

WATERSHED Partner Value Review

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Context: Creativity and Public Investment
 - 2.1 Public Policy and Public Funding
 - 2.2 New Kinds of Creative Organisations
3. Watershed: The Story So Far
 - 3.1 A Pioneering Vision Whose Time has Come
 - 3.2 Capital Development and Stabilisation
4. Watershed: Kicking On to a Stable Future
 - 4.1 Digital Creativity in a Mixed Economy: Opportunity and Challenge
 - 4.2 Discussion Forum Feedback: Perceptions of Partner Value
5. Conclusion

Annex A
Partners Discussion Forum: Attendees

Annex B
The Framework for Partnership:
Collaborative Projects Centred on Watershed in 2004

1 Introduction

Commission

This short piece of research was commissioned in October 2004 by Watershed's Director. It forms part of the implementation of the Strategy for Change supported by the Stabilisation Unit at Arts Council England (ACE). The commission anticipated five days work during November 2004.

Objectives

Watershed (WS) is fundamentally different from traditionally configured arts and cultural organisations in receipt of public money. It works through different processes to achieve different things for different constituencies. Although its value is widely acknowledged, the acknowledgement isn't currently reflected in core funding agreements which allow the sustained development of a distinctive WS vision in a stable trading environment. The result is a "mixed economy" business model which needs to be reinforced if WS is to fulfil its potential and maximise the service return on public investment. To strengthen the foundations of the model this research tests and articulates the nature of WS's value to a range of partners across the voluntary, public and private sectors.

Methodology

To achieve this objectives the research has asked a number of inter-related questions of those partners:

- Is it possible to define a distinctive role and function for WS?
- How might we measure, test and quantify its value?
- How can it be developed to be more effective?
- What public sector objectives does it deliver?
- What does WS make happen that wouldn't happen if it didn't exist?
- How does WS work through its relationship with partners?
- Where does WS sit in a mixed creative economy?
- What is WS's role in Bristol's creative landscape?
- Does WS play a regional and national as well as a local role?
- What role does WS have in supporting/developing creative talent?
- What role does WS have in supporting commercial practice?
- Watershed as venue/social space: What is the role and function of the building?
 - How important is the cinema exhibition programme?
 - What is the role of a showcase festival programme?
 - How significant is the social focus of the bar and restaurant?
- Virtual WS: What is the role and function of the web presence?
- WS as media sector development agency: How does WS approach art form and creative industry development?
- What is the nature of WS's engagement with education?
- What are the key components of WS's creative contribution:
 - Provider of facilities and spaces?
 - Staff skills and sectoral leadership?
 - Creative catalyst and facilitator?
 - Training and skills development?

- Networking centre through creative public social space?
- Physical centre for exhibition and festival programmes?
- Focus for public debate providing context for programme?
- Advocate for digital and moving image culture?
- Information resource?
- Education and lifelong learning – provider or facilitator?
- Community development and social inclusion – provider or facilitator?
- Production enabler?

Initial briefing meetings were followed by five facilitated group discussions in early November. These and other questions formed the informal agenda for discussion. Background documentation has also been reviewed. A list of those who attended the group meetings at WS's invitation is appended at Annex A. It includes practicing artists as well as representatives from the education sector, Bristol's media and creative industries, the BBC, community groups, funded arts organisations, funding bodies, local government, and cultural development agencies. Thanks are due to all of them for taking time out of crowded schedules and, in some cases, for travelling considerable distances to take part in the research.

The range of their backgrounds and the breadth of their relationships is testimony to WS's ability to "add creative value" through stimulating and nurturing debate. It does so first by providing a public platform for ideas (both formal and informal) and, then, by forging the links which turn ideas into action. To give some sense of its impact in the local, regional and national landscape a summary of the collaborative projects brokered through WS in 2004 is appended at Annex B. They show how building-based, networked and virtual programmes can work together in a new kind of 21st century creative organisation to make each pound of public money run as hard and as far as possible.

November 2004

2 Context: Creativity and Public Investment

2.1 Public Policy and Public Funding

The application of public money for cultural purposes is driven by central government policy and local government imperatives. Treasury resources routed through the DCMS seek educational, social inclusion, cultural diversity and economic benefit as well as artistic outcomes. The DTI and the RDAs focus more sharply on employment and regeneration impact. Local government balances statutory responsibilities with discretionary spend in a world of increasingly constrained budgets.

