatre of Warsaw, and with only one-sixth of the National Theatre's funding.

From the talent-filled Slovakian festival Divadelná Nitra to the Rozmaitiisci theatre of Warsaw, via the Bunker group of Ljubljana and Krétakör, the Hungarian company Arpad Schilling, the independents of Central and Eastern Europe, established their activities mostly thanks to foreign funding. This spearhead of the new creation has hosted artists in residence and participates in the activities of the European cultural networks. They are also confronted with large misunderstandings. Tráfo, the eminent multidisciplinary venue of contemporary creation in Budapest has recently been criticised for the "excessively experimental" character of some of the foreign shows it hosts, thus suggesting that it does so at the detriment of Hungarian companies.

In the five Eastern European countries studied by the European Arts and Entertainment Alliance in 2002, the number of independent workers has rapidly increased since 1990. Their employers, which include some public institutions, are hoping to free themselves from having to pay social charges. The main problem is in the lack of an autonomous social dialogue in the performance sector, despite the existing legal parameters. In Latvia, artists' unions are attempting to organise themselves to obtain social coverage for independents, financing for their retirement, as well as access to rehearsal spaces. However, the professionals of this country have been confronted with the inertia of their own authorities regarding the necessity of providing payment for reproduction. This obligation is already written into law, but material importers refuse to comply by it. An arbitrage by the European Commission has been expected... for almost two years!

Confronted with these kind of situations, an entire generation of the Culture programme 2000 will have been necessary for the national and communal authorities to realise that the 5% obligatory co-funding rule for each of the European co-organisers on budgets of at least 100,000 euros, was turning the participation of Eastern European operators in the programme into a high risk venture. The 5% rule was removed from the new Culture programme (2007-2013). Furthermore, two of its main goals are the European circulation of works and individuals.

The festivals, talent smugglers and vehicles of anchoring

Today, there are more than 6,000 of them in Europe. Their numbers were multiplied in 1990. As the work of the European Group of Festival Research (EFRP) has shown, they crystallise the contradictions of public policies and studies have focused on them in England, Hungary, Finland, France and Italy. In the interest of cost inflation and extreme prudence among artistic institutions, the festivals have come to play the role of employers, trendsetters and reflections of society. They often combine all forms of public and private funding, even if they are essentially supported by local channels. They allow for events of different origins to be concentrated over a limited and therefore visible range of space and time. Aside from their economical role, which would be difficult to measure due to the disparate indicators, many are in agreement in according them with a certain social role, which allows them to re-anchor one or several communities to its territory. By shattering the habitual codes of artistic practices, they are able to federate heterogeneous audiences. Otherwise, they create a craze, which goes beyond the artistic performances. In the small communities, shop owners feel as though they are taking part in "their" festival, even if they do not attend any of the performances. The Urban Festival of Zagreb has an established spot on all the guides released by the municipal Office of Tourism, and even in the Routard Guide.

Other considerations of an anthropological nature come to justify the validity of festivals, pointing out that they allow for exchange between ravaged or even enemy communities. They create an open and provisory space without any further commitment. They show another, somehow magnified facet of everyday life. Their appeal can also be measured by the number of volunteers involved in their organisation. Volunteers seem to be as numerous as resources are rare. Among them, the in situ festivals, or those which invest in all or part of a city, are clearly the most sought-after. Lastly, they expose (and employ) artists that the classic cultural institutions are not equipped to host. At best, they reconcile mobility and anchoring, acceptance of the other and attachment to a territory.

However, the festivalisation of cultural activities has highlighted a few contradictions:

- > There is the unequal professionalisation of festival management, which is often marked by short-term positions within their staff and a large number of volunteers without any real training.
- > There is often a surge of festivals during certain times of the year, most notably during the spring.
- > This causes a level of competition in terms of obtaining resources and mobilising audiences.
- > We also find a strong desire for media exposure, which sometimes pushes the festivals to favour success over experimentation.
- > There is a lack of durable relationships with local cultural institutions, as well as brief, and often opportunistic relationships with educational centres or marginalised communities.
- > Finally, there are geographical concerns, in that these festivals often involve clearing out the popular class from city centres.

Then there is the disparity within the societal and professional statuses of festivals. Parliaments of certain EU authorities have ruled in favour of coordination between national institutions in order to avoid things such as double taxation and the acrobatic character of career restitution for the most mobile artists. This implies the formation of administrative bodies within Europe, which are responsible for matters of employment and social affairs, as well as work inspections, as has been recommended by unions and artistic associations.

During his time, Mazarin had been strongly criticised for inviting Italian actors to the French court. The second obstacle to mobility has to do with the slow pace of cultural movements. Mental mobility is often lacking. One needs only to consider the mix of distrust and suspicion met by the first attempts to form European cultural networks in the 80s to realise that the models of exclusion and fear of the other are still in existence.

The idea of a national cultural substance, naturalised by years of institutional and affective sedimentation has always been present, especially when resources dwindle. We must therefore look to education and training. Today there is general agreement on the need to reflect upon artistic education within Europe. Why not also take advantage of this sentiment by setting the foundation for an intercultural artistic education, based on both the European artistic movements as well as the artistic and intellectual contributions of minorities and migrant communities from all over the world? This is the "diasporic" knowledge that will one day set the foundations of our societies. Moreover, mobility cannot prove fruitful unless it implies a possible return on the horizon. As such, the Indian government has put into place a dual-nationality status for the migrant children born and studying in the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere.

Finally, a high level of responsibility is to be given to the artists and culture professionals. In the context of solidarity and competition, which characterises the artistic circles, the most efficient mobility funds have been put in place by collectively managed foundations and European cultural networks. If we take the example of the Roberto Cimetta fund or the new Art Moves Africa fund, created with the help of the Ford foundation, we find that with relatively modest sums we can multiply networking and training opportunities. Let us again mention the initiatives of collectively managed firms in their work for mobility and the training of its members. There is NORMA in the Netherlands, and the SGAE and the AISGE in Spain, to give just a few examples.

However, all of this legislation has, for a few years now, come across a considerable stumbling block, and that is the difficulty that non-Europeans face in obtaining visas, or even renewing their visitor status in a country within the Union. The creation of Schengen Opera is a testament to this.

These questions, which are just as much a matter for the member States as for the communitarian executive authorities, could be the object of different open methods of coordination, as proposed by the Communication of the European Commission regarding a European cultural agenda during the era of globalisation. The French presidency over the European Union and the European Year of intercultural dialogue in 2008 will certainly provide propitious frameworks for such initiatives.

Methodology

1. Selection of 66 companies from street arts and circus disciplines; these to come from as many of the EU nation states as possible. These companies will form the basis of the study
2. Compilation of a questionnaire that aims to investigate each company's attitude and philosophy towards international touring, the extent that they achieve this, the resources they have or lack and the problems and pitfalls that limit their success at this.
3. A comparative assessment of the results, drawing out some of the key features common to many, cultural and national differences, the extent of knowledge about touring and access to resources and information.

1. Selection of the artistic companies:

This was a difficult task as the sample was very small and therefore could provide a very variable number of results. There are 27 countries in the EU; thus if each country was to provide both a street arts and a circus company, this meant one company only representing each artform from each nation. The variations resulting from this were very wide. Selection could have been made from

- > Companies that already tour a significant amount over a year,
- > Companies that have not yet managed to break into the international market,
- > Companies that are well funded by their host state and expected to work internationally (as cultural ambassadors),
- > Companies that are not funded by their host state yet who manage to work internationally,
- > Companies from host nations where there are numerous outlets for their work at home,
- > Companies from host nations where there are few outlets for their work at home,
- > Companies that are new,
- > Companies that are well-established,
- > Companies working with 'text-based' shows that they can perform in other languages,
- > Companies working with non 'text-based' shows,
- > Companies able to make a living from their street arts/circus shows alone,
- > Companies unable to make a living from their street arts/circus work, who have to undertake other work (or receive grants/subventions).

It was decided that the best way to get a realistic sample was by selecting a 'random' list of companies, making sure that there was one from each sector per country. The list was compiled from the Circostrada Network database, to which were added:

- > Another approx 50 companies already known to the researcher,
- > Companies not included in the Circostrada Network database from countries that had no, or almost no entries. Such countries included: Austria, Slovenia and Hungary,
- > No companies were found in Cypress, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania, Slovakia,
- > Companies in Norway and Croatia were included as, although not full members of the EU, they have many cultural accords and their companies tour throughout Europe,
- > A few countries had only circus and no street arts companies – Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Croatia, Hungary, Finland,
- > There were few circus companies in the Netherlands.

Around 200 companies were selected at the start, working from the assumption that one company in two was likely to be either too busy or not wish to be involved.

2. Drafting of the questionnaire:

This was compiled by the researcher from suggestions made by Circostrada Network, and checked with them. An introductory letter was agreed, that explained the background to the project and was written on Circostrada Network headed notepaper.

It was agreed that information that was easily available on the Hors les Murs database or on groups' own websites would not be duplicated.

This research was aiming to ascertain from each company:

- > How many shows they have available to tour at the moment; and precise information on these,
- > The extent of their touring, in their own country and within and outside of the EU,
- > The proportion of income coming in from fees charged for their work,
- > Whether artists were able to make a living solely from their street arts activity,
- > Indications of groups' attitudes to Europe as an entity, to intercultural dialogue, to touring as an ideological principle.

