CHAPTER 2:

A brief history of South African arts funding from 1994 to the development of the five major funding bodies

The shifting trends internationally, and the specific needs of South Africa have given rise to a funding environment with a variety of funding bodies and mechanisms. Given the purpose and size of this research report, I have selected five of these organizations as they are each connected to public money. The Department of Arts and Culture (DAC) is one of the founding bodies of The Arts and Culture Trust (ACT), Business and the Arts South Africa (BASA) receives funding from the DAC for its Supporting Grant Scheme, the National Arts Council (NAC) is the DAC's main distributor of funds for arts and culture, and finally, our National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund (NLDTF) is included as it distributes public money from ticket sales, and contributes the largest amounts of funds to the arts and culture sector. Each of the funding bodies, presented in the chronological order of their development, potentially provides for differing needs within the dance community. Their specific mandates have arisen out of problems that were identified while our new democracy was being established.

The election of 1994 saw a change in government and the dawning of a new environment for South African arts. There was recognition of the need for research in the Arts sector in order to develop the country's policies regarding arts, culture and heritage, hence the drafting of the country's White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage in 1996. In November 1994 Minister BS Ngubane of the then Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) appointed an Arts and Culture Task Group (ACTAG) to research the state of the arts environment and a means of achieving a more effective and equal distribution of government funds to the Arts. This research was not the first of its kind, but was preceded by the findings of the National Arts Initiative (NAI) in 1991 and of the National Arts Coalition (NAC) in 1993. The NAI was established in order to research and produce better protection, support, and funding mechanisms for South African arts and culture[1]. Both the NAI and the NAC were active in petitioning for recognition and inclusion of arts and

[1] 'The Foundation for the Creative Arts and the National Arts Initiative': editorial. De Aarte. Issue 48, p.2, September 1993.

culture in the development of the country's Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)[2].

The ACTAG released their report in 1995, and this aided in the development and drafting of the White Paper of 1996. Two of their suggestions were for the transformation of the Performing Arts Councils (PAC's) from production houses to playhouses, and for the formation of a National Arts Council to take over distribution of government funds from the Foundation for the Creative Arts (FCA)[3]. The White Paper outlined the needs for an organization promoting sponsorship of the arts in the corporate sector, the formation of the National Arts Council, and gave rise to the possibility of a National Lottery that would provide additional benefits to the Arts and Cultural sector.

i. DACST to the Department of Arts and Culture

The present day Department of Arts and Culture (DAC) came into being on 1st August 2002, when the previous Department of Arts and Culture (DACST) split into two separate departments – the DAC and the Department of Science and Technology[4]. At the time of its formation in 2002, the DAC housed four programmes: Administration; Arts, Culture and Language in Society; Cultural Development and International Relations; and Heritage, National Archives and Library Services. As it exists today, the DAC consists of 6 programmes: Administration; Arts and Culture in Society; National Language Service; Cultural Development and International Co-operation; Heritage Promotion; and finally, National Archives, Records, Meta Information and Heraldic Services.

The department's vision is "to develop and preserve South African culture and to ensure cohesion and nation-building"[5]. It states four points that constitute its mission, but I find that two of these points are more relevant to the performing arts:

> *to develop and promote arts and culture in South Africa and mainstream its role in social development;* and *to improve economic and other development*

[2] http://www.artsmart.co.za/miscellaneous/archive/929.html
[3] Arts and Culture Task Group Report, 1995.
[4] http://www.dacst.gov.za
[5] http://www.dac.gov.za/vision_mission.htm

opportunities for South African arts and culture nationally and globally through mutually beneficial partnerships, thereby ensuring the sustainability of the sector[6].

It has taken me quite a while to realize that the DAC itself is not a funding body, but are more concerned with policy making and strategic planning, and are most likely to point you in the direction of the NAC or your local arts and culture council to request funding. However, under the circumstances that you feel your particular project fulfills the criteria of one of their sub-programmes, or is covered by one of their bilateral agreements, you may be able to enter into discussion with them[7].

The DAC has clearly outlined their objectives and means of achieving them for each of their 6 programmes[8]. Programme 2, Arts and Culture in Society, focuses on increasing accessibility and sustainability of the arts through its sub-programmes *Arts, Social Development and Youth* and *Arts and Culture in Society*. These grants can be accessed primarily through the NAC and BASA, or directly through the DAC if your project suites the criteria of the department. Programme 4, Cultural Development and International Cooperation, seeks to "improve economic and other development opportunities for South African arts and culture nationally and globally through mutually beneficial partnerships, thereby ensuring sustainability of the sector" through their sub-programmes *Cultural Industries*, *Investing in Culture* and *International Relations*[9].
These programmes consist of their own sub-programmes in order for them to achieve their objectives:

Programme 2: *i.i. Arts, Social Development and Youth,* and
i.ii. Arts and Culture in Society
Programme 4: *i.iii. Cultural Industries*
i.iv. Investing in Culture
i.v. International Relations

---

[6] http://www.dac.gov.za/vision_mission.htm
[7] I found it strange that the only gentleman from the DAC who was willing to talk to me wished to remain anonymous.
[8] See their Strategic Plans for 2003-2006, 2005-2010.
[9] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p.33.

i.i. Arts, Social Development and Youth

This sub-programme of the DAC focuses on Arts Education and Training, Arts Access, a Youth Expressions campaign, Women and Gender, and the Field Band Foundation. In partnership with the Department of Education, this arts education and training allows for the development of programmes promoting arts in schools, and developing curricula to support this. Arts Access promotes the arts in marginalized sectors which have had limited access to the arts, for example the Artists in Prisons programme aiming to contribute towards the rehabilitation of offenders[10]. The Youth Expressions Campaign focuses on the youth, creating awareness through debate and dialogue, and promoting the development of a common identity and civil consciousness. Initiated in August 2003, the Woman and Gender programme aims to celebrate and acknowledge the vital role played by women in society; the approach to this is based on the belief that by producing positive role models for the youth, self-esteem will be boosted, supporting a "moral regeneration" of society[11]. The Moral Regeneration Programme has developed into its own unit, and was allocated R2million in 2004/2005, and is focused on "restoring a value system corroded by the disintegration of families, poverty, greed, the abuse of women and children, racism, corruption and so forth"[12]. One project listed here relates to the dance industry directly, Contemporary Dance Education – July 2005.

