



INSTITUTO
UNIVERSITÁRIO
DE LISBOA

Moving Pieces: Risk Management Practices in Temporary Art Exhibitions

António de Castro Corte-Real Andresen Leitão

Master in Management

Supervisor:

Professor Doutor Carlos Miguel Correia Hernandez Jerónimo, Professor Auxiliar
Convidado, ISCTE Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

September, 2024

Department of Marketing, Strategy and Operations

Moving Pieces: Risk Management Practices in Temporary Art Exhibitions

António de Castro Corte-Real Andresen Leitão

Master in Management

Supervisor:

PhD, Carlos Miguel Correia Hernandez Jerónimo, Invited Assistant Professor

Iscte – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

September, 2024

To grandma,

"If you hear those things which I have said to you, your wisdom will be fully advanced. Although they are the means which are suitable for arriving at the Maat, and it is that which makes them precious, their memory would recede from the mouth of men. But thanks to the beauty of their arrangement in rhythm all their words will now be carried without alteration over this earth eternally."

Agradecimento

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian for its support,
to the twelve souls who quenched an economist's curiosity,
and to the *duca* who led me to them

*Ond' io per lo tuo me' penso e discerno
che tu mi segui, e io sarò tua guida,
e trarroti di qui per loco eterno*

Resumo

Este estudo explora práticas de gestão de risco na organização de exposições de arte temporárias, centrada na integração de *standards* de gestão de projectos nas práticas culturais em Portugal. Visa colmatar a falta de literatura extensa sobre esta aplicação em particular, analisando se e como as normas de risco são aplicadas para melhorar a gestão de exposições de arte. Através de entrevistas semiestruturadas individuais em profundidade com profissionais da área, a pesquisa identifica práticas actuais e propõe recomendações para melhorar a gestão de risco. As principais conclusões destacam a primazia da segurança e protecção das obras de arte, ilustrada pela utilização quase universal de dispositivos de segurança, seguros e transporte especializado de obras de arte. No entanto, as respostas denotaram uma consciência reduzida de outros tipos de risco, bem como uma ausência de uma abordagem holística de gestão de risco. O estudo conclui com recomendações práticas para os profissionais optimizarem a gestão de risco, para garantir a conclusão bem-sucedida de exposições dentro das suas restrições e de forma alinhada com os objectivos da organização.

Palavras-chave: *Gestão de Projectos; Gestão de Risco; Gestão de Museus; Abordagem Integrada de Risco; Exposições Temporárias de Arte; Risco nas Artes*

Classificação JEL: D81 Criteria for Decision-Making under Risk and Uncertainty; Z11 Economics of the Arts and Literature

Abstract

This study explores risk management practices in the organisation of temporary art exhibitions, focusing on the integration of project management standards within cultural practices in Portugal. It aims to address the lack of extensive literature on this specific application, by examining if and how risk standards are applied to enhance the management of art exhibitions. Through semi-structured in-depth individual interviews with professionals in the field, the research identifies current practices and proposes recommendations to improve risk management. Key findings highlight the primacy of artwork safety and security, illustrated by near universal use of security mechanisms, artwork insurance and specialised transport. However, the answers denoted a reduced awareness of other risk types, as well as an absence of a holistic risk management approach. The study concludes proposing actionable recommendations for professionals to optimise risk management, ensuring the successful delivery of exhibitions within their constraints and aligned with organisational goals.

Keywords: *Project Management; Risk Management; Museum Management; Integrated Risk Approach; Temporary Art Exhibitions; Risk in the Arts*

JEL Classification: D81 Criteria for Decision-Making under Risk and Uncertainty; Z11 Economics of the Arts and Literature

Index

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Type and Theme.....	1
1.2. Research Problem	1
1.3. Objectives	2
2. Literature Review	3
2.1. Arts.....	3
2.2. Arts Management	4
2.3. Arts and Risk	7
2.3.1. Practices and Standards	7
2.3.2. Tailoring.....	8
2.3.3. Limitations and uncertainty	10
2.3.4. Wide application of risk in the context of the arts.....	12
2.4. Art Exhibitions and Risk	16
3. Methodology	19
4. Findings and Discussion.....	21
4.1. Context.....	21
4.2. Risk management procedures	23
4.2.1. Planning.....	23
4.2.2. Identification	25
4.2.3. Qualitative and quantitative analysis.....	26
4.2.4. Response	27
4.2.5. Monitoring.....	29
4.3. Summary and examples.....	29
4.3.1. Threats.....	30
4.3.2. Opportunities	31
5. Conclusion	33
5.1 Recommendations	34
5.2 Limitations and Contributions	38
Bibliographical references.....	39
A: Risk management in arts manuals	47
B: Recommendations Summary	52

1. Introduction

1.1. Type and Theme

This research examines risk management practices in cultural institutions. It focuses on integrated risk management tailoring in the organisation of temporary art exhibitions, drawing on the intersection of project management standards and the practices of cultural agents in Portugal. It aims to provide specific advice to managers of temporary art exhibitions in order to minimise threats and maximise opportunities at the lowest possible cost.

After stating the research problem and its objectives, a literary review is presented. It covers relevant publications in the field of arts; then it focuses on arts management, and particularly the organisation of temporary exhibitions; and it shifts to the risks associated with these exhibitions. The results of these findings in the three fields of art, management, and risk are synthesised from the point of view of temporary exhibitions. Next, the research methodology is presented, followed by the analysis of the results and the discussion and findings. The conclusion sets forth the key findings, future lines of research, and limitations.

1.2. Research Problem

Art is universal and has been with mankind since its dawn, being one of its defining characteristics (see for example Morriss-Kay, 2010). Evrard & Colbert (2000) argued that subjectivity, the prominence of the artist, and the relationship with the public influence arts management, which must respect the autonomy of the artist and the role of the audience in the process of art creation (“active reception”). Adding to the perspective of art as entertainment (similar thus to other primarily profit-making events), the authors mention its relevance in the fields of education and spirituality. The former in the sense that it enables a conversation about society and its values, as illustrated by the current discussion about art restitution, or art as a centrepiece for public outcry; the latter as it provides a spiritual beacon, all the more relevant in post-religious societies. In fact, there is even a debate about whether curating (the selection and display of art) should be seen as an art form in itself (Ventzislavov, 2014, defended this; for an argument against see for instance Spaid, 2016).

Selwood et al. (2018) stated that “...considerable research has focused on the two fields of project management and arts management separately, with only a limited number of attempts linking the two. There has been little discussion about whether project management tools are adaptable or appropriate for arts projects” (p. 201). In the literature on temporary art exhibition management there is little reference to project management, and even less so specifically to the risk knowledge area.

Yet it can be argued that project managements principles, despite long ignored as an application area, could aid nonprofit organisations achieve their goal (Cabanis-Brewin, 1998). Chapman (2014) argued that project risk management not only seeks to minimise exposure to threats and exploit opportunities, but also supports the project’s objectives, be it cost, time and quality, or other dimensions – hence the need to understand and identify it. McClinton (2021) defended the need to assess risk in all business sectors, particularly having in mind contemporary risks.

This research seeks to contribute to narrowing the perceived gap between project risk management and the arts, by investigating the following question: how can risk management practices be optimised to reduce negative risks and increase positive risks in temporary art exhibitions?

1.3. Objectives

This study examines the existing literature to ascertain whether risk management practices are employed in art exhibitions. It assesses the application of standards in the cultural sector, particularly in temporary art exhibitions. It covers not only negative but also positive risks, ranging from those related to the safety and security of works of art (e.g. theft or vandalism), financial (e.g. budget slippage), or reputational (e.g. unintended association with dubious sponsors). This is subsequently verified through primary data collection in the field. Data collection focuses on the identification and assessment of risks, on the establishment of suitable response plans, the appropriate involvement of stakeholders and end-to-end risk planning and monitoring.

The goal is to propose a list of actionable recommendations based on best practices, providing an integrated model that can be tailored by cultural institutions in the organisation of temporary art exhibitions. Improved practices should bolster risk management in these entities’ exhibitions, helping them to achieve their aims within time and cost constraints, while also facing specific challenges, such as the fragile and unique nature of works of art. The adaptable risk management model constitutes a theoretical contribution, while the practical contribution to professionals working in the cultural sector are the recommendations to improve success through variables such as security, logistics and strategic exhibition management.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Arts

As GDP grows, so does the services sector, measured by its share of total employment or value added (Herrendorf et al. 2014). The tertiarisation of the economy in Europe has led to a sharp increase in the size of certain sectors, including culture (Pauget et al., 2021). Recently, cultural tourism accounts for almost 40% of international tourist arrivals (Richards, 2018). Pine II & Gilmore (1998) argued that a fourth sector/stage of “experiences” is discernible as “the next step in (...) the progression of economic value”¹. Experiences involve audience participation, either passive or active; and connection, either absorption or immersion. The intersection of these dimensions results in four areas of an experience: entertainment, education, escapism, and aesthetics – the authors illustrate this with a visitor to an art gallery (immersed but participating passively)². Temporary exhibitions are suited for this stage, and indeed these events have increased in museums, institutions mainly devoted to the conservation of permanent collections (Tobele, 2011).

It is debatable whether arts organisations are (or ought to be, as Amendola et al., 2020, defend) in the business of engaging the senses and hence in the experience sector, or “simply” using resources (equipment, people, art) to provide a service (displaying works of art) – or something in between. Notwithstanding this and avoiding the aforementioned debate about whether curating should be understood as a fine art, the role of creativity is a distinctive trait in the field of arts management. Several authors (Chong 2010; Hartman et al. 1998; or Selwood et al., 2018) highlighted its role, despite the widening of this term, for instance to advertisement. They note that art is subjective and has a significant intangible component, which leads to an emphasis on product quality (as opposed to market demands, where quality is inherent in the commodity sold). Hartman et al. (1998) and Selwood et al. (2018) pointed how difficult it would be to apply project management tools and techniques in such a subjective environment (guided by artistic merit, aesthetics, and significance to audiences), and how their inflexible application would stifle the creative process that is just what sets this field apart.

¹ The price and differentiation grow as societies progress from extracting commodities, to making goods, to delivering services, to finally staging experiences.

² Though one could still have experiences in the other fields in an art exhibition: a “blockbuster” exhibition could be closer to the entertainment quadrant (passive participation, absorbing); a guided visit to an art exhibition might be educational (active participation, absorbing); and the recent rise in co-participatory projects can be escapist (highly immersive and involving active participation).

The subjectivity of art is linked to its definition and has implications for its management. Evrard & Colbert (2000) stated that art can be considered in terms of aesthetics (beauty), the role of the artist (as opposed to the craftsman), and the relationship with the viewer (Duchamp's "fountain" becomes art because of the viewer's perspective). The first two definitions imply the priority of art³, even though historically the artist has had to compromise with his patrons; the third implies the importance of provoking an active reception by the viewer – and thus relates with the experience sector.

The authors noted furthermore that the place of art in society might be considered from three perspectives: as a substitute for religion, as an integral part of the education of a good citizen, or as a leisure activity. The first two perspectives warrant a non-profit management mindset, whereas the third brings it closer to other economic sectors, albeit with its own specificities.

2.2. Arts Management

Arts people regard business terminology as antithetical to art, science, and culture, due to its link with the economic dimension, which is reductively assumed to be identical to profit (Jalla 2001, as cited in Massi and Piancatelli, 2020). Johansson (2022) pointed out how arts and business organisations have traditionally been relegated to opposing worlds because their goals and perspectives are different: art aims at human and aesthetic development, while business focuses on economic growth.

Macdonnell and Bereson (2020) criticised the "odd obsession with managerialism", arguing that the concept of "arts management" was externally imposed (namely by the funders), rather than because the activity itself requires it. They stated that this "plague" spread to other climates, infecting further countries apart from the English-speaking world. They noted that "management of the arts", however defined, implies commodification; that to speak of arts as an industry is to demean them; and that the not-for-profit ethos weighs down the arts, as it implies a loss – whereas there is (non-financial) gain for all in the realisation of artists' dreams. The authors fear that, by accepting the "reduction to a sector", following the "dark arts" imposed by the "tyranny" of the "management apparatchiks", speaking their "Orwellian Newspeak", "arts managers became complicit in the dumbing down of that which they sought to protect and preserve" (p. 8). This echoes the belief that the spread of "market reasoning" from lower to higher-order goods degrades these (Anderson, 1993, and Sandel, 2013). On the other side of the debate, authors suggested that the corruption argument does not apply to the traditional framework of welfare economics (Qizilbash, 2019), or that distrust of the market leads to worse outcomes (Clowney, 2020), implicitly criticising the exceptionality of fields such as the arts.

³ *L'art pour l'art* – incidentally, media company MGM's motto "ars gratia artis" stands over the roaring lion that opens several blockbusters.

Lindqvist (2012, p. 24) suggested that public sector reforms have led to "managing to audit and symbolic management" and argued that the challenges of arts management, embedded in a complex web of political and economic structures and forces, cannot be truly understood from a general management perspective, but rather from a multidisciplinary perspective. This is corroborated by Uotila (2012), who claimed project management is not a neutral tool⁴, while widely spread in cultural management. He noted that "the practices of cultural project execution are still based on surprises, unintended outcomes and improvisation" (p. 63), forcing cultural managers and EU funding schemes to spend time and resources trying to fit their uncertain activities into a bed of Procrustes.

However, most of the authors consulted seek a compromise between management and the arts. Raikes (1996) noticed the scientific element in collections management (e.g. through specialisation, digitalisation, and standards) made them better documented, cared for, and accessible. Yet, pointing the room for flexibility and creativity, she stated, "I believe that although collections management now veers more towards being a "science" than it did in the past, it contains elements of both "art" and "science" and is neither truly one or the other" (p. 19). Writing in the *Journal of Marketing Management*, Butler (2000) pointed out the value of professional development in the management of the arts grows with the sector. Conceding that the imperatives of culture and commerce are often at odds, he argued that it is absurd to suggest that artistic and business minds can't meet. He warned against the triumphalism of the notion of marketing over production orientation stating:

In one sense, artists are the ultimate manifestation of that absolute insult in the marketing schoolyard, namely the "product orientation". But their internal focus, that total commitment to their artistic endeavour, is what makes them artists. Whatever detracts from that may make for better commerce but worse art. (Butler, 2000, p. 359)

The author went on to argue that this is not anti-marketing, in the sense that the art has a long-term, outward-looking, inherent respect for the public, i.e., the market.

Crealey (2003) stated confidently that "arts organisations have moved beyond the notion that a marketing orientation is anathema to artistic integrity" (p. 24), and that the orientation in the arts is moving from the product (art) to the customer (audience), even while acknowledging resistance from some sectors. Benghozi (2006) considered that the mixture of permanence (conserving collections) and temporality (displaying collections) in the cultural sector provides a role model. It reconciles flexibility in the face of risk and stability, which allows the appropriation and reproduction of know-how, as well as ballast when projects fail. Kuesters (2010) rejected the widespread conceptualisation of arts managers as simple detached enablers of art, instead pushed for the duality of arts managers, as financial stewards as well as performers according to artistic criteria.

⁴ "Project management is more about storytelling than natural science" (p. 63).

Tobelem (2011) defended that a managerial approach would unlock the advantages derived from temporary exhibitions, while maintaining the fundamental missions of preserving and studying permanent collections. This approach requires management training for department heads, recruitment of specialised personnel and optimisation of existing human, technical and financial resources. Splitting exhibition production between curator-driven and manager-driven, Reidla (2020) reported that curators in Baltic Sea museums in the latter model perceive their credibility as experts suffers and their competencies are underexploited, as they are reduced to a concept design and execution role.

