

# Te Tahua Whakamarohi i te Rāngai Ahurea - Ngā kōrero matua i puta i ngā uiui rāngai | Cultural Sector Regeneration Fund - Summary of themes from sector engagement

For more information about Te Tahua Whakamarohi i te Rāngai Ahurea | the Cultural Sector Regeneration Fund see our website at [mch.govt.nz](http://mch.govt.nz).

## Te Pūtake | Background

### 1. Te tirohanga whānui | Taking a wider view

Earlier this year, the Government established the COVID Response and Recovery Fund to address both the immediate response to the global pandemic and support a longer-term recovery.

The response for the cultural sector included more than 25 initiatives, which together form the Arts and Culture COVID Recovery Programme led by Mānatu Taonga - Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

Many of these initiatives have a shorter-term focus to address immediate COVID-related costs and impacts, and are already delivering support or taking applications. This has included funding for:

- the film, music and museums sectors, and Pasifika festivals
- the cultural organisations funded by the Ministry
- expanding existing programmes.

As announced in May, Te Tahua Whakamarohi i te Rāngai Ahurea | the Cultural Sector Regeneration Fund has a sector-wide and longer-term focus and will make \$150 million available over the next 2-3 years through three funds.

### 2. Ngā tahua e toru | The three funds

#### Te Tahua Whakakaha | Capability Fund

- Purpose: ensuring organisations in the cultural sector have the tools to work within a COVID and post-COVID environment.
- Funding: already allocated to funding agencies - \$8m over 2 years; contestable - \$12m over 2 years.

#### Te Tahua Whakahaumarū | Creative Arts Recovery and Employment (CARE) Fund

- Purpose: enhancing access to cultural and creative experiences, while creating new opportunities for employment and skill development across the cultural sector.
- Funding: contestable - \$70m over 3 years.

## Te Tahua Āki Auahatanga | Innovation Fund

- Purpose: encouraging innovative practice and partnerships to change the way cultural content is made available to audiences, helping to create a more resilient and sustainable sector.
- Funding: contestable - \$60m over 3 years.

**For more information** about Te Tahua Whakamarohi i te Rāngai Ahurea | the Cultural Sector Regeneration Fund see our website at [mch.govt.nz](http://mch.govt.nz).

## 3. Te kokenga i te haerenga whānui | Where we are on the journey

### Funds announced

#### Sector engagement

- Proposed approach released
- Online survey
- Focus groups and hui
- Report back engagement feedback (we are here)

#### Detailed design

- Details finalised
- Ministers approve details

#### Prepare for launch

- Details finalised

#### Funds launch

1. Capability
2. CARE
3. Innovation

## Te āhua o tā mātou uiui i te rāngai | How we engaged with the sector

### 1. Te uiui rāngai e pā ana ki te rautaki hukihuki | We engaged with the sector on the draft approach

We engaged with the arts and cultural sector on our draft approach for the funds.

We initially planned a roadshow across four or five urban and regional locations, but this was re-planned to be online only due to increased COVID alert levels in August and September.

The move to an online-only engagement provided an opportunity to extend the reach of our engagement and widen the diversity of participants.

#### What we shared with the sector

We published the following documents, in PDF and text versions, on our website:

- High-level draft approach for the funds overall and for each fund.
- Supporting material including indicative scope and examples of potential applications for each fund.

### 2. Te Uiui ā-ipurangi | Online survey

- On our website and open for feedback 9-22 September.
- All questions were optional and responses anonymous.
- Questions covered all three funds and respondents' demographics.
- Promoted through our email newsletter and sector networks.

We received 219 online survey responses.

### 3. Ngā uiui arotahi me ngā hui | Focus groups and hui

- 14 focus groups and hui held from 10-25 September.
- Facilitated by external facilitators.
- Around 140 individuals participated, with some attending more than one for a total of 200 across all focus groups and hui.
- Participants represented a cross-section of the arts and culture sector, including voices from diverse audiences and perspectives.
- Each fund had at least two rounds of focus groups: a first round with a larger number of participants, and a second round with selected participants to discuss the proposals in more detail.

- Additionally, there were two hui discussing how to provide for mātauranga Māori outcomes in Te Tahua Āki Auahatanga | the Innovation Fund.

#### Te Tahua Whakakaha | Capability Fund

Round 1: two focus groups with 36 participants

Round 2: one focus group with 10 participants

#### Te Tahua Whakahaumarū | Creative Arts Recovery and Employment (CARE) Fund

Round 1: four focus groups with 59 participants

Round 2: one focus group with 9 participants

#### Te Tahua Āki Auahatanga | Innovation Fund

Round 1: three focus groups with 59 participants

Round 2: one focus group with 9 participants

Mātauranga Māori hui: two hui with 18 participants

## Ngā kōrero matua i rangona | Themes we heard across all funds

### Broad consensus for support for the sector

- There was a broad consensus behind support for the sector, especially those particularly impacted by COVID.

