



Funded by the  
European Union



# GLAMMONS

# A POLICY REPORT ON COLLABORATIVE CULTURAL PRODUCTION AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT IN CCIS; WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM THE COMMONS?



CREARE  
SOCIAL

in  
polis  
urbanism



TECHNISCHE  
UNIVERSITÄT  
BERLIN



BSB  
BURGUNDY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS



europoian  
creative  
hubs  
network

MAZOMOS  
LANDSCAPE | HERITAGE | CONSULTANTS



Nova Iskra

## **Disclaimer**

This document contains information, which is the copyright of GLAMMONS Steering Committee, and may not be copied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, in whole or in part, without written permission. The commercial use of any information contained in this document may require a license from the proprietor of that information. The document must be referenced if used in a publication.

The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The document delves into the critical challenges faced by cultural institutions, particularly those operating at local and community levels, and explores how the commons framework can serve as a viable solution. Key findings highlight the financial pressures many cultural institutions experience due to decreased public funding and changing economic priorities. However, the commons model, which emphasizes community-driven support, offers resilience and autonomy in times of financial uncertainty.

The digital transformation in cultural institutions presents both opportunities and challenges, particularly in terms of access and inclusivity. The commons approach encourages equitable and participatory engagement, empowering local communities to co-create and preserve cultural heritage. Furthermore, small-scale, grassroots cultural initiatives—though often overlooked—play a pivotal role in fostering innovation and inclusive cultural practices. These initiatives benefit greatly from the legitimacy and structural support that the commons model provides.

Additionally, the systemic barriers to inclusivity, especially for marginalized groups, can be mitigated through the shared governance principles inherent in the commons model, promoting greater participation and representation in cultural processes.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVISION HISTORY .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	4
Purpose and Scope .....	4
Contribution to other Deliverables .....	4
Structure of the Document.....	4
1. REIMAGINING CULTURE AS A COLLECTIVE PRACTICE.....	5
2. CULTURAL COMMONS IN ACTION.....	7
2.1. Beyond Ownership: The Commons As A Space Of Collective Agency .....	7
2.2 The Cultural Commons: Living Heritage, Collective Practices .....	8
2.3 Transformation Of Cultural Production As A Commons .....	9
2.4 Operational Models Of Commoning In Cultural Practices .....	10
Community-based Models: Grassroots Commoning and Participatory Cultural Practices .....	10
Public Institution-Enabled Models: Supporting Cultural Commons in the Public Sphere .....	11
Grant-Funded Models: Private Foundations Supporting Collaborative Cultural Practices .....	12
3. NAVIGATING CULTURAL CHALLENGES: A COMMONS-ORIENTED PERSPECTIVE	14
3.1. Financial Insecurity and Alternative Economies Of Support .....	14
3.2 Digital Transformations as a Site Of Care And Co-Creation .....	14
3.3. Recognition and Protection Of Small-Scale And Informal Cultural Actors.....	15
3. 4. Addressing Inequity, Exclusion, and Cultural Inertia.....	15
4. SKILLS FOR COLLABORATIVE CULTURAL WORK.....	17
4.1. Facilitation and Mediation .....	17
4.2. Active Listening and Horizontal Communication .....	17
4.3. Digital Literacy and Co-Curation Tools .....	18
4.4. Participatory Governance and Conflict Resolution.....	18
4.5 Collaborative Knowledge And Practice .....	19
4.6 Relational And Emotional Intelligence.....	20
4.7 Commons-Oriented Strategic Thinking .....	20
4.8 Integrating These Skills Into Cultural Institutions And Ecosystems .....	21
5. MAKING IT HAPPEN: ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
5.1 Co-Creation and Community Engagement.....	23
5.2 Governance and Institutional Practices .....	24
5.3 Access and Open Resources .....	24

5.4 Financial Sustainability and Alternative Funding .....	25
5.5 Collaboration and Knowledge-Sharing .....	26
5.6 Transforming Institutional Culture .....	27
<b>6. WRAPPING UP: KEY LESSONS AND NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
6.1 Long-Term Benefits of a Commons-Based Approach for Cultural and Creative Industries (CCIs) .....	29
6.2 Vision for the Future of Cultural Production and Management Through the Commons .....	29
<b>7. CASE STUDIES IN ACTION: PRACTICAL EXAMPLES OF CULTURAL COMMONS ..</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Museums .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Initiatives .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Libraries .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Cultural Centres .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Galleries .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>35</b>

# INTRODUCTION

## Purpose and Scope

The purpose of the policy report is to provide recommendations for the ways cultural production, management and development within the CCI sector can be empowered through commons arrangements. The report withdraws insights from previous research papers of the GLAMMONS project<sup>1</sup>, highlighting main conclusions, making direct correlations, and transforming them into concrete solutions.

## Contribution to other Deliverables

This policy report is part of WP5 whose main objective is to provide innovative evidence-based policy recommendations, with the focus on ways GLAMs can make use of more commons-based approaches and how cultural policy environments in different socio-economic contexts could support that emergence. The report contributes to the working package by offering implementation of GLAMMONS results on wider scope of actors within cultural and creative industries, and to other deliverables by providing practical application of their outcomes.

## Structure of the Document

Section 1 provides an overview of the report's context, underlying main ideas and questions concerning reimagination of culture as collective practice. Section 2 briefly introduces concepts of commons theory and key elements of cultural commons when it comes to transformational possibilities and operational models. Section 3 is focused on ways in which commons-based practices can answer the arising challenges of the cultural sector- financing, digital transformation, strengthening of small scale actors, and inequity. Section 4 presents crucial skills for enabling collaborative cultural creation-Facilitation and Mediation, Active Listening, Digital Literacy, Participatory Governance, Collaborative Knowledge, Relational And Emotional Intelligence and Commons-Oriented Strategic Thinking. Section 5 provides actionable recommendations for Co-Creation and Community Engagement, Governance and Institutional Practices, Access and Open Resources, Financial Sustainability and Alternative Funding, Collaboration and Knowledge-Sharing and Transforming Institutional Culture. Each recommendation suggests concrete steps as well as examples of organizations which are already implementing those activities. Section 6 discusses potential and vision of commons based approaches for cultural production and management on a long term level. Lastly, Section 7 presents a brief overview of organizations and initiatives recognized as important cultural commons, selected and researched by GLAMMONS project.