In their exploratory study about so-called “blockbusters”, Rentschler et al. (2014) pointed that museum management seeks to balance education and entertainment, and the authors argued that a shift is underway from “less curatorial reverence and more audience relevance” (p. 47). While pointing to “the age-old overlap and indeed conflict between art and market or between culture and business”⁵, Camarero et al. (2015) noted that museums have become part of the “experience economy”, shifting from inward focus on the growth, care, and study of their collections, to a “more entrepreneurial management approach aimed at serving the public” (p. 234). They considered valid and even complementary both exhibitions geared towards large audiences (“blockbusters”) and those resulting from concerns with conservation and research (niche) - constant turnover of temporary exhibitions being a way to continuously engage visitors. Johansson (2022) mentioned a balancing act between the creativity of the arts and the “order” of business, concluding that the cultural management should draw from several disciplines in addition to management, to solve the conflicting nature of cultural organisations. Coate & Hoffmann (2022) contended that traditional economic assumptions often don’t apply to cultural markets and suggested that behavioural economics can provide the synthesis to reconcile the peculiar (economic) behaviour of these markets with the methodology of economics. Focussing on urban contemporary art museums, Santandreu and Rivero-Moreno (2023) argued that the International Council of Museums’ (ICOM) current statement of museums as non-profit institutions is problematic. Though stating that the “definition might be used as a containment barrier against the dangers of the advance of post-capitalism” (p. 12), the authors acknowledged that current management practices may make it sound cynical. The authors illustrated this not only with the context (e.g. existence of strong private funding, or benefits to investors and artists) but also with the profit-seeking attitude by some museums, “in monetary, social, or symbolic ways” (p. 12).

⁵ And pointing to the initial rejection of museum curators of pop art, given its business connotations.

2.3. Arts and Risk

Risk management's importance has risen within an increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous context, and cultural organisations must address the resulting challenges and opportunities (Amendola et al., 2020). In this context, McClinton (2021) emphasised assessing risk across all sectors.

Distinctive traits of the arts include the role of creativity and subjectivity (Evrard & Colbert, 2000), and the fact that profit is not the main goal, as artists and cultural agents have other, "higher", aims in mind. Specifically, these higher aims might justify more risk appetite⁶. Lindqvist (2003, p. 7) stated: "A masterpiece cannot be commissioned. This is why aesthetic production is defined as high-risk activity".

2.3.1. Practices and Standards

Project Management Institute's (2021, p. 53) (PMI) Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) and Standard for Risk Management in portfolios, programs, and projects (2019, p. 1) defined risk as "an uncertain event or condition that, if it occurs, has a positive or negative effect on one or more project objectives". Risk features prominently in PMBOK's Uncertainty Performance Domain and there is a dedicated Standard for Risk Management. It stated that "the purpose of risk management (...) is to support the optimal delivery of project results", also helping to "ensure that delivery of these results occurs within the identified project constraints" (p. 57). According to this publication, Risk Management principles include its alignment with organisational strategy, focussing on the most impactful risks, balancing realisation of value against overall risks, fostering a culture that embraces risk management, and navigate complexity using risk management to enable successful outcomes. PMBOK indicated that risk responses should be "appropriate and timely to the significance of the risk, cost effective, realistic within the project context, agreed to by relevant stakeholders, and owned by a responsible person" (p.54). It framed uncertainty within the organisation's risk tolerance, project complexity and technological uncertainty, size (in terms of budget, duration, scope, or team size), suggesting tailoring risk management with simple or robust approaches according to the need.

⁶ "Blockbusters" today are based on art that was banned from the museums in the XIX century: in 1874, painters rejected by the official art exhibition of the Académie des Beaux-Arts in Paris organised their own exhibition, which would be later called the Impressionists Exhibition.

PMI's framework is aligned with International Organisation for Standardisation's (ISO), among others. Pursuant to Chapman & Ward (2011) and Tysiak (2018) one can outline the follow "macro-phases" that bridge PMI's and ISO's cycles: PMI's 4.2 Planning (6.3 Scope, Context and Criteria in ISO 31000:2018); 4.3 Identification (6.4.2 Risk Identification); 4.4 Qualitative and 4.5 Quantitative Analysis (6.4.3 Risk Analysis and 6.4.4 Risk Evaluation); Response 4.6 Planning and 4.7 Implementation (6.5 Risk Treatment); and 4.8 Monitoring (6.6 Monitoring and Review). Compared to the previous edition, ISO 31000:2018 emphasised the integration of risk management, its iterative nature and aimed to provide an open systems model that can be adapted to different needs and contexts.

PMI's Standard for Risk Management (2019) listed 44 techniques in its Appendix X6, organising them according to the cited phases. ISO/IEC 31010:2019 provided 42 techniques, partially covered by PMI but with a stronger technical side.

There are other risk-related standards in the cultural sector, usually focussed on conservation and not systematic and flexible as PMI's and ISO's: for instance, the conservation standards and regulations provided by CEN (European Committee for Standardization), ICOM, UNESCO, Ibermuseus or Museus e Monumentos de Portugal (a public body with responsibilities in the management of national museums, monuments and palaces), available on its website⁷.

According to PMI (2015), organisations that report they always use risk management practices have significantly better project outcomes compared to entities that do not: 73% met original goals (+13 percentage points regarding organisations that do not always use risk management practices), 61% finished on time (+15 p.p.) and 64% finished with budget (+13 p.p.). The same survey indicated that 83% of high performers report frequent use of risk management practices (vs 49% in low performers). In the following year's report (PMI, 2016), 63% of the surveyed project management practitioners stated use of risk management practices often or always, second only to the use of project performance measures (65%).

2.3.2. Tailoring

Several authors stressed the need to adapt risk management to the project to ensure its success. Raz et al. (2002) argued that risk management techniques ought to be adapted to different types of projects, as one should use only the appropriate tools from a toolbox. As size and complexity of projects grow, the use of techniques becomes more relevant. However, the authors noted that risk management techniques are not widely used in the 100 Israeli projects that were examined, but when used, they appear to be related to project success, especially in time and budget.

⁷ <https://www.museusemonumentos.pt/en/pagina/formularios-requerimentos-e-regulamentos>.

Rankins (2009) supported this view, arguing that small, low risks projects could be dealt with by someone with limited contact with project management techniques, whereas larger, risky, projects can demand certification (PMI's PMP and PRINCE2 are mentioned). Chapman & Ward (2011) warned against adopting "one size fits all" procedures, but rather adapting them to different project and organisational contexts, stressing that "this kind of formal process must not be a source of restriction, but a facilitator of intelligent, skilful, creative and cost effective analysis and management of uncertainty" (p. 102).

Despite reporting limited research on the actual use and effect of project management best practices (or standards), including those pertaining with risk management, Papke-Shields et. al (2010) found widely varying usage of practices and differences in use depending on the context of the project, consistent with the principle of tailoring. The results suggest that the differentiating practices are not necessarily the most frequently used. The authors associated risk-related actions with success: quantitative risk analysis is related to achieving technical specifications, quality requirements and client satisfaction. Besides, understanding potential risks' probabilities and developing response plans prepare the organisation to complete the projects as close to planned as possible.

This was supported by Zwikael & Ahn (2011), who explored the effectiveness of risk management practices in reducing project risk, based on a survey involving 701 project managers and their supervisors in several industries and countries (including Israel). The results show that project context (namely the level of uncertainty avoidance) and risk management play a significant role in project success, indicating that even moderate risk management planning is sufficient to mitigate the negative impact of risk on projects, a clearer portrayal of benefits than Raz et al. (2002) had found.

Comparing oil and gas in Norway with the construction and technology sectors, Karlsen et al. (2013) suggested that complexity is key to determine project risk management and specifically which tools to use. They considered it more relevant than culture or industry – even if some tools provide greater benefits in some industries than others. Irrespective of complexity, the authors supported the view that proactive strategies outperform interactive or reactive ones, enabling the exploitation of opportunities. Thakur (2019) also stressed the importance of proactive, continuous, and tailored risk management. Project managers acknowledged in interviews that, even if risk identification is initially conducted, often the review is done only after something goes awry, instead of continuously. Besides, the cost of risk treatment can't be incurred beyond a reasonable limit – therefore one must accept the risks and create adequate risk reserves. Yet, the author cautioned against solely focusing on risks and the building of extensive risk reserves, as this can lead to higher project costs and potential unviability.

Surveying 87 US project managers in several sectors (48% of which from non-profits or the government), Anantatmula and Fan (2013) found that these professionals associate project risk with cost and time rather than with scope. The writers stated that it is not so much the organisation type but rather its project management maturity that influences risk management strategy. The authors denoted a lack of formal approach to risk management, stating that "as projects are time bound, organisations may prefer contingency budget rather than making efforts to build a formalised risk management" (p. 38). After contingency funds, insurance is the preferred project risk management tool. While helpful, this reflects absence of systematic risk planning, as practitioners use such tools due to the lack of a priori cost-benefit analysis of risk responses. The authors recommend that managers define success, namely criteria and stakeholders' tolerance regarding variation around them.

Regarding the relationship between risk management and project success or failure, Carvalho & Junior (2015) argued that the findings of many studies regarding its impact have been controversial. They suggested that one of the reasons might be the type of project, which can affect its performance and the effectiveness of project management practices; and the other might be the neglect of relevant aspects in uncertainty management, like stakeholders' soft skills.

The somewhat detached approach to risk management that comes out from some of these sources is, in a way, consistent with the standards. For instance, right from the first phase in the risk management life cycle ("Plan Risk Management"), PMI's Standard for Risk Management states:

The feasibility of risk management planning is dependent upon the features of the organisation in which it is carried out. The rules and guidelines defined in the risk management plan reflect (a) the culture of the organisation, (b) its capabilities regarding people and facilities, and (c) its values, goals, and objectives. (PMI, 2019, p. 30)

Regarding tailoring and scaling the risk management plan, this standard also stresses the importance of the organisation's process maturity and several adaptable elements, such as available resources, tools and techniques used, review and update frequency, or reporting requirements.

2.3.3. Limitations and uncertainty

Applying the seminal work of Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky to risk management, Tysiak (2018) argued that risk management requires human judgement, which is often influenced and distorted by individual perceptions. He concluded that risk management involves everyone in the project, not just specialists, defending simplicity and clear understanding of cause-effect relationships. Willumsen et al. (2019) stated furthermore that risk management is widely used in projects under the assumption that it adds value, but since value is subjective, stakeholders' perceptions are important in determining the effectiveness of project risk management practices. Therefore, these perceptions should be taken into account when tailoring risk management to specific contexts.

This is followed by Green & Dikmen (2022, p. 620), who were critical of the “dominant narrative of risk as objective fact”, disagreeing that it can be scientifically analysed according to generic principles. The findings of their focus groups indicated that practitioners are influenced by published methodologies, but also draw on their own experiences and incorporate various narratives, creating a hybridised and workable approach to project risk management. The authors suggested that the role of traditional project risk management techniques, rarely used in practice, is primarily symbolic in the self-identities of risk managers. They proposed a less restrictive “Soft Project Risk Management” as an alternative narrative, but participants were reluctant to accept it – due to their own self-identities, the authors claimed, since participants must maintain legitimacy in the eyes of different audiences.

Perhaps this relates with the difference between uncertainty and risk⁸ that began to be recognised by the project management community in the late 1990s (Morris, 2013). Hazır & Ulusoy (2020) presented a classification scheme based on uncertainty sources in project management, and suggested investigating multiple sources of uncertainty, their relationships and developing models to deal with combined sources, which would help address the concerns expressed by Green & Dikmen (2022).

Likewise, other authors recognise the limitations of risk management. Chapman & Ward (2011) warned that common practice risk management processes have shortcomings that limit their effectiveness, such as inflexibility, unclear motivations, inappropriate level of detail, overemphasis on events rather than composite uncertainty, deficient structured view, unclear ownership, inefficient quantification, inadequate evaluation, absence of iterative process and lack of clear objectives.

Though acknowledging the benefits of automation based on historical data to reduce human variability as a source of error, Turner and Kutsch (2015) warned against blind adherence to traditional risk management principles and advocated context awareness, critical thinking and willingness to act offhand within a pre-set framework (the authors used jazz as a metaphor). Trickey (2018) distinguished an “objective” approach (quantitative assessment procedures adopted to deal with exposure to risk factors, their probability, and likely impact on project aims) from a “subjective” approach that accounts for personal risk disposition. He argued that it is counterproductive to focus only on the former and points out the growing emphasis on project members participation and risk leadership in standards.

⁸ As Donald Rumsfeld famously put it in 2002, “unknown unknowns”.

Olechowski et al. (2016) admitted that risk management practices remain ad hoc and non-standardised, but defended that this happens because a one-size-fits-all approach is wrong. They argue that ISO 31000's principles have the potential to universal applicability precisely because of their flexibility. Even regarding financial firms, where a highly technical approach is the norm, Pidun et al. (2017) stated that risk management must not be seen as a bureaucratic requirement but as a value-creating activity, and pointed out that it is an art as much as science. The principles the authors identified touch the importance of a risk-aware culture in all the organisation, the value of transparency and general grasp of probabilities rather than precise metrics. This echoes Chapman (2014), who stated that, like the delivery of quality and safety, risk management is the responsibility of everyone. Aven (2018) argued that the science of risk analysis extends beyond traditional scientific method principles, approaches, and methods: for example, risk assessment does not have explanatory power in highly uncertain settings – in this case one should resort to generated knowledge on how to conceptualise, assess, characterise, communicate, and manage risk in these types of instances.

2.3.4. Wide application of risk in the context of the arts

Irrespective of its effectiveness, unsurprisingly risk management is well represented in the arts. The growth in art market values and the expansion of large-scale exhibition activity increased the need for improved risk management practices (Pfeffer, 1972). The author pointed how works of art are prone to loss or damage due to their high unit value, fragility, including sensitivity to movement. Their authenticity and originality are valued, and their irreplaceability makes exposure to hazards like fraud or inadequate care particularly harmful. Pfeffer listed three categories of loss: (i) Frequent small losses occurring when artworks are exposed to transportation hazards; (ii) Less frequent severe individual losses arising from theft, vandalism, or other damage; and (iii) Low frequent catastrophic losses arising from concentrations of values at exhibitions, which is the insurance industry's chief concern⁹.

There are many references to this sort of “conventional” risk in art institutions – in order to display the art, they have to keep it safe. In fact, ICOM defines a museum as “a *not-for-profit*, permanent institution in the service of society that researches, collects, *conserves*, interprets and *exhibits* tangible and intangible heritage (...)”¹⁰.

⁹ To illustrate, the co-curator of the largest gathering of Vermeer ever showcased in Amsterdam's Rijksmuseum, “declines to say exactly how much the show cost, other than to note that exhibitions usually amount to “several millions” and that “insurance costs were high” (surely an understatement)” (Tarmy, 2023).

¹⁰ New museum definition approved in 2022 in the Extraordinary General Assembly of ICOM (ICOM, 2022).

One of the main themes in the literature is the safety and security¹¹ of works of art (usually in permanent collections), as evidenced by whole journals and manuals dedicated to it¹². With various levels of detail, from individual artworks to whole organisations, it features risk analysis abundantly, for instance in the context of cultural heritage, dealing with extreme weather events, or managing collections.