### Plan a joined-up funding ecosystem

- Many said that the funds need to be carefully lined up with other funding sources to ensure there aren't any overlaps or gaps. This could risk confusion, wasted time, or wasted money.
- Many also said they needed clarity about which agency they should apply to for funding.

### Make it easy to apply for funding

- Many wanted application processes to be as simple and easy as possible, to minimise barriers for smaller organisations and independent applicants.
- Some suggested simpler processes for applications for smaller amounts.
- Many supported flexible applications processes to make it easy to apply.

### Ensure support reaches Māori

- Many were concerned that support might not reach Māori practitioners and projects.
- Some wanted to ensure Māori applicants can apply for funding from any of the funds, not just for mātauranga Māori projects supported by the Innovation Fund.

### Ensure support reaches under-served communities

- Many were concerned that support might not reach under-served practitioners and projects.

### Leverage sector expertise

- Many voiced the need to ensure sector expertise is involved in the assessment of applicants.
- Some also mentioned the importance of local practitioners assessing local projects.
- Some also said sector expertise needed to be involved in the detailed design of the funds.

### Concerns about contestable funding

- Many feel contestable funding processes are often onerous and time-consuming, which favours larger, well-resourced applicants and creates a barrier for independent applicants.
- Some fear contestable funding will encourage competition rather than collaboration.

### Mixed views in the sector about:

#### Purpose

Many said their first priority was certainty to continue in the sector beyond the next few months and they need urgent COVID relief funding to do that.

Many said the proposed funding is a rare opportunity and needs to be a carefully considered strategic investment in the long-term sustainability of the sector beyond the life of the funds.

### Eligibility

Some wanted the funds to directly support independent practitioners and didn't want funding to go to large organisations or businesses.

Some said funding needed to go through large organisations and businesses to be effective.

### Targeting

Some wanted funding to focus on the arts and culture sector and were concerned that funding might go to others outside the sector.

Many said funding also needs to reach beyond the sector to include suppliers of services the sector depends on.

## Te Tahua Whakakaha | Capability Fund

### Ngā kōrero matua i rangona i ngā uiui | Themes we heard across our engagements

#### General support for focus and eligibility

- There was broad support for the proposed focus areas.
- Many supported the proposed eligibility and targeting.

#### Assessment needs to involve sector expertise

- Need to involve sector expertise in designing the fund.
- Need to involve expertise from particular sector to assess applications from that sector.

#### Reaching independent artists

- Many were concerned about how funding will reach independent artists and diverse communities if eligibility is focused on organisations and businesses.
- Many were concerned that only large, well-resourced organisations would have capacity or eligibility to apply for funding.
- Some suggested using organisations such as membership bodies or local agencies to distribute funding.

#### Reaching regions

- Many were concerned that funding might not reach the regions, and might be limited to the main urban centres.
- Some pointed out that regionally-based organisations might have higher barriers to accessing funding.

### Ngā kōrero kapohia i kitea i ngā uiui ā-ipurangi | What we heard in the online survey

#### There was general support for the proposed eligibility and targeting

We proposed making funding available to all organisations and businesses in the cultural sector, prioritising proposals benefiting multiple organisations.

Fifty-three respondents agreed, and 23 respondents disagreed. 95 respondents provided feedback but did not express clear agreement or disagreement.

#### There was general support for the proposed focus

We proposed focusing on building and enhancing skills and knowledge, access to external advice services, and access to tools and resources.

Fifty-eight respondents agreed, and 11 respondents disagreed. 95 respondents provided feedback but did not express clear agreement or disagreement.

#### There was general support for the proposed scales

We proposed two scales of funding: up to \$100,000 for proposals benefiting a single organisation or business; and up to \$750,000 for proposals benefiting multiple organisations or businesses.

Forty-nine respondents agreed, and 12 respondents disagreed. 124 respondents provided feedback but did not express clear agreement or disagreement.

### Barriers to accessing funding is a major concern

Summary of concerns ranked by percentage of responses. Respondents could identify multiple concerns.

Barriers e.g. access, awareness, process	30%
Assessment, monitoring, outcomes	24%
No focus on independents, small operators	22%
Lack of detail or clear objectives	18%
Regions/communities left out	17%
Specific creative sectors left out	17%
MCH ability to design and deliver	16%
No focus on Māori and other underserved groups	15%
Collaboration challenges	12%
Funding captured by agencies or other sectors	7%
Too much commercial emphasis	5%

## Te Tahua Whakahaumarū | CARE Fund

### Ngā kōrero matua i rangona i ngā uiui | Themes we heard across our engagements

#### Broad support for well-being and building skills for the future streams

- There was broad support for the well-being and building skills for the future streams of the fund.