---

<sup>1</sup> This policy paper draws on a broad range of documents and insights developed within the GLAMMONS project. For the sake of clarity and coherence, cross-cutting references are made specifically to selected deliverables—D5.1 (*Code of Conduct*), D5.3 (*Quality Evaluator+ Toolkit*), D5.4 (*Digital Strategy Blueprint*), and D5.7 (*Skills-Development Toolkit*)—in order to avoid unnecessary overlap and ensure a focused integration of key findings and approaches.

# 1. REIMAGINING CULTURE AS A COLLECTIVE PRACTICE

Cultural organizations — such as museums, libraries, archives, cultural centers, theatres, and grassroots collectives — have traditionally operated within top-down frameworks. While institutions have often been regarded primarily as custodians of heritage and authoritative sources of knowledge, others have focused on the presentation of artistic content, typically addressing audiences as passive consumers. These conventional roles tend to emphasize preservation and expert curation over community engagement and creative collaboration.

In contrast, a commons-based perspective reimagines all these cultural actors not only as guardians of memory or platforms for showcasing artistic work, but as active facilitators of collective meaning-making and co-creators of cultural knowledge, identity, and expression. Whether dealing with heritage or contemporary creativity, this shift affirms the importance of shared ownership, participatory governance, and open collaboration. By embracing the commons as a guiding logic, cultural spaces of all kinds can become more inclusive, dynamic, and community-rooted—places that reflect the diversity, imagination, and evolving needs of the societies they serve.

The GLAMMONS project emphasizes that cultural production is never neutral—it is shaped by local histories, socio-political dynamics, and power relations. A central insight from the project is that the concept of culture as a commons is not a metaphor, but a practical framework for governance, participation, and knowledge-sharing. It entails horizontal collaboration among professionals, activists, and communities; collective decision-making on how culture is produced and accessed; and shared infrastructure, including digital platforms, open archives, and participatory spaces. In this model, cultural production becomes an act of mutual care and co-responsibility, fostering empowerment and inclusion across all levels of engagement.

Despite growing interest in commons-oriented thinking, many cultural actors face challenges in translating these ideas into practice. Transitioning from expert-led to participatory models demands not only a shift in institutional mindset, but structural changes in governance, funding, and policy. Key questions arise: How can diverse communities—especially those historically excluded—be meaningfully involved in decision-making? How can professional standards coexist with local knowledge systems and cultural expressions? The digital shift also brings its own tensions, including risks of cultural homogenization, data extraction, and digital exclusion.

Nevertheless, when thoughtfully implemented, commons-based practices offer a compelling path forward. By embracing co-creation, shared responsibility, and more equitable distribution

of value, cultural institutions, organizations, and initiatives can evolve into spaces for civic engagement and cultural democracy—moving beyond traditional roles as repositories of the past or arenas defined solely by elitism.

## 2. CULTURAL COMMONS IN ACTION

### 2.1. Beyond Ownership: The Commons As A Space Of Collective Agency

Since the early 1990s, the concept of the commons has re-emerged as a key framework for managing natural, urban, and digital resources through collective, democratic, and sustainable means. This renewed interest is linked to the retreat of the state and the growing importance of civic engagement in addressing ecological and social challenges. Bauwens and Niaros (2017) identify five waves of commoning, ranging from traditional natural resource commons, labor-based mutual support structures, and digital knowledge sharing networks, to urban commons and re-localized production systems. These forms illustrate how commons can function as both material resources and social systems shaped by collective action.

A pivotal moment in commons theory came with the contrast between Hardin's (1968) "tragedy of the commons" and Elinor Ostrom's (1990) response. While Hardin warned that open access would lead to resource depletion, Ostrom argued that commons, when governed by communities through shared rules and principles, can be sustainably managed. She introduced eight design principles for effective commons governance, emphasizing the importance of self-organization, monitoring, conflict resolution, and nested governance structures. For Ostrom, commons are not defined by ownership type but by social relations and practices that enable collective management.

Building on Ostrom, the autonomist perspective views the commons not just as a management model, but as a transformative political project. Scholars like Hardt, Negri, and De Angelis highlight the commons as spaces of resistance against capitalism, fostering self-governance, equality, and horizontal decision-making. In this view, commons represent prefigurative social practices aimed at creating alternative ways of living beyond state and market structures. They function as "cracks" within capitalism—emerging social forms that challenge commodification and dominance while enabling collective subjectivity, autonomy, and systemic change.

The concept of the "new commons" has expanded the traditional understanding of commons beyond natural resources like forests and fisheries to include shared social systems built around urban infrastructure, public spaces, digital platforms, knowledge, and culture. Unlike natural commons, which are often subtractable and require limitations to prevent overuse, new commons—such as digital or knowledge-based resources—are typically non-subtractive and non-excludable. In urban contexts, the use and production of commons are deeply interwoven, with consumption contributing to their reproduction. Moreover, digital transformation and peer-to-peer models—often inspired by open-source programming and hacker ethics—are

increasingly shaping how these commons are produced, accessed, and managed through collaborative, decentralized practices.

Theoretical developments have further enriched the definition of the commons (Avdikos, Dragouni, Michailidou, & Pettas, 2024). Elinor Ostrom conceptualized the commons as social systems governed by communities around shared resources, while later thinkers like De Angelis, Hardt, and Negri emphasized the commons as collective, relational social practices and political projects of emancipation. These practices are grounded in principles of co-production, co-management, and democratic participation. Across different schools of thought, the commons are understood not as open-access resources but as systems actively managed by specific groups. Three essential elements underpin commons systems: the shared resource itself, the community that manages and uses it, and a governance framework—both formal and informal—that ensures its sustainability and ongoing reproduction.

## **2.2 The Cultural Commons: Living Heritage, Collective Practices**

The concept of cultural commons encompasses the shared cultural resources, knowledge, practices, and symbolic meanings that are created, maintained, and transmitted within communities. These commons are not merely static assets but dynamic processes shaped through collective use, negotiation, and reinterpretation. They include a wide spectrum of cultural expressions—from traditional music, oral histories, and artisanal crafts, to contemporary forms of digital culture such as open-access archives, collaborative platforms, and community-driven initiatives. What binds these diverse forms is the principle of shared access, collective stewardship, and the ongoing contribution of individuals and groups. Cultural commons represent an alternative to purely market- or state-driven models of cultural production and preservation, offering a more horizontal and participatory approach to how culture is lived and sustained. However, they are often vulnerable to external pressures such as privatization, commercialization, restrictive intellectual property regimes, and urban redevelopment processes that can displace local knowledge and traditions.