i.ii. Arts and Culture in Society

This sub-programme of the DAC serves as a vehicle for promoting "social development, urban regeneration, job creation and the development of sustainable Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's)"[13]. The department contributes to the support of festivals financially and nationwide, but points out that it still needs to develop policies that can grow the performing arts – most notably "choral music, poetry, indigenous music and dance"[14]. The second means by which the department strives to help arts and culture contribute towards social and economic development of communities, is through Community Arts Centres. The budget for this purpose has grown from R1 million in 2003/2004 to R5 million in 2004/2005, as it is believed that

[10] http://www.dac.gov.za/projects/asdy.htm
[11] http://www.dac.gov.za/projects/asdy.htm
[12] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p. 23.
[13] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p. 23.
[14] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p. 23.

these 24 centres could aid in the alleviation of poverty in certain areas too[15]. This sub-programme of the DAC had a budget of R188,134 million in 2004/2005, and 19% of this (R44,668million) was allocated to the NAC for distribution.

i.iii. Cultural Industries

The DAC aims to support and grow the cultural industries, which they classify as "crafts, music, books and publishing, technical services and performing arts, audio-visual design (including film) and visual arts"[16]. Yet when looking at the pie chart showing the percentage of distribution to each of these industries, it is evident that technical services and performing arts have been allocated 0%. It is only noted that research is underway, and a Technical Support Conference is in the process of being arranged.

Under this sub-programme, I find it most interesting to note the DAC's focus on the development of skills and employment, and the aid provided by the CreateSA project. The Creative Industries Growth Strategy (CIGS) highlighted the lack of training or qualifications available in its industry. The Creative, Research, Education and Training Enterprise South Africa (CreateSA) was a result of discussions between the Media Advertising, Publishing, Printing and Packaging Sector Training Authority (MAPPP SETA) and the DAC, and has provided advice regarding the framework on which to build training opportunities within the creative sector[17]. It was funded by the Department of Labour's National Skills Fund, and aimed to ensure that the creative industries were included in government's promotion of skills development. This has been significant in developing Unit Standards for Dance within the National Qualifications Framework and in formulating appropriate training frameworks within the creative industries[18]. Dance has been included in this development, as evident through the Moving Into Dance Mophatong learnerships.

i.iv. Investing in Culture

The DAC's Investing in Culture sub-programme focuses on "creating opportunities for musicians, performers, crafters and artists to contribute to the economy; providing

[15] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p. 23.
[16] DAC Annual Report, 2004-2005, p. 33.
[17] CreateSA handout.
[18] CreateSA Report.

infrastructure for the promotion and further development of enterprises; ensuring sustainability of projects by providing the necessary training (mainly product development, entrepreneurial skills, marketing, etc); and contributing to the development of 'liveable communities'[19]. Some of the key criteria for projects wishing to apply for these specific funds are those of poverty alleviation, sustainability and capacity building, but particular attention is paid to the number of women, children and disabled people targeted[20].

i.v. International Relations

This sub-programme was established in 2000, and focuses on social and economic development through the formation of bi- and multilateral agreements. According to the 2004-2005 Annual Report, the DAC currently maintains 42 international agreements where the motivation behind agreements has shifted from one of donor aid to that of mutual benefits[21]. The DAC's agreement with Flanders resulted in an investment of approximately R25 million between 2003 and 2005, with the DAC providing an additional R5 million[22]. The Swedish-South African Culture Partnership Programme (funded with the DAC and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)) was established in 2004, and has generated R57 million over a three-year period, and focusing on freedom of expression, capacity building and institutional development[23]. A number of bilateral agreements and commitments through the SADC have also generated a very substantial amount of funds. While funding from the British Council may be on the decline, partnerships with the Netherlands, Pro-Helvetia, Africalia, and even Ireland still strong at the time of writing.

It may not be obvious at first, but there are opportunities for the creation of dance projects within these sub-programmes, depending on their focus, size and plans for implementation. I was unable to access any actual contemporary dance companies that have done this, but it would be interesting to establish how many have been successful and if the opportunity has been utilized. The official funding vehicles of

[19] DAC Strategic Plan, 2006-2009. p.37.
[20] DAC Strategic Plan, 2006-2009. p. 37., and http://www.dac.gov.za/projects/investing_culture.htm
[21] http://www.dac.gov.za/sa_flemish_art/background_bilateral.htm
[22] http://www.dac.gov.za/sa_flemish_art/background_bilateral.htm
[23] DAC Strategic Plan, 2006-2009. p.39.

the DAC are the NAC and BASA, and since 1997 the NAC has been allocated R247,158,000 and BASA has been allocated R24,952,000[24].

Altogether, the sub-programmes seem to be imperative for the cultural life of the country, and I think that this is reflected in the table below, which represents the accumulated expenditure of Programme 2: Arts and Culture in Society, and Programme 4: Cultural Development and International Cooperation[25]:

Year	Programme 2	Programme 4
2001/2002	146,486,000	44,647,000
2002/2003	152,615,000	78,501,000
2003/2004	192,011,000	121,672,000
2004/2005	232,802,000	140,047,000
2005/2006*	200,802,000	165,995,000

* Preliminary expenses.

ii. Performing Arts Councils to the National Arts Council.

Before 1994, the performing arts of South Africa were supported through the four Performing Arts Councils: Performing Arts Council of the Transvaal (PACT), Performing Arts Council of the Orange Free State (PACOFS) the Cape Performing Arts Board (CAPAB) of the Natal Performing Arts Council (NAPAC). These councils were funded mainly through the Department of National Education, but the Foundation for the Creative Arts (created in 1989) provided very limited funds for artistic projects that fell outside the scope of the PAC's, which predominantly produced opera, theatre and ballet. These four Councils formed part of a larger co-coordinating body, the 'South African Co-ordinating Performing Arts Council (SACPAC), which guided the Councils and provided recommendations based on existing policies (Steinberg: 104). Around 1994 it is evident that some attempted to create outreach or training programs serving a greater public around them: the creation of Siwela Sonke alongside the Playhouse Dance Company in Durban, 1995[26]; Jazzart, the then modern dance department of CAPAB between 1992 and 1999, was

[24] As calculated by the author.
[25] Figures sourced from the DAC Annual Report 2004/2005, and the DAC Strategic Plan 2005-2010.
[26] Playhouse Company Annual Report, 1994-1995.

facilitating workshops with children in the Cape Flats in 1996[27]. These four Councils existed in the major cities of Pretoria, Bloemfontein, Cape Town and Durban, and were strongly criticised for producing for the interests of predominantly white audiences and serving predominantly white interests.

