



CANADIAN ARTS
COALITION
CANADIENNE DES ARTS

Study on the impact and utilization of Canadian culture and arts in Canadian foreign policy and diplomacy, and other related matters

Supplementary brief in response to questions from members of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Submitted on May 29, 2018

Submitted by:

Frédéric Julien

Co-Chair, Canadian Arts Coalition

Director of Research and Development, Canadian Arts Presenting Association (CAPACOA)

Renuka Bauri

Steering Committee member, Canadian Arts Coalition

Advocacy and Communications Director, CARFAC

Christine Pellerin

Co-Chair of the Research and Policy Committee, Canadian Arts Coalition

Development Officer, Foundations at the Toronto Symphony Orchestra

Hamal Docter

Co-Chair of the Research and Policy Committee, Canadian Arts Coalition

Communications consultant

Introduction

This supplementary brief was prepared following the appearance of the Canadian Arts Coalition before the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, on April 26, 2018. It provides detailed answers and technical information in response to questions raised by members of the Committee.

The Canadian Arts Coalition would like to acknowledge the thoughtful contributions of members of its Research and Policy Committee, as well as from representatives of the Association of Canadian Publishers and of the Performing Arts Tax Working Group. We also want to thank members of the Committee for undertaking this study and for their consideration of this supplementary brief.

Answers to Questions by Senators

Questions related to foreign workers regulations

The Honourable Patricia Bovey

Senator Bovey: I have a follow-up question on NAFTA. You talked obviously about mobility. I want to push the mobility a little bit further. In the former NAFTA agreement for artists going into the U.S., and let's say they were there for residency for a year or two years, as I understand it, they were eligible as long as they were going to an academic institution. But if they were going to another kind of institution that was not listed as a reciprocity in the NAFTA, it was not allowed. Is that your interpretation of it, and is this one of the issues you have put forward to the NAFTA discussions that are, as you say, coming to a close?

Senator Bovey: They can visit without earning any money, but if they are there on a residency they are paid. Is that part of discussion you brought forward this time?

Answer

Currently, artists may visit the United States freely, but they cannot render services (including performances), regardless of whether they are receiving compensation or not, without a visa. Three options exist for artists who wish to visit an academic institution:

1. The Exchange Visitor (J-1) non-immigrant visa category is for "individuals approved to participate in work-and study-based exchange visitor programs". The J-1 visa is sometimes used by performing artists to perform and work in an ongoing fashion at academic institutions.
2. The Cultural Exchange (Q) non-immigrant visa category is similar to the J-1 category, but for international cultural exchange programs designated by USCIS. The Q exchange program is for the purpose of providing practical training and employment, and to share the history, culture, and traditions of your home country with the United States.
3. The Temporary Business (B-1) Visitor visa is for "individuals participating in business activities of a commercial or professional nature". The B-1 status doesn't generally allow artists to render professional services (including unpaid performances) save a few narrow exceptions: the industry showcase exception, the academic exception, the embassy event, and the recording exception. The B-1 status can be used in limited situations for paid performances that occur as part of an academic program.

Both of these options, however, are atypical for performing artists. The B-1 status in particular has several restrictions and any violation can lead to deportation proceedings and inadmissibility to the U.S. for a protracted period of time. Associations and unions therefore strongly advise their members to avoid the B-

1 status and to continue to rely on O and P visas, in spite of their notorious inefficiencies. O and P categories are temporary workers classifications designed for artists, performers, teachers or coaches. The petition process for obtaining O or P classification is slow, expensive and places undue evidence requirements upon the petitioners. The [Artist Mobility Advocacy Coalition](#), a U.S.-based ad hoc international coalition issued a . *White Paper on Artist Mobility to the United States*, which sums up the situation thusly:

“The current policies and procedures around the enforcement of O and P classifications have created an unconscionable lose/lose situation for the United States: they impede the activities of U.S. businesses and cultural organizations that rely on foreign performers, they unnecessarily strain chronically understaffed and overworked employees at USCIS and DOS, and they significantly impact the American people’s access to international culture.”

Under NAFTA, the [TN nonimmigrant classification](#) permits qualified Canadian and Mexican citizens to seek temporary entry into the United States to engage in business activities at a professional level. Among the types of professionals who are eligible to seek admission as TN nonimmigrants are accountants, engineers, lawyers, pharmacists, scientists, and teachers. Currently, artists cannot enter the United States under the TN status, because artists aren’t included in the list of eligible professions for this classification.