One can find risk in further contexts, for example regarding the artists and visitors, or the nonprofit character of cultural entities. Yet, this review found scarce application of a holistic risk management framework specifically in the context of organising art exhibitions. The consulted arts manuals¹³, reviewed in Appendix A, do not provide a risk management framework within the context of the organisation of temporary exhibitions. By and large, risk management, if mentioned, is primarily linked with the safety and security of the works of art, whether in temporary or permanent exhibitions; it often doesn't address other risk types (e.g. commercial); and is focused on negative risks.

Out of these manuals, Matassa's (2014) handbook for *Organising Exhibitions* has the most "managerial" perspective in the manuals consulted and deserves a closer look, as, though lacking an integrated risk management framework, it deals with temporary art exhibitions from a project management perspective. The author provided a few examples of (negative) specific risks while organising exhibitions and calls for them to be identified from the outset, so that they can be managed effectively and don't become problems. Matassa likened an exhibition to a temporary project, outlining the classic project management five phases (Initiating, Planning, Executing, Monitoring and Controlling, Closing). She outlined exhibitions in five phases: Idea generation, Evaluation and development, Planning, Implementation (including loaning and transporting the works, installing, opening, maintaining, and closing the exhibition), and Review. The writer emphasised as usual pitfalls flawed planning and monitoring, also stressing the importance of effective communication.

¹¹ Usually safety stands for accident avoidance, and security for crime prevention.

¹² For example, the International Journal of Conservation Science, Journal of the Institute of Conservation, Studies in Conservation, or Journal of Art Crime.

¹³ *Running a Museum: a Practical Handbook* (Boylan, 2004) and the companion Trainer's Manual (Boylan & Woollard, 2006), published by the ICOM; *Arts Management* (Chong, 2010); *Museum Collections Management* (Matassa, 2011); *Exhibitions: Concept, Planning and Design* (Klobe 2012); *Museum Exhibition, Planning and Design* (Bogle 2013); *Organising Exhibitions* (Matassa, 2014); *Creating Exhibitions: Collaboration in the Planning, Development, and Design of Innovative Experiences* (McKenna-Cress & Kamien, 2013); *Curator's Handbook* (George, 2015); *Guide to Risk Management of Cultural Heritage* (Pedersoli et al., 2016); *Companion to Arts Management* (Byrnes & Brkić, 2020); *Museum Management: Opportunities and Threats for Successful Museums* (Půček et al., 2021); and *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* (Piacente, 2022).

In comparison to permanent exhibitions, a particular risk issue in temporary exhibitions is artwork transportation, as any movement can place collections at risk (Cross & Flynn, 2003; Papadimitriou & Vamvakari, 2008). Drawing on a travelling exhibition as a case study, the first paper provided advice to ensure the safe delivery and display of works of art, regardless of the exhibition's theme. The authors defended that loans require careful planning and clear scope definition since its inception. They counselled the use of guidelines incorporating lessons learned, stakeholder involvement, alternatives analysis, the use of couriers¹⁴ and transport outsourcing. The second paper's authors argued that cultural entities in Greece are unmindful of this risk and proposed improvements in the organisation and planning of transportation procedures. Considering natural hazards and security threats, Cannon-Brookes (1995) emphasised careful handling, responsible couriers and transport safety to decrease risk. He noted that curatorship and conservation decisions are often clouded by reasons unrelated to cultural gains, and urged professionals to adopt new approaches and be willing to compromise on everything except the well-being of the objects. Examining a traveling exhibition with a sustainability angle, Galán-Pérez et al. (2020) identified gaps in implementation of protocols and set forth the need to create a risk management database.

As noticed, safety and security are a key concern. The trade-off between art preservation (conservation) and public access (exhibition) has been known for a long time (Ward, 1986)¹⁵. Authors such as Gallardo-Frías & Mairesse (2021) or Runhovde (2021) also reflected on the link between public access and the security of collections. The latter pointed that the combination of an emphasis on accessibility and art mediation with risk unawareness and lack of funding have compromised security in the museums she studied. She strived for a new balance between security and exhibition, in a compromise that fosters the development of preventive measures, while avoiding over-securitisation. This field is in constant change, as attested by the recent growth of art vandalism by climate activists (Kinyon et al., 2023). For the questioned art professionals by Manners et al. (2016), safety is also the third most important critical success factor for a visual art exhibition. This pertains here to the audience rather than the works of art, meaning for instance security staff, evacuation plans and cleaning of hygienic facilities.

In another perspective, Shindell (2016) argued that museum professionals should recognise the changing landscape of art provenance and title risks, including regarding exhibition lending, and incrementally and proactively mitigate the risks (transfer to third parties, by insurance or other means).

¹⁴ "The courier (...) is responsible for the care of the object during the journey and/or during installation", (Matassa, 2014, p. 236).

¹⁵ According to Ward (1986), for curators "the conservator is typecast as an interfering nuisance with a negative attitude" (p. 53).

Furthermore, risk management in a cultural institution can be understood in the perspective of visitors, past the damage they could cause or suffer while visiting. Using a case study of two Australian museums, against the backdrop of “culture wars” in an ambiguous setting, Ryan (2017) pointed out that museums risk patronising behaviour and “dumbing down” content to engage a broader audience, suggesting these institutions should transition from “legislator” to “facilitators” of art. In a broader sense, the author argued that risk is always relative, and both the internal situation and the context must be considered in managing it.

Other (arguably the most important) stakeholders are the artists themselves: for example, Chang & Wyszomirski (2015), Vecco (2020), and Woronkowicz (2021) highlighted the risk-taking mindset of the artists, dubbed “artpreneurs”, mentioning creativity, market and career risks, and the role of leveraging opportunities in art creation. The role of creativity in the arts is well-illustrated by art galleries’ operation between cultural and commercial constraints: they should create risk, by supporting struggling or neglected artists (Peterson, 1997). Notwithstanding this risk acceptance, cultural organisations must balance their “high” cultural aims with “low” commercial (or financially sustainable) constraints. Lazzaro & Picchi (2023) identified risk and vulnerability as a main theme for art galleries. While underscoring commercial concerns specific to galleries (such as the limited number of collectors or consignment vs owned artworks sale), the acknowledgement of the uncertainty of art valuation mirrors the uncertainty over (especially contemporary) art acceptance by the audiences.

Letts et al. (1997) remarked that risk management is the biggest difference between very profit-oriented venture capital firms and foundations: VC expects a big payoff from a few investments and aims to protect itself from the rest of project failures, whereas foundations are more worried about not spending enough than losing money, so officers feel little pressure regarding weak performance of their projects and do not have to implement the same controls. Conversely, Wasilewski (2014) noted the peculiar nature of cultural organisations – for instance, two exhibitions of the same artist might reinforce, rather than harm one other. Yet they operate in the market economy and face increasing competition and declining sources of income, which should push them to analyse risk to reach better decisions. Nevertheless, the entity he studied lacked formalised risk analysis processes, and managers had low awareness of risk factors and basic risk analysis tools, so the author recommended outsourcing. Tomastik et al. (2020) also diagnosed a grim view of risk management in museums of the Czech Republic: it is inadequate and not implemented in most of them. Focusing on the vulnerability of unique collections to the exposure to disasters¹⁶, the authors defended the application of common-sense principles of risk management, as it makes its comprehension and implementation more likely.

¹⁶ But additionally listing neglect of administration as a common risk.

An additional feature of risk in cultural organisations is related with the coexistence of permanent with temporary traits, for instance the conservation of a permanent collection and the display of temporary exhibitions, wholly or partially based on it (Benghozi, 2006; Pauget et al., 2023). In this respect, continuous and effective risk management is seen as tool that enables the fulfilment of the aim of conservation of art with lower cost and damage, while allowing higher quality in activities that it supports (e.g. exhibitions with well conserved works of art, more knowledge retained, enhanced digital access) (Tomás-Hernandez, 2021; Van der Made, 2021). Pisarek (2023) pointed that temporary exhibitions reshape museums, ensuring the sustainability of knowledge in a changing environment.

Lastly, the relevance of risk management is demonstrated by the impact of Covid-19 in the cultural sector, and the abundance of risk-related papers in the arts in its wake (e.g. Bernardi, 2022; Frost, 2021; Hoffmann et al., 2022; ICOM, 2021; Jurčišinová et al., 2022; Labrador, 2021; Maciuk et al., 2022; Mackay, 2021; Prokůpek et al., 2023; Werner et al., 2022). Considerations range from physical adaptations in art display (e.g. one way corridors, bigger spaces) to a marked increase in digital strategies (when teams had IT skills), from the alteration of visitors' experiences (keenly aware of the Anthropocene) to considerations regarding business models (e.g. relevance of crowdfunding or "blockbusters"), and especially an increased awareness of risk, as cited by a respondent in Mackay (2021, p.18): "I think what this shows us is that massive things can happen, that our crises are not all going to be a fire in a boiler room, or a theft of an artwork, or something that's scalable. It's going to be something that brings your whole company to the brink".

2.4. Art Exhibitions and Risk

This review didn't find many references to risk management within the context of temporary art exhibitions, perhaps partially related with the reluctance of mixing arts and management terminologies (Macdonnell & Bereson, 2020; Massi & Piancatelli, 2020), although several relevant issues come up. Aside from their "managerial" jargon, approaches from project or event management do not foresee idiosyncrasies of exhibitions (such as creativity's role in scope, the meaning of art losses, or the not-for-profit ethos), and hence would likely not be embraced by cultural professionals.

For instance, Silvers's (2008) comprehensive guide *Risk Management for Meetings and Events* included (corporate) exhibitions, but art isn't mentioned. After presenting the role of risk management and tools, the author divided its scope in compliance, health and safety, loss prevention and security and emergency preparedness – issues also covered in other publications about the organisation of art exhibitions. This was followed by organisational (administrative, communications and marketing) and operational safeguards (programme design, site, and attendee management).

It appears that the realms of management of the arts, particularly of temporary exhibitions, and risk in a project environment are apart, at least in a formal, structured way. A project is a very encompassing term, suiting both a temporary art exhibition and the construction of a nuclear powerplant. The focus on event management would narrow the field, but under the word “event” an art exhibition can still co-exist with a Coldplay concert or a pig farming fair. Not only are the themes, but also the aims and traits are different, reducing similarities in their risk management.

Creativity in arts projects makes their scope uncertain. Therefore, risk is larger than in other fields, and organisations must accept it to some degree (Selwood et al., 2018). These authors queried South Australian funding bodies and art managers in various fields (visual art, music, theatre, opera, festivals and circus) through an online survey, to which 20 answered, followed by four in-depth interviews. Their research was based on an entire project management framework, including a risk management section. They found that risk management was used both for threats and opportunities, and advised pre-emptive action and strong risk planning. Selwood and her colleagues argued that PMBOK is more applicable in risk management (along with cost, time and communication) than remaining areas.

Museums often possess a permanent collection; yet (or due to it) temporary exhibitions provide an indispensable way for institutions to engage in new discourse, being thus particularly exposed to change (Piacente & Molineux, 2022). These exhibitions offer the chance to avoid permanent collection restrictions and allow professionals to “demonstrate their artistic creativity and sense of innovation, and possibly to raise controversy - aspects which are highly valued by museum people for their own sake, but also because it is beneficial for their careers” (Frey & Meier, 2006, p. 1041). Seeing exhibitions as (unique) projects makes risk management segregation impossible, given the interweaving of activities. Therefore "core risk management has to be performed by the personnel involved in the project itself", not only for the sake of agility but also due to risk's ubiquitousness (Tysiak, 2018, p. 5).

Nevertheless, references of risk in the arts are mostly focused, namely in safety and security (with insurance being often used as a response plan), used more often in its traditional (negative) sense, and not analysed in a systematic framework within the context of organising a temporary art exhibition. This research will attempt to confirm that and suggest added-value ways to address risk management within the organisation of art exhibitions.

3. Methodology

This research is based on the collection of secondary data through a literature review. Based on these data, primary data was collected through semi-structured in-depth individual interviews with professionals involved in organising temporary art exhibitions in Portuguese cultural institutions. In the discussion chapter, field data is set against data collected in the literature review.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the primary method to gain an in-depth understanding of risk management practices directly from field professionals, addressing the gaps identified in the literature review. For instance, the perceived differences in terminology in the arts sector vis-à-vis project management¹⁷ were considered. An example of this is the clarification of PMI's definition of risk from the beginning. This qualitative approach provides the necessary flexibility and depth to capture the nuances of applying risk management standards across different cultural contexts.

Participants were selected based on their experience within Portuguese cultural institutions that organise temporary exhibitions. The selection process adhered to a convenience sampling criterion due to the limited access to professionals specialised in this area. Although this approach limits geographical representation, it offers valuable insights pertinent within the national context.

Data triangulation was employed to contextualise the interview findings within a broader framework. The interviews were integrated with the analysis of secondary data, including literature on risk management or institutional reports. Prior to the interview, some publicly available data on the interviewees (age, education, position) and the organisation (perceived size, recent exhibitions) was gathered, when possible.

The interviews followed a script covering the following broad issues:

1. Context of exhibitions: why does the institution execute temporary exhibitions, and what are the key aspects of its' organisational structure.
2. Risk procedures: following risk standard structures, what is done regarding risk planning, identification, analysis, response and monitoring.
3. Overview: which aspects and phases does the respondent find more relevant in risk management, and examples of negative and positive risks (i.e. opportunities) that ended up occurring.

¹⁷ For instance, Selwood et al. (2018, p. 205) stated "Terminology used in project management may not be fully understood by arts managers, influencing the way in which survey respondents and interviewees may have responded".

There were some follow-up questions on relevant topics as each interview progressed. The interviews were recorded¹⁸, but anonymity was guaranteed, and therefore no names shall be revealed. Qualitative data analysis was conducted through thematic coding, identifying emerging patterns and categories from the interview transcripts. Coding was performed manually, with the assistance of software to facilitate the categorisation of data.

The qualitative interviews were conducted online, telephonically or in-person throughout the first semester of 2024. The 12 individuals work or worked in 11 different institutions, but occasionally referred to more than one institution in their answers. Their ages range from 30ies to 70ies (one of them is retired), three of which under 40, two over 60, and the rest in between. Their positions include museographic technicians, curators, conservators, and directors. Broadly speaking, half are involved mainly in curatorial tasks, three in the production of exhibitions and three work as directors. It should be noted that in most institutions there is some degree of juxtaposition between the professions, i.e., a conservator might become the curator or the production responsible of an exhibition. Furthermore, the experience in this type of projects differs not only with age, but also with the degree of involvement in the organisation of temporary art exhibitions. It could vary according to the functions each individual performs, as well as the frequency and complexity of these exhibitions in the institution. Based on this a subjective classification can be made: three respondents are perceived as having low, three as having medium, and six as having high experience. As to training, the level is high, and several participants have studied in several fields. Eight have studied history or archaeology; five have studied specifically museology or arts; two have studied architecture; and two have studied marketing, in addition to their studies in museology.

Half of the institutions are based in Lisbon; the rest are spread throughout Portugal. Half of them focus on contemporary art, the remaining on heritage and classical art. All but three possess permanent collections, with temporary exhibitions representing variable degrees of relevance in their activity. Their mission statements include the preservation and display of their heritage and permanent collections, the advancement and promotion of contemporary art and artists, the support of research and dissemination of knowledge, and personal and social change through the arts. The organisations range from niche and regional entities to some of the country's largest museums. The number of foreign visitors is substantial and has been rising, especially in the Lisbon based museums. Besides presenting exhibitions, the majority of them provide related programming, for example mediation and visits, catalogues, conferences, and other shows. All institutions organise more than one exhibition per year, of various dimensions.