These councils selected and cast productions that remained elitist – productions of "classical" arts such as ballet, symphony orchestras, drama classics and opera remained dominant. White preferences remained culturally dominant, despite attempts to change and develop multi-racial casts and audiences. In her research into the transformation of PACT in 1994, Carol Steinberg highlights that many 'progressive' shifts towards inclusivity and increased access to audiences remained flawed purely by the fact that founding policies remained unchanged and skills remained firmly in the hands of the white managers. Steinberg also highlighted how racial bias remained obvious, with audiences remaining 95% white, and productions admittedly remaining "eurocentric".

Further, more detailed research was undertaken regarding the PAC's, where some alarming statistics were revealed. The research revealed the following facts about 1995/1996: the operating income of the PAC's was R160-million; box office income accounted for only 18% of this; that about R112-million had been granted by the State alone[28]. Examination of the report showed that box office intake was not even covering the costs of administration, proving that government was "subsidizing expensive art forms and infrastructure for a small audience at an unaffordable level"[29].

It was decided that the FCA would be closed as the proposed NAC came into fruition, in order to be a more hands on and viable conduit of government funds. However, as the core infrastructure and skills already existed for the running of an arts council, the NAC took over the infrastructure and resources of the FCA. Funds would still be received annually from the DACST, and the physical infrastructure and staff would be absorbed into the new council. Evidence of the initial transformation of the PAC's

---

[27] CAPAB Annual Report, 1996; http://www.jazzart.co.za
[28] *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*, 1996, Chapter 4, Point 18.
[29] *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*, 1996, Chapter 4, Point 19.

was apparent as central government, their provinces and their municipal areas in which they were situated began to take over their administrative and infrastructural costs of running the soon to be playhouses. Over a period of three years (1996-1999), central government would gradually decrease their financial support until it only supported the core running costs of the organizations. The White Paper also indicated that the existing PAC's were to be restructured in a way that would free and reallocate public funds and resources to other areas, addressing issues of access and distribution[30].

Any associated companies, such as PACT Dance Company or Jazzart Dance Company at CAPAB, would have to seek independent funding from the NAC or local councils, encouraging a shift in the number of their funding sources and a split in the approach to funding playhouses and production companies. These companies were no longer the primary recipients of government funds, and had to apply for grants alongside everybody else. This process of transformation was to be completed by 2000. Currently, the running costs of the six playhouses are funded by the DAC through the NAC – these are the State Theatre, Artscape, PACOFS, the Playhouse Company, the Windybrow Theatre and the Market Theatre. The initial funding cut was of 22%, and funds freed up by this were handed to the NAC for distribution. Today, the infrastructure of the previous PAC's still exists: PACT has become The State Theatre; CAPAB is now Artscape; PACOFS is now the Performing Arts Centre of the Free State; and NAPAC is now the Playhouse Theatre.

Allocated Funds, as gathered from the organization's Annual Reports and also from the data presented in the PANSA research 2005:

	CAPAB/ ARTSCAPE	**PACT/ STATE**	**NAPAC/ PLAYHOUSE**	**PACOFS**	**TOTAL**
'94-'95	34,728,000	42,629,250	23,142,000	16,508,000	117,007,250
'95-'96	33,315,000	42,214,250	22,097,000	15,523,000	113,149,250
'96-'97	28,335,000	35,298,830	19,787,000	13,864,000	97,284,830
'97-'98	24,500,000	33,004,000	19,682,000	14,085,000	91,271,000
'98-'99	26,327,000	33,107,466		15,408,000	74,842,466

[30] Chapter 4, point 13.

'99-'00	23,387,000	31,110,000	20,081,000	15,821,000	90,399,000
'00-'01	21,920,000	31,891,000	21,060,000	16,024,000	90,895,000
'01-'02	23,511,000	17,350,000	22,641,000	17,332,000	80,834,000
'02-'03	18,755,000	16,436,000	15,708,000	12,780,000	63,679,000
'03-'04	20,213,000	17,895,000	11,360,000	14,108,000	63,576,000
'04-'05	21,845,000	19,377,000	18,520,000	15,303,000	75,045,000

* The data gathered from annual reports does not include funds from local or national government.

The existing National Arts Council came into being in 1997, and was developed in order to continue public funding of the arts, but in a manner that would be viewed as "at arm's length", following international trends. This means that although the government provides the funds, the government is not supposed to be involved in decisions of the board, or how the funds are distributed (Steinberg:111).

Each discipline has one specialist representative in the NAC, who is assisted by a panel of five colleagues of said discipline who advise decisions regarding applications and policies. Each of the 21 board members is supposed to serve for 3 years, with a minimum three-year break before being allowed to serve again. At least one third of the board is supposed to remain at a time in order to encourage continuity. The NAC has been riddled with problems regarding their board, involving dissolutions, legal action and issues of transparency when appointing new members[31]. This paper does not seek to research these details, but these infrastructural problems have affected the distribution of public funds, as board members are supposed to oversee and sign for fund allocations.

In 1997 the NAC was allocated R10-million for distribution, when their total applications were requesting R129-million[32]. The NAC initially began to fund in a manner that was very 'reactive'[33]. As there were a number of incoming applications and existing projects/companies relying on the funds, the NAC's preliminary criteria were less specific. It was only as the organization began to grow that specific

[31] See PANSA Media Statement of 16 September 2006.
[32] Chairman's Report, Dr. John Kani, NAC *Annual Report 1997-1999*.
[33] CEO's Report, Doreen Nteta, NAC *Annual Report 2000-2001*.

requirements began to be developed. The NAC funds according to the following categories: Theatre/Drama, Music and Musical Theatre, Dance and Choreography, Visual Arts, Craft, Literature and Multi-discipline. Their vision is “to promote the free and creative expression of South African culture”, and its mission is “to promote excellence in the arts”[34]. Community groups, institutions and registered companies that are formally registered, plus individuals are eligible for funding from the NAC, and projects that will be considered should do the following: deal with unique artistic wealth of the nation; address the unique artistic wealth of a particular province and may propose benefits outside of its host province; assist in the process of fostering South African identity; seek to address national priorities; seek to achieve artistic merit and excellence; and promote the rights of any person to freedom of expression in the practice of the arts[35].