This could change under a modernized NAFTA. The Canadian Arts Coalition is of the opinion that live performing artist should qualify as an eligible profession for TN temporary entry. This recommendation was expressed to Canada’s negotiators ahead of the renegotiation, and Foreign Affairs minister Chrystia Freeland has since indicated that the expanding the list of eligible professions for temporary entry is among Canada’s top priorities.

The inclusion of live performing artists in the list of NAFTA TN professions, as recommended by the Canadian Arts Coalition, would alleviate most of the challenges related to B, O or P visas. It would allow performing artists to get paid to perform at residencies (and other engagements) even when those engagements are not at academic institutions. The TN status would also make the process of getting employment authorization much simpler and more affordable.

The complete policy proposal for adding live performing artist as an eligible profession for NAFTA Professional (TN) Nonimmigrant Status is detailed in a [joint brief by CAPACOA and the Canadian Arts Coalition](#). This brief also provides information on challenges related to O and P classifications.

Questions related to international taxation

The Honourable Victor Oh

Senator Oh: I would like to ask a question about taxation on artists performing abroad. With how many countries has Canada signed tax treaties with to avoid double taxation and are there any major international markets that are important for Canadian artists but have not signed such treaties with us? How can the government and your association help?

Answer

Tax treaties are in force with the vast majority of Canada's trade partners:

- Within the European Union, treaties are in force or signed with every member country.
- Of the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership member states, Brunei is the only state with whom Canada does not yet have a tax treaty.
- In the Mercosur area, treaties are still needed with Bolivia, Paraguay, Suriname and Uruguay.

In total, Canada has 93 tax treaties that are in force. Four (4) treaties are signed, but not in force. Seven (7) treaties are currently under negotiation/re-negotiation, including important markets such as China, Germany and Australia. These re-negotiations are wonderful opportunities to integrate the exclusions recommended by the Canadian Arts Coalition and the Performing Arts Tax Working Group (see below).

Complete information on the status of our tax treaties is available on the website of [Finance Canada](#).

The Honourable Paul J. Massicotte

Le sénateur Massicotte: Je vous remercie de votre présence ici ce matin. Je vais jouer à l'avocat du diable pour mieux comprendre vos arguments. Deux choses en particulier m'interpellent en ce qui concerne les ententes fiscales qu'on a conclues avec les autres pays. Je comprends bien votre désir, mais il y a quand même une norme internationale à laquelle vous faites référence. À ma connaissance, une retenue pour les services rendus c'est standard. En d'autres mots, il y a quand même une retenue si vous offrez des services aux États-Unis et vous pouvez aller chercher une exemption qui prend des mois. On veut être exempté complètement de cette procédure très standard et que les artistes soient traités différemment des gens d'affaires. Ai-je raison? Si c'est le cas, pourquoi avons-nous un traitement spécial comparativement aux transactions typiques commerciales?

Le sénateur Massicotte: Si un particulier décide d'offrir ses services aux États-Unis — il est difficile d'offrir des services, car on est tellement préoccupé avec les douaniers — et qu'il se fait payer en dollars américains, il y a toujours une retenue. Un particulier ou une entreprise qui offre des services aux États-Unis est visé par une retenue sur tout montant qu'il reçoit. Ai-je raison?

Answer

Most tax treaties, including the *Canada-United States Convention with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital*, provide tax exemptions to both businesses and individuals as long as they don't have a permanent establishment in the country where the service is provided.

The "Business Profits" exemption of the *Canada-United States Convention* states:

“The business profits of a resident of a Contracting State shall be taxable only in that State unless the resident carries on business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If the resident carries on, or has carried on, business as aforesaid, the business profits of the resident may be taxed in the other State but only so much of them as are attributable to that permanent establishment.”

Similarly, the “Independent Personal Services” article states:

“Income derived by an individual who is a resident of a Contracting State in respect of independent personal services may be taxed in that State. Such income may also be taxed in the other Contracting State if the individual has or had a fixed base regularly available to him in that other State but only to the extent that the income is attributable to the fixed base.”

The “Dependent Personal Services” article also provides an exemption to employees, as long as the remuneration does not exceed \$10,000. Canada’s [Non-Resident Employer Certification](#) program, which removes employer’s withholding, remitting and reporting obligations, is modeled after the “Dependent Personal Services” provision.