Under these circumstances it becomes increasingly important for cultural organisations to balance their programmes in response to circumstances over which they have no control but which significantly affect their ability to function. Building-based organisations with high fixed-costs are especially prone to the implied trading tensions. Those working across the emerging creative forms (rooted in digital technologies) must make a particularly strong case for resources during a period of below-inflation treasury settlements. Simply put, in a “sealed system” with no new money, if they are to be funded in relation to the scale of the opportunity then somebody else must lose out.

2.2 New Kinds of Creative Organisations

Confronting and resolving this conundrum is the key challenge for WS’s public stakeholders. If they are to do so it will be on the basis of a shared understanding that, in a dynamic and rapidly changing culture, new kinds of creative organisations need to be designed and delivered for the 21st century. They are likely to share a number of characteristics:

- A strongly entrepreneurial creative vision
- The ability to function in a multi-discipline environment
- The courage to trust talent and back new kinds of creative process
- A firm commitment to collaboration and partnership
- The desire to “add value” to existing initiatives
- Open and inclusive management style and operating culture
- An understanding of how to integrate public and private sector interests
- A commitment to education in all its forms
- A deep-seated empathy for the principles of accessibility
- A flexible and responsive business model
- Maximising the return of public investment in terms of value for money
- The ability to attract non-arts public investment for creative outcomes

WS is just such an organisation. Working with a range of partners it constantly tests what this new kind of organisation might feel like, look like and behave like. It is the opinions of these partners that this research seeks to test. If we can understand what they value in their relationship with WS then public stakeholders will have a clearer view of what they are supporting and the potential “opportunity cost” of not backing WS in its quest for a stable future.

3 Watershed: The Story So Far

This section provides a brief overview of the key stages in WS's development. It sets the context for partners' perceptions of the organisation's current and future value.

3.1 A Pioneering Vision Whose Time has Come

In 1982 there was no such thing as a "media and communications centre". When first coined by WS's founders, the term had yet to be devalued by either repetition or distortion. The notion of a contemporary arts centre operating in a different part of the creative economy from that inhabited by "traditional" high fixed-cost, building-based cultural organisations was highly unusual. Its starting point in what were slightly clumsily termed the "technologically reproducible creative forms" marked a sharp distinction from both live performance culture and "unique artefact" art. It was accompanied by clear assumptions about cultural democracy and access in a wired universe as well as a commitment to working proactively with private sector media enterprises in a different kind of economic model.

In retrospect these early ideas seem genuinely visionary; that they gained expression in a pre-digital world seems little short of astonishing. With hind-sight it seems obvious that the digital revolution was necessary before the WS dream could become a fully achieved reality. Only now can producer and consumer engage directly with each other without the need for cultural intermediaries to determine quality thresholds or exploit the financial basis of the transaction.

This proposition has been, to a greater or lesser extent, understood and shared by WS's board, by its management and by stakeholders. It has formed the basis for the great strides made towards stability over the recent period. That journey is not yet complete. The scale of the future opportunity is now determined by the continuing dizzying pace of change as digital media respond to huge increases in data processing capacity and the potential of wireless connectivity. Given the right support, in another ten years WS may still represent a pioneering vision whose time has yet to come. It could be that the organisation's true purpose is to stay just ahead of the breaking wave of emerging technologies and to mediate their capacity to be used creatively in a fully inclusive knowledge economy.

3.2 Capital Development and Stabilisation

Relative to its ambition, WS was under-capitalised from square one. In the early days the relationship with the building and the nature of its facilities was constrained by the original "capital funding gap". The resulting debt servicing costs, in turn, placed heavy pressure on the trading account. The commitment to functioning through a "mixed economy" with high levels of self-generated income in its revenue base was partly a matter of design and partly a pragmatic response to the low level of committed core funding from both NGO and local authority sources. Early business planning made a virtue of necessity in its high gearing of earned income to subsidy. For most of its first two decades WS nonetheless struggled to maintain a stable financial base while the

structure and fabric of the building, the lack of appropriate cinema spaces and the urgent need to invest in the technologies implied by the digital revolution all continually threatened the capacity to deliver an ever-sharpening cultural mission.