In this context, the potential of cultural commons to transform the ways in which cultural heritage is governed and experienced becomes especially relevant for institutions like galleries, libraries, archives, and museums (GLAM). These institutions, traditionally seen as custodians of cultural heritage, are increasingly called to engage with communities not merely as audiences but as active participants in the production and care of cultural meaning. Analytical frameworks developed in recent years aim to better understand how cultural commons function by focusing on the interplay between the resource itself, the communities

who interact with it, and the formal and informal rules that structure those interactions. Such models emphasize the need to consider cultural heritage as a living, evolving system rather than a fixed repository. Furthermore, they highlight the importance of inclusive governance arrangements that account for the diverse voices, interests, and knowledge systems involved. By adopting a commons-based perspective, GLAM institutions can reimagine their roles, moving toward more democratic, collaborative, and sustainable practices of cultural stewardship that are better aligned with the needs and aspirations of the communities they serve.

### **2.3 Transformation Of Cultural Production As A Commons**

Cultural and creative industries (CCIs), including galleries, libraries, archives, and museums (GLAMs), are increasingly being recognized as spaces for commoning. The GLAMMONS project, which initially focused on these institutions, highlighted how the principles of the commons could transform the management, production, and dissemination of cultural resources. The insights from this project are broadly applicable across the entire CCI sector, offering a way to understand cultural production as a commons.

Cultural commons, unlike traditional commons, do not diminish through use but rather increase in value the more they are shared and used. This generative potential is key to their uniqueness—resources such as artworks, archives, and digital content thrive as they are engaged with, reproduced, and circulated. In contrast to traditional commons, where overuse can lead to depletion, cultural commons benefit from collective engagement and reinterpretation, expanding in richness and relevance through community interaction.

This concept is particularly significant for smaller, community-driven CCIs, which often face challenges related to sustainability, visibility, and access. The principles of commoning practiced in these smaller institutions can motivate and inform larger organizations, demonstrating effective models for community-driven governance, open access, and sustainable resource management. These practices emphasize collective responsibility, solidarity, and long-term care of cultural resources.

The concept of cultural commons focuses on three interconnected elements: shared resources, self-organized communities, and governance systems. Resources in the cultural sector are both tangible—such as artifacts, buildings, and digital collections—and intangible, like knowledge and expertise. These resources are supported by diverse forms of labor, from volunteers to paid staff, and require active, collective management. Communities within these institutions, whether professional or volunteer-based, play a central role in ensuring the

survival and growth of cultural commons. These communities not only engage with resources but help define them, establishing norms and rules for how resources are accessed, preserved, and shared.

Governance within cultural commons is also fundamental. Decision-making bodies—often in the form of boards or councils—are responsible for determining access, preservation, and the broader direction of the institution. However, governance in a commons context is dynamic, and the rules may evolve based on the changing needs and values of the community. This process requires balancing openness and protection, as well as navigating issues of power and access.

## **2.4 Operational Models Of Commoning In Cultural Practices**

As the commons-based approach to cultural production continues to gain ground, various initiatives have emerged across Europe and globally, illustrating the transformative potential of the commons in a broader cultural context. These models demonstrate how not just GLAM institutions (galleries, libraries, archives, museums), but also grassroots cultural spaces, community-driven projects, and public heritage initiatives can embrace collective governance, participatory engagement, and resource-sharing. The implementation of commons-based principles is expanding to encompass a wide range of cultural organizations and practices, challenging conventional models of cultural production, preservation, and dissemination. Three distinct models of commoning have been identified in practice: community-based approaches, public institution-enabled initiatives, and grant-funded projects.

### **Community-based Models: Grassroots Commoning and Participatory Cultural Practices**

Across Europe, a growing number of communities are reclaiming cultural spaces and heritage sites, transforming them into commons—shared resources governed collectively, outside traditional state or market frameworks. From occupied theatres in Italy and revitalized libraries in the UK to grassroots ecomuseums in Spain and cooperative tourism networks in France, these initiatives demonstrate a shift in how culture is produced, preserved, and governed. Rather than treating heritage as static property to be managed from above, these projects foreground local participation, horizontal decision-making, and sustainable economic practices. This emerging movement reflects a broader redefinition of cultural commons: not simply as inherited artifacts, but as living processes shaped through collective agency, social cooperation, and shared responsibility.

For example, in Italy, Teatro Valle in Rome became a pivotal case study of commons-based

governance. In the early 2010s, a community of citizens, students, patrons, and arts workers occupied the historic theatre in response to austerity measures that led to public funding cuts and the privatization of cultural institutions. The occupation aimed to reclaim the theatre as a cultural commons, establishing a foundation under the concept of *bene comune* (common good). Decision-making within the theatre was based on public deliberation and consensus, and the project became a model for other theatres across Italy, promoting the idea of cultural commons and alternative governance models (Bailey & Marcucci, 2014).

In the UK, the community-transferred heritage initiative allowed local communities to take over ownership and management of heritage assets, such as historic buildings and cultural institutions, from local authorities. This scheme was designed to address the financial strain caused by public spending cuts and rising management costs. Local groups were empowered to revitalize historic sites and create community hubs, with examples including the Battersea Arts Centre and the Brunel Museum. These initiatives reflect principles of commons management while also requiring sustainable business plans to balance community needs with financial viability.

In Spain, the Santo Adriano Ecomuseum emerged as a response to the economic crisis. Managed by a civic association of local residents and archaeologists, the Ecomuseum exemplifies a grassroots effort to engage the local community in heritage preservation and cultural activities. Operating without public subsidies, the Ecomuseum has developed basic infrastructure such as a visitor center and community workshops, while advocating for legal reforms that would delegate heritage management to civil society. This initiative highlights the participatory and sustainable approach to cultural commons in Spain.

In France, several community-based economic development organizations have emerged to support heritage sites and create economic opportunities for local residents. For example, the Hotel du Nord cooperative in Marseille offers accommodation and hospitality services, governed by local control and democratic principles. Similarly, Les Oiseaux de Passage in Poitiers promotes a web platform for community hosts to offer accommodation and cultural services to tourists, emphasizing sustainability and social solidarity. These organizations, part of the Faro Convention network, seek to democratize heritage governance and promote best practices in heritage management.