However, as per Article 17 of the OECD Model Tax Convention (upon which Canada’s tax treaties are based), **none of these exemptions apply when fees or salaries are paid to performing artists and other “entertainers”**.

For example, the “Artists and Athletes” article of the *Canada-United States Convention* explicitly states:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of Articles XIV (Independent Personal Services) and XV (Dependent Personal Services), income derived by a resident of a Contracting State as an entertainer, such as a theatre, motion picture, radio or television artiste, or a musician, or as an athlete, from his personal activities as such exercised in the other Contracting State, may be taxed in that other State”

On the positive side of things, some tax treaties do include restrictions to the scope of Article 17 on Artists and Athletes:

- The *Canada-United States Convention* has a *de minimis* exception that exempts artists fees under \$15,000 from tax in the performance state.
- Canada’s tax treaties with France, Germany and the United Kingdom exclude from Article 17 events supported from public funds. This exclusion does however not automatically apply to not-for-profit organizations, which makes the burden of proof difficult.

These are the kinds of exclusions that Canada could negotiate with its cultural trade partners. In doing so, it would be important to ensure that the exclusion:

- applies to both employee and contract staff;
- removes not only the withholding requirement but also the information return requirement and the tax return requirement (under certain conditions); and,
- does not impose undue evidence requirements.

Canada’s Performing Arts Tax Working Group has developed a [white paper](#) that provides several recommendations for negotiating such exclusions. This white paper has guided the development of a new simplified policy that the Canada Revenue Agency will be issuing shortly. However, the scope of this policy is limited, because the Canada Revenue Agency is bound by Canada’s tax treaties and the *Income Tax Act*. To effectively reduce this administrative burden and remove the fiscal obstacles to cultural exchanges and trade, changes are required at the treaty level.

At the administrative level, policies can vary significantly, even among countries that share a tax treaty.

For example, Canada's Regulation 105 Withholding tax follows similar guidelines as the United States' Nonresident Alien Withholding, but Canada's administration is generally less efficient and user-friendly than with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). In the United States, the Central Withholding Agreement is a contract between the IRS, the foreign artist, and a designated "withholding agent." The Central Withholding Agreement process assigns an Internal Revenue Service representative upon receipt of the withholding waiver application, and is further facilitated through the involvement of the withholding agent. In Canada, the R105 waiver application is submitted directly by the foreign artist to the Canada Revenue Agency. The CRA does not provide an acknowledgement of receipt and doesn't provide any efficient means of verifying the status of the application with a CRA representative. When changes need to be made to touring dates (for example, when additional engagements are added to a tour), the ability to contact a representative makes it possible for artists touring in the U.S. to easily amend their waiver application; this is not easily possible in Canada.

In addition, the United States has a process that enables foreign tax-exempt organizations (i.e., not-for-profit organizations) to be exempted from the withholding obligation. Although most foreign nonprofit organizations are not automatically eligible for this exemption, the IRS has created a short-cut to obtaining 501(c)(3) status for Canadian organizations that have obtained "Registered Charity" status from the Canadian Revenue Agency. Canada has yet to reciprocate this exemption. Doing so could enable non-resident not-for-profit companies to qualify for the Non-Resident Employer Certification program and reduce their compliance burden with 2nd-level withholding, remitting and reporting obligations.

For more information on Regulation 105 Withholding, the Committee may consult the web pages of the [Performing Arts Tax Working Group](#).

For more information on Nonresident Alien Withholding, the Committee may consult the [artistsfromabroad.org](#) website.

For more information on the rationale for the differentiated tax treatment of entertainers and the options to limit unintended negative effects of this special treatment, the Committee may consult the commentary on Article 17 of the [2017 OECD Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital](#). The Committee should note that paragraph 2 of the commentary does acknowledge the negative side effects of Article 17: "*too strict provisions might in some cases impede cultural exchanges*". This is in essence what the Coalition has endeavoured to bring to the attention of the Committee.

Questions on Intellectual Property

L'Honorable René Cormier

Le sénateur Cormier: J'ai une deuxième question concernant les droits de suite. Vous indiquez dans votre mémoire que la question des arts visuels est extrêmement importante. Il y a un enjeu à ce chapitre, mais qu'en est-il des arts de la scène, des œuvres littéraires et musicales? Quelle serait la solution pour régler cette question de droits de suite?