¹⁸ Except one due to technical issues.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Context

Regarding the purpose of organising temporary exhibitions, ten out of the 12 respondents emphasised the link between the exhibitions and their context, mainly the permanent collections¹⁹, but also the rest of the organisation to which they belong, e.g. other facilities such as libraries or gardens, or within a wider activity of the affiliated entity, like a municipality. They state that temporary exhibitions offer a way of reinterpreting permanent collections, in new, more contemporary ways, allowing for instance in-depth handling of specific themes, new readings through the combination of different works of art, or unveiling art usually stocked in reserves. While the presentation of art and artists was alluded to, only three respondents specifically mentioned exhibitions as a way of attracting new visitors and/or retaining existing ones.

Given the abovementioned “permanent” context, it wasn’t surprising that most interviewees underlined the flexibility that these exhibitions allow. One interviewee stated:

The permanent exhibition is a bit monolithic in character, i.e., it is locked in time and doesn’t have versatility in the sense that we can’t change the content quickly or easily. Temporary exhibitions give us this versatility: the possibility of working on themes that are already covered in the permanent exhibition, but in a summarised way, or on other themes that are not covered.

All of the aims of exhibitions identified by Piacente & Molineux (2022) were mentioned²⁰, except co-creation with the public and additional revenue generation – indeed, financial motivations were barely hinted at, with the exception of one respondent who signalled that travelling exhibitions allowed partial fixed cost sharing between participants; and by one interviewee whose institution delivers bespoke cultural projects on a turnkey basis. For this respondent, temporary exhibitions (and associated events) constitute her core business; conversely, another stated that they aren’t central to her institution, but rather the care and sharing of the permanent collection.

In what regards organisation, several necessary functions were identified by the surveyed, some of which repeatedly. These functions might be rendered in-house or outsourced; and if internal they can be performed either directly or by shared services departments.

Ten respondents mentioned the existence of adjacent cultural equipment (e.g. a permanent collection). These institutions have a security department that takes an integrated approach to the

¹⁹ The remaining two work in organisations that do not possess a permanent collection.

²⁰ Namely encouraging repeat visitation and maintaining loyalty; bringing otherwise inaccessible works to the audience; interpret the permanent collection and unveil the stored items; and develop partnerships.

security of works of art against theft or damage, as well as the safety of the public in the event of an emergency. This department often relies (partially) on outsourcing for manpower.

Transport and insurance were touched upon by all 12 interviewees as essential aspects that are always outsourced. Production and curatorial work are usually done in-house, but production may be shared within the organisation, and guest curators may be invited (one respondent indicated that her museum relies on them as a rule). Conservation is an ongoing concern and is usually carried out in-house, although three respondents mentioned outsourcing specialist work, when lacking in-house expertise. Other relevant in-house functions were communications, procurement, and legal services.

These findings suggest a number of ideas. First, make-or-buy decisions and the existence of shared services vary across entities and exhibitions. For instance, in the presence of a permanent collection, the security department would continue to function even in the absence of temporary exhibitions – hence there’s already a framework in place to deal with issues also faced by temporary exhibitions, which can be adapted if necessary. For example, a metal detector at the building entrance may already exist to mitigate some risks, which can be supplemented with extra guards when particularly valuable works are on show. However, it is critical to retain risk management at the project level, otherwise it might misfit the exhibition (Tysiak, 2018).

Second, none of the inquired people has a single source of resources, calling instead upon a mix of internal resources, shared services within the wider organisation and external suppliers. This complexity makes communication key, an aspect mentioned by Matassa (2014) and additional authors. For instance, shared services imply competition with further internal clients: an exhibition promotion may be subordinate to the whole organisation’s communication agenda. In another example, the involvement of external companies implies loss of control and possible grey areas, if responsibilities aren’t clear²¹. Another example is the interdependence of decisions, such as reducing the number of guards from the security department with the use of ample areas with high visibility or alarmed display cases (included in the exhibition’s budget), which can affect visitors. These decisions thus influence each other and imply different costs and risk levels.

Third, these different profiles and objectives suggest different degrees of dependency on temporary exhibitions: for some organisations programming is ancillary to the permanent collection, whereas for others it may be their sole aim. One reason for the pull towards permanence as to do with the “concern to spread risk (to avoid depending on the ups and downs of one project)” (Benghozi, 2006, p. 75). The impact of failure or success, however defined, is therefore different across institutions, according to where they locate in this permanent/temporary nexus.

²¹ For instance, even “nail-to-nail” artwork transport insurance might duplicate costs (Cannon-Brookes, 1995).

4.2. Risk management procedures

The next findings relate to risk management procedures, following Chapman & Ward (2011) and Tysiak (2018) “macro-phases” Planning, Identification, Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis, Response, and Monitoring, and comparing them with the key success factors of Project Management Institute’s Standard for Risk Management (PMI, 2019).

4.2.1. Planning

Regarding planning, nobody alluded to measurable risk thresholds reflecting the organisation’s risk appetite, nor general rules for defining high or low impacts and probabilities needed to estimate and compare the exposition’s overall risk with the acceptable exposure for the entity. There was scant reference (in any phase) to the techniques listed in PMI’s (2019) Standard Appendix X6 – the exception being checklists, embodied in existing standards. Yet several respondents mentioned general rules that apply to all exhibitions on specific topics, either by their teams or by other (specialised) departments. For instance, eight interviewees referred insuring all works of art as a general rule; seven resort to specialised artworks transportation companies; seven referred the existence of general evacuation plans, usually designed for the whole organisation (namely permanent collections) and under the responsibility of security departments; and six mentioned additional general procedures beyond those related to insurance, transport and safety plans.

This reflects how these respondents thought primarily in terms of “production” (transporting, assembling and dismantling the exhibition) and “operation” (keeping the works of art and visitors safe during the exhibition) when thinking about risk. However, one interviewee pointed out that in her mind “in most regional museums and cultural centres, [risk management] is not a very widespread practice”, so it’s understandable that there is no framework in place in these institutions, given that the activity itself is still incipient. Nobody explicitly referred tailoring general rules e.g. to the exhibition’s size, complexity or strategic importance, but some considerations are worth mentioning.

All inquired referred directly or indirectly to the conservation/exhibition trade-off, suggesting that it would be useful for institutions to clarify their position, which would provide a priori guidance to curators managing this conflict in the production of each exhibition. One interviewee proposed a golden rule: take more risk if the artist is alive (and therefore able to weigh in and repair the work if necessary). The same respondent admitted that this still raises some questions, e.g. about property rights (the owner might have a different risk appetite), or even moral issues²². Echoing Lindqvist (2003), five respondents (all working with contemporary art) emphasised their high risk appetite in dealing

²² According to legend, Virgil’s dying wish was for the Aeneid to be burned, but his request was – fortunately – overruled by Augustus.

with the uncertain. They noted how works of art are often commissioned specifically for an exhibition and even produced in situ, particularly given the ephemeral and sudden nature of contemporary practices (e.g. live performances). Furthermore, some risks are expected, for instance reputational risk is inherent when working in politically charged environments.

There was also a universal recognition of the frequent involvement of multiple stakeholders, both internal and external, which allows for specialisation but risks misalignment throughout the project. In this respect, the inquired gave many examples of written commitments (especially with external parties) that define general rules and clarify responsibilities (e.g. insurance contracts). Some of these stakeholders can increase risk, namely artists, but also for instance local associations – nonetheless, the institution's goals may be precisely to work with them.

One of PMI's (2019) key success factors in this phase is stakeholder acceptance. While the broad rules (not necessarily written) and the existence of departments specialising in important areas denote that risk management is relevant, the absence of a visible and formal plan may leave some of the participants unaware of their role and unsure of how to act in the absence of a "compass". PMI also pointed out the need to align constraints and priorities and to balance the cost or effort with the benefits of risk management. This is probably a reason why respondents focus primarily on works of art, against the backdrop of limited resources and flexibility that exists in public institutions.

Lastly, the risk management plan should reflect the organisation's culture, its capabilities in terms of people and facilities, and its objectives. There were many mentions to the caretaking of works of art, relating with the objective of preserving it, but fewer references to the aim of attracting visitors to see the art. Perhaps this is because many of the respondents focus on "production" and perceive visitor attraction as "operation", or interpret this side of the work as "managerialism" contrary to simply providing a public service (the dilemma alluded to by Ryan, 2017). Yet, these institutions have (implicit if not explicit) non-financial visitor objectives, and the choices made in production will influence them. Another example is the risk of programme misalignment: the personal (subjective) choices of the programme-makers may not correspond to the organisation's strategy, even if known and accepted, in line with Frey & Meier's (2006) statement. Perhaps the programme is not keeping up with new trends in contemporary art, e.g. by not including new artistic languages such as graffiti, or local artists off the beaten track. Or, since there is great latitude in the choice of pieces and their arrangement, the specific choices in each exhibition may lead to undesirable outcomes.

Conversely, the capabilities should also be considered: for example, one respondent explained how the programming pace can be too fast for the teams to produce the exhibitions while managing risk. This interviewee pointed the clash between the top management's desire to show new exhibitions, and the production's time requirements. The argument for production is that more time reduces uncertainty (including financial) and stress for the team. So, either (human, financial)

resources ought to be increased, or the pace reduced, or the production adjusted, e.g. by widening public attendance to the installation phase, thereby increasing display time (as the respondent suggested) or by adapting processes and scope to make production simpler and faster.

4.2.2. Identification

All in all, identification is done on a case-by-case basis, without recourse to formal, overarching risk matrices. Seven interviewees indicated that risks are identified ad hoc, often in response to specific events. These risks can affect the rest of the organisation, such as theft and damage. However, six respondents mentioned specific standards and guidelines, notably condition and facility reports.

These reports²³ are well established in the sector. Among other cited standards (namely Ibermuseus and ICOM), *Museus e Monumentos de Portugal* provides a condition report that records the main conservation problems and damage to individual pieces. The facilities report is a 12-page checklist including sections on the physical conditions of the building, specific exhibition venue and storage; transport, arrival, reception and packaging of works; conservation and restoration; environmental and lighting conditions; fire protection; safety; and insurance.

Although no respondent mentioned a formal process embodied in a written risks list (broken down by cause, event and consequence), risk identification is often done informally, usually by one or more departments, resorting to tools such as the designated reports. Setting them up against PMI (2019), they are early (these reports are filled out a priori), workable and provide a shared language, even with external stakeholders. However, they are not comprehensive, often contain issues, and might not enable iterative but rather one-off interactions, failing to incorporate emergent risks and lessons learned (which is challenging for fixed standard checklists). Chapman & Ward (2011) identified further shortcomings, including ignoring interdependencies and prioritisation (especially in long lists), insufficient flexibility for specific projects, and a simplistic overview that disregards omitted items and does not foster a sophisticated attitude towards uncertainty. The authors warn “if any kind of “checklist” is used it should be referred to as a “prompt list”, and used in that spirit as a catalyst and stimulant, not as a definitive statement of possibilities” (p. 193). The reports also do not explicitly cover opportunities (contrary to Selwood et al., 2018, who found that risk management was used both for threats and opportunities²⁴). The answers tended to focus on technical and material threats, rather than financial, organisation or legal threats, nor opportunities (Půček et al., 2021).

Another relevant finding is the fact that nine interviewees explicitly alluded to stakeholder involvement in this step, as this is vital to ensure a broad perspective and promote ownership (PMI,

²³ Matassa’s (2014) definitions are stated in Appendix A.

²⁴ Yet, one interviewee indicated that opportunities were discovered too late to capitalise on them.

2019). In most cases they meant the security team (e.g. identifying particularly valuable or fragile works with the security team), but other stakeholders as well, such as the facilities team (including cleaning services) or artists who are producing the works in situ. One respondent even remarked she resorted to external, informal, networks to identify emergent risks, stating "In Portugal we are beyond formal networks: we ended up crossing paths in different circumstances, more social than professional. That's why I would say we have a friendlier relationship [than abroad]".

Finally, seeing as the process is rather informal, though based in recognised standards, lessons learned are gathered irregularly. One respondent explained how arriving in the institution and being at once immersed in the preparation of an exhibition, he felt rather helpless in trying to understand the different roles and stakeholders. Rather than follow written procedures, he strived to connect informally with the stakeholders he felt were key to understanding the project, namely the production team. While this sort of communication is effective, it makes continuous improvement less robust.

4.2.3. Qualitative and quantitative analysis

PMI (2019) states: "Qualitative risk analysis evaluates the importance of each risk in order to categorise and prioritise individual risk for further attention" (p. 33). *Stricto sensu*, nobody carried out this step as envisaged. This is unsurprising since there was no record of formal integrated risk identification. Even so, this does not mean that risk prioritisation does not take place, albeit unconsciously.

When asked about how they prioritise risks, seven interviewees cited artwork protection against damage and theft as the chief concern. As one respondent said regarding the conservation/display trade-off, "the work of art has the final say" – the exhibition team mediates as a kind of Pythia. Four interviewees mentioned furthermore the importance of deadlines, especially after the opening dates have been announced to the public, to avoid reputational damage.

The consideration of characteristics such as probability and impact, but also causes and effects, relationships with other risks, or timings, is a both a means and an end of qualitative analysis. Although there was no evidence of a wide array of risks being considered, implicitly it seems that respondents are primarily concerned either with the likelihood or the impact of risks affecting works of art. It should be noted that certain risks (e.g. theft, fire) can have very different likelihoods (e.g. it's easier to steal a piece of jewellery than a large painting) or impacts (e.g. drawings are more easily damaged than stone statues). This sort of evaluation appears natural to experienced professionals, even if not necessarily written. Alternative considerations are even harder: one interviewee explained that her organisation was in the process of identifying priority works (that could be shown in either permanent or temporary exhibitions) and planning tailored strategies with other stakeholders (e.g. security teams, fire brigade) to ensure that those works are secured first in emergency situations. Another respondent mentioned how a foreign lender's request (standard on their side) made her reconsider the ranking of earthquake

risk. This notwithstanding, in the absence of an agreed approach and definitions of risk terms, the same perceived categories of impact and probability may mean different things for the participants, causing biased results; and the lack of a formal framework spur an incidental rather than iterative analysis.

Quantitative risk analysis was even less acknowledged. It “provides insight into the combined effect of identified risks on the desired outcome. This process takes into account probabilistic or component-wide effects, such as correlation between risks, interdependency, and feedback loops. It provides an indication of the degree of overall risk faced by the portfolio, program or project”, and the results allow for the establishment of contingency reserves (PMI, 2019, p. 34). The fact that there is no quantitative analysis providing the comprehensive estimation of an overall quantified risks does not mean that there are no quantitative assessments: for example, certain levels of humidity or luminosity are known to be damaging, and hence trigger certain actions. Since technical specifications, quality requirements and client satisfaction seem somewhat diffuse, perhaps professionals find the step less relevant (Papke-Shields et al., 2010). This is also in line with Wasilewski’s (2014) case study’s findings of unsatisfactory risk analysis. Nevertheless, significantly there isn’t any measure of overall risk, which would imply mindfulness of risk interdependency and the establishment of risk-based contingency reserves (so these are estimated case by case). Anyhow, PMI (2019) stresses the importance of collecting reliable risk data through appropriate models and technical skills, in order to understand interrelationships between risks and achieve the objectives of quantitative risk analysis.