Under its current Director and Chair, WS has responded energetically and successfully to these challenges. The active support of the main public stakeholders has rationalised the lease-hold relationship with the building and made possible a highly cost effective capital development. Over the last two years £2.2m from a range of public sources has been invested in a capital programme which will be completed in spring 2005. A further £700k enabled the purchase of a long-term peppercorn rent lease. As a result WS now has a third cinema and a range of highly flexible public spaces (equipped to appropriate technical specifications) to augment the bar and restaurant which has long been the social heart of the operation. Within an expanded cultural footprint the Sheds are also home to NESTA's innovative Futurelab project, to the Mobile Bristol wireless communication research collaboration between HP Labs and Bristol University Computer Science and to the emerging media companies occupying UWE's "eMedia incubator spaces". The capital partnership which has made this possible is a metaphor for WS's chosen approach to the strategic development of its prime city centre site and the programme which animates it. The building hums with creative energy. It is arguably the most intensively used and accessible public domain space in the West Country.

Getting the building right is only half the story. WS has simultaneously worked with ACE's Stabilisation Programme to invest £800k in a Strategy for Change which seeks to clarify the artistic and social vision, build capacity and stabilise the business model. The third of these aspirations remains the outstanding organisational challenge. WS's ability to innovate has consistently outstripped the capacity of the public funding base to respond. The reconfigured operation works in a multi-discipline creative environment which doesn't sit comfortably with funding decisions driven by traditional art form definitions. It "adds value" to the work of others in ways which aren't easily measured by numerically driven indicators.

With the work on the building complete and the stabilisation programme nearing conclusion, WS's continuing capacity to deliver creative, education and community development services at the public domain end of the mixed economy now depends on its capacity to defend the appropriate space in its financial model to test and develop its ground-breaking approach. Ironically this is the very point at which its public funding base, far from being enhanced in response to the opportunity, is being undermined by policy decisions beyond WS's control. Public support for the programme was originally based on film exhibition. Running back to the early days of the BFI and the Regional Film Theatre network, this funding strand has been a consistent key-stone in WS's financial architecture. As the WS proposition has developed so it has attracted increasing support from the City Council and ACE. As ACE investment has gone up, Film Council funding has been under consistent threat and has moved from a revenue to a project basis. It is likely that it will diminish significantly over the next period.

Although the Strategy for Change anticipated the resolution of this dilemma, no replacements have yet been identified to support the highly successful cultural cinema programme leave alone the broader range of creative and community services which WS has developed over the last five years. WS must now either make a successful case for increased public support for its unique social and cultural contribution or it must reconsider its financial model from first principles.

4 Watershed: Kicking On to a Sustainable Future

So how can WS build on the integrity of its cultural values, the capital development and the stabilisation programme while defending the space to further develop the logic of its core proposition? A sustainable solution requires urgent negotiation with public stakeholders based on agreed mutual expectations. As well as “value for money” (each public pound invested in WS generates a remarkably high rate of cultural return), these expectations will centre on the perceived value of WS’s contribution to the extended partnerships which make up its operating constituency. It is the purpose of this research to articulate the nature and extent of this “perceived partner value”.

4.1 Digital Creativity in a Mixed Economy: Opportunity and Challenge

The WS framework for partnership reflects the extent to which digital media affect our lives. That the penetration is so deep (and is deepening by the month) has profound implications for personal creativity, for community development, for education and for a thriving private sector. Some commentators have argued that it represents a cultural and economic shift on the same momentous scale of the 18th century move from rural to industrial economies. In a post-manufacturing world our economic future depends on nurturing individual creativity and providing opportunities for it to express itself within the emerging knowledge economy. There are implications for the ownership of intellectual material, for the management of our collective narratives, for social inclusion, for government (and/or corporate) control of the media industries and for personal liberty which raise the stakes ever higher. They make the public domain debate of these and related areas of paramount importance by defining the nature of 21st century citizenship.

These are matters of substance moving beyond passive entertainment. The extent to which digital media open up educational possibilities while empowering individuals and communities who may not have had full access to mainstream forms of creative expression makes the issue as important for social as it is for economic reasons. Public and private sectors both need to negotiate a mediated position in the debate. This is WS’s natural terrain – the point in a mixed private and public economy at which Hewlett Packard meets the Knowle West Media Centre, the Philharmonia Orchestra meets Massive Attack and Electric December meets Dreamworks. Without a public space like WS these widely different perspectives struggle to inhabit the same universe leave alone talk to each other using a common vocabulary. It is by holding this ground that WS can take its place on an international platform at the same time as responding to its drive for social inclusion and cultural diversity – thus integrating its local, regional and national missions.