The NAC website states that it will fund individuals, organizations, and projects that do not exceed twelve months. They also advise that they will probably not award the full amount requested, and that additional funding sources should be sought and declared. The website also states that touring projects will be funded, as long as supporting documentation from the host country is also provided. Alongside project and company funding, the NAC also provides institutional and international bursaries. The category of *Company Funding* is approved by the Minister of Arts and Culture, and assists companies over a period of three years, in an attempt to provide stability, create employment and facilitate the creation of new works[36]. I personally find it rather strange that the minister has anything to do with this especially if the NAC funding is meant to remain at “arms length”. Only companies with a proven track record are eligible for this category, and the following documentation is required: *company profile; business plan, including artistic programme; audited financial statements, and the structure of management*[37].

How does this affect dance and choreography? The NAC will fund projects that include:

[34] Information sheet accompanying July 2006 application forms.
[35] Information sheet accompanying July 2006 application forms.
[36] http://www.nac.org.za/fundingMoreInfo.htm
[37] http://www.nac.org.za/fundingMoreInfo.htm

creation and performance of new choreographic works; touring in South Africa and abroad; research and documentation thereof; residency programmes; community outreach projects; exchange programmes; conferences; workshops which lead to performances (names and CV's of facilitators, plus detailed workshop content must be supplied*);* and finally, *festivals with track records*[38].

and the budgetary items it lists are as follows:

artists fees (rehearsal, performance, production crew and choreographers); venue hire; publicity costs; administration costs; travelling costs, accommodation for touring productions; costumes and props; other project related costs (administration).

In the graph that follows, the **total** amount is the total budget allocated to the NAC by DACST/DAC, followed by the total amount awarded to the discipline of **dance**, and finally how much of this was awarded to **contemporary dance**[39]:

YEAR	TOTAL	DANCE	CONTEMP DANCE
Feb '97 – Oct '99	25,000,000	R6,051,012	3,531,750
Nov '99 – March '00	25,000,000	R389,000	199,000
April '00 – March '01	35,000,000	R2,700,237.75	2,302,280
April '01 – March '02	35,076,000	R5,482,440	3,470,440
April '02 – March '03	40,342,000	R8,746,655	5,346,023
April '03 – March '04	42,072,000	R8,345,090	5,183,590
April '04 – March '05	44,668,000	R10,911,410	5,840,662
TOTAL:	**247,158,000**	**R42,702,844.75**	**25,873,745**

*An additional table can be found as **Appendix A**, showing the % of budget allocated to dance between 1998 and 2005.

38 'Dance and Choreography Funding Guidelines', information sheet accompanying July 2006 application forms.

39 Figures have been taken from the PANSA research of 2005

The NAC was allocated R47,894,000 for the April 2005 – March 2006 funding cycle. Since it began distributing funds in 1997, the NAC has funded a variety of dance projects, be they individual or company works. Recipients have varied greatly, and the lists of recipients are long: these can be seen in the NAC Annual Reports, available directly from the NAC, or can be found on the Internet.

These figures appear to grow, but the NAC has been plagued by problems of infrastructure and distribution. In an interview Thato Monamodi, Dance/Choreography and Multidisciplinary Consultant for the NAC, informed me that the organization receives an average of 100-120 applications for each of the biannual funding cycles, with 220 being the maximum number he has received. Of these applications, Monamodi reveals that only 50-70% can be processed, and that those that are declined receive letters explaining why. He also stresses that the NAC tries to accommodate established companies and to groom new ones through site visits, and offering assistance artistically and administratively; that they also try to help companies who did not receive funding, if potential is seen in the work or the vision.

Monamodi expresses another problem he experiences: that the number of applications is increasing, but the number of people processing them remains the same, and the "funding pot" cannot grow at the same rate as the number of requests. A second issue is that he finds people writing one thing, but actually doing something different. He explains that people need assistance in expressing exactly what it is that they need from the NAC, especially when it comes to meeting the criteria of "national significance". I struggle with this concept of how my dance piece might have "national significance", but Monamodi explains that if a dance piece were to only be performed once, in a very specific geographical location, then I should possibly rather apply to my local council for funding; but if it deals with issues affecting the nation, then the NAC might just be the right avenue to follow. It appears then that content and geographic location are both equally important, and perhaps a stronger point of persuasion is then how many people the performance can reach.

While Monamodi feels that government provides many opportunities for the public to access money through not only the NAC, but through provincial and local government too, the NAC is the only office with a specialist in dance. He is also hoping to introduce a three level tier system: newcomers enter in level one, and move through the tiers over a period of three years, in an attempt to guide learning and create an environment of sustainability[40]. According to information sheets made available to the public for the July 2006 application form deadline, the NAC budget is approximately R51million for project and company funding, and for overhead costs. There are two funding cycles per year – one near the beginning, and one towards the end.

iii. ACT

The Arts and Culture Trust (previously known as the Arts and Culture Trust of the President[41]) has existed for the longest out of my selected funding bodies, and was launched just after the first democratic election in October 1994. The ACT is a joint venture between the private and public sectors, and its formation was initiated by Nedbank and supported by Sun International. Nedbank had already begun its affinity products such as the WWF Trust and the Sports Trust, whereby the public can make donations to these trusts by opening accounts linked to these affiliated products[42]. Nedbank not only generates new income for itself, but also increases the public profile of the company as it is seen to be giving back to the public in a positive manner. These two organizations approached the then Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology with a proposal to establish a funding body supporting and promoting growth and sustainability in the arts (I suspect they saw the opportunity for marketing and increasing the numbers of their own clientele). Each of the three founding members pledged an initial R1-million to the Trust, with R500 000 to follow in each of the next two years. DACST committed R1-million over three years and the then National Network Television (NNTV of SABC) sponsored R1-million of free airtime for publicity[43]. NNTV was subsequently transformed into SABC 3, and

[40] Interview with Thato Monamodi, August 2006.
[41] Former President Nelson Mandela acted as ACT's Patron-in-Chief from 1996-1999.
[42] Conversation with Ashraf Johaardien, General Manager of the ACT, 10th August 2006.
[43] NNTV no longer exists and is therefore not referred to as a founding member.

changes within the DACST created an initial delay in the distribution of funds, but by September 2006 the Trust was fully operational[44].