4.2.4. Response

Regarding risk response or treatment, PMI (2019) considers avoidance, transfer, mitigation, escalation, and acceptance as responses to threats; the last two are also applicable to opportunities, as are exploitation, sharing, and enhancement (pp. 36-37). These responses are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and others might be suggested. For instance, Pfeffer (1972) suggests the slightly different avoidance, evasion, prevention, protection, transfer, assumption, neutralisation and combination. Chapman & Ward (2011) list the following (not mutually exclusive) generic response types: modify objectives, avoid, influence probability, modify consequences, transfer consequences, develop contingency plans, keep options open, monitor, accept, remain unaware, and optimise all others.

All response types to threats were mentioned: risk transfer (e.g. artwork insurance); active risk acceptance (e.g. contingency reserves)²⁵; risk mitigation (e.g. setting up of safety plans, reducing the impact or the probability of hazards); risk escalation (e.g. safety and security management at the

²⁵ Contrasting with passive acceptance, which Chapman & Ward (2011) call “Remain unaware”, a default option if no alternative is pursued: “It is a sensible option in cases where threats and opportunities can be dealt with effectively and efficiently as and when they arise. It has obvious dangers in other cases” (p181).

facility level, including the temporary exhibition venue); and risk avoidance (e.g. artwork removal from the draft list, in order to avoid budgetary or schedule slippages).

Since opportunities were more seldom touched upon, there were fewer responses on how to deal with them. For instance, two respondents pointed out that the artwork list can offer risk enhancement as well as risk avoidance, by seeking additional items from the same sources, which would have low marginal transport costs and/or increase the quality of the exhibition; another implied risk sharing by involving contemporary artists in the preparation of the exhibition, thereby enhancing its quality. According to an additional respondent, “Working with contemporary artists and practices is a risky endeavour. This risk doesn't have to be understood as something negative, it's a *sine qua non* condition. (...) There must be a space for openness”. Nevertheless, this interviewee pointed out the difficulties of working with artists, as did another, who expressed concerns about unfeasible, too expensive, or too time-consuming requests²⁶, supporting Evrard & Colbert (2000) mindset.

All 12 respondents mentioned insurance for works of art, the presence of security teams and equipment (such as alarms), and almost all also referred specialised transport companies as responses to threats. Insurance usually covers each work of art (or sometimes it covers whole collections). Security and safety often go hand in hand, as a guard or a display case protect a work of art from either theft or damage. In line with the assessment that the movements required by temporary exhibitions might place the works of art at risk (Cross & Flynn, 2003; Papadimitriou & Vamvakari, 2008), it is not surprising that organisations resort to experts for transport and handling, and two interviewees use couriers as well. Other risk responses were less frequently brought up, for example addressing legal (e.g. copyright) or reputational risks (e.g. dealing with the political implications of the exhibition, for instance by carefully framing it in the context).

The aforementioned widespread use of standard documents like condition and facilities reports indirectly affects risk treatment. To illustrate, should the mandatory condition report pinpoint a fragile work of art, the museum may display it in a particular way or provide additional protection; if the facilities report points to a lack of proper security measures, the museum might enhance its security system (either at its own discretion or at the request of the lender), or decline the loan (risk avoidance). Moreover, these are formal, signed documents that serve as contracts between different institutions, facilitating the delineation of clear responsibilities at an early stage.

The adoption of practices such as standard facility and condition reports, or default measures like specialised transport, blanket artwork insurance or risk reserves, are accessible tools even for less

²⁶ This respondent noted how in her capacity of exhibition producer she had to deter an artist of intervening in his own work of art, seeing as he already had sold it, that the venue wasn't suitable for it, and that it would compromise the exhibition opening date. She suggested that the team could deliver the work of art to the artist's atelier after the exhibition for this additional intervention, provided the current owner agreed.

mature organisations and teams. This follows the simplicity and effectiveness principles championed by Trickey (2018), Turner & Kutsch (2015), and Tysiak (2018), also supported by authors focussing on museums, including Tomastik et al. (2020) or Wasilewski (2014). Regarding other key success factors cited in PMI (2019), the routine assignment of resources, budgets and schedules to insurance and security measures is noteworthy. Furthermore, the cost of these responses is calculated and taken into account as part of the planning process (though not necessarily in the exhibition budget, e.g. if provided by shared services like a security department), presumably also by way of reserves, that were mentioned by two respondents. As to risk ownership, responsibilities for the timely implementation of regular responses seem well established, according to the department that usually runs these tasks.

4.2.5. Monitoring

When asked about risk monitoring, nine interviewees cited inspections, focusing either on environmental conditions, typically conducted by the exhibition team or someone from collections care; or on the security of works of art, usually done by external teams. Regular team meetings addressing identified risks (or checklists of some sort) were only mentioned by two interviewees.

There is therefore no indication of project-level integrated monitoring to continuously track identified risks and response plans, which is highlighted as critical in this phase by PMI (2019), and is consistent with Thakur's (2019) findings of discontinuous monitoring, even when identification is carried out. For example, as the iterative identification of new risks is not formally but rather sporadically addressed, passive risk acceptance is highly likely. It is likewise coherent with Matassa's statement (2014, p. 24): "Once the project is up and running, there is often little interest in [project management] monitoring; it is more or less expected to manage itself". However, the responsibilities and tasks regarding monitoring safety and security appear to be well established, primarily by specialised teams but also by others: a manager mentioned she would ask the security team to double check measures when she received text warnings from civil protection services. Nevertheless, the exhibition's aims may be compromised if there is no coordination. For instance, if the security team has an overbearing handling of visitors approaching the works of art, they probably ensure their security, but not the visitors satisfaction. Similarly, the transfer of responsibility to specialised teams may have the unintended effect of scattering risk management as a series of fragmented events across different teams, rather than the intended continuous and integrated process.

4.3. Summary and examples

In terms of the most salient aspects of risk management for respondents, half explicitly identified the safety and security of works of art. Otherwise, five emphasised the importance of communication

between stakeholders, which facilitates the maintenance of high risk awareness within teams; and four cited training, not only because knowledge of materials and techniques is central to the conservation of works of art, but also because it can raise risk awareness. One interviewed alluded here to the ageing and stagnation in cultural institutions' staff, advocating change and renewal of staff, to avoid loss of knowledge and absent-minded routine repetition. There were three further references to the importance of lessons learned to continuous improvement; three to the use of guidelines (and specifically of internationally recognised ones) to help clarify responsibilities and define common terminologies; and two to the ability to adapt to circumstances and openness to change, that is, a judicious approach, even if grounded on standards.

As to the phases when risk management is most important, none stood out. Planning was alluded to as relevant not only regarding budget and time reserves, but also in terms of anticipating threats²⁷. Three respondents underscored how important the definition of the list of objects is, as insurance and transport costs depend heavily on it, as do timely installation and associated activities (e.g. catalogues). This fits Cross & Flynn's (2003) case study topmost lesson: precise and early loan definition (namely venue and object lists). As referred by these and other authors, transport was signalled as a phase when works of art could be damaged, but moreover as an item that might have significant financial slippages, given its weight in the budget. Installation was mentioned, echoing the concerns expressed in the literature reviewed that this is a stage where damage or theft is more likely to occur. And, while less alluded to, the "operation" (i.e. exhibition) itself can also demand closer management, either because it is the moment when the number of people close to the works of art significantly widens to include the audience, or because of the contemporary art trend towards live performances, led by those supreme risk agents, the artists, whose autonomy must be respected (Evrard & Colbert, 2000).

4.3.1. Threats

Asked about threats that occurred, half of those questioned mentioned breaches in the safety and security of works of art. Two referred facility related incidents (leaks), in one case caused by an extreme weather event, in other by a pipe rupture. This was later documented in the internal audit report for the organisation and display in that area is now conditioned. Three mentioned damage by members of the audience, another during transport. Two alluded to damage to works of art by the cleaning teams. Finally, two cases of theft were reported.

Regarding artwork damage, it should be noted that in some cases the risk had been identified and actively accepted, in light of the trade-off between artwork protection and visitors' experience pointed

²⁷ One interviewee stated that in this phase "banana peels" (e.g. reputational risks) can be at once detected and dealt with.

out by the interviewees. For instance, a display case can interfere with the direct engagement with an object; guards may be perceived as intimidating, which could negatively impact the stated objective of reaching new audiences in several institutions (the over-securitisation mentioned by Runhovde, 2021). The ultimate decision additionally reflects the equilibrium of the different objectives of several stakeholders, e.g. collection care, safety department, education teams, among others.

Moreover, three respondents also mentioned delays when working with external parties, among others artists or partner companies, caused by their lack of expertise and communication issues. Additionally, there were three references of reputational damages, for instance in the relationship with other museums, local authorities, or sponsors. This could cause artwork unavailability, increased logistics costs, or lack of support in future projects. Two further instances of budgetary slippages were identified, namely due to unexpectedly high transportation costs, surpassing the ordinary reserves; and two to climate effects, e.g. inclement weather affecting not only live performances, but also (short) outdoor exhibitions. Some of these issues were minor, for example when during the vernissage with a minister's visit the director and curator had to hurriedly hide some furniture that turned out not to be part of the artist's installation²⁸.

4.3.2. Opportunities

References to opportunities were scarcer. Three respondents indicated that travelling exhibitions could be a cost-effective strategy (and likewise potentially environmentally sustainable, as the same materials reach a larger audience)²⁹; three mentioned the unexpected involvement of communities, such as activities targeting blind people, works of art made by people with mental disorders, or the use of pop-up art exhibitions as beacons for the gathering of local communities; and two highlighted how the artists' involvement allowed unexpected propositions, even if, as one interviewee stated, it is important to unburden the artist from "project management" tasks, so that they can focus on their areas of expertise (echoing the grievances mentioned in Reidla, 2020). One interviewee observed that occasionally the quality was found to be better than expected, while another noted that if the event proved popular, the exhibition could be extended.

²⁸ The respondent who gave this example stated "as a rule, exhibitions aren't ready until the eleventh hour".

²⁹ Even if one of them stated "I see these [travelling] turnkey exhibitions with some suspicion", citing technical challenges such as increased number of stakeholders or timeline dependences, but above all the need to reconcile the "standardised" exhibition to each organisation's specific strategic goals.

5. Conclusion

The literature review did not reveal much material on the application of risk standards specifically in the organisation of art exhibitions from a project perspective, nor on practices reflecting an integrated risk management approach. This research seeks to address this gap by exploring potential application of the standards and offering specific risk management recommendations for professionals. It is geared to the reduction of negative risks and increase of positive risks in temporary art exhibitions, promoting optimal delivery within the exhibition's constraints and aligned with the institutions' goals.

The literature review and the interview results both point to the primacy of ensuring the safety and security of works of art in the organisation of temporary exhibitions. Risk measures are accordingly very thorough in this respect, as evidenced by the sector's standards. However, a holistic approach reflecting the institutions' strategies, one that is not limited to classic artwork (negative) risks, is currently lacking. While a formal quantitative assessment would probably also prioritise works of art, unawareness of other risk types can cause suboptimal delivery of the objectives. For instance, if an exhibition exceeds expectations, there could be plans to extend the schedule or duration, to pack and reallocate it, to register and capitalise on lessons learned.

Moreover, risk management deals with a "way of thinking – more specifically a process for systematic but creative thinking – not an inflexible procedural basis for a bureaucratic checklist" (Chapman & Ward, 2011, p. 115). The often-cited checklists may cause teams to fill them absent mindedly and overlook the fundamental. This is especially relevant in a rapidly changing environment, where a black swan event like an abrupt pandemic may suspend exhibitions, an artwork provenance may be disputed, or the reputation of a sponsor be questioned – and where organisations promptly shift their strategies to explore new paths, such as adapting to changing audiences (e.g. migrants or tourists). Some respondents noted that there is room for improvement in their risk management practices, including in terms of training in crisis management procedures to raise risk awareness. Fostering this attitude towards uncertainty is capital, because crises are manifold, go beyond the theft of an artwork and could be massive (Mackay, 2021). To this end, some illustrative recommendations can be outlined by juxtaposing PMI's (2019, p. 17) key success factors for risk management with this study's findings (summarised in Appendix B).

5.1 Recommendations

Strategic alignment

First, risk management must be aligned with the organisation's goals, values and policies. The policies and procedures ought to draw on acknowledged standards with accepted terminology. Most respondents mentioned the existence of such generic rules, e.g. every artwork is subject to insurance and specialised transport. Attitudes towards risk vary, even if organisations did not report risk appetite thresholds. If establishing them is unfeasible, institutions ought at least to position themselves in a "risk spectrum" that accounts for resources and goals.

Risk management in temporary exhibitions must take into account financial and human resources: for example, the technical or digital skills required to research and produce exhibitions of different topics and kinds. Smaller entities should consider simpler models and ponder outsourcing, if they lack the expertise and have the financial means (Wasilewski, 2014) - they may even resort to turnkey exhibitions, as a respondent suggested. Above all, it should factor in the "diversification" of the institution's "portfolio". Each exhibition should be set against the institutions' permanent assets, which must be levered on, considering scale and spillover effects. For instance, higher proportions of owned items reduce risks of delays and slides in budget balance in temporary exhibitions; exhibitions offering fresh perspectives on the own collection themes can rekindle interest on them. Reliance on specialised departments³⁰ for critical functions may prove problematic. While it would be inadvisable to allocate e.g. security to the core exhibitions teams, it is beneficial to involve these teams from the beginning of the project due to likely feedback loops. For example, if an external work of art is included in the exhibition, the conservation team can appraise its fragility, the curator its value, and the security team its susceptibility to theft or vandalism³¹. Failure to do this would contradict the necessity of core risk management implementation by the project team (Tysiak, 2018). At any rate, even if other functions are neglected, specialisation promotes success in the conventional realms of safety and security. This may suffice to ensure the long-term preservation of the permanent assets but might be suboptimal regarding the broader aims of temporary exhibitions, often more audience-centred.

Concerning goals, if the criterion were profit than probably many exhibitions would not take place, due to most institutions' nature. They should ascertain the desired impact (e.g. number of visitors, critical acclaim, societal change, increased environmental awareness...) and manage risk accordingly.

³⁰ Organisational structures are usually functional, not projectised. In smaller institutions, these functions should either be simplified and centralised, or outsourced.

³¹ Though the security department would need aid distinguishing performances from incidents. For example, in 2023 a museum staffer cried in alarm when a college student seized Maurizio Cattelan's *Comedian*, a \$120,000 banana taped to the wall, and proceeded to eat it (he did reattach the peel); in 2019, after David Datuna's performance piece *Hungry Artist*, in which he (the hungry artist) ate a previous iteration of the said banana, the leftovers had to be temporarily removed due to the health and safety risk caused by the crowds surrounding it.

The mission statement can help clarify the institution's placement regarding the display/conservation dilemma. If it favours the preservation of the collection, safeguarding the heritage might be paramount³², limiting for example (incoming and outgoing) travelling exhibitions³³. Conversely, if the mission consists in the advancement and promotion of contemporary art and artists, the institution can or even should take the chance of making exhibitions that may not attract large audiences, and affording greater discretion to curators and artists, as suggested by Ventzislavov (2014).