It is perhaps WS’s most valuable contribution to act as a channel for communication and debate linking new kinds of creativity with new kinds of consumers and participants. That it does so in ways which don’t determine value by the nature of the investment base and which insist that private profit and public benefit aren’t mutually exclusive is itself an interesting reflection of our changing culture.

4.2 Discussion Forum Feedback: Perceptions of Partner Value

November's "Partner Discussion Forum" reflects the range and diversity of interests which find common ground and communicate with each other through WS. The rest of this section summarises their main conclusions and the implications for WS's future pattern of activity. The stimulating discussions were energetically engaged in their enthusiasm for WS and its programme. As an "over-arching" comment it is important to stress the perception that WS makes something special by the mixture of activities touched on below and that the whole adds up to more than the sum of the parts. Indeed there is a strong sense that WS requires all five core functions to be thriving if it is to fulfil its potential and that it is diminished if any one of them under-performs.

4.2.1 Venue and building-related issues

WS is defined in the public eye by its distinctive building in a prime city centre waterfront location. 22 years ago it represented a public beacon for the regeneration of the docks; now it reflects and endorses Bristol's commitment to a vibrant leisure and entertainment economy. Within the city's cultural landscape the building has taken iconic significance. It has been suggested that there may be some tension between the high fixed costs of maintaining the building and WS's aspirations to be a sectoral development agency – a function which could presumably be discharged from a much cheaper base in a non city centre location. The view of the discussion forum is unequivocal in the value ascribed to WS's high profile physical base at the heart of Bristol and its ability to provide a warmly social "people-focused" heart to its digital universe.

The key points emerging from the partner discussion forum were:

- WS would be significantly diminished without its social centre
- The city centre location increases the iconic nature of the proposition
- It makes it possible for WS to function as an "ideas-driven creative market place"
- The bar and restaurant provide a powerful environment for proactive networking
- The capacity to exhibit the best contemporary work at the heart of the city on a regular basis validates, supports and raises the profile of digital creativity
- The cinema is highly valued for its distinctive contribution to Bristol cultural mix
- The festival programme is an important showcase for specialist work
- Festivals succeed because of the distinctive WS environment
- Delegates want to come because of the facilities but also because of the atmosphere created
- The flexibility of the building's public spaces is seen as a major plus
- Their neutrality attracts people from a wide range of backgrounds
- WS's demonstrable commitment to access is reinforced by both the volume and the demographic profile of its users
- This commitment would be less visible in a lower profile physical environment
- There is no perceived difficulty with the range of day time activity in public spaces
- The greater the level of use the higher the level of energy in the building
- Some people would love to see WS's building used as a 24 hour resource
- Others would like to see it used as a centre for wireless connectivity – the ultimate "hot desk" facility for creative business on the move

4.2.2 Web presence

WS's location and building allow it a high profile presence at the heart of the city which provides the chance to show the best international work in Bristol. Partners are clear in their understanding of the importance of this role. In some senses it is balanced by the WS commitment to using a sophisticated web presence to "export" Bristol based creativity to the rest of the world. In part this is an extension of the idea of the WS experience into a virtual universe. More importantly it provides a platform on which all kinds of digital creativity (from the individual to the corporate) can be expressed and made available. "Electric December" is widely felt to be exemplary in its capacity to integrate work from a wide range of sources into a single conceptual framework. There are other examples listed in Annex B. There is widespread support from partners for the active development of an exemplary WS web presence. There are implications for resources in terms of both in-house skills and budgets.

The key points emerging from the partner discussion forum were:

- WS's web presence is highly valued and well regarded by partners
- It is a critical component of the commitment to access
- It is felt to be important that WS's web presence should be innovative, cutting edge and exemplary
- The capacity to link producers directly to consumers makes possible an interactive debate which has no parallel in other creative forms
- WS's role as a high quality digital web publisher is currently under-developed
- It represents a major area of potential growth
- Partners acknowledge the potential benefit of a well-resourced digital production laboratory to feed this publishing capacity
- dShed is widely supported for its work with artists and community groups
- The WS web presence is not felt currently to provide a portal through which to access commercial work made in Bristol – the same is true of the building
- As a result some partners feel that key content providers in the private sector don't yet see a personal advantage in working with and through WS
- Of all the areas of WS activity this is the one area where partners see potential for development

4.2.3 Catalyst for media arts and digital creativity

Art form development has always been a key issue for the application of public resources. Alongside the commitment to quality and to access it has formed a critical measure of success for treasury funds routed through ACE, the BFI or the Film Council. In emerging creative forms change happens at high speed as boundaries are pushed and new opportunities responded to. Because it is fundamentally a delivery mechanism rather than an art form, digital technology has implications for a wide range of practice across traditional performing and craft disciplines. Its impact is felt by artists working in music, dance and theatre as well as in film and photography - WS's historic areas of concern. What happens at the point of cross-over from one form to another is particularly fascinating. When classical musicians engage with silent film the impact is powerful. Something special potentially happens when education meets computer game technology.

