

2nd think tank meeting MusicAIRE on the topic “just & resilient”

16 December 2021, 10:00 – 13:00 CET, online

The aim of the 2nd think tank focus meeting was to tackle the following questions:

- What kind of projects could be funded under the different topics and within the different project sizes?
- How could the European-added value look like, what concrete ideas and examples do you have?
- Should the projects be mono-beneficiary or multi-beneficiary?
- Lump sums: Do you have good models for lump sum funding, e.g. from your local, national level or from foundations? How are the lump sums proven in the end to conclude that the project was successful?
- Do you have good and simple examples for project applications (instead of complex and lengthy EU applications)?

Discussion points raised:

- Mono-beneficiaries should demonstrate European-added value e.g. through being active in several countries, inviting participants from different countries
- European organisations could use the funding as cascading grant to offer training and smaller grants to their members working on the overall objective of the project
- European-added value can also relate to multiplying aspect: producing something that can be used by others, others can learn from
- Because grants are relatively small maybe rather look at extending an existing activity/project, make it transferable
- should also be open to smaller entities such as labels, venues e.g. for bottom-up, pilot projects but should be clear the purpose of the grant is not to fund their regular activity and results should benefit peers or sector at large
- focus should be on experimental projects, prototypes
- example: prototyping with small MitOst funding, very simple application
- example for simple application: Bosch Foundation
- suggestion that there could be a difference in requirement for partners depending on the size of the grant
- Suggestion for 3 different project types/objectives:
 1. Pilot, experimentation: start on something new that doesn't exist yet
 2. Boost or accelerate idea that already exists
 3. Disseminate, share, train others (based on existing material, knowledge), raising awareness
- Innovative is relative term: rather use experimentation
- Lump sums rather in business not so much cultural projects. But could consist of overall numbers on project management, travel etc.
- Rather a question of assessment, evaluation, reporting, proof that activities happened (not by invoices etc. but in different form)
- Flatrate (would need to be pre-defined), e.g. for speaker fees, travel costs to internationalise events

- There could still be a requirement to keep receipts for a certain amount of time for potential check
- Question what kind of co-financing will be eligible: own costs for salaries?
- Question whether there needs to be proof for the co-financing or just prove of the costs of the project overall?
- Potentially different formats for bigger and smaller grant
- If no differentiation in requirements, people will apply for the bigger grant
- Will there be a possibility to negotiate based on evaluation? E.g. applicant applied for 55.000 EUR but will be offered to down-scale to 30.000 EUR to do the project?
- keep it flexible: For the last creative Europe call apparently the mid size projects were overasked and because it was not flexible, many good projects won't have the chance to succeed