Risk management ownership

Second, risk management should be valued by management, team members and stakeholders as "providing a positive return on investment". Chapman (2014) advocates acceptance across the board of the mantra "risk management is everyone's responsibility". Risk is embedded in the queried organisations: all displayed concern for the valuable and fragile works of art and undertook frequent risk responses; there are often departments specifically dedicated to critical areas; and the very terms "preserving" collections or "curator" are telling. The numerous references to serious risk-related incidents in temporary art exhibitions underscore the relevance of robust risk management practices. The reported incidents with cleaning teams are paradigmatic of the need of stakeholder alignment, regardless of how "menial", or whether outsource or in-house. However, authors including Willumsen et al. (2019) or Macdonnell & Bereson (2020) might challenge the expression "positive return on investment", and given that the safety and security of works of art was identified as the most relevant for the respondents, perhaps they see risk management more as a threat reduction function than an investment with positive return – missing its potential to enhance opportunities. Furthermore, the mentioned specialisation might work as a double-edged sword, isolating the responsibility for security and safety in segregated teams. Team members must own risk management rather than feel it is a cumbersome ritual of ticking off checklists to satisfy audits (Green & Dikmen, 2022; Lindqvist, 2012). Testing the approach in pilot exhibitions might engage stakeholders. Customised training in risk management techniques could help professionals recognise their value. One respondent suggested top management should sponsor the definition of guidelines, as one way to ensure commitment. Likewise, it ought to set in place a framework that incentives stakeholders to work together to lower risk and optimise total cost for the institution, regardless of which department benefits the most.

³² For example, Tutankhamun's gold mask is not allowed out of Egypt for travelling exhibitions, let alone being shown without a display case. Yet its beard was knocked off in 2014, according to some accounts by a cleaning team, and museum staff faced trial over their hasty attempt to glue it back on.

³³ For instance, a jewel heist occurred in 2002 in the temporary exhibition "The Diamond: From Rough Stone to Gem" in Museon, a municipal educational museum in the Netherlands. Security had been boosted, but perhaps because of a mismatch between the regular and extra security, failures were glaring, including broken alarms, surveillance cameras turned off and unaware guards. This raised a debate whether the six particularly valuable Portuguese crown jewels that were robbed should have been sent there in the first place.

Risk tailoring

Third, risk effort must be tailored to the significance of the exhibition to the organisation and its constraints, among others risk tolerance, available resources, or public bodies' legal requirements. Authors such as Evrard & Colbert (2000) noted that to accept the artist's independence is to (actively) accept risk, while Selwood et al. (2018) emphasised that inflexible management tools can stifle the creative process, compromising the sector's essence. Absence of a fully-fledged risk management framework in exhibitions risks "blind spots" and missed interrelationships; yet respondents adopt simple and well-established practices and default measures. Nevertheless, institutions must ponder whether these generic rules ought to be adaptable parts of broader plans, as they could promote risk compensation, supplier overreliance, and may be symptomatic of absence of systematic risk planning (Anantatmula & Fan, 2013; Thakur, 2019). Institutions should embed the Planning-Identification-Analysis-Response-Monitoring flow in a simplified way³⁴. Policies and procedures should be flexible and scalable, to adapt to the size, type and complexity of exhibition. This includes the number and sort of external stakeholders, such as outsourcing, partner museums, or artists, who require particularly flexible arrangements. Template risk registers ought to be broad and adjustable. Risks should be ranked to deploy proportional cost-effective responses, even in the absence of quantitative assessment. Considering the respondents' education, it is doubtful that similar teams would have the numerical skills for the quantitative analysis, even with training. Likewise, many of the 44 techniques listed in PMI's (2019) Appendix X6 are too complex to be helpful in any likely scenario (e.g. Monte Carlo simulation or decision tree analysis). Institutions in the public sector, unbound by profit-oriented competition (rather benefiting from it, as mentioned by Wasilewski 2014), are advised to leverage on networks for shared services, including those closely related with risk management³⁵. Travelling exhibitions allow risk sharing and, if planned in a modular fashion from the start, the misalignment that one respondent referred can be softened. However, their benefits imply added challenges, e.g. ensuring a good relationship with suitable partners (Matassa, 2014).

Risk management integration

Fourth, risk management does not exist in a vacuum; it is integrated with the organisation's project management processes (PMI, 2019). The project's limits need to be clear, not only regarding further permanent functions but also with complementary activities (such as organising conferences or publishing catalogues). Budget and timeline ought to incorporate risk management³⁶, which must not be segregated but rather integrated within the entity. Just as in other knowledge areas, there

³⁴ Perhaps practitioners in the arts would be enticed with jazz as a metaphor (Turner & Kutsch, 2015).

³⁵ And indeed Museu e Monumentos de Portugal deploys the "José de Figueiredo" conservation lab.

³⁶ Respondents stated that needs such as cost of insurance or specialised transport are included.

should be room for continuous learning, as emphasised by the respondents. To that end, it would be useful to maintain and use lessons learned registers, to record them less haphazardly than mentioned. This seems especially relevant given the frequency of exhibitions, the number of internal and external participants involved, and the danger of silo mentality. Moreover, institutions ought to make the most out of available tools and technology. While their infrastructure and workforce may not be ready, given the average age and academic training (Carvalho & Matos, 2018), institutions ought to consider targeted training on user-friendly tools, which users can perceive as valuable rather than bureaucratic. They should facilitate collaboration, enhance the automatic integration of data and the use of analytics to provide fast and accurate decision-making. If this is unfeasible, organisations could adopt ownable “low-tech, high-touch” approaches, such as asking input from experienced staff in key moments (especially those who recall past threats). In any case, the use of integrated data has spillover effects: for instance, using reliable, accessible and up-to-date artwork databases would enable more agile risk identification but would also make preliminary research (“Idea generation”) easier and fruitful.

Clear communication

Fifth, proactive approaches and effective decision-making depend on open and honest communication. The answers concurred with Matassa (2014), who stressed the importance of effective communication throughout the project, involving other departments such as security, facilities, or visitor services (or everyone in small organisations), as well as external stakeholders like lenders and funders. The cases illustrated the importance of requesting input of several stakeholders, beyond the most obvious (e.g. curators, conservators), clarifying responsibilities, and ensuring the coordination of all (including external stakeholders). Lack of clarity between stakeholders increases the chance of overlapped or overlooked tasks. Some respondents also alluded to informal contacts, which is agile but dependent on goodwill and existent personal connections. Regardless of the chosen form (e.g. regular meetings or inspections), the channels should be known and accessible by all, allow feedback mechanisms, including the incorporation of external input (e.g. visitor satisfaction surveys or peer benchmarking in sector networks), and contribute to raise risk awareness.

Ongoing action

Lastly, the standard stresses the need to act in a timely and iterative fashion. Bearing in mind the already-cited limitations of checklists, the rigid standard lists that are used may become outdated if some trends materialise. This is particularly relevant given the role of temporary exhibitions as a bridge between permanent collections and a changing environment (Piacente & Molineux, 2022; Pisarek, 2023). For example, Lord (2022) argues that exhibitions will tend to meaning-making in the face of social change, leaning towards the online, and reflecting major shifts in museological thinking, such as

the “rise of the visitor”. This is marked by co-creation with different communities, fostering empathetic spaces with broader learning contexts, and the use of social media, trends that other authors also identify (e.g. Fleming, 2019; Gallardo-Frías & Mairesse, 2021; Moreno-Mendoza et al., 2020; Richards, 2018). There are implications for instance on (i) the number of inexperienced participants in the production of exhibitions, (ii) the museum as a stage for (often destructive) social discontent, or (iii) the increased relevance of technology, which raises issues of cybersecurity³⁷. Regarding these examples, organisations ought to (i) bolster participants’ strengths and mitigate their weaknesses, e.g. factoring in time and resources to provide extra production support to a young artist, to communicate with large, bureaucratic, partner firms, or to scrutinise patrons; (ii) relate ongoing and incoming exhibitions with broader social discontent, and use it as an opportunity for “meaning-making”, while ensuring the safety and security of art and visitors; (iii) empower the organisation to face the threats and opportunities ensuing from the growth of technology and social media, training staff and engaging if needed additional departments like IT or Marketing, or outsourcing.

5.2 Limitations and Contributions

The study main limitation is that research was restricted to a diverse yet small group of Portuguese professionals, so may not accurately reflect practices elsewhere, e.g. in the presence of different project complexity, available resources, or public sector prominence. Other methods could be used to widen the sample, such as online surveys, but some answers might have been shorter, particularly in sensitive issues, and they might increase terminology misunderstandings that had been identified by Selwood et al. (2018) and others. Lastly, comparing these results is challenging due to the lack of research in this specific topic. Avenues for future research include determining practices in other countries, exploring currently under-researched risks in the sector (such as positive risks, commercial or reputational), and testing the impact of recommendations in pilot projects.

This research makes an original contribution by attempting to extend the application of rigorous risk management standards to projects seldom examined in this context. It contributes to the body of knowledge by addressing the literature gap, which, despite extensive studies on risk and project management, lacks focused research on the application of these concepts to temporary art exhibitions. This study aims to bridge this gap by proposing a risk management model specifically tailored to the cultural sector. This model constitutes a theoretical contribution that can be applied in cultural institutions to increase the effectiveness in the organisation of temporary art exhibitions.

³⁷ A respondent explained, “not only is there higher dependency on infrastructure systems, such as the ticket office, but also the art itself may resort to live Internet connection and QR codes, which could be hacked”.

Bibliographical references

- Amendola, J., Feldman, K., & Welch, M. (2020). Funding forward: Stable funding for museums in an unstable world. In W. J. Byrnes, & A. Brkić (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management* (pp. 438-460). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Anantatmula, V., & Fan, Y. (2013). Risk Management Instruments, Strategies and Their Impact on Project Success. *International Journal of Risk and Contingency Management*, 2(2), 27-41. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijrcm.2013040102>
- Anderson, E. (1993). *Value in Ethics and Economics*. Harvard University Press.
- Aven, T. (2018). An Emerging New Risk Analysis Science: Foundations and Implications. *Risk Analysis*, 38(5), 876-888. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12899>
- BBC. (2016, January 23). Tutankhamun: Egypt museum staff face trial over botched beard job. *BBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-35392531>
- Benghozi, P.-J. (2006). La gestion de projet dans le secteur culturel. *Hermes*, 44(1), 71-77. <https://doi.org/10.4267/2042/24011>
- Bernardi, M. (2022). The Covid-19 Pandemic and the Inescapable Challenge of the Anthropocene for Museums. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 146-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2016285>
- Bogle, E. (2013). *Museum Exhibition, Planning and Design*. Altamira Press.
- Boylan, P. J. (Ed.). (2004). *Running a Museum: A Practical Handbook*. ICOM – International Council of Museums.
- Boylan, P. J., & Woollard, V. (2006). *Running a Museum: A Practical Handbook - The Trainer's Manual*. ICOM – International Council of Museums.
- Butler, P. (2000). By Popular Demand: Marketing the Arts. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16(4), 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725700784772871>
- Byrnes, W. J., & Brkić, A. (Eds.). (2020). *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Cabanis-Brewin, J. (1998). Reinventing the business of doing good: project management in the nonprofit sector. *PM Network*, 12(4), 54-56. Retrieved 11 6, 2023, from <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/project-management-nonprofit-sector-3267>
- Camarero, C., Vicente, E., & Garrido, M. (2015). Achieving effective visitor orientation in European museums. Innovation versus custodial. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 16, 228-235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2014.05.006>
- Cannon-Brookes, P. (1995). Art exhibition transport: the case for alternative strategies. *Museum International*, 47(2), 55–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0033.1995.tb01242.x>
- Carvalho, A., & Matos, A. (2018). Museum Professionals in a Digital World: Insights from a Case Study in Portugal. *Museum International*, 70(1-2), 34-47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/muse.12191>

- Carvalho, M. M., & Junior, R. R. (2015). Impact of risk management on project performance: the importance of soft skills. *International Journal of Production Research*, 53(2), 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.919423>
- Chang, W. J., & Wyszomirski, M. (2015). What Is Arts Entrepreneurship? Tracking the Development of its Definition in Scholarly Journals. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 4(2), 11-31. <https://doi.org/10.1353/artv.2015.0010>
- Chapman, C., & Ward, S. (2011). *How to Manage Project Opportunity and Risk: Why uncertainty management can be a much better approach than risk management*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119208587>
- Chapman, R. J. (2014). *The Rules of Project Risk Management: Implementation Guidelines for Major Projects*. Gower. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315553177>
- Chaudhry, F. (2020). More than the sum of its parts: dance, creative management and enterprise in collaboration. In W. J. Byrnes, & A. Brkić (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management* (pp. 104-120). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Chong, D. (2010). *Arts Management* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203995358>
- Clowney, S. (2020). Does Commodification Corrupt? Lessons from Paintings and Prostitutes. *Seton Hall Law Review*, 50, 1005-1060.
- Coate, B., & Hoffmann, R. (2022). The behavioural economics of culture. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 46(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-021-09419-2>
- Crealey, M. (2003). Applying New Product Development Models on the Performing Arts: Strategies for Managing Risk. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 5(3), 24-23.
- Cross, M., & Flynn, K. (2003). From sausage rolls to sushi and back again: Lessons for successful travelling block-buster loans. *The Paper Conservator*, 27(1), 59-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03094227.2003.9638631>
- Evrard, Y., & Colbert, F. (2000). Arts Management: A New Discipline Entering the Millennium? *International Journal of Arts Management*, 2(2), 4-13.
- Fleming, D. (2019). Global Trends in Museums. *Museum International*, 71(1-2), Museum International. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2019.1638065>
- Frey, B. S., & Meier, S. (2006). The Economics of Museums. In V. A. Ginsburgh, & D. Throsby, *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 1018-1042). Elsevier.
- Frost, S. (2021). Pandemic, Protests and Building Back: 20 Months at the British Museum. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 70-83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2016277>
- Galán-Pérez, A., Biedermann, A., Galán-Pérez, F. J., & Ferreiro, L. (2020). Preventive conservation and sustainability of heritage collections in transit. *ECR – Estudos de Conservação e Restauro*, 11, 31-51. <https://doi.org/10.34632/ecr.2020.9586>
- Gallardo-Frías, L., & Mairesse, F. (2021). The Paradox Of Access: The 21st Century Museum Confronted By Its Security. *Spatium*, 46, 54-65. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SPAT2146054G>
- George, A. (2015). *The Curator's Handbook: Museums, Commercial Galleries, Independent Spaces*. Thames & Hudson.