## **Public Institution-Enabled Models: Supporting Cultural Commons in the Public Sphere**

Publicly funded cultural institutions have an important role to play in supporting commons-based cultural practices. When public institutions recognize the value of community-driven

initiatives, they can offer long-term support and infrastructure to facilitate their growth and sustainability. In many cases, public funding helps expand the reach of these initiatives, making cultural resources more accessible to diverse communities.

For instance, public institutions like museums, libraries, and archives, along with socio-cultural centers, are increasingly moving towards more participatory and inclusive models. Initiatives such as the Casco Art Institute in Utrecht show how public support can empower arts organizations to serve as facilitators of commons-based practices. Casco, supported by the municipality of Utrecht, encourages projects that explore themes of collective living and community engagement through art. Public funding in these cases helps foster an open governance structure, allowing cultural institutions to function as collaborative spaces for cultural production and knowledge-sharing. Public sector funding thus becomes a key enabler, not just of cultural preservation, but of community-centered cultural practices that reflect the diverse needs and aspirations of society.

### **Grant-Funded Models: Private Foundations Supporting Collaborative Cultural Practices**

Private foundations have also become critical players in the development of cultural commons, providing long-term financial support and facilitating global knowledge exchange among cultural initiatives. Many cultural commons projects, particularly in the arts and cultural heritage, have received significant backing from philanthropic organizations. These grants help create a framework for sustainable cultural initiatives while fostering collaboration across local, national, and global networks.

For example, platforms such as the Arts Collaboratory, funded by the Stichting DOEN Foundation, are vital for supporting global networks of cultural practitioners working within the commons paradigm. Similarly, the ERSTE Foundation's support of the tranzit network in Bucharest and the GLASS House Trust's funding of MayDay Rooms in London exemplify the role that private foundations play in fostering networks of cultural practitioners dedicated to collaborative knowledge-sharing and the co-production of cultural resources. Through grants, private foundations are helping to build the infrastructure for a global commons in the cultural sector, enabling organizations to collaborate across borders and create transnational spaces for cultural exchange.

By recognizing the broader cultural landscape—including community-driven initiatives, public heritage projects, and global cultural networks—commons-based practices have the potential to reshape how cultural resources are produced, shared, and governed. Whether through grassroots activism, public institution support, or philanthropic grants, the principles of shared

responsibility, collective governance, and inclusivity can be applied across a diverse range of cultural practices. These models represent a shift towards more democratic, participatory, and sustainable cultural systems that not only preserve but actively engage communities in the creation and stewardship of culture. As cultural commons continue to expand and evolve, they offer a transformative path forward for cultural democracy, ensuring that cultural heritage and creative expression belong to all.

### **3. NAVIGATING CULTURAL CHALLENGES: A COMMONS-ORIENTED PERSPECTIVE**

In the current context of uncertainty, economic instability, and accelerated digital transformation, cultural organizations—especially those rooted in local and community contexts—are facing profound structural challenges. These issues go beyond managerial or operational concerns; they reach into fundamental questions of governance, participation, and cultural value.

Conventional frameworks have proven insufficient for ensuring resilience, inclusion, and sustainability. In contrast, the commons offers a model that redefines cultural organizations as participatory, community-managed spaces grounded in care, reciprocity, and shared responsibility.

Four interconnected challenges stand out in shaping the present and future of cultural work, each revealing how commons-based practices can provide viable and forward-looking responses.

#### **3.1. Financial Insecurity and Alternative Economies Of Support**

Across Europe and beyond, cultural organizations are under increasing financial pressure. Public funding has decreased due to shifting political priorities and broader economic shifts. These pressures have had a particularly strong impact on small-scale and community-based initiatives, many of which lack access to sustainable funding.

Commons-based initiatives, even when operating outside of formal financial systems, demonstrate remarkable resilience. Community-driven economic models—such as micro-donations, cooperative memberships, in-kind contributions, and crowdfunding—have been essential for maintaining autonomy and building cultures of mutual responsibility.

Many of these initiatives operate informally, which limits access to public resources and structured support. Hybrid arrangements have emerged in response, where public entities or foundations support long-term infrastructural needs while respecting the autonomy and values of grassroots groups. These models combine public support with horizontal governance, preserving the spirit of the commons while enabling long-term sustainability.

#### **3.2 Digital Transformations as a Site Of Care And Co-Creation**

The integration of digital technologies into cultural work has expanded opportunities for

access, storytelling, and preservation. At the same time, it brings risks related to exclusion, centralization, and the reinforcement of existing inequalities.

Digital commons—such as open-access archives, participatory mapping tools, and collaborative storytelling platforms—enable communities to shape narratives and preserve memory beyond traditional gatekeeping structures. These platforms support decentralized authorship and inclusive cultural production.

What distinguishes these practices is their grounding in the ethics of care. Co-curation is understood not simply as collaboration, but as a process rooted in empathy, emotional connection, and shared responsibility. Digital tools, when guided by these values, become more than functional infrastructure—they become spaces for genuine participation and mutual recognition.

### **3.3. Recognition and Protection Of Small-Scale And Informal Cultural Actors**

While cultural policy often prioritizes large, nationally visible organizations, it is small-scale, community-rooted, and often informal initiatives that drive much of today's cultural innovation. These organizations are embedded in everyday realities and frequently emerge through local needs, creativity, and self-organization.

Examples abound of abandoned or neglected spaces being transformed into vibrant centers of collective activity. These spaces operate as commons: open, self-managed, and anchored in shared values and care. Their flexibility allows for experimentation, cultural exchange, and new forms of learning.

Yet without legal recognition or long-term security, these spaces remain precarious. The commons provides a framework that not only strengthens their internal organization, but also offers a language for demanding recognition and integration into broader cultural ecosystems. These actors are not peripheral—they are essential to a plural and resilient cultural landscape.

### **3. 4. Addressing Inequity, Exclusion, and Cultural Inertia**

Cultural organizations are increasingly expected to reflect the diversity of their communities. However, systemic inequality, colonial legacies, and institutional inertia continue to limit genuine inclusion and participation.

Traditional models of public engagement often fall short by maintaining hierarchical control and offering only symbolic or consultative roles to marginalized groups. Commons-based approaches disrupt these dynamics by centering shared authorship, horizontal decision-

making, and distributed ownership.

Participatory heritage-making and community-led memory initiatives exemplify how collective remembrance can serve as a tool of healing, empowerment, and narrative restoration. These practices embed culture in lived experience and allow for the emergence of stories that are often excluded from dominant frameworks.