To enable comparison to be made, it was agreed to select 2006 as the year to examine; this on the grounds that it was the most recent that would already have final accounts and statistics available

Translations were arranged for the questionnaire into French, Spanish, Italian and German. It was also suggested to respondents from other language groups (Scandinavian, Portuguese, Baltic and Balkan) that they might answer the more discursive questions in their own language as they were better able to express themselves that way. People were then found to translate these responses where necessary.

3. Sending out the questionnaire and collecting responses:

The questionnaires were sent out by email during the first two weeks of November; replies started to come in by the third week and have continued to arrive since then.

Very few companies were uninterested in the project (in fact the only ones who declined for this reason was because they felt they had been contacted in error as their work did not fit the categories the questionnaire was looking at). Around 25 companies were unable to take part because of lack of time or resources; a few had not been in existence for the full year of 2006; and a further 40 did not respond to requests to take part at all.

Surprisingly, the winter is NOT an easier time for street theatre and circus companies – many were creating new shows, performing indoors, or undertaking other paid work to earn their living; others were touring in warm parts of the world beyond Europe – emails were received from Asia, Australia and South America from artists unable to take part as they did not have information to hand.

Responses that were unclear to me or that warranted fuller explanations were followed up; some organisations that had not responded were phoned and encouraged to take part, in order to have wherever possible at least one circus and one street arts company from each country. It should be said at this early stage that there is room for a significantly larger sample, in order to make comparisons between companies of similar size, with similar kinds of shows, with similar longevity and from the same nation – as funding and recognition vary so enormously between EU states.

Findings from the companies who responded have been entered into a spreadsheet, which can be used for comparative information in many categories.

Survey Results

by Anne Tucker

(1) The countries companies come from

Country	Street	Circus	Both
Austria	2	–	–
Belgium	5	2	1
Bulgaria	1	–	–
Croatia	1	–	–
Czech Republic	2	1	–
Denmark	–	–	1**
Finland	–	2	–
France	2	3	2
Germany	4	–	–
Hungary	–	–	–
Ireland	1	1*	–
Italy	4	1	–
Netherlands	1	1	–
Norway	–	1	–
Poland	2	–	–
Portugal	2	–	1
Slovenia	4	–	–
Spain	4	1	1
Sweden	–	1	–
UK	7	3	1
TOTAL	42	17	7

* This company has a British section with separate bank account

** This company has a French section with separate bank account

(2) Longevity of groups

Date formed	Number	Country (number of companies)
1970-79	4	France (1), Belgium (2), Italy (1)
1980-85	4	France (1), Spain (1), Poland (1), UK (1)
1986-90	12	France (1), Ireland (1), Germany (1), Austria (1), Spain (2), UK (3), Italy (2), Slovenia (1)
1991-95	10	Germany (1), Netherlands (1), UK (3), Belgium (1), Spain (1), Italy (1), Bulgaria (1), Slovenia (1)
1996-2000	17	France (2), Ireland (1), Austria (1), Belgium (2), Spain (1), Slovenia (2), Czech Republic (1), Finland (1), UK (2), Denmark (1), Portugal (2), Sweden (1)
2001	5	France(2), Belgium (1), Italy (1), Czech Republic (1)
2002	4	Netherlands (1), Portugal (1), Croatia (1), Belgium (1)
2003	4	UK (1), Norway (1), Czech Rep (1), Finland (1)
2004	4	Poland (1), Belgium (1), Germany (1), UK (1)
2005	1	Germany (1)
2006	–	

The majority of groups surveyed were formed between 1986 and 2000. There is no obvious link between longevity and country of origin either.

It may be worth saying that there is a massive difference in the number of groups available in each country. In selecting 1 – 5 groups from each EU state, this does not give a true picture of the wealth of street arts/circus companies originating from each country and how established this artform is.

(3) Annual budget (euros)

Under 50,000 €	13	Austria (1), Belgium (1), Portugal (1), Poland (1), Slovenia (1), Germany (1), Denmark (1), Croatia (1), Finland (1), Czech Rep. (1).
51,000 – 100,000 €	14	Germany (1), Austria (1), Netherlands (1), Belgium (1), Spain (1), Italy (1), Portugal (1), Bulgaria (1), UK (1), Finland (1), Czech Rep. (1), Sweden (1).
101,000 – 150,000 €	8	France (1), Ireland (1), Germany (1), Spain (1), UK (1), Slovenia (1).
151,000 – 200,000 €	7	France (1), Italy (1), Norway (1), UK (1).
201,000 – 250,000 €	2	France (1), UK (1).
251,000 – 300,000 €	5	France (1), Spain (1), UK (1).
301,000 – 350,000 €	2	France (1), Belgium (1).
351,000 – 400,000 €	–	–
401,000 – 450,000 €	1	UK (1).
451,000 – 500,000 €	–	–
501,000 – 550,000 €	2	Ireland (1), Netherlands (1).
551,000 – 600,000 €	–	–
601,000 – 650,000 €	–	–
651,000 – 700,000 €	2	France (1), Italy (1).
701,000 – 750,000 €	1	Belgium (1).
751,000 – 800,000 €	–	–
Over 1,000,000 €	2	Spain (1), UK (1).
Over 2,000,000 €	1	Italy

In addition: 6 companies failed to answer this question:

- > One company did not know,
- > 3 would not give an answer
- > One company earned nothing in 2006 because of injury
- > One company could not extract the street budget from their overall 'private theatre' budget

No particular pattern here; some points of interest (though it must not be forgotten that this was a random small sample):

- > The researcher had wondered whether the French and Belgian groups might come out with better funding levels than other countries as street and circus arts are better established there. But this did not prove to be the case.
- > There was no obvious link between groups' longevity and the size of their annual budget; although 6 of the 7 budget holders with annual turnovers of more than 350,000 euros all were founded before 1995.
- > 47% of groups surveyed have an annual turnover of less than 100,000 euros.
- > All but 3 of the companies from countries formerly in Eastern Europe fell into the under 50,000 euros category and 2 of these live partly in France/Spain.

(4) How artistic companies acquire their money

	Grants	Fees	Other work eg teaching/directing festival	Sponsorship
0%	25	2	25	55
1 – 20%	16	4	35	11
21 – 40%	6	10	4	–
41 – 60%	12	12	1	–
61 – 80%	7	10	1	–
81 – 99%	–	16	–	–
100%	–	12	–	–
TOTAL	66	66	66	66

Other sources of money included: box office on shows, bar income, co-production fees, income returns from travel costs, subs for producing a magazine, bank interest, grant income for indoor/social arts work

Points of Interest:

- > The single most striking finding from this is that almost no income for street arts and circus derives from sponsorship – only 9 companies (out of 59) claimed any commercial income, and the highest percentage was 10% in one case only. Several companies mentioned that sponsorship was impossible to depend on.
- > More than half the respondents gain no grants at all or less than 20% of their income.
- > More than half the respondents earn 60 – 100% of their income directly from fees for their shows, and a third of them earn 80% or over from fees.
- > There is no immediate correlation between annual turnover and grant aid. It might be useful to undertake further research to ascertain how many of those in receipt of grants get money for their street shows as opposed to educational or community arts work.
- > There was no obvious correlation between grant aid and nation states, although all but one of the French companies receives grants of between 10 and 45%.
- > Both the Irish companies surveyed received a substantial percentage of their turnover as grant aid (60% and 70%), which perhaps reflects that country's recent policy to encourage and support fledgling street arts and circus groups, in order to develop the sector.
- > Several companies did not include their 'freelance'/ outside/ educational work in this survey, as it does not feature in the budgeting of the organisation. Many artists do undertake much work of this nature, in order to earn a living; but it does not show in this graph.

(5) Staffing

Number of staff	Permanent Full and part time	Intermittent/ Freelance
0	10	4
1-5	28	13
6-10	5	8
11-15	3	4
16-20	–	6
21-30	–	9
31-40	–	2
40 - 50	–	1
50 - 60	–	1
More than 60	–	1

Points of Interest:

- > Several companies explained that many of their permanent staff are part-time and involved in indoor theatre/circus or completely other paid work as they cannot earn a living through their street arts/circus business alone. Some companies were not able to disentangle the finances for each aspect of their income.
- > 'Permanent' was interpreted by a number of respondents to mean 'commitment to the company' , rather than 'able to earn a living' through this.
- > Street arts and circus companies have skeletal teams and make use of freelance and temporary staff as designers, performers, technicians and tour management/marketing.
- > Respondents work for more than one company themselves; some had great difficulty extrapolating appropriate information on staffing and felt that this question was not relevant to them, or needed much explanation.

"Apart from the street shows, we perform a lot indoors, for youth audiences, for corporate, trades, openings, partys, etc. otherwise a street performer can't earn for living".

"In addition to the street shows, we do indoor work, especially in the fields of small children and family theatre, which have also won numerous awards and recognition and get many bookings. Our goal, rather than be solely a street theatre company is to be a theatre company using mime and physical and visual techniques. For this reason we developed various processes and languages, depending on the context in which we are moving in. So we have people who work all year long. In addition to this work, we have begun a series of drama workshops at institutes focused on adolescents between 12 and 16 years, as an alternative, both leisure and culture".

"Actually, no one is employed, I do all the paper work, advertisement, logistics, technical stuff... I am technical director in another dance group and freelance light designer. Would love to earn from performing... maybe in 2008"

"The work is shared among our members. As a member I mainly do street performances and anything that isn't stage (bars, markets, bus, gardens, kindergardens etc). However as a free lance artist I collaborate with puppet theatre and do

directing, design and construction of puppets- this part of my metier represents the source of my income."