- Green, S. D., & Dikmen, I. (2022). Narratives of Project Risk Management: From Scientific Rationality to the Discursive Nature of Identity Work. *Project Management Journal*, 53(6), 608–624. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728221124496>
- Hartman, F., Ashrafi, R., & Jergeas, G. (1998). Project management in the live entertainment industry: what is different? *International Journal of Project Management*, 16(5), 269-281.
- Hazır, O., & Ulusoy, G. (2020). A classification and review of approaches and methods for modeling uncertainty in projects. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 223, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.107522>
- Herreman, Y. (2004). Display, Exhibits and Exhibitions. In P. J. Boylan (Ed.), *Running a Museum: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 91-104). ICOM – International Council of Museums.
- Herrendorf, B., Rogerson, R., & Valentinyi, Á. (2014). Growth and Structural Transformation. In P. Aghion, & S. N. Durlauf (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Growth* (Vol. 2, pp. 855-941). Elsevier.
- Hoffmann, R., Hölzel, C., & Henning, H. (2022). Managing an Exhibition Project in the Midst of the Covid-19-Pandemic: A Case Study in Berlin, Germany. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 84-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2016283>
- ICOM. (2021). *Museums, museum professionals and Covid-19: third survey*. International Council of Museums. Retrieved November 11, 2023, from https://icom.museum/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Museums-and-Covid-19_third-ICOM-report.pdf
- ICOM. (2022, August 22). *International Council of Museums: Standards and Guidelines*. Retrieved from ICOM: <https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/>
- International Organization for Standardization / International Electrotechnical Commission. (2019). *Risk management: Risk assessment techniques*. (ISO/IEC Standard No. 31010:2019).
- International Organization for Standardization. (2018). *Risk management — Guidelines*. (ISO Standard No. 31000:2018).
- Johansson, T. (2022). Managing The Arts – Managing The Unresolved Conflict. In V. Simjanovska, & T.-M. Karjalainen (Eds.), *The Art of Re-thinking: New Era for Arts Managements* (pp. 57-65). Sibelius Academy Publications 23.
- Jurčišinová, K., Wilders, M. L., & Visser, J. (2022). Blockbuster Exhibitions After the Covid-19 Crisis: The Case of the Dutch Museum Sector. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2016279>
- Karlsen, J. T., Folke-Olsen, O., & Torvatn, T. (2013). Project Risk Management: Use and Benefit of Various Tools. *International Journal of Risk and Contingency Management*, 2(4), 79-101. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijrcm.2013100106>
- Keynes, J. M. (1945, July 12). The arts council: Its policy and hopes. *BBC broadcast*. Reprinted from The Listener.
- Kinyon, L., Dolšák, N., & Prakash, A. (2023). When, where, and which climate activists have vandalized museums. *npj Clim. Action* 2, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-023-00054-5>
- Klobe, T. (2012). *Exhibitions: concept, planning and design*. The AAM Press.

- Kuesters, I. (2010). Arts Managers as Liaisons between Finance and Art: A Qualitative Study Inspired by the Theory of Functional Differentiation. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 40(1), 43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921003603976>
- Labrador, A. M. (2021). The Empty Museum: A Southeast Asian Perspective. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 180-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2059244>
- LaMarre, R. (2022). Effective Exhibition Project Management. In M. Piacente (Ed.), *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* (3 ed., pp. 391-404). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lazzaro, E., & Picchi, G. (2023). Business Models of Contemporary Art Galleries and Art Fair Influence: A Thematic Synthesis of the Literature. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 25(2), 34-50.
- Letts, C. W., Ryan, W. P., & Grossman, A. S. (1997, Mar-Apr). Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(2), 36-44. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1997/03/virtuous-capital-what-foundations-can-learn-from-venture-capitalists>
- Lindqvist, K. (2003). Exhibition enterprising – project management issues in six European cases. *AIMAC conference, Bocconi, Milan, 29/6-2/7* (p. 16). Milan: AIMAC.
- Lindqvist, K. (2012). Effects of Public Sector Reforms on the Management. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 42(2), 9-28. <https://doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825420201>
- Lord, G. D. (2022). The Future of Exhibition-Making. In M. Piacente (Ed.), *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* (3 ed., pp. 405-409). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Macdonnell, J., & Bereson, R. (2020). Arts Management and its contradictions. In W. J. Byrnes, & A. Brkić (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management* (pp. 3-15). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Maciuk, K., Jakubiak, M., Sylaiou, S., & Falk, J. H. (2022). Museums and the Pandemic - How Covid-19 Impacted Museums as seen through the Lens of the Worlds' Most Visited Art Museums. *International Journal of Conservation Science*, 13(2), 609-618.
- Mackay, R. (2021). An Abrupt and Brutal Audit: An Analysis of the Crisis Management Response of UK Museums and Heritage Attractions to the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Museum International*, 73(3-4), 8-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.2016275>
- Manners, B., Borstlap, H., & Saayman, M. (2016). Is There More to A Visual Art Exhibition than just Art? *Contemporary Management Research*, 12(4), 435-454. <https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.14019>
- Massi, M., & Piancatelli, C. (2020). Tracing the evolution of marketing in arts organizations: from "third wheel" to protagonist of the arts scene. In W. J. Byrnes, & A. Brkić (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management* (pp. 313-330). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Matassa, F. (2011). *Museum Collections Management: a Handbook*. Facet. <https://doi.org/10.29085/9781856048699>
- Matassa, F. (2014). *Organising Exhibitions: A handbook for museums, libraries and archives*. Facet. <https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v14i1.679>

- McClinton, S. D. (2021). *Principles of Risk Management*. Salem Press Encyclopedia.
- McKenna-Cress, P., & Kamien, J. A. (2013). *Creating Exhibitions: Collaboration in the Planning, Development, and Design of Innovative Experiences*. John Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.14361/zkmm-2015-0213>
- Moreno-Mendoza, H., Santana-Talavera, A., & Boza-Chirino, J. (2020). Perception of governance, value and satisfaction in museums from the point of view of visitors. Preservation-use and management model. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 41, 178-187.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2019.06.007>
- Morris, P. W. (2013). *Reconstructing Project Management*. John Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118536698>
- Morriss-Kay, G. M. (2010). The evolution of human artistic creativity. *Journal of Anatomy*, 216, 158–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.01160.x>
- Olechowski, A., Oehmen, J., Seering, W., & M., B.-D. (2016). The professionalization of risk management: What role can the ISO 31000 risk management principles play? *International Journal of Project Management*, 34, 1568–1578.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.08.002>
- Papadimitriou, M., & Vamvakari, E. (2008). Risk Assessment during art loan and transportation at the Byzantine and Christian Museum of Athens. *Studies in Conservation*, 53(1), 69-75.
<https://doi.org/10.1179/sic.2008.53.Supplement-1.69>
- Papke-Shields, K. E., Beise, C., & Quan, J. (2010). Do project managers practice what they preach, and does it matter to project success? *International Journal of Project Management*, 28, 650–662.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.11.002>
- Pauget, B., Tobelem, J.-M., & Bootz, J.-P. (2021). The future of French museums in 2030. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 162, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120384>
- Pauget, B., Tobelem, J.-M., & Wald, A. (2023). La projectification dans les organisations culturelles: le cas d'une exposition temporaire. *Recherche en Sciences de Gestion - Management Sciences - Ciencias de Gestión*, 157(4), 357-380. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.3917/resg.157.0357>
- Pedersoli, J. J., Antomarchi, C., & Michalski, S. (2016). *A Guide to Risk Management of Cultural Heritage*. International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration.
- Peterson, K. (1997). The distribution and dynamics of uncertainty in art galleries: A case study of new dealerships in the Parisian art market, 1985-1990. *Poetics*, 25, 241-263.
- Pfeffer, I. (1972). Fine Arts: A Problem in Risk Management. *California Management Review*, 15(2), 117-127.
- Piacente, M. (Ed.). (2022). *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* (3rd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Piacente, M., & Molineux, K. (2022). Temporary Exhibitions. In M. Piacente (Ed.), *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* (3 ed., pp. 119-132). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pidun, U., Rodt, M., Roos, A., Stange, S., & Tucker, J. (2017). *The Art of Risk Management*. The Boston Consulting Group.

- Pine II, B., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998, Jul-Aug). Welcome to the Experience Economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 97–105. Retrieved November 11, 2023, from <https://hbr.org/1998/07/welcome-to-the-experience-economy>
- Pisarek, A. (2023). The Museum as a Laboratory of Change. *Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 11(4), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.46284/mkd.2023.11.4.1>
- PMI. (2015). *Pulse of the Profession: Capturing the Value of Project Management*. Project Management Institute.
- PMI. (2016). *Pulse of the Profession: the High Cost of Low Performance*. Project Management Institute.
- PMI. (2019). *The standard for risk management in portfolios, programs, and projects*. Project Management Institute.
- PMI. (2021). *The standard for project management and a guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide)*. Project Management Institute.
- Prokůpek, M., Loots, E., & Betzler, D. (2023). Emergency or emerging financing strategies of art museums in the context of a pandemic? *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 38(5), 530-547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2022.2111327>
- Půček, M. J., Ochrana, F., & Plaček, M. (2021). *Museum Management: Opportunities and Threats for Successful Museums*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82028-2>
- Qizilbash, M. (2019). The market, utilitarianism and the corruption argument. *International Review of Economics*, 66, 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12232-018-0302-2>
- Raikes, S. (1996). Is Collection Management an "Art" or a "Science"? *Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies*, 1, 16-20. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jcms.1964>
- Rankins, G. (2009). Comparing PMBoK and PRINCE2 in 2009. *OGC Conference* (p. 19). Brisbane: Goal Professional Services Pty Ltd. Retrieved from <https://www.inspiringprojects.com.au/docs/comparing-pmbok-and-prince2-in-2009.pdf>
- Rato, V. (2022, December 7). As jóias da coroa roubadas correram um risco desnecessário. *Público*. Retrieved from <https://www.publico.pt/2002/12/07/jornal/as-joias-da-coroa-roubadas-correram-um-risco-desnecessario-177263>
- Raz, T., Shenhar, A. J., & Dvir, D. (2002). Risk management, project success, and technological uncertainty. *R&D Management*, 32(2), 101-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9310.00243>
- Reidla, J. (2020). Who Is Leading the Project? A Comparative Study of Exhibition Production Practices at National Museums in Finland and the Baltic States. *Museum & Society*, 18(4), 368-385. <https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v18i4.3456>
- Rentschler, R., Bridson, K., & Evans, J. (2014). Exhibitions as sub-brands: an exploratory study. *Arts Marketing: An International Journal*, 4(1-2), 45-66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AM-07-2014-0023>
- Richard, M., Mecklenburg, M. F., & Merrill, R. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Art in Transit: Handbook for Packing and Transporting Paintings*. National Gallery of Art.

- Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005>
- Runhovde, S. R. (2021). Risking Munch. The art of balancing accessibility and security in museums. *Journal of Risk Research*, 24(9), 1113–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1801810>
- Ryan, L. F. (2017). Australian museums in the "age of risk": a case study. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 32(4), 372-394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2017.1345647>
- Sandel, M. J. (2013). Market Reasoning as Moral Reasoning: Why Economists Should Re-engage with Political Philosophy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(4), 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.4.121>
- Santandreu, M., & Rivero-Moreno, L. D. (2023). Are contemporary art museums non-profit institutions? Axioms, paradoxes, and contradictions on the economic role of museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2023.2289120>
- Selwood, M., Metcalfe, H., & Wood, A. (2018). Project Management in the Arts: Integration, Application and Benefits. In A. Wood, & R. Rameezdeen (Eds.), *Perspectives in Project Management* (pp. 201-216). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Seo, Y. (2023, May 1). Student eats artwork of a banana duct-taped to a museum wall because "he was hungry". *CNN*. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/style/article/student-eats-maurizio-cattelan-banana-art-south-korea-intl-hnk/index.html>
- Shindell, L. M. (2016). Provenance and title risks in the art industry: mitigating these risks in museum management and curatorship. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 31(5), 406-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2016.1227569>
- Silvers, J. R. (2008). *Risk Management for Meetings and Events*. Elsevier.
- Spaid, S. (2016). Revisiting Ventzislavov's Thesis: "Curating Should Be Understood as a Fine Art". *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 74(1), 87–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12252>
- Stolow, N. (1981). *Procedures and Conservation standards for museum collections in transit and on exhibition*. UNESCO.
- Tarmy, J. (2023, 2 13). Her, Again? *Businessweek*, pp. 51-53. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-02-08/vermeer-rijksmuseum-exhibition-2023-in-amsterdam-is-latest-bucket-list-art-show>
- Thakur, H. M. (2019). Risk Management – A critical link in Project Success. *PM World Journal*, 8(10), 1-9.
- Tobelem, J.-M. (2011). Le rôle des expositions temporaires dans les stratégies événementielles des musées. *Revue Française du Marketing*, 232(2/5), 45-59.
- Tomás-Hernandez, A. (2021). Storage Debt: Applying the Theoretical Model of "Technical Debt" to the Management of Museum Storage. *Museum International*, 73(1-2), 10-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13500775.2021.1956728>
- Tomastik, M., Vichova, K., & Wagnerov, D. (2020). Risk Management in Museums in Czech Republic. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 82, 121-126. <https://doi.org/10.3303/CET2082021>

- Trickey, G. (2018). Risk Type and Behavioural Bias: How Projects Fail and What to Do About It. *International Journal of Risk and Contingency Management*, 7(4), 21-36.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/IJRCM.2018100102>
- Turner, N., & Kutsch, E. (2015, November). Project Resilience: Moving beyond traditional risk management. *PM World Journal*, 4(11), 1-8.
- Tysiak, W. (2018). A Deeper Insight into the Human Factor in Project Risk Management. *PM World Journal*, 7(10), 1-10.
- Uotila, P. (2012). Projects as the Institutional Context for Cultural Managers: A critical approach. *ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, 54-64.
- Van Der Made, M. (2021). Risk Management for Art Collections and Archives. *New Review of Information Networking*, 26(1-2), 81–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614576.2019.1608579>
- Vecco, M. (2020). The “artpreneur”: between traditional and cultural entrepreneurship. A historical perspective. In W. J. Byrnes, & A. Brkić (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Arts Management* (pp. 85-103). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351030861>
- Ventzislavov, R. (2014). Idle Arts: Reconsidering the Curator. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 72, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12058>
- Ward, P. R. (1986). *The Nature of Conservation: A Race against Time*. Getty Conservation Institute.
- Wasilewski, W. (2014). Risk analysis in cultural institutions. *Research Papers of Wrocław University of Economics*, 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2014.345.10>
- Werner, K., Junek, O., & Wang, C. (2022). Event management skills in the post-covid-19 world: insights from China, Germany, and Australia. *Event Management*, 26, 867–882.
<https://doi.org/10.3727/152599521X16288665119558>
- Willumsen, P. L., Oehmen, J., Stingl, V., & Geraldi, J. (2019). Value creation through project risk management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 37(5), 731-749.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2019.01.007>
- Woronkowicz, J. (2021). Arts, Entrepreneurship, and Innovation. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 45, 519–526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-021-09432-5>
- Zwikaël, O., & Ahn, M. (2011). The Effectiveness of Risk Management: An Analysis of Project Risk Planning Across Industries and Countries. *Risk Analysis*, 31(1), 25-37.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01470.x>

APPENDIX A

A: Risk management in arts manuals

The consulted arts manuals do not provide a risk management framework within the context of the organisation of temporary exhibitions. This appendix expands on the analysis mentioned in the literature review.

Boylan's (2004) *Running a Museum: a Practical Handbook* and the companion Trainer's Manual (Boylan & Woollard, 2006), published by the ICOM, include a section written by Herreman entitled "Display, Exhibits and Exhibitions" which does not envisage risk management in its insights. Risk management is covered mainly in the sections "Care and Preservation of Collections", "Museum Security, including Disaster Preparedness" and "Illicit Traffic"; the use of SWOT³⁸ analysis is suggested within the context of planning museum management. In museum security, risk analysis separates emergencies according to disasters, illegal acts, accidents, and other emergencies. An appendix provides a quantitative approach, through a table including frequency, probability, seriousness of consequences, degree of seriousness, risk degree of risk, and ranking against priorities. It also includes risk related templates, such as Emergency Plan preparation or an Exhibition Feasibility Study³⁹. The focus is on safety and security, not addressing for instance commercial or management risks, not taking into consideration temporary exhibitions specific aspects, and listing only negative risks.