WS understands that under these circumstances artists need a special kind of support. Sometimes it involves money and bursaries; more often it is about trust and opportunity. Many of the artists in the forum paid tribute to the open-ness and flexibility with which WS has provided space, skills and facilities to support an emerging creative vision. Providing opportunity for individuals with limited access to the means of creative expression has provided examples of rapid personal growth which is widely acknowledged to have great significance for the development of new creative art forms.

The key points emerging from the partner discussion forum were:

- WS has supported many individual artists in their developing practice
- It has provided space, time, skills and facilities
- It has brokered relationships which would not otherwise have been easily made
- It functions as a lightning rod as well as a transmitter
- A commitment to enabling production remains a central component of its vision
- The lack of a sense of “controlling ownership” of the process of production is much valued
- The parallel commitment to exhibition and to publishing enables work to be seen as well as made
- WS is open to and triggers innovative collaborations with other creative organisations
- As a result work has been made that would not have happened without WS
- That work has constantly pushed at the creative boundaries of digital technology
- Collaborations with other regional centres (notably Plymouth) spread the impact of WS accumulated experience
- WS allows larger creative organisations in all sectors (including the BBC) access to a wide range of digitally based creativity
- This two way flow of energy and creativity is mutually advantageous
- A 22 year history provides important credibility and continuity for areas of volatile cultural practice
- Under its current management there is a strong sense of trust from artists
- WS doesn't let people down and delivers when it says it will
- It thereby creates the conditions in which other people's creativity can thrive rather than feeling the need to deliver everything in-house
- The sense that a predetermined WS creative agenda is not imposed as a quid pro quo for support is seen as a major advantage

4.2.4 Educational and community development resource

WS has long been at the foreground of media education. In its role as a regional film theatre it always accepted and promoted a responsibility to place moving image culture in a critical context. Over a long period, its education programme has been cited as exemplary and used as a model of good practice in other parts of the country. SW Screen has developed a regional pattern of education hubs which build on WS's work in this area.

In the post-digital world the opportunities to place the technology at the service of an educational mission have increased exponentially. The development of the Creative Partnerships pilot in Bristol and Cornwall reinforces the potential to work in partnership with and through schools. The mission to educate sits very comfortably with the aspiration to use digital technology as a community development mechanism. WS has

sought innovative relationships across the City and beyond. It has not taken the view that it needs to deliver everything itself. On the contrary it has sought active partnerships with local providers and groups; seeking to support and work alongside organisations like Kuumba in St Pauls, the Knowle West Media Centre, the City of Bristol College and UWE.

The key points emerging from the partner discussion forum were:

- As a regional education contributor WS adds value to the work of partners by providing a high profile platform for show casing their work
- Its strong track record in this area is reinforced by digital opportunity
- There are many examples of the empowerment of young people both in and beyond the building
- The commitment to physical access is reinforced by both management style and operating culture
- The relationship with accessible cultural forms (TV, film, music etc) increases the sense of accessibility and breaks down barriers
- The regional education hubs offer a model for other kinds of development
- WS operates through an instinct for democratic process which is inclusive from first principles
- Its “can do” approach seeks ways of making things happen rather than reasons why things are difficult

4.2.5 The power of connected networks: A “Hub and cluster” development model

WS’s desire to facilitate rather than to control and its capacity to function as a catalyst rather than a “sole service provider” is acknowledged and welcomed. “Networks” and “connectivity” are the two buzzwords most frequently used by futurologists in discussing the development of the knowledge economy. They reinforce and extend the “value chain” through which the digital revolution drives the creative industries. WS has the capacity to seize this proposition and run with it. The perceived “neutrality” of its space is felt to be an important reason why such a wide range of individuals, organisations and groups feel comfortable in the building. Issues of operating culture and management style are as important to this proposition as the nature of the building, its location and facilities. It provides firm foundations for what many partners consider to be WS’s most significant characteristic – the ability to make safe common ground for people working with and through digital media from a wide range of backgrounds.