"in our experience much of the street arts/circus world is subsidised by our partners and families, who have regular paid jobs as well as (more than) grants from governments!!"

(6) Analysis of shows performed in 2006

No of performances	Home country		Other EU state		Outside EU	
	Programme In	Programme Off	Programme In	Programme Off	Programme In	Programme Off
0	3 groups	27 groups	17 groups	47 groups	42 groups	58 groups
1-10	12 groups	32 groups	20 groups	16 groups	20 groups	7 groups
11 - 20	6 groups	4 groups	11 groups	1 group	3 groups	–
21-50	25 groups	2 groups	12 groups	–	–	–
51-75	8 groups	–	4 groups	1 group	–	–
76-100	4 groups	–	1 group	–	–	–
101-150	4 groups	–	–	–	–	–
151-200	2 groups	–	–	–	–	–
Over 201	1 group	–	–	–	–	–
No answer	1	1	1	1	1	1
TOTAL	66	66	66	66	66	66

Points of Interest:

- > The majority of artists get most of their work in their home country, although there is a reasonable amount of touring within the EU. There are a few notable exceptions, companies that get nearly half their work outside their own country; a few companies got more work abroad than at home in 2006, but this is not born out beyond this one year, when subjected to comparison with their responses to questions about the shows they have available and the touring history of these. Further research could look at whether work in other EU states has increased over recent years or not.
- > Shows performed by companies with over 100 bookings in 2006, were mostly small scale with minimal technical requirements.
- > There was no obvious pattern relating to the country of origin of companies with with over 100 bookings in 2006
- > All of the companies with over 100 bookings in 2006 earned over 85% of their income through fees, most of them earn 100%.
- > Companies with over 20 'off' performances at home were almost all from France, reflecting the established pattern of companies performing on the 'off' as a way to test shows in front of live audiences and also to be seen by programmers.
- > Companies from most countries performed occasionally in 'off' programmes at home; this included both the Polish companies, both the Austrian companies, most of the Belgian, Italian, Spanish and French companies.
- > Interestingly, the Spanish companies only showed small numbers of off performances at home, which contradicts much 'anecdotal evidence' heard widely, that more and more Spanish festivals call themselves 'showcases and expect people to perform for no fees.
- > Companies undertaking 'off' performances 'elsewhere in the EU' were from Belgium, Germany and France, fairly close neighbours therefore perhaps lower travel costs incurred.
- > Companies performing in 'off' programmes outside the EU were predominantly self-financing. On one occasion was a grant given.
- > It was pointed out that in 2006, Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania were not yet in the EU, so their bookings technically were 'outside the EU'. However, for the purposes of this study, they have been included within the category of EU member states.
- > The figures given may relate to the number of separate contracts, rather than the number of days, or possibly even the number of times a show was performed (groups may do 1, 2 or 3 shows a day for a daily fee).

(7) Income levels from selling shows

Fee Income in euros	Within EU	Outside EU
0	1 group	40 groups
Moins de 20,000	10 groups	11 groups
21,000 - 50,000	10 groups	5 groups
51,000 - 75,000	15 groups	–
76,000 - 100,000	4 groups	3 groups
101,000 - 150,000	6 groups	–
151,000 - 200,000	3 groups	–
201,000 - 250,000	1 group	1 group
251,000 - 300,000	1 group	–
301,000 - 400,000	–	–
401,000 - 500,000	–	–
501,000 - 1,000,000	2 groups	–
Over 1,000,000	1 group	–
Didn't answer	12 groups	6
TOTAL	66	66

It must be repeated that this is a very small sample of a hugely diverse area. There is a very wide range of fees earned by street arts/circus companies across the EU. There is a huge variety in the scale (and therefore cost) of shows, the amount of performers needed for each, the number of outings over a year for particular projects, the number of different shows available to tour at any one time. In addition, crucial information concerning whether companies have an agency, a dedicated marketing person, get further bookings in a country once they have been seen once may all be researched in the future.

Points of Interest:

- > Over half the companies surveyed earned all their income within the EU
- > There is no obvious correlation between companies getting bookings outside the EU and their international marketing spend
- > Of the 20 companies getting work outside of the EU, 7 received grants specifically for international touring. However groups have not specified whether this money was for inside or outside the EU.
- > A further 9 companies received money for travel to other countries within the EU. This included travel to a different autonomous region, within the same nation state (Catalonia, Euskadi)
- > A few companies bemoaned the fact that we were only targeting one year "Indeed, last year (2005) we were in Colombia and Korea, but this year, 2006, we have done nothing abroad".
"This year by the pregnancy of my wife we did not travel out from EU, but normally we travel one or two times a year to south America"
- > It was pointed out that in 2006, Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania were not in the EU, so their bookings technically were 'outside the EU'. However, for the purposes of this study, I have included them within the category of EU member states. (A further error may also be that bookings in Switzerland or Norway are included in the category 'within the EU')
- > Understandably, companies with large incomes sustain permanent paid staff and may be touring several projects at the same time.

(8) Shows participating companies currently have available to tour

A. The number of shows

The street arts/circus world is highly prolific. Many companies have several different shows they are able to present, which gives an excellent choice to promoters.

Number of Shows available	Number of companies
1	9
2	10
3	15
4	6
5	11
6	5
7	2
8	–
9	–
10 and more	4
Not stated	3
Other (all individual events)	1

Points of Interest:

- > Some companies explained that they also do site specific and one-off performances, on commission. Some also run festivals themselves (booking other groups)
- > Over half the companies surveyed (37) have between 3 and 6 shows available all the time – and 4 companies have 10 or more shows.

B. Longevity of shows

A key feature of street arts and circus companies is that they keep a show in repertoire over a long period of time. This is different from much of the indoor theatre circuit, and to a lesser extent, dance and music.

Date Created	Years of life	Number of Shows
1970 – 79	25 - 35	1
1980 – 89	15 - 24	4
1990 – 94	14 - 18	10
1995 – 99	9 - 13	18
2000	8	10
2001	7	10
2002	6	11
2003	5	17
2004	4	22
2005	3	28
2006	2	36
2007	1	22
Creations in 2008	–	3
Not stated, n/a	–	4

Some shows have been reworked several years after they were founded. In these cases they have been listed under the original creation date.

Points of Interest:

- > Shows are kept in the repertoire of a group often for many years, which enables the company to 'pay off' the production costs over time.
- > Some groups state that with rarely booked shows, they need to find time to re-rehearse a piece (and may charge the promoter this cost).
- > Groups are particularly creative and many are creating a new show every one or two years.
- > Many shows have been performed hundreds of times since their creation. It does not always follow that shows created more recently have less bookings than older ones - the variation is colossal. However, it is fair to say that shows that have been running a number of years will be likely to be those that have been particularly successful.
- > Although this question was not specifically asked in the questionnaire, several groups commented on the difficulties they face storing shows, especially large ones. The cost of storage space is very high in some countries, and this may result in shows becoming prohibitively expensive to keep in repertoire.

C. Pricing of shows

There was a very wide range of prices, which depended on many different things

- > The number of performers on tour,
- > The number of technical staff required
- > The size and scale of the show.
- > Equipment and vehicles required.

It is not useful to chart a comparison of prices as the variables are very large and companies were not always specific about the above features. (Just in this questionnaire, fees ranged from 150 euros to 25,000 euros per performance)

Prices are necessarily much higher for circus shows that use big top (or little top) tents as the time and crew needed to erect and take them down adds significantly to the price. Additionally, overnight security is usually required, and possibly fencing.

Several companies made it clear that their fees drop proportionately as the number of days increases in any one contract.

Prices were mostly quoted for fees, royalties and (with smaller shows) technical costs. Larger performances include a technical specification separately.

Almost no companies include travel and accommodation/food within their fee, though in a few cases (particularly with companies that tour only within their own country), prices included travel costs.

Several companies cited a different level of fee for international bookings (higher) although these did not include travel costs.

There are likely to be significant inaccuracies in any attempt to make direct comparisons between groups over 'value for money' or 'fee structures' for a variety of reasons:

- > Companies may have included their fees for one day (perhaps up to 3 performances), or for one performance. In one case, a fee was described as covering "7/8 performances plus 10 days get-in etc, with all costs covered". Another company described a fee as covering one public show and a week of rehearsals with community participants.
- > Circus performers can only perform for short periods of time as the work is physically exhausting and demanding. Fees may therefore seem disproportionately high for 'minutes of entertainment given'.
- > Shows may be designed for very different audience sizes; fees may appear high when shows are for very small audiences only.
- > The larger shows tour with teams of 'backstage staff' that are essential to the effective running of the show and therefore are costed in; yet there may be relatively few performers 'on stage'. Very few companies listed the number of performers/technicians /drivers / manager on tour with each show , making comparison difficult.
- > Production costs very enormously - promoters may be asked to fund these to varying degrees; these costs are therefore supplementary to 'fees/cachet'.
- > Outdoor performance (especially large scale) usually needs 'bedding in' time - some shows take a couple of years before artists are satisfied with them; in this testing period, performances with live audiences are essential, therefore fees may be kept low to encourage bookers

D. Relativity of cost and amount of touring

The graphs below illustrate several different points:

- > The relative prices of shows coming from different EU countries,
- > A comparison –both numerical and proportional – of bookings at home and abroad (inside and outside the EU) from different countries,
- > A comparison –both numerical and proportional – of bookings at home and abroad (inside and outside the EU) according to how long the show has been running,
- > A comparison of how long-established street theatre may be in different EU countries.