Arts Management (Chong, 2010) covers several intense debates, due to the difficulty of reconciliation of managerial, economic and aesthetic objectives by arts managers. It does not have a dedicated section on temporary exhibitions, nor on risk management in this context. Risk-related covered issues include the relevance of ownership and control of arts organisations (e.g. commercial or for-profit arts enterprises tend to take more risk, or risk sharing with art market intermediaries); the risk appetite of collectors who "gamble on paintings"; and financial investment in the arts.

Matassa's (2011) handbook *Museum Collections Management* chapter 4 "Practical aspects" opens with a risk management section proposing a simplified risk assessment model for collections care, followed by topics on insurance, security and emergency responses. The risk assessment is resumed in chapter 6 covering artwork movement (which begins recommending minimum movement to reduce risk of damage) and in the last chapter on access. Chapter 9 on "Loans" cautions against both damage as well as reputational risks. Chapter 10 "Exhibitions and displays" includes risk related sections, such as due diligence policy for loans, maintenance plan, insurance and ends stating "Advance planning, risk management and good communication are the keys to a successful exhibition" (p. 227), but it does not envisage a complete risk management framework.

³⁸ Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats.

³⁹ Covering objects (e.g. conservation and security issues), space, staff, timing, cost, and exhibition team.

Klobe's (2012) manual *Exhibitions: Concept, Planning and Design*, while offering practical advice, is focused less on management and more on quality (what constitutes a technically good exhibition). It does not have a risk management section, and risk issues are mostly confined to security and safety. In the same vein, Bogle's (2013) guide on *Museum Exhibition, Planning and Design* provides a detailed set of tasks to achieve "aesthetically pleasing results". It focuses on issues like colour and light, shape and materials. There is no section on integrated risk management. Risk-related issues show up on design choices to minimise hazardous situations for visitors.

Contrasting to Bogle's (2013) more artistic approach, Matassa's (2014) second handbook specially dedicated to *Organising Exhibitions* deals with temporary art exhibitions from a project management perspective, though lacking an integrated risk management framework. It is divided into a step-by-step guide to organising exhibitions, and a directory covering specific aspects of exhibition organisation, such as copyright, insurance, pest control, etc. One of the aspects considered in the first chapter, devoted to the initial Idea for the exhibition (Stage 1), is objectives and risks, to which the author dedicates little under a page. Examples of risks are the inability to get loans, an unappealing subject, funding attraction, physically moving large or fragile objects, difficult lenders, or time constraints. Matassa calls for them to be identified from the outset, so that they may be managed effectively and don't become problems. The writer suggests using a risk assessment since Stage 1, to monitor and manage throughout the project, ensuring that everyone is aware of the main risks. The sample risk assessment is a table that lists risk, impact (purely qualitative), management of risk (i.e., response plans) and responsible (i.e. risk owner).

Matassa goes on to explain that the Planning phase begins (Stage 2) from the moment work starts to make the exhibition happen. Likening an exhibition to a temporary project with a beginning and end, and within constraints regarding time, space and finance, the author proposes a project management model that includes risk identification and relies on various skills. Matassa outlines the classic project management five phases, emphasising that many projects do not spend enough time on proper planning and research, leading to problems project delivery. Once the project is underway, there is often a lack of interest in monitoring, which can lead to problems with schedule and budget. The text also acknowledges that there will be changes to the plan and unforeseen situations that may arise (such as unavailable loans, or changes in opinion and timing), but the goal is to manage change and risk. The author also stresses the importance of effective communication throughout the project. While acknowledging that no two exhibitions are the same, the writer suggests adapting a template project management plan to an exhibition, illustrating it with five phases (Idea generation, Evaluation and development, Planning, Implementation, and Review). The Implementation phase includes loan and transporting the works, installing, opening, maintaining, and closing the exhibition.

By the end of Stage 3 (Organisation), Matassa indicates that risk management should be operational, mentioning for instance the need for a secure and up-to-date database system (with regular back-ups); insurance; or schedule monitoring according to risk management procedures. In this stage, she explains a condition report is a statement of the condition of a work of art: “No matter what the type or value of the objects you are borrowing is, it is essential to inspect their condition as soon as they enter the exhibition space” and the “important thing is that the object is inspected and a note made of any damage, wear and tear, chips, scratches or dents” (p. 67). A facilities report is a “description of the exhibition space and services” that “should act as a basis for discussion between lender and borrower so that any difficulties can be resolved at an early stage”, providing information like type of building and access, exhibition space, security, environmental conditions, and staff (p. 73). Stage 4 (Packing and transport) focuses on risk assessment for internal and external moves of works of art, with detailed considerations on object types, timings, handling, materials and equipment, people, route, procedures, communication, documentation, security, transport and packaging options, and related insurance. Safety and security, including the role of invigilators, also feature abundantly in Stage 5 (Installation). They are also present in Stage 6 (Openings), for which an emergency response plan should be created, and that also highlights the opening date (including how to manage the vernissage itself⁴⁰) and the role of the visitors, requiring crowd control.

In Stage 7 (Maintenance and programmes) stresses the importance of risk monitoring during the entire exhibition and taking preventive action when necessary. This includes continuously measuring performance and staying alert regarding security and environmental conditions, concerns that linger (and are reinforced) during Stage 8 (Closure). One of the listed benefits of the optional Stage 9 (Touring exhibitions) is risk (and resources) sharing among participants, even if this may lead to unclear responsibilities, e.g. in insurance. Stage 10 (Legacy) is essentially a phase for recording lessons learned, which in itself is a good risk management technique for the organisation.

In the guidebook *Creating Exhibitions: Collaboration in the Planning, Development, and Design of Innovative Experiences* McKenna-Cress & Kamien’s (2013) explore the process of creating successful exhibitions not only in museums, but also other institutions such as science centres. The book emphasises the importance of collaboration among all stakeholders involved, as suggested by the fact that six of the nine chapters cover advocacy of some sort. Risk is seldom and sporadically mentioned, for example in terms of presenting controversial topics or in rigid planning.

⁴⁰ For instance, including flowers has the risk of bringing insects, that could infest some materials, aside from the water spillage risk.

George (2015) provides a step-by-step *Curator's Handbook*, ranging from concept, pitching, negotiation to installing, opening, and closing the exhibition. There is no section on integrated risk management, but there are frequent risk-related recommendations, especially regarding security and safety. The author states that accidental damage to works of art is the greatest risk and occurs most often, recommending for example the latest possible installation to avoid damage. Security issues are grouped into people, works of art, and reputational risks. Simple risk assessment techniques are mentioned, such as the checklist "people, assets, reputation" to guide response to unexpected action.

Pedersoli's et al. (2016) *Guide to Risk Management of Cultural Heritage* follows the ISO 31000:2009, Risk Management - Principles and guidelines (meanwhile reviewed by ISO 31000:2018), adapting them to the cultural heritage sector, structuring the publication by context, risk identification, analysis, evaluation, treatment, and monitoring. It explicitly defines risk in the negative sense and confines impact as the expected loss of value to the heritage asset, consequently covering the usual safety and security issues. The authors explain that risk management enables the systematisation of priorities and optimisation of available resources to maximise the benefits of the cultural heritage over time. Although dedicated to cultural heritage, it highlights issues that are relevant to art exhibitions: for instance, agents of deterioration (including criminals or natural hazards), layers of enclosure (a work of art on a support, inside a showcase, in a gallery, inside a museum), or stages of control (avoid cause of risk, block, detect and respond to the agent of deterioration, recover from damage).

The *Companion to Arts Management* (Byrnes & Brkić, 2020) covers current topics of arts management rather transversal in nature (e.g. entrepreneurship, leadership, diversity, sustainability, fundraising). It does not have a dedicated section on temporary exhibitions, much less on risk management in that context. However, chapters such as "Managing change and the implications for leadership" or "Funding forward: stable funding for museums in an unstable world" show how uncertainty is well present in arts management. In the chapter "Dance, creative management and enterprise", Chaudhry's recommendations (p. 110) are consistent with a positive perspective on a risky environment, including "Be prepared to 'kill your sacred cows'", "Enjoy the risk that is inherent in the process", "Don't try to over control the process to make it efficient", "Enjoy being lost and the change that will come from it", or "Be prepared to make it up as you go along". Otherwise, risk appears as a sporadic concern, e.g. relating edgy art with donors (reputational risk) and investors/sponsors (market-friendliness risk); the risk of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion oriented programming; how to motivate the public to commit to expensive artistic events of unknown quality; entrepreneurship, risk-taking and creativity; the comparison between a normal product or service and something that involves audience, leading to unknown interactions; the role of international fundraising to reduce single funder dependency; and market risk.

While the authors work at the National Museum of Agriculture in Prague and do not cover temporary art exhibitions, *Museum Management: Opportunities and Threats for Successful Museums* (Půček et al. 2021) takes a risk-based approach, proposing a holistic model of risk (or challenges) and opportunity management. Besides following the standard flow (identification, analysis⁴¹, management, and monitoring), the risk scope is wide, provide sprawling negative and positive risk identification categories. The threats span over (i) financial (e.g. related to the management of resources, budgeting, tax matters, accounting); (ii) organisational and personnel (e.g. management errors, competence or lack of staff, poor timing of activities); (iii) legal (either contracts and internal regulations such as visiting rules, or current or forthcoming legislation); (iv) technical (e.g., the condition of museum buildings and expositions); and (v) material (e.g. protection and management of collection objects, museum exhibitions). The opportunities are classified as (i) financial (e.g. related to rational savings, good practices or improvements in the management and use of resources); (ii) organisational and personnel opportunities (e.g., good practices, synergies in human resource management, cooperation or partnerships); (iii) legal (either internal regulation or existing or forthcoming legislation); (iv) technical (e.g. synergies or revenue increases resulting from the use of museum grounds); and (v) material (e.g. better practices in the protection and management of collection objects). It is illustrated with five case studies: museum threats, museum opportunities, corruption or fraud, Covid-19, and Internet Museum.

Whereas Piacente's (2022) far-reaching *Manual of Museum Exhibitions* offers a comprehensive set of chapters focusing on different aspects of museum exhibitions, risk management is not given a formal, separate section. Piacente & Molineux's chapter on Temporary Exhibitions is an enlightening, albeit rather descriptive, summary of this activity, including aims, team composition, insurance, contact with the public and funding. LaMarre's chapter on Effective Exhibition Project Management encourages project management to help deliver exhibitions with quality, on time, and on budget. It suggests applying project management methodology at any stage in the exhibition development process, including using standard templates, a Work Breakdown Structure (a task list), a Gantt chart (schedule), or dashboard reports. It recommends a flexible attitude, including continuously looking for opportunities for improvement. The remainder of the book merely covers the usual risk-related security and safety topics, also related with the visitors' safety. In that respect, since the book is more recent than the other manuals consulted, it has the advantage of including lessons learned from Covid-19, which include relying more on local audiences, adopt flexible models to adapt to changing situations, or take into account the growing digital offer. Tellingly, the glossary definitions of risk and risk analysis display on one hand the negative bias, and on the other the focus on security needs.

⁴¹ A relatively simple Frequency (Probability) x Impact assessment is proposed.

APPENDIX B

B: Recommendations Summary

The recommendations mentioned in section 5.1 can be structured in the following way:

Key Success Factors	Recommendation	Purpose
Strategic alignment	Use established standards with accepted terminology.	Reduce biases by building on sector standards, streamlining communication with internal and external stakeholders.
	Position in “risk spectrum” (accounting for resources and goals).	Guide professionals regarding allowed risk with a metric, even if establishing risk tolerance thresholds is unfeasible.
	Acknowledge resources (financial, HR), e.g.: • Is exhibition programming core activity? Could objectives be achieved with lower negative risk using outsourcing? • How does the exhibition relate with permanent assets? Is it possible to build on and benefit the permanent assets (e.g. use owned artwork, rekindle interest in it)? • Are teams focusing on their strengths (e.g. conservation, security, marketing)? Are other relevant teams involved early on? Are they mindful of the exhibition's goals? • Are there skills (e.g. technical, digital) to research and produce exhibitions of this topic and kind?	Leverage on existing resources, deal with lack of resources.
	Acknowledge goals, e.g.: • What is the desired impact of the exhibition (e.g. financial performance, number of visitors, critical acclaim, societal change, increased environmental awareness...)? • Does the mission statement clarify the institution's placement regarding safeguard collections vs displaying to target audiences? E.g. if the emphasis is on safeguard, travelling exhibitions should be limited; if the aim is advancement of contemporary artists, it can afford greater discretion to curators and artists, even if attracting less visitors.	Adapt risk management to the desired impact of the exhibition.
Risk management ownership	Ensure guidelines sponsorship by top management and establish a suitable incentive framework.	Signal risk management's importance to the whole organisation.
	Ensure stakeholders are aware of risk and feel they are a part of risk management, considering how they affect and are affected by the exhibition, and avoid “silo mentality”.	Promote stakeholder alignment and ownership, regardless of external/internal.
	Use pilot exhibitions, customise training, to showcase risk management value, including its potential to enhance opportunities.	Address “manage to audit” concerns.

Key Success Factors	Recommendation	Purpose
Risk tailoring	Tailor risk management efforts according to the exhibition's significance to the organisation and its constraints (e.g., risk tolerance, available resources, legal requirements of public bodies).	Do not stifle the creative process with inflexible management tools.
	Balance simple and well-established practices and default measures with adaptable parts of broader plans, e.g. avoiding that transport outsourcing enables reckless behaviour.	Avoid risk compensation, supplier overreliance, and absence of systematic risk planning.
	Adopt flexible framework Plan > Identify > Analyse > Respond > Monitor ("Jazz as a metaphor").	Avoid "blind spots" and missed interrelationships, using flexible and scalable policies and procedures, adapting them to the size, type, and complexity of the exhibition.
	Identify and rank risks (even if qualitatively) through broad and adjustable registers.	Examine non-traditional risks; deploy proportional cost-effective responses.
	Leverage networks for shared services; share resources through travelling exhibitions, considering specific challenges (e.g. relationships with suitable partners, modular planning).	Use established informal and formal networks, that tend to benefit rather than harm cultural institutions.
Risk management integration	Define project boundaries regarding further permanent functions and with complementary activities.	Increase awareness of the relationships between different activities and clarify responsibilities.
	Factor in time and cost estimates for risk management.	Handle resources for risk management as an "investment".
	Maintain lessons learned registers, documented records of knowledge gained from past exhibitions, which can be used to improve future.	Ensure continuous learning within the organisation.
	Use available tools and technology to facilitate collaboration, enhance the automatic integration of data and the use of analytics; alternatively, resort to simple measures such as seek input from experienced staff at critical moments.	Considering infrastructure and workforce limitations, either promote user-friendly tools that users perceive as valuable rather than bureaucratic, or adopt "low-tech, high-touch" approaches.
Clear communication	Involve stakeholders, including relevant departments and external stakeholders; clarify responsibilities and ensure coordination.	Avoid overlapping or overlooked tasks.
	Clarify communication channels (e.g. meetings, inspections, visitor feedback collection).	Ensure access and feedback mechanisms to improve continuous learning and increase risk awareness.
Ongoing action	Continuously monitor the context and adapt procedures to the changing environment, e.g.: • If cocreation with inexperienced participants increases, is extra production support envisaged to make the most out of their participation? • In the presence of social discontent, is there an opportunity for "meaning-making" in the exhibition while ensuring the safety and security of art and visitors? • Is the organisation ready (including by training staff, engaging additional departments, or outsourcing) to face the threats and opportunities ensuing from the growth of technology and social media?	Ensure that as exhibitions evolve, so does risk management.