This is as much a matter of defending and promoting a forum for ideas-based discussion as it is of proactively establishing and nurturing partnerships. From it flows what is possibly WS’s most significant future role – to act as the hub at the heart of a wheel whose spokes are made from the whole spectrum of public and private sector digital media interests. It is in this respect that WS is genuinely reconfigured as an exemplary creative organisation for the 21st century. This is where the apparent circle of the cost of the building and the commitment to sectoral development in the public domain is finally squared. In this joined-up integrated media world, WS can act as the router; a hub for presentation, debate, learning and the development of practice.

The key points emerging from the partner discussion forum were:

- Partners universally acknowledge WS's unique capacity to forge and sustain sectoral partnerships
- Some are formalised while others develop through informal contact and "serendipity"
- WS's capacity to speak to and for an implied constituency is an important strength for partners
- They welcome the sense that it has iconic significance for creative early adopters
- The neutrality of WS spaces and ideas is valued from all directions
- A progressive culture of innovation marks WS out as different from traditional high culture organisations
- The sense of shared "brand values" binds disparate worlds together
- As a result the world of education, commerce and art find common ground to a highly unusual extent
- Pure and applied research become part of the same process
- By linking disparate digital communities WS adds value to all of them
- The physical location in the city centre is an important rallying point for informal and formal networks
- Collaborations have generated a "critical mass" which WS would not be able to sustain in isolation
- They have made possible both the capital partnership for the development of the building and the revenue base for a sustainable programme
- Their power is drawn from WS's role as a market place for ideas based around introducing "digital natives to digital immigrants" and mediating their responses
- As a result WS can deliver across a range of public policy objectives
- It responds equally to the DTI's commitment to "knowledge transfer" and the DCMS's commitment to quality and access

5 Conclusion

Using digital creativity in a dynamic mixed economy, Watershed delivers a potent mix of cultural, social, economic and educational benefits. The unequivocal message from the research is how valuable these benefits are felt to be – right across the framework for partnership which is both their achievement and their chosen form of expression. Partners repeatedly returned to the energy, flexibility and speed of response which is WS's distinguishing and most valued characteristic. There was almost a sense that to define its function too precisely is to limit its potential. As one consultee said: "You don't nail a butterfly to the table to find out what colour its wings are". On the other hand a mixed economy involving public investment and service outcomes requires clarity of mutual expectation in a formally planned world. Negotiating an agreed basis for a stable operation depends on being able to describe a distinctive proposition for WS in a world which is vision-driven, managerially achievable and financially sustainable.

The ratio of earned income to subsidy in WS's business model has always been highly "geared" in favour of self-generated revenue. The relationship between public money in a volatile area of cultural practice and the capacity to generate trading income in a prime city centre location has never been satisfactorily resolved. There is perhaps an ironic tension between the chimera of artistic freedom brought by public funding and the process-heavy increases in accountability it carries with it. By its nature accountability breeds fear of risk which is in turn the enemy of creativity.

The key to a self-determined future lies in a financial model in which management controls rather than responds to the key variables. WS needs to be able to graft the flexible, entrepreneurial and innovative culture which partners value so highly onto a sustainable core. That "core programme" needs to be capable of description and supported with appropriate "core funding" so that its delivery doesn't require the constant and enervating spinning of plates on sticks. Perhaps "pulses" of partnership-based development money need to augment DCMS core support. The key lies in outputs which are driven by a proactive development programme focusing on "content" but taking maximum advantage of WS's prime location as a high-profile "vessel".

An inexorable logic flows from this proposition. In a post-development, post-stabilisation world, the status quo is not a sustainable option. It may be possible to cut back the WS commitment to art in a socially responsive culture and develop the organisation as a successful building-led entertainment facility. This would represent a major failure of public nerve. The opportunity to nurture a new kind of entrepreneurial service model (which isn't driven by either over-riding commercial imperatives or the dependency mind-set of high subsidy culture) would disappear. The Partner Value Review suggests it would be a major loss. Much better to invest in a planned development programme which fine-tunes the emerging proposition over a three year period. Such a partnership-based programme would need sufficient time and space to show how the sustained and monitored delivery of the WS vision over a period might blaze a trail for a different kind of creative organisation. To develop a transferable model of good practise (an exemplary social enterprise with culture and community at its heart driven by an instinct for entrepreneurial collaboration) would indeed be a prize worth winning.