The ethics of care that underpin commons practices extend to emotional and ecological dimensions, reinforcing a more holistic understanding of cultural sustainability. Diversity, in this context, is not treated as an add-on—it is embedded in how the organization is structured, governed, and sustained.

The commons offers a powerful perspective for reimagining the future of cultural organizations. In the face of financial instability, digital fragmentation, and systemic exclusion, commons-based approaches provide practical models and ethical orientations that support sustainability, inclusivity, and participatory engagement.

Cultural organizations and policymakers alike must understand these practices not as peripheral or experimental, but as central to the future of the field. Investing in the commons means investing in culture as a living, shared process—co-created, co-managed, and collectively sustained.

## 4. SKILLS FOR COLLABORATIVE CULTURAL WORK

In contemporary cultural industries that aim for commons-based models of management and collaboration, the development of specific skills becomes essential for achieving inclusive and sustainable cultural practices. Instead of relying on traditional, hierarchical approaches that favor experts and centralized control, the commons-based approach emphasizes participation, collective responsibility, and the co-production of cultural values. In this context, there are several key skills that enable effective and inclusive cultural creation.

### 4.1. Facilitation and Mediation

When it comes to participatory management of cultural resources and production, developing facilitation skills is crucial, as they allow for a balance between various interest groups, including experts, activists, and communities. Facilitation involves the ability to guide group processes toward consensus, enabling openness, transparency, and effective communication between all participants. The role of mediation becomes critical when it comes to resolving disagreements and providing space for constructive debate, without allowing one group to dominate another<sup>2</sup>.

Communities managing cultural resources must develop the capacity to lead processes where all are involved—from planning cultural programs to decision-making and conflict management. These skills enable institutional actors to create inclusive spaces for cultural collaboration and nurture mutual trust and shared responsibility.

### 4.2. Active Listening and Horizontal Communication

In commons-based cultural production, directing attention to the needs and ideas of all participants is essential. Active listening allows for better understanding of the perspectives of different communities and individuals, creating space for authentic and inclusive cultural dialogues. Together with horizontal communication, which involves an equal exchange of information and ideas, this creates the foundation for sustainable collaboration<sup>3</sup>.

Using this skill in cultural work means avoiding hierarchical and authoritative models, instead encouraging participants to actively engage in decision-making, sharing, and creating. Horizontal communication helps break down barriers between different social, cultural, and

---

<sup>2</sup> See D5.7, *Module 1: Participatory Governance* — section on *Consensus-building and conflict resolution*, which provides practical methods and exercises for facilitation and mediation skills.

<sup>3</sup> See D5.7, *Module 1: Stakeholder Engagement*, emphasizing *Active Listening* as a core skill for fostering horizontal communication within governance structures.

professional layers, creating an egalitarian space for all voices.

### 4.3. Digital Literacy and Co-Curation Tools

In contemporary culture, digital transformation presents new challenges and opportunities for commons-based cultural production<sup>4</sup>. Understanding and utilizing digital tools for co-curation enables communities to actively participate in the creation, archiving, and sharing of cultural resources<sup>5</sup>. Digital platforms and tools such as shared databases, open archives, and participatory storytelling tools provide space for inclusive creation and distribution of cultural content<sup>6</sup>.

However, digital literacy is not just about technological knowledge, but also about an ethical approach regarding data protection, the preservation of cultural heritage, and addressing issues of digital exclusion. In order to foster the creation of cultural resources through open and commons-based channels, institutions must invest in training on using these tools and raising digital literacy among communities and cultural industry workers.

### 4.4. Participatory Governance and Conflict Resolution

For cultural institutions to function as spaces for collaborative cultural production, there must be a redefinition of decision-making processes. Participatory governance involves creating structures and processes where all stakeholders have the opportunity to participate equally in decision-making<sup>7</sup>. This model not only helps decentralize power but also ensures that cultural practices are developed based on the needs of the community and all its members.

Conflict resolution becomes an important part of participatory governance. In commons-based cultural production, differences in opinion, interests, and approaches are not exceptions but rather an integral part of a dynamic community. Conflict resolution skills allow for constructive engagement with disagreements, ensuring that conflicts do not escalate but are used as opportunities for learning and growth within the community.

---

<sup>4</sup> According to the *Code of Conduct* (D5.1), GLAMs must embrace open access and collaborative authorship as part of their digital literacy practices.

<sup>5</sup> See D5.7, *Module 4: Digital Skills for Commons-Based Institutions* and D5.4 *Blueprint: Digital Strategies for GLAMs under Commons* for practical tools and ethical guidelines on digital participation and co-curation.

<sup>6</sup> *The Blueprint (D5.4) extends this by offering a range of open-source tools that can operationalise co-curation and digital collaboration.*

<sup>7</sup> According to the *Code of Conduct* (D5.1), participatory governance in cultural institutions should be grounded in principles of transparency, accountability, and collaborative management.

## 4.5 Collaborative Knowledge And Practice

Collaborative Learning, Curation, and Creation represent an interrelated set of practices that enable knowledge exchange, shared meaning-making, and collective cultural production<sup>8</sup>. In this approach, the boundaries between learning, curating, and creating become porous, while traditional hierarchies between experts and audiences are reexamined and transformed.

Co-learning refers to a process of mutual learning in which all participants contribute to collective knowledge based on their experiences, perspectives, and skills. This practice unfolds in both formal and informal settings—through workshops, open dialogues, collaborative research, and digital knowledge-sharing platforms. At its core lies the recognition that knowledge is neither static nor exclusive; rather, it is continuously shaped through interaction and co-existence.

Co-curation moves beyond the notion of the curator as a singular authority, opening up space for shared decision-making about what is preserved, displayed, and interpreted in cultural institutions or community spaces. Through dialogue and horizontal communication, participants collectively develop narratives, thematic frameworks, and modes of presentation that reflect diverse experiences and identities. This process not only decentralizes power but also fosters deeper relevance and rootedness of cultural content within its social context.

Co-creation is the collective act of making—whether it is an artwork, a piece of knowledge, a method, or a strategy for action. In such processes, all contributors participate equally in shaping the idea, elaborating it, and bringing it into being. Co-creation is grounded in mutual trust, openness, and a willingness to allow initial visions to evolve through collaborative engagement. It is not only a working method but also a form of relationship that reflects values of solidarity, care, and shared responsibility.