Answer

In matters of intellectual property in the arts, Canada has been, at best, a good follower among progressive countries and, at worst, lagging behind even those countries that outwardly favor users over right holders.

In music, on the one hand, Canada has harmonized its copyright regime with the European Union in 2015, extending the copyright of sound recordings from 50 years to 70 years. On the other hand, however, the Copyright Board of Canada's ruling on Re:Sound Tariff 8 for music streaming in 2014 was considered by domestic and foreign industry associations as "a serious setback for the music community". This particular tariff is less than 10% of the rates that the same services pay in the United States and many other countries.

In the live performing arts, grand rights, copyright, and neighbouring rights are enshrined in the Copyright Act. They are well protected, and are managed according to international standards.

With respect to writing and publishing, amendments to Canada's Copyright Act in 2012 are largely viewed by the international community as being out of step with Canada's international treaty obligations. Hugo Setzer, Vice-President of the International Publishers Association recently appeared before the Standing Committee on Industry as part of their review of the Copyright Act and his testimony (available here: <http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/INDU/meeting-110/evidence>) provides a good overview of the issue from an international perspective, including the following:

"Our concern at IPA is that Canada is now considered internationally an outlier, not only with its fair dealing exemption for education, but with its court-made law that equates fair dealing exemptions with so-called user rights, all of which has resulted in loss of income for Canadian publishers and others. Publishers report reduced or even complete withdrawal of investment in Canada's specific K-to-12 educational content."

As to the visual arts, at a meeting of the World Intellectual Property Organization in April 2017, it was recommended that all signatories of the Berne Convention be required to adopt the Artist's Resale Right. According to a study in 2015 by Sam Ricketson, nearly half of the Berne Convention signatories have implemented the Artist's Resale Right, which puts artists in those countries at an advantage compared to those that have not legislated it. Canada has only ratified the 1928 version of Berne, but the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights essentially bind it to the Paris Act of 1971, where the Artist's Resale Right was introduced as an optional provision under Article 14*ter*.

In October 2017, copyright collective members of the CIAGP (the International Council of Creators of Graphic, Plastic, and Photographic Arts) held a congress and stated that the changes implemented in Canada in 2012 led to significant challenges for their visual artist members. They also passed a resolution to be endorsed by CISAC (the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers), calling on Ministers Bains and Joly to: "...adopt the Artist's Resale Right, a measure of fairness essential to the livelihood of visual artists, and to support the adoption of a universal treaty on the Artist's Resale Right,

currently studied at WIPO's Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR)." In this context, the adoption of the Artist's Resale Right appears to be a necessary step to straighten Canada's track record on intellectual property.

The Honourable Paul J. Massicotte

Le sénateur Massicotte: J'aimerais vous demander pourquoi il y a un traitement spécial du point de vue de la ristourne pour la revente d'œuvres d'art? Je ne connais pas cette application. Il se peut que d'autres pays se soient mis d'accord, mais toute autre vente d'une propriété, d'un intérêt ou d'un actif comme tel n'est pas visée par une éventuelle ristourne sans permanence. Pourquoi l'artiste, après indication de sa vente, pourquoi n'exige-t-il pas 5 p. 100 de toute revente future négociable. Pourquoi le gouvernement imposerait-il cette commission sur les futures ventes alors que ça ne fait pas partie du contrat original de vente?

Answer

There are several reasons why it is necessary to legislate an Artist's Resale Right (ARR), rather than simply leaving it to the market to regulate. Firstly, without legislation, there would be no compliance. Very few art galleries in Canada have said they would choose to pay voluntarily. Most galleries and auction houses currently do not, and would not, pay unless required to do so. In Canada, most of the major auction houses and galleries have already said they would pay the ARR if it is legislated, so we believe compliance for the law would be relatively high.

If Canada had legislation with specific eligibility criteria and collection terms, it would be much easier to administer. We are not asking for the government to administer a program or provide public funding for the ARR, but legislation is required to collect and distribute it to artists. It is proposed that the administration of the ARR in Canada be handled through mandatory collective management, and that reporting enforcement measures be put in place. In many countries where the ARR is in place, it is required by law that an artist collects the ARR through a copyright collecting society, and that Art Market Professionals (AMPs) report on all sales through that society. The facilitation of the program through collective management would allow for cost efficiency and effectiveness in the process. It is easier to maintain a registered database of artists and AMPs if such a system is in place, and it is more efficient for AMPs to report sales and turnover to collecting societies rather than individual artists.

