



The magnificent concert hall, Sala Sao Paulo, in Sao Paulo, Brazil, completed by Artec Consultants in 1999

are defined in national or local government regulations about how a building is designed, constructed and operated. As a result these projects tend to go towards a very bi-lateral and often confrontational

relationship between the owner and the architect. This is especially true in the case of a building owner and the architect who are constrained to follow strict regulations about how to hire and pay the architect to constitute the design team and to hire a contractor. This can lead to a number of consequences.

Of course, a mixture of public and private funding, and the flexibility that this mixture affords depends on the laws of each country and the ability of the

project team to make best use of those laws. One issue which, for those who are trying to fund the project may seem a little bit unimportant, is that funding in general can cause a stressed out design team and stressful design process. I am not here referring to the mental health of the design team so much as the unintended impact on the quality of the design process. Incomplete and changing levels of funding can cause hesitation on the part of the design team, affecting whether or not they feel they can propose what best fulfils the needs expressed in the brief. Questions about whether the project will ever actually get funded can subconsciously impact on how much design team members will actually invest their energies into finding effective solutions. There is no question – and I am expanding on something David Staples said earlier – that when you know a project is going forward you tend to concentrate on it, develop it and put your energies into it in a much more consequent manner than if you think that it is going to be years before this actually gets off the ground anyway and it is sure to be changed along the way. That sort of mental framework can have a significant impact on the quality of the design.

Ultimately each community will finance its project in the best way it can, and the best that can be achieved is to structure a project and the procurement of its team so that the quality of the design is protected. A form of financing that is very popular today, but which is probably creates the highest risk to the quality of design, is actually a

Management consultant Duncan Webb describes the arts project financing situation in the US and cost consultant John Burgess explains the approach in the UK, while here, Tateo Nakajima examines the risks of various partnership arrangements.

PRIVATE FINANCING
 Freedom to undertake best (or worst) processes
 1 Rare
 2 Can lead to problems if donations come with specific usage requirements – the design gets driven by individual desires
 3 Requires large and sophisticated fundraising staff (unless single donor)
Project team is often professional and of high quality

PUBLIC FINANCING
 Very difficult for client to change “traditional” approach to selecting design team or managing process
 1 Also relatively rare
 2 Extremely vulnerable to political situation
 3 Timetable driven by politics and public funding schedule
 4 Public procurement regulations often based on simpler building types

MIXTURE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
 1 Flexibility gained depends on each country's laws
 2 Can be stressful for entire team as money is found little by little and team is typically very aware of the process; creates uncertainty in budget and schedule, survival of project, delays and redesign
There is no solution to this problem as fundraising process will typically require the products of the design and planning process as it develops

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP
 1 Funding mechanism
 2 Requires careful adaptation of design process
 3 Requires particular care and attention by public entity
 4 Risk to quality of resulting facility is similar to Design-Build process
Currently popular concept – but not too many completed examples in the performing arts to date