Together, these three practices—learning, curating, and creating in collaboration—form the foundation of a participatory culture that revitalizes the idea of the commons. They enable institutions, collectives, and individuals to co-build knowledge, narratives, and practices that are inclusive, reflective, and resilient. In this sense, Collaborative Learning, Curation, and Creation are not only skill sets, but also political and ethical orientations toward a culture rooted in togetherness, dialogue, and collective imagination.

Participatory evaluation methods can support collective reflection, knowledge sharing, and

---

<sup>8</sup> See D5.7, *Module 3: Collaborative Cultural Production* — sections on *Co-creation with communities* and *Inclusive curation and programming*, focusing on participatory cultural work and collective authorship.

value alignment among stakeholders<sup>9</sup>.

## 4.6 Relational And Emotional Intelligence

Relational and Emotional Intelligence is a core capacity in commons-based cultural work, where trust, care, and collaboration are essential<sup>10</sup> to sustaining collective efforts. It involves self-awareness, empathy, and attentiveness to group dynamics, enabling individuals to navigate emotions—both their own and those of others—with sensitivity and skill.

This intelligence begins with the ability to reflect on one's motivations and impact, and to regulate emotions in a way that supports group cohesion. Empathy and active care help build psychological safety, allowing participants to speak openly, take risks, and co-create without fear of judgment.

In horizontal or non-hierarchical settings, emotional intelligence becomes especially vital. It supports the recognition and transformation of tensions, fosters inclusion, and helps groups navigate complexity with compassion and clarity.

Rather than being a secondary or “soft” skill, relational intelligence is foundational to shared governance and sustainable collaboration. When practiced collectively, it nurtures a culture of belonging, mutual respect, and responsibility—turning a group of collaborators into a resilient and caring community.

## 4.7 Commons-Oriented Strategic Thinking

Commons-Oriented Strategic Thinking refers to a capacity for envisioning, articulating, and implementing strategies that center the collective good, long-term sustainability, and shared responsibility. Unlike conventional strategic thinking that often focuses on competition, growth, and efficiency in service of private or institutional gain, this mode of thinking reorients priorities toward cooperation, ecological balance, and the equitable stewardship of resources.

At its heart lies systemic thinking—the ability to perceive the interconnectedness of cultural, social, economic, and ecological systems. This includes recognizing how interventions in one area can reverberate through others, and how small, well-placed actions can generate disproportionate positive impacts over time. Practitioners of commons-oriented strategy learn to identify leverage points within systems—places where change can be both catalytic and

---

<sup>9</sup> See D5.3, Quality Evaluator +

<sup>10</sup> See D5.7, *Volunteer Engagement and Care* section, highlighting the importance of relational and emotional intelligence in sustaining inclusive and collaborative communities.

sustainable.

Another core aspect is the ability to govern and share resources—whether material (like physical spaces and tools), social (like networks and relationships), or symbolic (like narratives and cultural meanings)—in ways that are transparent, participatory, and inclusive. Rather than seeing resources as scarce and privately owned, commons thinking approaches them as collectively generated and maintained through mutual care, responsibility, and ongoing negotiation.

This form of strategy also calls for radical imagination—the courage and creativity to envision alternatives to dominant, extractive paradigms. It requires rethinking notions of value, ownership, and success, and proposing models that prioritize reciprocity, cultural autonomy, and ecological embeddedness. Such alternatives might include cooperative governance structures, regenerative funding mechanisms, distributed leadership models, or time-based economies rooted in care and contribution.

Crucially, commons-oriented strategic thinking is not only analytical but also ethical and relational. It asks: ***How do our decisions affect others, now and in the future? Whose voices are included in shaping these decisions? What forms of knowledge are valued or excluded?*** In asking such questions, this approach fosters a culture of responsibility—not just toward institutions or projects, but toward communities, environments, and generations to come.

Ultimately, this kind of strategic thinking empowers individuals and collectives to move beyond reactive problem-solving, toward proactive shaping of cultural ecosystems that are more just, resilient, and aligned with the principles of the commons.

#### **4.8 Integrating These Skills Into Cultural Institutions And Ecosystems**

To successfully implement these skills, cultural institutions must invest in education and training programs that promote this type of collaboration. Through various workshops, training sessions, and co-learning platforms, institutions can support the development of these key skills among their employees, volunteers, and the communities they serve. Such processes not only contribute to the creation of cultural content but also strengthen the resilience of cultural ecosystems, making them more sustainable and adaptable in the face of contemporary challenges.

In implementing the ***commons-based approach***, these skills can also help reduce social inequalities within cultural industries, allowing for greater participation and inclusion of

marginalized groups. When facilitation, communication, digital literacy, and conflict resolution skills are accessible and implemented on a broad level, institutions become catalysts for the creation of culture based on shared responsibility, mutual support, and collective production.

## 5. MAKING IT HAPPEN: ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Co-Creation and Community Engagement

The cultural heritage sector, alongside contemporary artistic and creative practices, has seen a significant shift from top-down management to more participatory models, where the public plays an active role in the creation, interpretation, and dissemination of cultural and creative expressions. This shift is particularly crucial for community-led initiatives and civil society organizations, which often have deep, direct connections with local populations.

For example, initiatives focusing on the documentation, preservation, and interpretation of cultural and creative assets highlight the power of community-driven efforts. These projects redefine traditional narratives, turning local knowledge, public participation, and creative input into core elements of heritage and cultural preservation. By fostering collaborative and participatory environments, cultural heritage, contemporary artistic practices, and creative industries become more inclusive, dynamic, and living entities, rather than static objects of institutional control.

**Recommendation:** Encourage and institutionalize community-driven co-creation processes across all sectors of cultural heritage, contemporary artistic, and creative practices, involving not only formal institutions but also civil society and grassroots initiatives.

- Develop platforms for collaborative research and cultural heritage interpretation, ensuring that local communities, civil society organizations, and informal groups are integral to the process.
- Facilitate inclusive educational programs that integrate various actors, such as heritage practitioners, artists, and the general public, ensuring co-creation is a core element.
- Leverage digital tools to enable broader community involvement in heritage interpretation and sharing, ensuring that all stakeholders—especially marginalized groups—have the chance to participate.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: Vrij Paleis (Free Palace), SciArt project of the Joint Research Centre, Erfgoedhuis Zuid-Holland (Heritage House of South Holland), Intercultural Museum

## 5.2 Governance and Institutional Practices

Effective governance is central to managing cultural heritage, contemporary artistic, and creative practices in ways that are inclusive, equitable, and responsive to local needs. However, governance is not the sole responsibility of institutions. Both civil society organizations and informal cultural initiatives must also adopt democratic, transparent, and inclusive governance models to ensure that cultural management is genuinely participatory<sup>11</sup>.