After five years two new partners came aboard - Vodacom and the Royal Netherlands Embassy – strengthening and increasing the size of the Trust. The 11 Trustees are nominated for their positions, and are responsible for policy changes and how the funds are distributed. Some of the founding partners are represented in the Management Committee of nine people. This committee manages the trust and also actively participates in fundraising. Projects are funded not only through corporate donations, but also through interest that accrues from the trust, through capital investments, international donations, and income-generating affinity products[45]. The Trust remains true to its commitment to growing the amounts of funding available to the arts: both local and international donors can gain founding partner status by matching the grants. The ACT also awards "appropriate status" to smaller private sector donors and encourages the opportunity for investment[46].

In line with international trends, the ACT does not only function as a receiver of donations and distributor of funds, it also seeks to provide benefits to its sponsors. Association with the trust offers a prestigious acquaintance with their current Patron-in-Chief, President Thabo Mbeki. The ACT also actively lobbies for tax exemptions to be made available for donations to the arts, an endeavor shared by Business and the Arts South Africa, but this has still not been realized legally. Another joint venture with BASA and the National Arts Council was in the lobbying for the formation of a National Arts and Culture Lottery Initiative (NACLI), the effects of which can be seen in the work of the National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund discussed in subheading *v*. The Annual ACT Awards were established in 1998 and this includes awards not only for the creation of arts, but also for the equally important roles of support, arts education, journalism and management. Investment in the ACT can be determined as a pathway of Corporate Social Investment (CSI), and it is a means for investors to see that their funds are being "carefully applied to greatest effect"[47].

---

[44] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
[45] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
[46] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
[47] http://www.nedcor.co.za/financials/2004sustain/artsculturetrust.asp

The King Report on Corporate Governance (King Report I) of 1994 led the shift in corporate mindsets away from purely profit orientation to a more socially responsible approach advocating "an integrated approach to good governance by including principles of good social, ethical and environmental practice"[48]. This report was headed by the former High Court Judge, Mervyn King S.C., and was published by the King Committee on Corporate Governance. The King Report on corporate Governance for South Africa (King Report II) of 2002 cemented this approach to good corporate governance, highlighting the focus on the "triple bottom line" of social, environmental and economic focuses in an organisation's activities instead of on profit for only the shareholders[49]. This is how Corporate Social Investment has grown, with organizations increasingly finding ways of giving back to the societies in which they operate. Not only do they align themselves with beneficial corporate activities internationally, but they also increase public support of their activities as they are seen to be returning some of their gains to their surrounding public. But one of the important points of CSI is that it emphasizes the "reciprocal relationship" between stakeholders, promoting equal benefits to all parties involved[50]. A separate CSI department was often developed in companies, in order to meet the needs of requests for corporate sponsorship from the public.

Increasingly, companies are beginning to finance such activities through their marketing departments, as they have realized the potential for promoting themselves in a manner than can be regarded as a tax incentive as marketing budgets (not donations) can be written off through tax[51]. From a marketing perspective, sponsors have the opportunity for product promotion and branding, reaching a wider audience at a cost that is tax deductible. The sponsors also benefit by increased goodwill towards their label for supporting a project of the arts. This creates an environment where everybody can win – the sponsored projects receive funds that help to increase marketing for their programs, but corporate sponsors also find reach into a new marketing audience for their products. The key to a successful partnership is to engage in a process and agreement where both parties benefit. On the ACT website it is stated that the amount of applications they receive far exceeds their resources, but

[48] http://www.deloitte.com/dtt/article/0,2297,sid%253D30215%2526cid%253D51089,00.html
[49] http://www.cliffedekker.com/literature/corpgov/index.htm
[50] http://www.i-value.co.za/king.html
[51] BASA document in hand of author.

that their primary aim remains to "increase the amount of funding available for the arts and culture through means such as corporate events, fundraising events, international donations, capital investments, and income-generating affinity products"[52]

The affinity products are developed to benefit both the corporate donor and the Trust. The donor benefits from the association with a prestigious organization, providing invaluable marketing and publicity opportunities, and the Trust benefits financially. For example, Nedbank's affinity products programme does the following: makes donations from credit card turnover (at no cost to their client), a premium from new cheque books is paid to the Trust, and each time a new savings account is opened, Nedbank again makes a donation to the Trust[53]. Sun International has offered the Super Bowl at Sun City to the ACT in order to host a fundraiser. Unfortunately, as Ashraf Johaardien (General Manager of the ACT) points out, the invited artist would need to fill the arena, and a sponsor who is able to cover the costs of such an artist would need to be found. Another problem arises here, in that the ACT is not an events company, and does not have the capacity to co-ordinate such an event. I find this point very interesting, as the participants of the research also complain about not having the time to work, create, perform and apply for funds too; and often, nor do they have the resources to employ someone else to do this.

The ACT has very clear and specific funding criteria, and its funding cycle normally occurs in the first quarter of the year, but the date depends on when the required amount has been acquired through fundraising or other agreements with new donors. There are no longer two funding cycles as the ACT has begun funding in larger amounts, promoting sustainability instead of funds for once off projects with no longevity[54]. Their website explicitly explains that once an organization/individual receives funding from them, their ongoing support cannot be guaranteed[55]. The Act admits in its website that it will probably not fund the full amounts requested, and they have six focal areas to guide their choice of projects: *job creation; creative skills; management skills; cultural diversity, awareness and understanding; cultural*

52 http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
53 http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
54 Interview with Ashraf Johaardien, GM of the ACT.
55 http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm

tourism; and *marketing*. Once it has been established that at least one of these has been addressed in the proposed project, the applications are evaluated according to:

> *Merit – is the project innovative, well conceived and inherently worthy?*
> *Impact – what impact will the project make in its focus area?*
> *Development – how will the project uplift communities/groups/individuals?*
> *Sustainability – how cost-effective and sustainable is the project?*
> *Capacity – does the project have the management and financial skills to succeed? Profile – what publicity and branding are offered to ACT and its partners?*[56]

According to the board's requirements, once a project has been awarded funding, it needs to be visited at least once. Johaardien reveals that out of approximately 500 applications per year, only 20-30 are fundable, and that in an attempt to moderate how they select projects, the applications are scored. All applications receiving above 80 points are eligible for funding, and are then handed over to the board to discuss the percentage of distribution between disciplines, but this monetary distribution depends on the specific needs of each project. The percentage allocated to each discipline also depends on the number of applications that are successful: the higher the percentage of applications per discipline, the higher the percentage of overall funds allocated to that discipline. The ACT has also funded a variety of projects, but as the shift in focus turned more towards sustainability, the numbers decreased. For example, in 1997, six contemporary dance companies were funded, but in 2005 only one was.