Shows under 500 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
36	2000	98	50	2	–	–	Belgium
20	620	80	50	7	100	13	Austria
16	45		15		–		Austria
14	500	85	85	15	–	–	Austria
13	110	92	10	8	–	–	Austria
13	95	100	–	–	–	–	Austria
11	130	87	20	13	–	–	Austria
11	50	100	–	–	–	–	Austria
9	77	96	3	4	–	–	Austria
9	56	100	–	–	–	–	Austria
8	300	99	–	–	2	1	Slovenia
7	70	95	4	5	–	–	Belgium
7	350	88	30	7	20	5	UK*
6	15	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
6	400	66	200	33	10	1	Austria
5	38	100	–	–	–	–	Croatia
5	150	75	50	25	–	–	UK
4	29	100	–	–	–	–	Croatia
4	110	88	5	4	10	8	Slovenia
4	250	100	–	–	–	–	UK
3	200	57	150	43	–	–	Austria
3	23	100	–	–	–	–	Croatia
2	5	71	–	–	2	29	Slovenia
2	8	100	–	–	–	–	Germany
2	6	86	–	–	1	14	Slovenia
2	76	95	4	5	–	–	Austria
2	20	71	6	21	2	8	Slovenia
1	11	100	–	–	–	–	Czech Rep.
1	–	–	–	–	–	–	Slovenia

Points of Interest:

- > Of 29 different shows in this price range, the vast proportion are performed at home – the lowest proportion is 57%.
- > 10 of the shows (ie: 1/3) have only been performed at home.
- > Only 7 shows had been performed outside the EU – and 5 of these are produced by companies within former Eastern Europe, who may therefore have stronger links with other (still) not EU countries that are their neighbours.
- > The highest proportion of work abroad in the EU is for the Austrian shows. Both the groups surveyed rated international work as most important as Austria has not a large enough market to sustain them.
- > The UK* refers to a British small scale company that has 14 different small scale shows, but had not the time to analyse more than one of them!
- > There is no dramatic pattern in the number of times a show has been performed depending on its age.

Shows 501 - 1,000 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
36	2000	98	50	2	–	–	UK
20	620	80	50	7	100	13	UK
16	45	–	15	–	–	–	Czech
14	500	85	85	15	–	–	France
13	110	92	10	8	–	–	Slovenia
13	95	100	–	–	–	–	Bulgaria
11	130	87	20	13	–	–	UK
11	50	100	–	–	–	–	France
9	77	96	3	4	–	–	UK
9	56	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
8	300	99	–	–	2	1	Belgium
7	70	95	4	5	–	–	UK
7	350	88	30	7	20	5	Bulgaria
6	15	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
6	400	66	200	33	10	1	Bulgaria
5	38	100	–	–	–	–	Austria
5	150	75	50	25	–	–	Czech
4	29	100	–	–	–	–	Czech
4	110	88	5	4	10	8	Czech
4	250	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
3	200	57	150	43	–	–	Portugal
3	23	100	–	–	–	–	Czech
2	5	71	–	–	2	29	Czech
2	8	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
2	6	86	–	–	1	14	UK
2	76	95	4	5	–	–	UK
2	20	71	6	21	2	8	Poland
1	11	100	–	–	–	–	Czech
1	–	–	–	–	–	–	Denmark

Points of Interest:

- > The vast majority of 29 different shows in this price range are performed in their home country. With three notable exceptions (2 Czech and a Danish show), home bookings account for 50% for everyone.
- > And more than half the shows have over 80% bookings at home.
- > Only 1/3 of the shows have had any bookings outside the EU, though they come from a much wider range of countries than those in the under 500 euros price range.
- > There is a much more noticeable increase in the number of times a show has been performed depending on its age.

Shows 1001 - 1,500 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
15	263	96	10	3.5	2	0.5	Slovenia
12	190	97	6	3	—	—	Poland
11	15	3	400	92	22	5	UK
11	1138	68	520	31	30	1	UK
9	47	81	11	19	—	—	Denmark
7	30	75	—	—	10	25	Denmark
7	64	91	6	9	—	—	Portugal
6	331	89	40	11	—	—	Belgium
6	38	53	34	47	—	—	Czech
6	28	64	16	36	—	—	UK
6	41	28	73	49	34	23	Spain
5	85	52	61	38	16	10	Czech
4	420	84	40	9	40	9	France
4	17	89	2	11	—	—	Bulgaria
4	35	100	—	—	—	—	Czech
3	200	66	100	33	—	—	Slovenia
3	90	88	12	12	—	—	Portugal
2	19	83	4	17	—	—	France
2	33	80	8	20	—	—	Czech
2	12	100	—	—	—	—	Belgium
2	8	100	—	—	—	—	Belgium
2	31	97	1	3	—	—	UK
2	—	—	30	100	—	—	Czech
2	15	83	3	17	—	—	Austria
2	27	75	9	25	—	—	Royaume—Uni
2	15	100	—	—	—	—	Royaume—Uni
1	9	90	—	—	1	10	Pologne
1	3	100	—	—	—	—	République Tchèque
1	10	25	25	62	5	13	Danemark

Points of Interest:

- > Of 24 shows surveyed here, there is a dramatic increase in the number of times a show has been performed depending on its age.
- > Again, with a few of exceptions, home bookings account for over 50% for all shows.
- > The French show was made specifically for a tour outside Europe.
- > There is a steadily rising proportion of shows performed abroad in other EU countries in this price range.
- > The Portuguese companies participating in the survey rated international work as most important as Portugal has not a large enough market to sustain them (they claim 73% and 40% bookings outside Portugal) – cf Austrian comments above.
- > One of the Czech companies in the price range is partly resident in Spain.

Shows 1,501 - 2,000 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
18	250	59	150	36	20	5	Italy
8	150	52	100	34	40	14	UK
8	20	100	–	–	–	–	Slovenia
7	15	100	–	–	–	–	Poland
7	36	7	390	81	57	12	Belgium
7	170	95	2	1	6	4	France
6	42	65	15	23	8	12	Italy
6	6	9	57	91	–	–	Finland
6	32	97	–	–	1	3	Spain
6	400	60	120	18	145	28	UK
5	1	10	7	70	2	20	Poland
4	46	36	79	62	3	2	Belgium
4	2000	98	50	2	–	–	Germany
4	9	69	4	31	–	–	Finland
4	25	71	10	29	–	–	UK
4	20	40	30	60	–	–	Portugal
4	34	94	2	6	–	–	Ireland
3	51	19	198	73	22	8	Belgium
3	47	41	58	50	12	9	Spain
3	14	100	–	–	–	–	UK
3	55	–	6	–	9	–	Italy
3	10	64	5	33	–	–	Belgium
3	2	33	2	33	2	33	Slovenia
2	30	27	80	73	–	–	Belgium
2	6	75	–	–	2	25	Finland
1	9	100	–	–	–	–	Italy
1	10	100	–	–	–	–	Ireland
1	10	91	1	9	–	–	Portugal
1	12	27	32	73	–	–	Belgium
1	3	100	–	–	–	–	Czech
1	–	–	60	100	–	–	Finland

Points of Interest:

- > Of 31 shows in this category, there is a noticeable increase in international bookings. The number of shows performed is lower, reflecting the need to receive substantial fees for performances and therefore requiring a larger festival circuit.
- > Significant proportions of international work may be accounted for in the inclusion in this price category of shows from Finland and Belgium, both countries where companies participating in the survey rated international work as most important as the home bases have not large enough markets to sustain them.
- > One of the Finnish companies is partly resident in France.

Shows 2,001 - 5,000 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
23	550	92	40	6	10	2	Italy
19	102	65	54	35	—	—	Italy
18	629	93	51	7	—	—	Italy
16	307	46	493	59	40	5	Italy
10	66	97	1	1.5	1	1.5	Spain
9	6	27	16	73	—	—	France
8	19	34	29	52	8	14	Poland
8	50	17	240	80	8	3	Portugal
8	140	87	20	13	—	—	France
8	105	74	33	23	4	3	Italy
8	30	43	40	57	—	—	Italy
6	90	72	35	28	—	—	Belgium
5	20	66	10	33	—	—	UK
5	17	45	20	53	1	2	Finland
5	37	70	16	30	—	—	UK
5	27	100	—	—	—	—	France
5	43	77	—	—	15	23	France
4	30	100	—	—	—	—	Italy
4	45	39	22	47	49	8	Finland
4	35	88	5	12	—	—	France
4	20	50	10	25	10	25	Italy
3	24	96	—	—	1	4	Finland
3	25+	71	10+	29	—	—	UK
3	24	96	—	—	1	4	Finland
3	35	100	—	—	—	—	Sweden
3	45	70	20	30	—	—	Belgium
3	6	100	—	—	—	—	Portugal
3	45	90	5	10	—	—	Sweden
3	16	100	—	—	—	—	Norway
3	19	63	11	37	—	—	UK
2	62	100	—	—	—	—	France
2	15	100	—	—	—	—	UK
2	3	100	—	—	—	—	UK
2	17	100	—	—	—	—	France
2	40	44	38	42	13	14	Germany
2	7	87	1	13	—	—	UK
2	6	60	4	40	—	—	UK
2	4	80	1	20	—	—	Portugal
2	4	100	—	—	—	—	Portugal
2	7	13	35	64	13	27	Finland
1	10	83	2	17	—	—	France
1	5	100	—	—	—	—	Finland
1	21	84	4	16	—	—	UK
1	31	80	—	—	8	20	Netherlands
1	4	100	—	—	—	—	Portugal
1	9	100	—	—	—	—	Spain
1	35	95	2	5	—	—	Belgium
1	1	100	—	—	—	—	Slovenia
1	7	100	—	—	—	—	UK
1	12	100	—	—	—	—	Finland
Now!	—	—	—	—	—	—	Portugal