Local communities and civil society actors can reshape cultural management practices by integrating community voices into the decision-making process. These initiatives showcase the potential for governance structures that balance expert knowledge with public participation, ensuring that heritage, art, and culture are managed in ways that serve and reflect community interests.

Recommendation: Encourage democratic, transparent, and inclusive decision-making practices in cultural heritage and creative sector management, recognizing the vital role of both institutions and civil society.

- Civil society organizations and informal initiatives should establish governance structures that integrate diverse community voices, particularly those of underrepresented groups.
- Cultural institutions and NGOs should collaborate to create shared decision-making spaces where local communities, heritage professionals, artists, and activists can jointly influence cultural and creative practices.
- Implement participatory budgeting and community-led decision-making in cultural and creative projects to ensure that public resources are directed toward initiatives that reflect community priorities.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: The New Patrons-Le Consortium, Santo Adriano Ecomuseum

## 5.3 Access and Open Resources

The principle of open access to cultural materials, including creative works and heritage

---

<sup>11</sup> As reinforced by D5.1, governance must be transparent, participatory, and free of conflicts of interest, ensuring public trust in cultural commons

resources, is fundamental to fostering engagement and enabling broad public participation. While cultural institutions play a significant role in providing access to resources, civil society organizations, and informal initiatives must also contribute by ensuring that cultural and creative materials are accessible and reusable. Open access ensures that these materials are not just available to experts but to everyone, promoting innovation and the democratization of knowledge.

Digital commons platforms have proven effective in improving accessibility, particularly through digital archives and open data systems<sup>12</sup>. These platforms empower local communities to access and contribute to cultural and creative resources, making collaboration and knowledge-sharing easier. Access to these materials must be a priority not only for state institutions but also for grassroots initiatives working outside traditional institutional frameworks.

Recommendation: Promote open access to cultural, artistic, and creative materials and resources across all sectors of the cultural landscape, recognizing the shared responsibility of institutions, civil society organizations, and informal initiatives.

- Adopt open-access policies in cultural institutions and civil society organizations that allow the public to freely access and use cultural, artistic, and creative resources.
- Civil society organizations and informal initiatives should develop digital repositories and platforms that host cultural, artistic, and creative materials, making them accessible to local communities and global audiences.
- Foster a culture of knowledge-sharing and collaboration between different sectors, ensuring that all actors can contribute to the stewardship of cultural heritage and creative practices.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: Oral History Groups, Contemporary Social History Archives, Ekatarina Pavlovic Library.

## 5.4 Financial Sustainability and Alternative Funding

A key challenge facing commons-based cultural and creative projects is financial

---

<sup>12</sup> D5.4 provides step-by-step guidance on open repositories, metadata standards, and licensing options to ensure broad accessibility.

sustainability<sup>13</sup>. Traditional market-based funding models often prioritize commercial interests or limit access to resources, making it difficult for community-driven projects to thrive. Therefore, alternative funding mechanisms must be explored to support both formal institutions and informal initiatives.

Community-driven projects such as crowdfunding campaigns, cooperative funding mechanisms, and other forms of participatory financing provide opportunities to involve local populations in the financial sustainability of cultural and creative initiatives. These models ensure that such projects remain relevant to the communities they serve while reducing reliance on profit-driven funding streams.

Recommendation: Explore alternative, non-market-based funding models for commons-oriented cultural and creative initiatives, ensuring that both cultural institutions and civil society organizations can maintain long-term sustainability.

- Institutions and civil society organizations should experiment with participatory funding models, such as crowdfunding or community-managed endowments, to support cultural, artistic, and creative heritage projects.
- Encourage collaborations between local businesses, cooperatives, and cultural organizations to create joint funding initiatives that align with the values of cultural commons.
- Provide resources for community-led initiatives to develop their own funding strategies, ensuring they are not overly dependent on institutional grants or commercial sponsorship.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: The Schwules Museum, Municipal Galleries in Berlin

## 5.5 Collaboration and Knowledge-Sharing

Collaboration across institutions, civil society organizations, and informal groups is essential for enhancing the preservation of cultural heritage and promoting shared stewardship of contemporary artistic and creative practices<sup>14</sup>. Knowledge-sharing plays a central role in

---

<sup>13</sup> See D2.1 Best Practices In Managing Financial Arrangements In Glams Under Commons D5.3 QE+ toolkit includes specific guides for funders and policymakers to evaluate and support cultural commons initiatives based on their foundational values, helping align funding with purpose.

<sup>14</sup> As highlighted in D5.1, meaningful collaboration in the cultural commons requires not only structural cooperation but also a commitment to respectful communication, mutual recognition, and shared responsibility among all participants.

ensuring that cultural and creative resources remain a common good, accessible and relevant to all. Collaborative efforts between local communities, cultural institutions, and creative professionals generate long-term value for all stakeholders.

Facilitating collaborations helps ensure that cultural heritage and creative practices are rooted in local contexts and reflect the diverse voices of all communities involved. By fostering these connections, we can create a more integrated and dynamic cultural landscape.

Recommendation: Foster international and cross-disciplinary collaboration to strengthen the commons-oriented approach to cultural heritage and creative practices, ensuring that both formal and informal actors are included in the process.

- Promote partnerships between local and international organizations, researchers, artists, and community groups to enhance the sharing of knowledge and expertise.
- Support the creation of networks where civil society organizations, informal initiatives, and creative professionals can exchange ideas, resources, and strategies for promoting cultural and creative resources as commons<sup>15</sup>.
- Ensure that all stakeholders—regardless of institutional affiliation—are given opportunities to contribute to and shape the cultural and creative narratives that define their communities.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: Cultural Center Magacin

## 5.6 Transforming Institutional Culture

Successfully implementing commons-based approaches to cultural heritage and contemporary artistic and creative practices requires more than technical adjustments; it necessitates a fundamental transformation in how cultural institutions operate. Effective collaboration depends on trust-building, transparency, and long-term engagement<sup>16</sup>. Cultural professionals, whether curators, archivists, or artists, must evolve from gatekeepers to facilitators, enabling communities to become active co-creators of cultural meaning and

---

<sup>15</sup> According to D5.4, fostering intercommoning across cultural and creative initiatives involves the use of open, digital infrastructures—such as Europeana, Wikimedia, and DIWO communities—that enable decentralized knowledge-sharing and collaborative cultural production.