There are currently two copyright collectives in Canada (CARCC and SODRAC), and it is recommended that these collectives administer the ARR on behalf of their respective memberships, with unaffiliated artists receiving payments from one central collective society. This is how it works elsewhere, such as the UK. It is recommended that CARCC administer the ARR for all artists unaffiliated with a collective.

Artists are not in a strong enough bargaining position to insist upon payment of the ARR, which is why at least 93 countries worldwide have legislated it. We are unaware of any country that has an effective voluntary payment system in place. Without legislation, Canadian artists are not only missing out on royalties in Canada, but also royalties from international sales. Countries that currently legislate it only distribute ARR payments to other countries that also legislate it. For example, Germany and the UK both have the law, and the German copyright collective will distribute payments to British artists, and vice versa, but German and British galleries and auction houses are not obligated to collect royalties for Canadian artists because we do not have legislation. Without legislation, we do not have international reciprocity, which makes this a trade issue, as highlighted in the Canadian Arts Coalition's initial brief.

Other Questions

The Honourable Victor Oh

Senator Oh: I have one more question. I always receive last-minute requests for help with visa problems. The artists plan a long time to do a performance in our country. In the last minute, half of the group is not coming because they cannot get visiting visas. What is your opinion?

Answer

Since 2015, cases of problems with temporary entry of foreign artists were indeed brought to the attention of the Canadian Arts Coalition. Notably, the Media Arts Network of Ontario and of the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres have had a number of member organizations experiencing difficulties with the temporary entry of visiting artists. Some of these cases were for short term presentation engagements or multi-city tours over the course of a couple weeks, but most were for longer-term production residencies. The cases highlight two types of problems. The majority of the incidents are related to artists being denied a temporary resident visitor (i.e., “visitor” visa) by an Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada office located in Canadian embassies, high commissions or consulates. A few other incidents involved artists being denied entry or being detained by customs officers at a Canadian port of entry (even though they had secured a visa).

Based on our initial research, cases of temporary entry obstacles involved artists coming from the Middle-East, Africa, and Latin America. Further research would be required to ascertain if and to what extent these problems are indicative of systemic barriers to artist mobility.

Currently, Canada requests visas for 148 countries, including many important trade partners (China, Malaysia, Vietnam, the entire Mercosur area). Sixty-four (64) countries are visa exempt.

The Honourable Patricia Bovey

Senator Bovey: I want to ask you both how important you think international expos are for the presentation of Canadian work. I understand, for instance, that the UAE is hosting an international expo in 2020, and Canada has not yet agreed to participate. Yet going back, we can think of the number of really important international expos where Canadian art has risen to the international stage.

Answer

International Expos have been and still remain important for cultural exchanges. Considering the benefits that they provide for artistic development and diplomacy, the Canadian Arts Coalition is supportive of Canada’s participation in as many cultural expos as possible. However, given current funding limitations to the Cultural Export Strategy, we do have to pick and choose among many showcase opportunities, based on artistic, diplomatic, trade and tourism objectives.

In the performing arts sector, industry association conferences and performing arts festivals are currently believed to be effective outlets for showcasing Canadian artists and for building reciprocal relationships with foreign companies and presenting organizations.

In the book publishing industry, we do have a positive example of cultural diplomacy in the fact that Canada will be Guest of Honour at the Frankfurt Book Fair in 2020. This is a significant opportunity to showcase Canada’s literature in Germany and beyond, but also the work of other artistic disciplines through touring and programming around the fair. Past Guests of Honour have used Frankfurt as a way to

invite interest in other sectors, too. For example, both Iceland and New Zealand had huge bumps in visits from German tourists following the Guest of Honour Year.

The Honourable Patricia Bovey

Senator Bovey: I want to move to another question. We have an indemnification program in Canada so that our art museums and museums can bring in major international exhibitions whereby the insurance costs above a certain amount will be indemnified, which has been wonderful for presenting international work to Canadian audiences. Tell me if you are aware of countries elsewhere in the world that have indemnification programs that would benefit from bringing major exhibitions of Canadian art to other countries, as Canadian art now gets a bit better known, thanks to exhibitions that have been in Dulwich and Paris. Can you talk about the need for other countries, or do they have indemnification programs to help the circulation of high-end Canadian art?