Points of Interest:

- > There are 50 shows included in this part of the survey – many more than in other price brackets.
- > Most of these shows are less than 10 years old, most created since the year 2000.
- > This, and the wide variety of countries presenting shows on this scale, undoubtedly reflects the growing interest across Europe in this sector of work.
- > It also points to the problems of keeping the larger scale shows for a long time, as such work incurs significant storage and usually rehearsal costs.
- > The companies from Italy who responded to my questionnaire are all making work in this more expensive price range. This may be because smaller shows have no infrastructure or paid staff (which has been a great problem undertaking previous research on Italian street theatre) and therefore people have little time to take part in surveys.
- > There is a noticeable increase in the number of times a show has been performed depending on its age, in this price range.
- > Additionally, the number of bookings away from home country increases significantly with the longevity of the show.
- > The shows in this price range are only from Western Europe and Finland/Poland.

Shows 5,001 – 10,000 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
16	400	89	50	11	–	–	Italy
11	100	83	20	17	–	–	Italy
10	67	40	63	38	17	22	France
10	38	45	24	29	22	26	Spain
10	38	73	11	21	3	6	UK
8	80	83	16	17	–	–	Italy
7	47	59	26	33	6	8	France
6	17	77	5	23	–	–	Italy
5	5	100	–	–	–	–	Spain
5	6	100	–	–	–	–	UK
5	149	74	56	26	–	–	Italy
5	6	60	4	40	–	–	Portugal
4	25	45	20	36	10	19	Spain
4	138	91	14	7	–	–	Spain
4	21	100	–	–	–	–	UK
3	9	100	–	–	–	–	UK
3	4	100	–	–	–	–	Norway
2	25	56	20	44	–	–	France
2	4	12	30	88	–	–	Ireland
2	75	50	52	35	23	15	Italy
2	6	100	–	–	–	–	Italy
2	4	100	–	–	–	–	Poland
1	3	75	1	25	–	–	Spain

Points of Interest:

- > The shows in this price range are only from Western Europe and Norway/Poland.
- > There are many less (23) and most have been made since the year 2000.
- > There is a small but healthy spread across Europe and beyond.

Shows over 10,000 euros

Age of show (years)	Perfs at home	% of total	Perfs abroad EU	% of total	Perfs outside EU	% of total	Country
22	800	80	160	16	40	4	Spain
18	150	54	100	36	30	10	Spain
14	150	54	120	43	8	3	Spain
11	19	66	7	24	3	10	UK
7	12	80	–	–	3	20	UK
6	38	73	11	21	3	6	UK
4	12	32	19	50	7	31	UK
3	3	18	14	82	–	–	Ireland
3	6	20	15	50	9	30	UK
3	13	81	3	19	–	–	Ireland
3	3	75	1	25	–	–	Spain
2	19	83	4	17	–	–	Spain
2	16	100	–	–	–	–	UK
2	3	100	–	–	–	–	UK
2	16	100	–	–	–	–	Norway
2	20	100	–	–	–	–	Finland
1	–	–	3	60	2	40	UK
1	3	100	–	–	–	–	UK

Points of Interest:

Conclusions drawn from this category should be interpreted with great caution:

- > Remarkably, half of the shows shown here are from the UK. However, this reflects the high return of questionnaires from UK companies – the researcher is aware that very few large-scale French, Dutch or German companies took part in the survey and there are a significant number of large scale shows made.
- > The definition of what is 'covered' in this fee scale varies very widely – in some cases the fee includes rehearsal time, a 'fixed number of shows' in one place, community participation.
- > Shows in this category are made often in response to particular events – centenaries, celebrations, openings of buildings or spaces; the shows may then stay in a company's repertoire (storage permitting) and be required for similar high profile events on an occasional basis.

E. Use of text

One of the most salient features of street arts and circus is that much of the work is accessible to all, irrespective of language and culture. The work is often highly visual, skill-based (acrobatic circus-based movement) and physical rather than verbal. Where text is used, it is frequently 'nonsensical' or 'universal'.

Where text is important, companies try and translate key messages for international performance. Additionally, many street performers are multi-lingual.

Text in shows	Number of Shows
No text	118
'universal' text	18
Text that can be translated	30
Text that cannot be translated	11

Points of Interest:

- > There is no obvious connection between the existence of text and international touring. None of the 11 shows with text that cannot be translated has worked abroad – they may not want to or have tried.
- > Companies acknowledged that the existence of a lot of text in some of their shows was problematic, in the context of international touring; however they were not unaware that certain shows cannot travel, but others can.

(9) Specific marketing issues related to selling work internationally

Nearly every participating group said that getting work outside of their own country was important; some advocated this very strongly. Reasons for the importance of international work included:

- > To promote the company further afield,
- > To meet with other cultures,
- > Opening up of cultures from country to country / cultural diversity,
- > Artistic exchange,
- > Artistic growth, enriching, development,
- > Bigger market,
- > Home market is too limited to be able to make a living,

However, when looking directly at what marketing spend was budgeted specifically in order to increase the international bookings potential, there was a wide variation in response.

Overall Marketing budget as % of annual turnover	Number of companies	Specific budget for international promotions	Areas of marketing						
			mailings	postage	photos	dvd/videos	translations (of publicity / website)	travel to international festivals	internet design/fees
0	4	4 no							
Under 1%	6	6 no		X			X	X	X
1-5%	16	7 no, 9 yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6-10%	11	2 no, 9 yes (3 said over 65%)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
11-15%	6	1 no, 5 yes (1 said 95%)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
16-20%	–	–							
Over 20%	1 (40%)	1 no							
Don't know/ Not calculated	14	8 no, 2 yes, 1 possibly, 3 don't know	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Points of Interest:

- > 3 companies spent nothing on marketing for international bookings.
- > 11 companies were unable to calculate this because of:
 - they could not breakdown staffing costs,
 - they could not analyse their marketing spend from their general budget,
 - they could not target marketing spend on international as opposed to general spend,
 - they did not yet know their figures for 2006,
 - they were abroad and unable to access figures.
- > Some companies had an unrepresentatively low spend in the year 2006 – they explained that they had produced all their publicity in a previous year.
- > There were a number of inconsistencies – of companies claiming no international marketing spend, one used money for travel to foreign festivals, one spent money translating their website...
- > Some companies commented on their lack of knowledge or analysis of the effectiveness of their marketing spend – and appreciated having to think about it for the purposes of this research. Some regretted the lack of time available to do this (crucial) analysis.

It was not possible to show that internationally focused marketing brought companies more bookings, or that a lack of it meant few or no bookings abroad. There was a complete range. Clearly groups find a variety of different ways to get their shows booked. They also held strong (and widely differing) opinions as to the usefulness (or lack of) afforded by different marketing spend.

[See detailed statements by respondents in Annex 1.]

(10) Financial help for touring

Country	Source of Funding	Amount in euros
Poland	Fundacja Stefana Batorego	500
Italy	EU Culture 2000 Italian Inst of Culture in Serbian and Tunisia, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	20,000 (breakdown not given)
Italy	Assessorato alla Cultura di Bergamo – Istituto Cultura Italiano	4,000
Italy	Istituto Cultura Italiano - Ankara Istituto Italiano di Cultura di Barcelona	2,500 7,500
Catalunya	Ramon Llull to go outside Catalunya but not Spain	6,000 13,000 another unspecified
Euskadi/Basque Government	Basque Govt	1,000
Spain	INAEM, Min Cult	16,000
Belgium	Commissariat Générale aux Relations Internationale de la Communauté Française de Belgique	1,300 1,800
Czech Rep	Czech Centre in England Czech Embassy (several countries) Czech Ministry of Culture Goethe Institut, Praha Czech cultural Center in Dresden	1,000 d/k d/k 780
Finland	Finnish Government, foundations	2,500
Netherlands	The Netherlands Fund of Performing Arts	40,000
Netherlands	Dutch embassy Croatia	3,000
Netherlands	Dutch Embassy in Denmark	3,000
	Private Korean sponsorship	20,000
Austria	Kulturbudget Land Tirol und Stadt Innsbruck	800
France	ONDA	Don't know
Bulgaria	EYF, ECF, Bahai'International Centre – Paris, Trust for Mutual Understanding - USA, Art International - USA	Don't know
France	Cultures France	5,000 (direct to Valladolid)
UK (2 diff groups)	British Council	Don't know
UK	UK Trade International	4,200
	British Council 1997 Italy 2001 Trinidad	Travel Don't know (used for Per diems, travel, minimum fee)

Points of Interest:

- > Very few groups had received money directly to help them tour; most were not aware of whether hosting festivals had managed to get money from international cultural institutes as they were not aware of this.
 - > One group said that the very long wait needed before hearing about travel grants meant that they could not hold onto bookings; several groups commented that they frequently have to confirm bookings before hearing that they have travel grants, resulting in anxiety and possible deficit (to them or the programmer).
 - > Several groups complained about "favoured companies" receiving all the available money.
- "The British Council have proved a real obstacle in our negotiations, telling festivals you can have this company but not that one. At times it feels like a sort of imperialism where foreign promoters are not trusted to know what they like."