In its first five years, ACT distributed close to R5-million to approximately 350 projects and bursaries[57]. In 2004, ACT distributed a total of R1,2-million to 30 projects of all disciplines[58]. By the time the annual ACT Awards took place in 2005, almost 500 projects had been funded, with nearly R6-million coming from Nedbank alone[59]. The graph below shows how much has been allocated firstly to the discipline of dance provided by ACT annual reports (left hand side), but then to the style of contemporary dance on the right, which I have abstracted:

---

[56] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/funds_criteria.htm
[57] Annual Report, 2000
[58] http://www.nedcor.co.za/financials/2004sustain/artsculturetrust.asp
[59] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/awards2005_winners.htm

Date	Total Budget	Dance	Bursaries	Contemp
Up to Dec **1996**		70,000	6,000	60,000
May/Nov **1997**	792,114	136,523	12,000	102,000
May/Nov **1998**	1,140,395	54,600	30,000	35,000
May/Nov **1999**	1,222,283	20,000	40,000	50,000
2000	1,112,150			
2001	1,032,720			
2002*	31,236			
2003	219,150	120,000		120,000
2004	1,159,195	282,000		217,000
2005/2006**	2,828,480	50,000		50,000
2006/2007	935,000	70,000		
TOTAL:	**10,505,723**	**803,123**	**88,000**	**634,000**

*According to records supplied by the ACT, there was no proper funding cycle in 2002, and breakdowns of funding were not available for 2000-20002.

**Projected estimates including RNE 3-year funded projects.

***These amounts include bursaries awarded to dance, and those more specifically to contemporary dance.

It surprised me to find that in some years no Annual Reports were published. Johaardien, who has been working for the ACT for the past three years, puts this down to a high staff turnover, where CEO's or GM's haven't been in place for long enough to produce them, and also suggests that there may not have been enough funds to produce them either. I also find it strange that it is difficult to access a breakdown of the years 2000-2002.

iv. BASA

Business and the Arts South Africa was established in 1997, in order to behave as a facilitator between the corporate and arts sectors, and its primary aim is "to promote and encourage mutually beneficial and sustainable business-arts partnerships that will, in the long term benefit the community at large”.[60] The need for such an organization’s existence was already recognized with the drafting of the White Paper in 1996, where the need for increased private sector support and investment in the arts is addressed, and the formation of a National Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts is suggested[61]. Following international trends, there has been increased emphasis on the benefits not only for the corporate sponsors, but for the arts too. The most obvious reasons for the arts to enter into partnerships with the corporate sector are for funding and increased marketing prospects to a larger target audience. But the corporate sector is slowly realizing the benefits available through sponsorship of the Arts, such as Corporate Social Investment and also marketing and publicity.

The arts world has a lot to gain from the experience of the corporate world in marketing. Yet artists also need to be aware of how they too can use marketing to their advantage, and not just to the advantage of the corporate sponsor. This requires knowledge of a variety of skills: planning; the many different means of advertising; public relations; and sales promotion to name but a few (O’Sullivan & O’Sullivan, Chapter 6). The power of effective marketing can be further enhanced if the participants have a good understanding of relationship marketing too, and attention is paid to how a new experience is being created for their audience. In order to do this, one needs to be aware of the ‘marketing mix’ and its ‘4Ps’: product, price, promotion and place, as well as developing an understanding of ‘customer value’ (Christopher, Payne and Ballantyne, Introduction). This is not as complex as it may sound, but it is language and content that your average choreographer will not have been exposed to in this context. The experience of working with a corporate sponsor can help to create understanding and develop these skills.

BASA generates its own funds through membership payments from the corporate sector, and these funds are used to cover the running costs of the organization. BASA has also introduced numerous incentives for corporate members. They benefit through association with a prestigious organization that supports arts and culture; experience increased opportunities for networking through events to which they may have special access; access to information and events; discounted offers; receive

[60] http://www.basa.co.za/about2.html
[61] *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*, 1996, Chapter 4, points 66-71.

electronic updates every 2nd month and newsletters three times a year; and can also use their membership to BASA as a vehicle for proving commitment to CSI. Yet one of the largest benefits may be seen as the opportunity to partake in the Business Day/BASA Annual Awards, which provide ample opportunity for positive publicity through the media.

Funds received from the DAC are distributed through the Supporting Grant Scheme (previously known as the Matching Grant Scheme). However, the majority of funding through this arrangement is generated from the corporate sector. BASA leaves the responsibility of finding a suitable corporate sponsor up to the arts organization/ individual. Once BASA sees evidence that mutual benefits are being "leveraged", it will process an application for the Supporting Grant Scheme. The idea of leveraging encourages participation from both parties, ensuring that all parties, through negotiation and clear statements of objectives, intentions, and equal input, receive maximum benefits. Application forms need to be completed by both the arts organization/artist and by the business sponsors. Leveraging in the Supporting Grant Scheme is not an approach whereby additional money is simply added to the budget though. The grant should be used to further attract possible sponsorship, and then provide additional benefits to the sponsor (see side question 5.1 of the application form). These benefits may be workshops, complimentary tickets, or special performances, for example. For this reason, BASA prefers to be involved in negotiations early on, ensuring that their own needs are being met too, such as strategic placement of their own Supporting Grant Scheme logo.