#### Little support for touring and public arts streams

- Many said the touring and public arts streams were too narrow and were not targeting the sector's greatest needs. Many also noted that now is not the right time to be investing in touring and public art.

#### Too visual arts focused

- Many felt the proposals were too visual arts focused.

#### Continuity in a COVID environment

- Many voiced the urgent need for support to continue in the sector, especially for organisations and artists that depend on live performances.
- Many said support needs to mitigate the impacts of changing COVID alert levels – for example, underwriting events for late cancellations due to alert level changes.
- Many said the fund needs to reach communities without advocacy groups or arts organisations to represent them.
- Many also said support needs to extend to supporting industries.

#### Use partnership opportunities

- Many said there were opportunities for collaborative partnerships between different parts of the sector beyond funded agencies.
- Some said there were opportunities for partnerships between local and central government (with varied responses across regions).

### Ngā kōrero kapohia i kitea i ngā uiui ā-ipurangi | What we heard in the online survey

#### There was mixed support for the proposed streams

We proposed four funding streams: wellbeing outcomes, funding for touring exhibitions, new public art, and building skills for the future.

Forty respondents agreed, and 33 respondents disagreed. 97 respondents provided feedback but did not express clear agreement or disagreement.

There was broad support for the proposed well-being stream and expanding the scope to other parts of the cultural sector.

Support for specific streams. Respondents could identify multiple streams they supported or suggest new streams.

Well-being	62.3%
Other sectors	34.0%
Venues, support, services	13.2%
Spaces and places	11.3%
Capability	3.8%
Museums, galleries and libraries	3.8%

There were concerns about how we define and measure success

Summary of concerns ranked by percentage of responses. Respondents could identify multiple concerns.

Assessment, monitoring and outcomes	37%
Definitions and eligibility	27%
Regions/communities left out	27%
Barriers e.g. access, awareness, process	26%
Overemphasis on visual arts and touring	17%
Lack of detail or clear objectives	16%
MCH ability to design and deliver	14%
Funding captured by agencies or other sectors	10%
No focus on Māori and other underserved groups	9%

# Te Tahua Āki Auahatanga | Innovation Fund

## Ngā kōrero matua i rangona i ngā uiui | Themes we heard across our engagements

### Broad support for funding innovation

- There was broad support for funding innovation, particularly where it has the potential to improve long-term sustainability of and encourage new partnerships across the sector.

### Need for ongoing sector collaboration

- Many said there needed to be ongoing collaboration with the sector to design and implement the fund.

### Supporting applicants to access funding

- Many said the application process should nurture and develop applications and that applicants need wrap-around support from the Ministry and sector.

### Focus funding on the cultural sector

- Some said the cultural sector should be the primary beneficiary of funding.
- Some were concerned about too much focus on digital technology.

### Need for clarity

- Many said they needed more clarity about *who* we want to fund, to do *what*, and *where*.
- Many said we need to be specific about what we want to see happen but not specific about how it should be done.
- Some recommended 'problem statements' clearly distinguishing between commercial and cultural outcomes.

### Supporting mātauranga Māori innovation

- All mātauranga Māori hui participants said it was essential that a kaupapa Māori approach informed the design and implementation of the fund.
- Many hui participants said mātauranga Māori expertise was essential in the design and implementation of the fund and on assessment panels.
- Many hui participants said innovation within mātauranga Māori should be defined widely and could include new projects, projects restoring and revitalising traditional knowledge (mātauranga), and innovation stemming from traditional mātauranga.

## Ngā kōrero kapohia i kitea i ngā uiui ā-ipurangi | What we heard in the online survey

### There was mixed support for the proposed targeting

We proposed targeting both the cultural sector and non-cultural sector organisations partnering with or benefiting the cultural sector.

Thirty-three respondents agreed, and 29 respondents disagreed. 129 respondents provided feedback but did not express clear agreement or disagreement.

### There was broad support for the proposed application thresholds

We proposed three thresholds for applications: seed funding, medium-sized funding, larger applications.

Fifty respondents agreed, and seven respondents disagreed. 90 respondents provided feedback but not express clear agreement or disagreement.

### There was uncertainty about the goals of the fund and the meaning of “innovation”

Summary of concerns ranked by percentage of responses. Respondents could identify multiple concerns.

Lack of detail or clear objectives	34%
Assessment, monitoring and outcomes	32%
Barriers e.g. access, awareness, process	21%
Funding captured by agencies or other sectors	18%
No focus on Māori and other undeserved groups	16%
Overemphasis on digital/commercial	16%
Overlap with other funding	10%
MCH ability to design and deliver	5%