(11) Companies' difficulties with international touring

This section of the questionnaire was fairly straight forward, though it prompted a lot of individual suggestions and comments.

The Most Useful Tools	No of Companies
Lists of festivals and programmers	55 (one made it essential)
Information on what styles of work work different festivals programme	45 (one made it essential)
New technologies *	12
Ability to speak (or find speakers of) other languages	33 (2 made it essential)
Information websites on street arts and circus	41 (one made it essential)
Being listed on street arts and circus websites hosted by development agencies and other networks	43 (one made it essential)
A specialist marketing officer within your company	33, plus 6 others who thought it was ideal but impossible to get money for this in reality. Some described their management / agent as fulfilling this function

* new technologies – this was to include use of You-tube, text messaging, networking sites such as facebook/myspace, etc.

It was generally agreed by all that the more specialist marketing that can be done, the better the chance of getting bookings abroad. However, juggling tight budgets means that this area is often under-resourced; artists do not have the time to even do the research needed to make use of these tools.

Points of Interest:

- > During the research into these companies using the internet, several key pointers became obvious (which were not specified in the questionnaire):
 - it was very helpful when email contact details were clearly shown on website 'contact ' pages. This included listing an email address in addition to having the facility to send one directly via the site,
 - some websites were difficult to find one's way around – they do need to be marketing tools as well as pieces of art!
 - the most useful websites are those that offer the visitor the option of 'skipping' the creative (often time-consuming to download) homepage introductions,
 - an impressive number of sites are now translated into one or more other languages. This is particularly the case with Baltic and Balkan artists/companies. It is an extremely useful tool, enabling international programmers to do much more than just glance at artists' workplans,
 - a growing number of groups now have video clips on u-tube. This is also useful as an initial introduction to the type of work a group/artist does. It would be helpful to have email contact (or website) information available on these sites, if possible.
- > Several artists described the importance of showcases to be seen, to meet and get to know international programmers.
- > Several respondents described the value of agents handling their bookings in foreign countries; some felt these people also enabled tours to be more efficiently scheduled. Others longed for better informed and more impartial advocates to support artists trying to get a foothold abroad.
- > One company described the importance of taking technical support abroad with a company – it adds to the cost (so is often not considered essential) but makes things immensely easier and avoids communication difficulties, differences in equipment between countries, etc.
- > One company mentioned the importance of knowing the budget of different festivals abroad, to be able to decide is show-casing was worth the money.

[See detailed statements by respondents in Annex 2.]

(12) The greatest obstacles to increasing international touring

Obstacles	Obstacles (touring EU) No of Companies	Obstacles (touring outside EU) No of Companies	Don't Know
Taxes	17	9	3
Travel costs	41	28	2
Administrative issues (eg visas, work permits etc)	11	11	2

Points of Interest:

- > The results show that travelling is the single largest burden; in many cases this may be the principal (and first) hurdle that companies face. If unable to pass that one, issues such as taxes and visas do not even start to get considered. For companies with installations or structures, air freight is prohibitive but the time to transport these by sea/road may be logistically impossible unless structures are made in duplicate. Some companies do this, but the logistics are still complex.
- > Companies citing taxes and visas as problems all had considerable international touring experience
- > The main taxes described are:
 - Ausländerteuer in Germany (apparently this may add an extra 100% to the fee),
 - Foreign Entertainers tax in UK (designed to prevent popstars earning a lot of money without paying tax. There are ways to circumvent this for street artists/circus companies),
 - Issues of VAT – there is some confusion as to whether this needs to be paid on all invoices or whether it is not charged on companies within the EU.
- > Within administration issues, health and safety restrictions were mentioned several times as being very variable from country to country. There were suggestions made about paperwork for customs officers, differing customs about royalty payments, insurance and risk assessments.
- > Few people cited visa restrictions, but there is considerable misunderstanding about the different arrangements for immigration within various EU countries: the UK, Ireland and Denmark are not the same as other EU states – additional visa restrictions are in force for non EU nationals, even if they have the right to travel within the rest of the EU.
- > Specific arrangements for licensing of pyrotechnics, circus tents, seating banks and other structures may be complicated and differ from country to country.

[See detailed statements by respondents in Annex 2.]

(13) Suggestions for improvements

There were many different suggestions made in response to this question. The principal categories include:

- > Marketing support : people suggested individuals, 'impartial ambassadors' to help companies from one country / region get international bookings, agencies to research administrative and tax implications of foreign working; to encourage co-ordination between programmers and organise coherent tours across Europe.
- > Marketing support: funding for travel and living expenses to attend showcase festivals, or to bring foreign programmers to showcases in respondents' countries.
- > Travel bursaries to encourage international movement, especially to the developing world.
- > Access to information on:
 - similar companies in other countries,
 - funding streams for international collaborations,
 - setting up a genuine European touring network, directed by co-operatives of artists and companies, funded by the regions (start small – between 2 countries that are neighbours – and then grow to cover Europe!),
 - supporting a network specifically for the presentation and the exchange of artists...
- > Simplified funding systems that are more appropriate for street and circus companies (rather than indoor institutions- dance, theatre, music).
- > Special grants to support circus companies working with big top tents – these are expensive on travel (weight), time (they need several days to rig and derig) and people (crew and production staff are skilled, they must travel with the tent). Small companies may rig their own tent but need time to rest before performing! Additional costs are for overnight security.
- > Unifying administrative and fiscal systems across the EU – taxation: VAT, foreign entertainers taxes to be cancelled for artists as 'international touring is so important for intercultural harmony'.
- > Unifying licensing regulations – fireworks, hazardous materials, tents.
- > Standardise health and safety legislation across member states for outdoor spaces legislation:
 - That public spaces must be preserved as places of social and cultural use. Social cohesion is an essential aspect of EU philosophy and policy should recognise the crucial role played by the public space and artists who engage with the public within it.
 - That all urban redevelopment uses street theatrical and artistic practice in all their projects, to engage with communities so as to create a legacy of positive empathy with the new environment. Only culture that is comfortable in the street can achieve that.
- > Greater attention of European cultural policy toward street theatre and circus, through legislation to prioritise, promote and support greater touring, information and financial support.

[See detailed statements by respondents in Annex 3.]

Annex 1

Sample of comments by respondents to the question 'what are the crucial tools you need to secure international work?'

"Videotapes/pictures of the performance, opportunities to meet programmers, good (press) reviews, first (international) prizes/awards." [Netherlands]

"Enough resources to take the necessary team on tour – sometimes a full time production manager does not fit into the budget... but the shows are always much more difficult without it, especially as foreign production teams may work very differently." [Netherlands]

"We get all our work by playing in showcase festivals (Chalon, Aurillac, Périgueux, Sotteville, etc.). These are essential (even though they do not pay fees): before a promoter buys a show, he wants to see it. I think it's important to offer platforms for young artists and companies where they can play and show their (new) work in a safe way." [Belgium]

"Costs of taking our work elsewhere, yet it is rare to meet foreign promoters at festivals in France." [France]

"Find written directories more useful than on internet, the funds and invitations to visit international showcases, strong visual publicity with videos." [UK]

"Marketing is my responsibility but I'm not keen on doing any selling for different reasons:

- > I don't think I have the personal qualities of a salesperson and I'm not very dynamic.
- > What we offer requires quite a lot from a presenter – they have to really want it if they're going to fulfil all our needs (not just technical) for there to be a worthwhile exhibition. Therefore it is important that the promoter comes to us and we're fortunate that they do.
- > If we already have the seeds of a tour in a given region (say North America) I will do a mail out to other presenters in the region who have contacted us previously – advising them of the possibility to participate in a tour where the transatlantic costs are already covered. That is about as pro-active as I get.
- > Occasionally I will have a project I try to develop – I am currently interested to try to exhibit in Iran and have exchanged a few emails with the UK Embassy. That's a small-scale bit of marketing.
- > This documentation that we send out is something I create and update and is probably an expenditure of my time on marketing
- > Looking for the occasional financial 'cushion' (We don't generally get more bookings coming in than we need – we're often producing a small loss at the end of the year so, to keep up our revenue we will make ourselves available for work that may not be an ideal match between artists and client. This applies to almost any commercial project – e.g. a company celebration or a product promotion. However we are usually only doing

one or two of those a year and we can justify it to ourselves by saying it can allow us to offer a cheaper price to work with someone we want to work with.)