BASA does not only provide financial support to the Arts. They are also lobbying for the introduction of a tax law that allows for donations to the arts to become tax-free. Currently, tax benefits can only be obtained if the sponsors can prove that the funds they provided were used for marketing/publicity/branding purposes[62]. BASA has also been part of research and seminars in the arts sector, and research undertaken by BASA in 2004 showed that corporate sponsorship of the arts amounted to a total of R201million, having grown from approximately R136million in 2001.

---

[62] http://www.basa.co.za/about3.html

In 2001, and again in 2004, BASA, ACT and the NAC commissioned BMI Sport Research to investigate the marketing potential posed by the arts. In 2003 they hosted the inaugural Arts Marketing Conference with the Performing Arts Network of South Africa, and have held Fundraising Seminars for the Arts. They have also introduced a mentorship programme, 'Artworks' with one of their members Barloworld. This programme aims to share some of the business skills from the corporate sector with the arts sector. This involves members of the corporate sector offering their time to mentor people from the arts through projects. This type of programme allows for the sharing of skills to promote development and sustainability in the arts sector. Yet despite all of these efforts to increase membership size and provide as much information as possible on the Internet, Nicola Danby (CEO of BASA) says that problems of misconception and a lack of research on behalf of the artists still exists[63]. Ms Danby still believes that the vast majority of the arts community has not yet made the mental shift from asking for funds, to selling their product in a manner that benefits all partners.

The table below indicates the amounts allocated to BASA by the DAC:

YEAR	**BASA**
Feb '97 – Oct '99	4,000,000
Nov '99 – March '00	2,000,000
Apr '00 – March '01	2,000,000
Apr '01 – March '02	2,000,000
Apr '02 – March '03	3,000,000
Apr '03 – March '04	3,500,000
Apr '04 – March '05	4,103,000
Apr '05 – March '06	4,349,000
TOTAL:	**24,952,000**

And the following table indicates how these funds were distributed through BASA:

[63] Interview, July 25th, 2006.

YEAR	TOTAL DANCE SPONSORSHIP	SUPPORTING GRANTS (Dance)	OF WHICH CONTEMPORARY
2001-2002		140,000	115,000
2003	2,396,783	R133,000	R71,000
2004		R106,000	R45,000
2005		R203,033	118,033
TOTAL:		**442,033**	**234,033**

*2003 is the only year that the actual sponsorship amounts are given in the annual reports alongside the supporting grants awarded.

v. National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund

The development of the National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund was stipulated in the formation of the Lotteries Act in 1997, and behaves as the distributor of Good Cause money for the National Lottery[64]. Prior to the development of this Act, the White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage already suggested the formation of such an agency in order to help with increasing the amount of funds available for supporting arts, culture and heritage. The Board of the National Lottery was formed in October 1998, but President Thabo Mbeki formally launched the Lottery with the sale of the first lottery ticket in March 2000[65]. In May 2000, the Department of Trade and Industry called for nominations from the public in order to appoint members to serve on the three Distributing Agencies: Arts, Culture and Heritage; Charities; and Sport and Recreation. Two further categories for funding exist – the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP, which has distributed no funds as of yet) and the category of Miscellaneous Purposes.

At the time of the development of the NLDTF, the ACT, BASA and the NAC came together to form a joint initiative lobbying for the provision of equal amounts of money to arts as for sports, and possibly even welfare. As such, the National Arts and Culture Lottery Initiative (NACLI) was established, with John Kani (then chairperson of the NAC) and Andries Oliphant (then chairperson of ACT) acting as joint chair and spokespersons. The aim of the initiative was "to promote the interests of the arts in all matters related to the lottery by lobbying government, political parties and all other

[64] http://www.nationallottery.co.za/Clientfiles/Documents/LotteriesAct1997.pdf
[65] http://www.nlb.org.za/history.asp

relevant bodies to achieve the best possible deal for the arts from the lottery process"[66].The efforts of the initiative obviously had an effect, as today, an equal amount is allocated to Arts, Culture and Heritage as is awarded to the Sports and Recreation programme. Any funds that are not allocated in one year roll over into the next. The total amount allocated to the NLDTF depends on the number of tickets sold and profits made by the National Lottery. The Good Cause funds are then transferred to Uthingo Management, the licensed operators of the National Lottery. The money is allocated along the following percentages (as set about in the Government Gazette No. 23465): Charities 36%, Arts, Culture and National Heritage 22%, Sports and Recreation 22%, RDP 15%, and Miscellaneous Purposes 5%[67].

At the time of the NACLI, Kani highlighted the pleas for the importance of substantial funding of the arts and culture sector, and pointed out that internationally, national lotteries contributed considerably to the survival of the arts. He also stated, that "the proposed national lottery will probably be the single most important source of new and large funding for the arts in the next 10 years"[68]. His words seem to have rung true, and it is for this reason that I have included the NLDTF in this research – it appears to be our largest distributor of funds to dance, most notably to contemporary dance, even though it is the newest funding body discussed within the research. As with all of the afore mentioned organizations, the NLDTF has its own set of funding criteria: the organization must prove non-profit status, must have a minimum of 2 years of audited financial statements (was 3 years until 2002), a completed 03/1 Form, the business plan and supporting documentation for the project, and the founding document/constitution/ articles of association or trust deed of the organisation[69]. In 2005, the NLDTF prioritized organizations "whose activities addressed the production and promotion of cultural products and/or performance; education, training and skills transfer, and the building of new audiences and increasing public access to the arts"[70]. In order to achieve this, the NLDTF give preference to companies that promote: *equity and redress of historic imbalances; nation building; job creation; capacity*

[66] http://www.artsculturetrust.co.za/overview.htm
[67] http://www.nlb.org.za/nldtf.asp
[68] Arthrob.htm
[69] Annual Report, 2005.
[70] Annual Report, 2005.

building and skills transfer; and the *creation of partnerships and opportunities for disadvantaged communities*[71].