Answer

Many countries have indemnity programs. Here are a few examples:

- Finland has the "Act on State Indemnity for Art Exhibitions" (1986)
- Japan has the "Government Indemnity for Works of Art" (2011)
- New Zealand has "Government Indemnity of Touring Exhibitions" under the Public Finance Act (1989)
- The United Kingdom has the "Government Indemnity Scheme" (1980)
- The United States has the "Art and Artifacts Indemnity Program" (1975)

The Honourable A. Raynell Andreychuk

The Chair: I wanted you to comment on two things. One is that, in the old days, art was either visual or dance or song or records maybe. We have a lot of new things that I don't even know exist — games and creativeness going on with the technologies. There has been quite an emphasis put by governments that that's a good thing. The government has announced that it helps the economy and trade. Is that the direction we should be going in, or should we continue to promote art for art's sake, as opposed to tying it to trade initiatives?

Answer

Upon soliciting input on this particular question from the Canadian Arts Coalition's Research and Policy Committee, one of our members provided this point of view:

"The value of our sector is both qualitative and quantitative - with the former being the most significant yet harder case to prove. We know that engaging in arts, culture, heritage and creativity of any sort are essential to well-being and a sense of belonging - two terms that are gaining popularity in government when it comes to measuring success and/or progress towards a better quality of life."

A good cultural diplomacy strategy absolutely has to place emphasis on the intrinsic value of the arts, and it should also pay consideration to its societal and economic benefits. To this effect, we would like to bring to the attention of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade the following recent research publications:

Community Foundations of Canada and CAPACOA, [Vital Signs: Arts and Belonging](#), 2017.

Statistics Canada, [Trade of culture and sport products, 2016](#), 2018.

The Honourable René Cormier

Le sénateur Cormier: La question des arts et de la culture, en lien avec la diplomatie culturelle, est un vaste champ d'études. On parle de fiscalité, d'ententes internationales, de propriété intellectuelle, de réciprocité et de réduction des barrières. Il y a énormément d'enjeux. Certains enjeux sont spécifiques aux différentes disciplines artistiques. On réfléchit en ce moment à la façon dont on pourrait formuler des recommandations au gouvernement sur ce à quoi pourrait ressembler une stratégie de diplomatie culturelle, qui pourrait en faire la coordination et ce qu'elle contiendrait. Avez-vous des idées à ce sujet? Nous savons que le Conseil des arts du Canada et Affaires mondiales Canada sont impliqués. Avez-vous une idée comment on pourrait assurer le développement d'une stratégie de diplomatie culturelle? C'est une question un peu simpliste, mais qui devrait coordonner cela?

Answer

Coordination of export efforts between the Canada Council for the Arts and federal departments involved in cultural diplomacy (Global Affairs Canada and Canadian Heritage) can be quite difficult for a number of reasons. First, the Canada Council for the Arts has been building internal and funding capacity to support market access for almost a full decade before the federal government started to reinvest in this area. A new culture of collaboration needs to be reinstated. Second, the Canada Council for the Arts is operating in an arms-length fashion from the government and is therefore not subject to government priorities in the same way as federal departments. Third, Canada Council for the Arts, Global Affairs Canada and Canadian Heritage all have different sets of priorities and goals.

In this context, it would appear prudent to stay away from centralizing approaches to coordination and to rather opt for a distributed approach involving all stakeholders, including arts sector representatives. A few arts service organizations in the performing arts have been consulting with their peers, with their members and their funders in order to define a shared national export strategy. Such initiatives should be encouraged with both financial and in-kind support, since they bear the potential of significantly enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of every stakeholder's considerable resource allocations into market access, cultural exchanges, trade, and/or cultural diplomacy.

About the Canadian Arts Coalition

The Canadian Arts Coalition is a collaborative non-partisan movement spearheaded by a group of national arts service and membership organizations, with a volunteer Steering Committee comprised of artists and arts administrators. We are united in the belief that a strong arts and culture sector contributes to economically vibrant, liveable, and innovative communities, and that strong federal cultural policy and investment frameworks leverage arts and culture's contribution to the Canadian economy, Canadian communities, and Canada's standing internationally.

The full list of [Coalition members](#) can be found on our website.