- > following up every enquiry but without being too idealistic – For 2007 I have counted something like 150 booking enquiries – most don't go beyond me emailing out the initial information (brochure, financial/technical summary) but some are very time consuming in the dialogue stage before falling at some hurdle.
- > in 2006, of 26 bookings, 8 were repeat ones.
- > in 2005 we did a taster exhibition, which got us a special 6 week special project in the Netherlands
- > we are in the Frans Brood brochure – in 2006 5 of our bookings came through someone contacting Frans Brood, for which we pay 10%.
- > Approximately half our bookings are new presenters approaching us. The avenues by which they arrive are diverse:
 - organisations like Xtrax & British Council who invite our participation in their company directories,
 - we have been around for a long time so there is already some built-up awareness. Word of mouth is important for us and we get a lot of work through recommendation,
 - we have a good web presence if someone is doing a casual search – not just our website but other material people (visitors & press) have posted – our website is now quite old but was a good marketing investment,
 - we have a strong media presence – people are often publishing articles – we've got 3 bookings right now in the USA because of one article in an American Express magazine. I do spend time responding to media enquiries and accumulating press-worthy material." [UK]

"These are our needs:

- Better knowledge of what programming works in different countries.
- The ability to bring programmers to see us at work in our space.
- having the budget to send a good video to those who cannot come and see us live.
- accessing accurate information on documents needed to pay taxes, visas etc in different countries ... preferably made clearer for artists, rather than having to look on government websites." [France]

"The problem with doing shows abroad is that travel costs are so high. We have had several reservations abroad (Canada, America, Poland), but often programmers are not able to cover shipping costs or means of living. eg a trip to Canada involves 40 days to ship material by sea, or exorbitant costs by air, that that the festival could not afford. This is only possible if we have no other work for that show during those 40 days!" [Portugal]

"I think that every festival programmer today is flooded with so much information and offers by artist groups that they must struggle to view all the material and decide objectively. With modern marketing methods, and a correspondingly large advertising budget, you can be in a good position, at least in Germany and Austria. However, our group works differently - we put as little money as we can get away with into advertising and marketing, leaving the maximum of energy and resources for new developments, innovation and knowledge exchange." [Austria]

"Reliable and accessible information about EC funding programmes that are available to groups like us." [Spain]

"The internet seems to be our main way of getting foreign work. This combined with word of mouth or bookers having seen our work. We haven't for now targeted festivals." [UK]

"Good co-ordination of a tour of different festivals so that a company can manage a sensible tour without going backwards and forwards travelling unlimited kilometres." [Spain]

"Knowledge of what scale of work (and budget) different festivals programme, so we do not waste time trying to interest people who only have very small budgets." [Italy]

"Being given the opportunity to show the work in key festivals in the UK and breaking through what seems 'a closed circuit' in the sector. This is particularly important for us as we create large-scale work, which is by its very nature a bigger risk, takes time to tune and refine the performance and is more expensive." [UK]

"Meeting with professionals while we are presenting shows abroad." [France]

"The most important thing for us and for young artists and creators in the development of our work has been the relations we have built (through organising a festival ourselves) with other directors, who have then taken the risk to programme Portuguese work. Our inclusion in the IN SITU programme has been the most important development for us." [Portugal]

"What is needed is good financial support for travel costs. And sensible touring schedules - the travel is often so hard because bookings are not grouped together well. So it is both money and a touring organiser - maybe for several companies as it is expensive for just one." [Germany]

"To belong to international and national networks." [Portugal]

"Clear information about tax and accounting issues of expenditure abroad, to avoid making costly miscalculations." [Austria]

"Participation in showcases leads to the first bookings abroad. Then promoters see us perform at Festivals and book us the following year. This is how it has worked for the last 10 years. This has proved far more effective than spending

money on print and sending it to promoters who are already swamped with publicity from groups they haven't seen. We also have a Dutch agent who gets us 5-10 bookings a year in Holland and Belgium." [UK]

"We think that more information you have about the others companies and organizations better it is, but internet is virtual, and what we need more is play in front of people who can engaged us later. We don't trust in selling our performance through video or photos. Theatre is a live fact. The creation of more meetings between artist and promoters will be helpfully." [Czech Republic]

"For us our agents in Spain and Italy, are essential We don't send mailings because we have like norm of the company don't contact with organizations which don't know about our work before. Also we don't spend too much in publicity for the same reason. We only made posters in order to send only when we are already engaged." [Czech Republic]

- Attendance of international promoters at UK festivals and showcases.
- Advocacy abroad by someone who is not partisan, yet more informed about outdoor work than the British Council.
- Support for British outdoor performance to be showcased at Edinburgh - we lost so much money attempting to capitalise on British Council showcase there." [UK]

"A person who speaks fluently German, Italian, Spanish,... A bigger knowledge of existing networks .. We need being introduced in existing networks by playing at big festivals where others can see our work (UK, Germany, Italy...)." [Belgium]

"Well, our organization is ran by circus artists and of course we would need a professional producer to deal with the work that touring or even getting to a tour demands which means we would need to have better economics to be able to hire a person. We need network, knowledge of marketing, travelling support." [Finland]

Annex 2

Sample of comments from respondents to the question 'what are the biggest obstacles to selling your work inside and outside the EU?'

"Difficulties in getting international programmers to come and see shows in their countries of origin. It cannot be stressed enough how important even the smallest meeting with promoters is, to show them the work of a company." [France]

"Difficulty in accessing funding to enable artists from different nations to work on co-productions. Most EU funds only pay many months after it has been spent, which is extremely difficult for independent companies with not a lot of cash flow." [Ireland]

"Outside the EU, there is little knowledge of networks and organisations willing to invite companies from Europe." [Netherlands]

"Travel costs are even more problematic in a international co-production. Although this is essential as part of Europe's policy of genuine "intercultural dialogue" (as opposed to superficial meetings) this is an obstacle because you have to fly in the co-producers each time you're having a performance. In this case a single performance is not an option, only a sequence is." [Netherlands]

"1) Existing tax regulations are designed for rock bands – it is really hard for independent and collective arts programmers to manage to pay this.

2) The existence of 'collaborative networks' that work to create and distribute shows they have commissioned themselves, is on one level a very good thing as it encourages new work to be made. However, it reduces the market considerably for independent companies.

3) Fireworks legislation varies wildly across the World. This includes both the import, the storage, the handling and the firing of these. It is extremely confusing and time-consuming trying to satisfy very different bodies.

4) Abusive rules imposed on artists by some Health and Safety Officers around Europe and beyond. We are often treated extremely disrespectfully, as though we were trying to kill ourselves and others!" [Spain]

"We do need to find other festivals sharing program so they can split cost on transport" [Belgium]

"Lack of marketing officer who knows how to propose the work in the right context and who is able to develop projects and furthermore who speaks more than just Italian." [Italy]

Some festivals abuse young companies by not paying them, saying they are a showcase festival only. [Belgium]

"VAT can be a problem for non-commercial organisations in the Netherlands. Tax thresholds in Spain mean having

to fiddle about with invoices. In Germany safety permits are very expensive (over 10,000 for a Baubuch) and local authorities are increasingly demanding". [UK]

"Our problems are often about moving a circus tent and equipment around... Our tent travels with us in flight cases. It weighs 700 kg and can go by airfreight if necessary. Or we drive it. We do not require helpers but we do ask for 12 x 300 kg weights to be provided if we are on hard ground (not grass). This can be a problem as organisers may give the wrong size, or not enough – or much too big, which is an aesthetic disaster as our tent is so little!

We have documentation about fireproofing and the structure of the tent, in 3 languages; we also have photos of the contents of the flight chests as they can be anxious at customs (especially Norway!)

We need to arrive and set up the day before we perform, as we perform for 4 hours each day; and we need security over night." [Belgium]

"In spite of free movement within the EC, there are indeed administrative problems when you cross borders. It is still extremely difficult and complicated to find out clear information on tax and legal issues abroad. And this is even more difficult outside of the EU. The work of organisations set up to help artists (HorsLesMurs in France), is making things much easier as there are information bulletins and guides to help us." [France]

"Taxes : At the moment it is as complicated as it could possibly be – and makes the costs of bringing foreign companies in very much higher for programmers, so they cannot justify this. Every time administrative officials ask programmers for more papers that describe the legal position of visiting companies. But also, every country in the EU has its own papers and formalities, that are not necessarily the same ones that I need in my home country."

"Administrative issues (e.g. visas, work permits, etc.). Time taken to produce 'carnet' particularly where we are not touring an off the peg show, but adding in new stuff or adapting various bits and pieces." [UK]

"Specific extra cargo and paperwork costs caused by travelling with a circus tent – The tents are for my solo work and I am alone on stage so we arrive often 2 days before the show day so that I get enough rest. Occasionally we have pitched up the tent the in the morning of the show day but it is too tiring. We are two on tour, me and a technician. We ask 2 technicians if we start pitching the tent 1 day before the show day and more if we pitch it up the same day.

There is a lot of other costs around the circus tents. You have to hire guardians during the night, you have to rent

barriers, toilettes, showers for artists, get electricity to the field on which you are playing (sometimes there is none)." [Finland]

"Lack of money and resources to co-ordinate a tour – so often you have to travel more than 2000km to take part in one festival and then go back home without picking up other bookings along the way.

Language problems – to be able to perform a show in other languages is not so difficult, but negotiating by phone in foreign languages is very hard!" [Spain]

"Serious lack of contact information and network – It would help if Norway was included in the EU community!" [Norway]

- Lack of equipment in the office – I work all alone.
- Lack of internet site, promotional material and competent PR.
- Costs of transporting shows." [Portugal]

"There is a lot of legal papers to do with circus tents – In France there is a lot of control concerning the safety of the public during the shows. I have taken safety workshops to learn the legislation concerning this and also bought and learned the law book about safety legislation in circus tents." [Finland]

"The problem is how we promote ourselves – how can festival organizers find our company and see our shows? Our web page with videos is a good promotion but still, if the company is not in the 'yellow pages of street arts', it may as well not exist. And even if they find our listing, what is the criteria of selection? We should know so we only contact appropriate promoters." [Slovenia]

"Poor language skills; ineffective marketing." [Austria]

"Outside EU – When you play in a first world country normally taxes are too high. EU should do some agreements to help developed this exchanges. Culture is not only business. Sometimes we were charged in taxes like if we were selling commercial products.