The amounts allocated to contemporary dance are as follows:

YEAR	**TOTAL DANCE**	**CONTEMPORARY**
2002	1,173,000	400,000
2003	7,069,235	2,804,235
2004	13,008,307	6,579,742
2005	23,243,151	14,844,068
TOTAL:	**44,493,693**	**24,628,045**

*The author has abstracted these contemporary dance amounts.

v) Conclusion:

To conclude the chapter, I have condensed and added the figures in an attempt to see how funding of contemporary dance has changed since the 2004 election:

<table>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>PAC/NAC</th><th>ACT</th><th>BASA</th><th>NLDTF</th><th>TOTAL</th></tr>
<tr><td>1996</td><td></td><td>60,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>60,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>1997</td><td rowspan="3">3,531,750</td><td>102,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>1,279,250*</td></tr>
<tr><td>1998</td><td>35,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>1,212,250*</td></tr>
<tr><td>1999</td><td>50,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>1,227,250*</td></tr>
<tr><td>2000</td><td>199,000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>199,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>2001</td><td>2,302,280</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2,302,280</td></tr>
<tr><td>2002</td><td>3,470,440</td><td></td><td></td><td>400,000</td><td>3,870,440</td></tr>
<tr><td>2003</td><td>5,346,023</td><td></td><td>71,000</td><td>2,804,235</td><td>8,221,258</td></tr>
<tr><td>2004</td><td>5,183,590</td><td>217,000</td><td>45,000</td><td>6,529,742</td><td>11,975,332</td></tr>
<tr><td>2005</td><td>5,840,662</td><td>50,000</td><td>118,033</td><td>14,844,068</td><td>20,852,763</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL:</td><td>25,873,745</td><td>514,000</td><td>234,033</td><td>24,628,045</td><td>51,249,823</td></tr>
</table>

*The total of R3,531,750 has been divided over the three-year period to find approximate totals from 1997-1999.

[71] http://www.nlb.org.za/announce.asp

This means the approximate amount awarded to contemporary dance by the NAC, ACT BASA and the NLDTF (as calculated by the author) is **R51, 249, 823.**

Total Funds Allocated to All Dance Since 1996

NAC	ACT	BASA	NLDTF	TOTAL
R42,702,844.75	**10,505,723**	**234,033**	**44,493,693**	**97,936,293.70**

This shows that my approximation of the funds awarded to contemporary dance since 1996 is over half of the **R97,936,293.70** total I have calculated that was awarded to dance in general, as seen above[72]. I find it encouraging to note that when looking at the funds allocated to contemporary dance by the afore mentioned bodies, amounts have indeed been increasing since 1994, in spite of the slump in 2000. Despite the fact that all of these agencies were established with the mandate of increasing the quantity and distribution of funds for the arts, it is not surprising that problems have arisen and that not everybody has been pleased with their running. The NAC and the NLDTF have both had problems involving their boards and have been criticised about their allocation and distribution of their funds. I am concerned by the so-called "arms length" approach of the government through the DAC, as for the past three years, the DAC has funded three orchestras R3million each, which seems to be preferential to one specific art form, rather than promoting equal and fair distribution as they preach[73]. The Minister of Arts and Culture is allocated a discretionary fund through the NAC, and it appears he can allocate these funds as he chooses. This is surprising seeing that while the NAC receives its funds from the DAC, the government should not have a say as to how the funds are distributed.

The process of transformation has not been as smooth as it may seem in this chapter. Not all of the research findings or recommendations of the NAI, NAC or ACTAG were agreed upon and supported. Many people also opposed the transformation of the PAC's, finding staff cuts and the drastic downsizing of budgets to be radical and extreme. The White Paper has many flaws that need addressing, and each of these funding bodies has been criticized in some manner – be it the de- and reconstruction

[72] R2,281,676 more than half of the total amount.
[73] 'Towards an Understanding of the South African Theatre Industry", PANSA, 2005, p. 36. Also see NAC Annual Reports

with their boards, or problems with the late distribution of funds. Some may also argue that the current playhouses are being allocated similar amounts to the old PAC's now, and these only serve four of the wealthiest provinces – Gauteng, Western Cape, KwaZulu Natal and the Free State.

Having spoken to representatives from the NAC, the ACT and BASA, it is clear that one major problem with application forms is the apparent lack of research by artists into the requirements and criteria of the funding bodies, and a lack of attempt to see how their project or company can fit the needs and requirements of the body that is being approached. Funding bodies also recognise a severe lack of skills in planning, budgeting, or even managing from applicants, but Thato Monamodi notes that when the NAC has held workshops, people do not attend. He also reveals that the main problems with applications that cannot be processed are that the individuals and organizations are not registered, and do not have bank details, tax clearance certificates or ID documents. The problem presented here is that the government requires these legal documents for accountability purposes. One of the problems noted in the next chapter is that without funding, no work can happen, which makes it very difficult for an individual or company to provide a history for funding bodies to look at. It then seems logical to me that the government needs to streamline the process and cost of acquiring the documents, as often one must travel to a different city in order to obtain official documentation. Monamodi also finds that many of the received applications do not have administrative compliance, or a management system in place ensuring the smooth running of the project or company. While being aware that there is a lack of skills in the industry, he feels that the government should be the one providing such education.

Each of the funding bodies I met with, express their own lack of human or financial resources too. Ashraf Johaardien, General Manager of the ACT, recognizes the problem with their application process being application form driven as opposed to interview driven, but as there are only three people employed in their office, and cannot really see a way around this. His job is not only to oversee the funding session, but also to keep their trustees happy, fundraise and manage the preparations for the annual ACT Awards too. Nicola Danby of BASA notes that their office receives countless phone calls per day requesting information about their organisation, but that the biggest problem she witnesses is still that of a lack of research into their criteria. She feels that arts organizations are still approaching funding in a needy way, instead of realizing that they should be selling their product and not asking for help. Danby points out that there are a number of funds and foundations that organisations could approach, at there is a need for artists to realize the necessity of multiple sponsors in the current funding framework.

My biggest problem with this is the apparent burden being placed on artists: so much focus on social responsibility. I wonder to what extent the average woman or man on the street considers her/his own contribution in their community, as they are certainly not forced to do this in order to make a living. I am not saying that it is bad to give back, but it feels as if creativity is being coerced into pathways deemed acceptable by NAC, or even more worryingly, the DAC. It seems logical that each funding body meets specific mandates in the creative industries, but this needs to be done in a manner that practitioners can understand and work with, instead of working around them. It is evident through this chapter that the funding of contemporary dance has increased dramatically, but what has become apparent in the research is that most participants are not aware of this. Instead, they have become frustrated with the process of applying for and accessing these funds, and the general response to the funding environment is sadly very negative.