Annex A

Partners Discussion Forum:

Briefing Day

Nick Markovitz, UWE
Sue Lion, Director Brief/Animated Encounters (former Administrator Wildscreen)
Paul Barnett, Bristol City Council
David Sproxton, Aardman Animations

Session A, Tuesday 9 November, 12.00pm Waterside 3

Peter Horne, 3Cresearch

Nathan Hughes, artist
Hazel Plowman, Eshoda Arts
Dave Richmond, Art & Power
Jeremy Howe, BBC

Session B, Tuesday 9 November 4.00pm Waterside 3

Anthony Rowe, artist group Squid Soup
Carolyn Hassan, Knowle West Media Centre
John Manley, Hewlett Packard Labs
Matt Little, Creative Partnerships Bristol
Keith Johnson, Luckwell Primary School
John Durrant, BDH

Session C, Wednesday 10 November, 10.30am Waterside 1

Ella Bisset Johnson, artist
Joe Magee, artist, filmmaker, illustrator
Phil Stenton, Mobile Bristol & Hewlett Packard Labs
Jacqui Thomas, Bristol Education Action Zone
Anne Scorer, BRIC & Broadband Show
Matthew Allen, preConstruct

Session D, Wednesday 10 November, 1.00pm Waterside 1

Bronac Ferran, ACE National Office:
David Whelton, Philharmonia Orchestra
Phil Gibby, Arts & Business SW
Rob Mitchel, First Born Creatives
Paul Hassan, SW Screen

Session E Wed 4.30 Waterside 1

Guy de Beaujeu, Film maker:
Menekse Ozkutan, Cineformation
Chris Daniels, Bristol Silents
B Aga, Submerge
Nema el Nahas, Submerge & ACESW
Simon Cooper, GWR & Brief Encounters

Annex B

Collaborative Projects Centred on Watershed in 2004

Electric December 2004

24 collaborations in media arts skills development and web publishing
Led by Watershed in association with Creative Partnerships.
Funded by LSCWoE, Creative Partnerships and the participants
Value: £60,000 funding plus £60,000 in kind

Calling

Digital arts skills and residencies for people of African and Caribbean origin
Led by Watershed in partnership with Kuumba
Funded by ACESW
Value: £60,000 funding

SE3D

10 x 3D animation commissions utilising experimental online on-demand render service
Co-ordinated by Watershed in collaboration with HP Labs and Alias
Funded by HP Labs, Alias, Arts & Business and various film funding agencies
Value: £100,000 funding plus £500,000 in kind

Electric Pavilion

Online festival for Creative Bristol 2005
Co-ordinated by Watershed with lead partners BBC, ITV West and GWR
Funded by the Urban Cultural Programme, ACESW, LSCWoE, Arts & Business and the lead partners
Value: £300,000 funding plus £275,000 in kind

Depict!

Online short film competition as part of Brief Encounters plus distribution of films on Orange 3G mobile handsets
Managed by Watershed in collaboration with Films@59 and Orange
Funded by Aardman Animations, Films@59 and Orange
Value: £16,000 funding plus estimated £200,000 in kind by filmmakers and Orange

The Interactive Building

Clark Bursary 5 - artists bursaries to explore practice using latest generation mobile technologies
Managed by Watershed in partnership with Mobile Bristol (HP & Bristol University) and UWE
Funded by J A Clark Charitable Trust, ACE and Mobile Bristol
Value: £100,000 funding

Media Arts and Technology Forum

A networking forum of Media Arts and Technology organisations in the Bristol area coordinated by Watershed
No funding

Bristol Silents

High quality programme of live music and moving image
Managed by Bristol Silents with support from Watershed and linking to the Philharmonia Bristol Partnership - developing music provision and innovation in Bristol
A development partnership between The Philharmonia, Colston Hall, St Georges and Watershed

Bristol and Plymouth Media Arts Consortium

Collaboration with Plymouth Arts Centre and Submerge
Submerge is an initiative to promote SW multimedia graduates to industry
A new consortium to develop media arts practice in the region supported by ACESW

Online publishing at www.dShed.net

A platform for publishing creative content from South West talent
Over 300 organisations, companies, schools, colleges/ universities, individuals and collectives have contributed – see separate list online at www.dshed.net/navigation/content/contributors.html