Travel costs – More than the price of the travel the problem is to be sure that the materials you need for play arrive with you. The insurance you have to pay and the possibility to lose your things are worst than the costs. In compare with the fees, today to fly is not so expensive. It is clear that we are a small company. We never travel more than three persons.

Administrative issues – In some countries the theatre material has to pass the costume controls like something which can be sold, so they applied you norms for exported and imported matters. Sometimes it is a long and complicated procedure. We need better agreements from the EU with other countries to considered the theatre materials like culture and not economic issue.

Another problem is the absence of promoters from outside EU looking for performances." [Czech Republic]

"There are no structures for different kinds of performing arts like mime theatre, street theatre or non-verbal theatre

in Poland, and there are no official or non-official institutions who work with information, help, education, popularization, etc.

There is almost not any help from officials in organization of touring for such kind of performing arts in our country.

There are not professional agents and managers in this kind of activity in Poland because there is no education in this area." [Poland]

"Of course we would like to travel more further than the EU, but the absence of promoters of other continents looking for shows in Europe is evident. Only a few festivals hosted them." [Czech Republic]

"Being a stranger to the biggest markets. Since the markets seem to be closing to international work, it is even harder to be let known if from streetwise underdeveloped country. It is hard to gain confidence, specially if the style of our work is storytelling..." [Slovenia]

Annex 3

Sample of detailed comments from respondents to the question

'what improvements could be made at an institutional level to alleviate these difficulties?'

"Europe should make sure to include all artists in their planning for things like the 2008 Year of Intercultural Dialogue, so that artists like us can plan far enough in advance to be able to have project ready ... once again we have been left outside in the dark." [Spain]

"A fund to help towards travel costs of companies and programmers who are determined to present an international programme of work."
[France]

"Funds to cover transport costs for very long distances (to Bogota from France was 15,000 dollars!)." [France]

"Access to information relating to organisations that do similar work to ours in other countries with a view to developing co-productions.
Access to more practically possible funding streams for this work." [Ireland]

"More and easier opportunities to show your performance/ theatre group, live or on a video. So more visits abroad and budget for a registration.
Reliable and accessible information about EC funding programmes that are available to groups like us." [Spain]

"- Support from the key festivals in UK, so we get enough bookings to then move further on.
- More constant support from ACE or British Council, which is quite sporadic.
- Resources to employ a producer familiar with international circuit and/or a full time marketing/sales person.
- Funding to market shows abroad, funding to go abroad and showcase (covering not only the travel costs), funding to invite promoters to come and see our shows."
[UK]

"- Unify the tax-collecting systems. If one state collects taxes, an arts company should be exempt or heavily discounted in any other state.
- VAT only to be paid in home country, not abroad.
- Unify the laws for pyrotechnics across Europe like has been done with other exports.
- Unify Health and Safety legislation across the member status.
- Guarantee the use of public spaces as places of social and cultural use. Included in these activities should be elements of risk and adventure that citizens may wish to see – these are vital aspects of human life. Preserve the right of citizens to select to take part in shows which may involve a limited risk." [Spain]

"Standardise safety and tax regulations across the EU – but I fear this is pure fantasy!" [UK]

"To have more transparent information for circus funds."
[Slovenia]

"A better trans-European booking network Outside Europe, financial help needed from rich countries to support work in poor (i.e. responsibility of EU)." [UK]

"Paying taxes in artists' country of origin only." [Belgium]

"Foreign entertainers taxes to be scrapped. Free border-crossing for artists as international touring is so important for intercultural cultural harmony." [Germany]

"Clear, accessible and accurate information on administrative requirements for each EU state (and beyond) to be available at national resource centres in each country." [France]

"Support for travel costs for people and production materials on tour; and for site visits (inside and outside the EU)." [France]

"Special funding to companies touring with circus tents."
[Finland]

"Greater attention of European cultural policy toward street theatre, as a valid (though small)artistic reality. Legislation that will promote and support greater touring, information and financial support." [Italy]

"Funding to invite promoters to the UK, funding to go abroad to show cases. Funding to go and visit festivals and conferences in order to make contacts and network." [UK]

"Support with travel costs, to help shows move around. Recognition in Portugal of Street Arts cultural value to the country and their specific needs. Recognition of the different laws that countries use to regulate the arts." [Portugal]

"Portugal to play some part in supporting their artists to work abroad." [Portugal]

"Better access to cultural institutes, recognition of the vitality and cultural importance of street arts; clear information concerning the criteria for funding applications from the Italian side." [Italy]

"To avoid double taxes in case of performing in foreign countries." [Slovenia]

- Acknowledge that street art practice is a very powerful tool for creating community cohesion and breaking down existing barriers caused by segregation of race / religion / class, etc.
- Pass a law that all urban redevelopment uses street and other theatrical and artistic practice in all their projects, to engage with communities so as to create a legacy of positive empathy with the new environment. Only culture that is comfortable in the street can achieve that.
- Pass a law that the income of land owners is taxed to finance street theatre festivals – and that each festival should dedicate some of its resources to draw on and celebrate the unique geographical history of the place that is being taxed." [UK]

"An neutral promotional organization in one country with whom we can work together from all countries." [Austria]

"More opportunities for funding travel costs and indirect grants to take our work abroad." [Portugal]

"The British Council could be more helpful instead of constantly setting their own agenda and controlling who is « allowed » to be booked. They have proved a real obstacle in our negotiations, telling festivals you can have A but not B. At times it feels like a sort of imperialism where foreign promoters are not trusted to know what they like." [UK]

"Try to create a running program during the year. Festivals and meetings are important because they give the chance to a city to host during few days a year a group of companies, but it is necessary after to develop this short time events in a long term program." [Czech Republic]

"To organize more meetings with promoters and try to press to the authorities to change some laws." [Czech Republic]

"Grant to go to showcases, not only with new work but maybe more importantly work that already had at least a summer to run in and get smooth before being brought to an international showcase.

A clearer understanding of what support is available for international touring (from EU funding, British Council, Arts Council England) and when it is worth contacting respective agencies to seek support for an international enquiry or project.

Help with translations, especially for technical documents. Ideally a 'bi-lingual facilitator' who can support in the dealings with international bookers." [UK]

"Big(ger) network in Europe that collects and represents all festivals, theatres, and so on (like Circostrada). The effort of all professionals (programmers and companies) to work on a common European language (such as English) because having a sales team that masters every EU language is pretty expensive." [Belgium]

"Help the companies who seriously want to tour in circus tents to buy a circus tent (after a study that project is a serious project and will continue and not stop after the first

problems – there is often with circus tents and it is hard work). They should also help with the upkeep of the materiel (tent, electricity, heating systems, seating, trucks, trailers... This cost quite much is sometimes you need to rent space to be able to for instance dry or repair the canvases and most of the time when you do repair stuff you need to hire people to do it with you (there is a lot of heavy part and to carry everything out of the truck by yourself is not possible). Sometimes bookers ask us to come without the tent and we have already done it but it is not the same thing. For me the circus tent is part of the set as much (or more) as any object on stage. When the audience goes inside a circus tent it is completely different than going in a theater." [Finland]

Here is the list of the street arts and circus arts companies that participated in our survey:

Austria

Zirkus Meer
Floraphoniker

Belgium

D'irque & Fien
Okidok
Magic Land Théâtre
Compagnie Céleste,
Sabine de Lange et Babyk
Baby Washboard Show
Circo Ripopolo
Cirq'ulation Locale
Compagnie des Quatre Saisons

Bulgaria

Theatre Tsvete

Croatia

Artistika
Krepsko

Czech Republic

Mimotaurus
Karromato

Denmark

Toons 'The Professional Idiot'

Finland

MedAndraOrd
Circo Aereo

France

Cirque en Kit
Souffleurs – commandos
poétiques
Baro d'ével Cirk Compagnie
Cahin-Caha – Cirque bâtard
Cirque Baroque
Compagnie du Mystère Bouffe
Zanimos

Germany

Ton und Kirschen Theater
PasParTout
Oko Sokolo
Ulik

Ireland

Macnas
Fidget Feet Performance
Company

Italy

Atmo
Arcipelago Circo-Teatro
Theatre en vol
Mabo Band
Silence Teatro

Netherlands

Circus Klomp
Lunatics

Norway

Circus Khaoom

Poland

Teatr Prawdziwy
Stowarzyszenie Teatralne
A PART

Portugal

FIAR – Centro de Artes de Rua
PIA – Projectos de Intervenção
Artística
Teatro Ka

Spain

Sarruga Produccions
Xarxa Teatre
Escarlata Circus
Markeliñe
Producciones Animasur
Boni

Slovenia

Trupa Aduta
Drulus
Gledališče Ane Monro
Magic Theater Saltimbanko

Sweden

Circus Arts

United Kingdom

Whalley Range All Stars
Architects of Air
Scarabeus
Bureau Of Silly Ideas
Faceless – Access the Arts
Mimbre
Walk the Plank
Ockham's Razor
Gandini Juggling
Wired Aerial Theatre
Artizani