<sup>16</sup> Professional conduct, respectful communication, and volunteer empowerment (D5.1) are key for cultural transformation

narratives.

To support this shift, institutions must undergo structural and cultural transformations that align with the values of inclusivity, equity, and community participation<sup>17</sup>. This transformation involves rethinking internal policies, institutional practices, and the ways in which success is measured.

Recommendation: Transform institutional cultures to align with commons-based values, ensuring that institutions facilitate community-driven cultural work rather than control access to knowledge and resources.

- Invest in capacity-building programs for both staff and community partners, providing training in collaborative practices, co-creation, and participatory governance.
- Develop and implement internal policies that reflect the values of equity, accessibility, and public participation, ensuring that institutional frameworks support a diverse and inclusive cultural landscape.
- Rethink institutional hierarchies and success metrics to prioritize inclusion, community engagement, and the collective creation of cultural and creative narratives, rather than focusing solely on prestige or institutional authority.
- Foster a culture of openness within institutions, encouraging staff to embrace roles as facilitators and collaborators rather than experts who solely control access to cultural resources.
- Promote long-term engagement with communities, recognizing that collaboration with local groups, artists, and heritage professionals is an ongoing process that must be sustained and nurtured over time.

Explore how following organizations and initiatives are already implementing these practices: Curating London-Museum of London, Hedgehogs Home- Museum of Yugoslavia, Society of Joint Responsibility, DIY Exhibitions- Estonian National Museum

---

<sup>17</sup> Digital strategies for open governance and networked collaboration (D5.4) provide the practical layer for institutional change.

## **6. WRAPPING UP: KEY LESSONS AND NEXT STEPS**

### **6.1 Long-Term Benefits of a Commons-Based Approach for Cultural and Creative Industries (CCIs)**

The long-term advantages of adopting a commons-based approach for cultural and creative industries (CCIs) are substantial. By moving away from traditional, hierarchical governance models, the commons fosters participatory, co-managed spaces that encourage sustainability, inclusivity, and collaboration.

In terms of financial sustainability, the commons framework promotes alternative funding models, such as crowdfunding, membership fees, and donations, reducing reliance on restrictive institutional funding. These models empower communities to take ownership of their cultural projects, strengthening the collective stewardship of cultural heritage. This autonomy also allows for a more diversified approach to funding, mitigating the vulnerabilities associated with traditional funding sources.

Moreover, commons-based models promote cultural diversity by creating spaces where multiple voices—especially those from marginalized communities—can contribute to the creation, curation, and preservation of culture. This inclusivity ensures that cultural production reflects the needs and aspirations of diverse populations, fostering a richer, more pluralistic cultural landscape.

From a governance perspective, the commons framework encourages democratic decision-making, ensuring that stakeholders from various backgrounds—including artists, cultural practitioners, and community members—have a say in the direction and management of cultural projects. The emphasis on collaboration over competition fosters the sharing of knowledge and resources, which strengthens resilience and builds stronger networks both within and between communities.

Over time, the continuous involvement of local communities in co-curation and the collective stewardship of cultural resources will enhance social cohesion, ensuring that cultural institutions remain relevant and responsive to the populations they serve.

### **6.2 Vision for the Future of Cultural Production and Management Through the Commons**

Looking to the future, the vision for cultural production and management through the commons embraces inclusivity, sustainability, and collective responsibility. As cultural institutions

navigate rapid technological advancements and shifting societal values, the commons offers a framework that ensures cultural heritage remains a shared, living resource accessible to all.

The future of cultural production should prioritize community participation, with local and global actors working together to create and manage cultural content. Digital platforms, open-access archives, and participatory tools will play a critical role in breaking down traditional barriers to access, enabling anyone—regardless of background—to engage in and contribute to the creation of cultural heritage.

Governance structures in the cultural sector must evolve to embrace the principles of the commons: decentralization, shared responsibility, and equitable decision-making. This vision includes a future where formal institutions and informal community-based organizations collaborate to co-create cultural spaces and manage resources in ways that reflect the needs and desires of local communities. Such an approach would foster a more resilient cultural ecosystem, where both large and small organizations coexist, support each other, and enrich the cultural landscape through shared stewardship and collaborative governance.

The long-term shift toward commons-based cultural management will also contribute to social cohesion and inclusivity. By emphasizing care, empathy, and mutual respect in cultural practices, the commons framework nurtures a cultural environment that values diversity not only as a goal but as an inherent principle. This future vision underscores the collective responsibility for cultural heritage, where communities, institutions, and individuals jointly care for, co-create, and steward cultural resources, ensuring that culture thrives for generations to come.

## 7. CASE STUDIES IN ACTION: PRACTICAL EXAMPLES OF CULTURAL COMMONS

The GLAMMONS project aimed to map out existing practices in the GLAM sector and identify innovative responses that could lead to greater resilience. Through multidisciplinary research, the team also looked at how small-scale, community-led GLAMs had been adapting and whether these practices could be transferred to other institutions and initiatives. The following list highlights institutions, organizations and initiatives throughout Europe that were recognized as inspiring practices of implementing principles of cultural commons in their organizational structures, ownership, productions or strategic repositioning. Detailed case studies analysis and reports covering various aspects of these practices can be found on Glammons website section Resources.

### Museums

#### [The Schwules Museum](#)-Germany

A communal space which consists of a museum, gallery and archive, devoted to inclusivity, collaborative engagement, and the dissemination of knowledge. Starting as a grassroots movement in Berlin, 1985 devoted to history of gay men emancipation movement, SMU became leading international center for *preservation, and presentation of the culture and history of queer people and sexual and gender diversity, as well as a sought-after cooperation partner for museums and universities, cultural funding institutions, artists, and activists from around the world.*

#### [The Museum of Political Exiles of Ai Stratis](#)-Greece

Museum firstly was in the form of a NGO, when it was initiated in 1988 by a community of ex-political exiles. Through the motto “By people, for the people”, the museum deals with the dark heritage by archiving personal stories and belongings related to the history of political exile and traumas of 20th century Greece. The collection is divided into a thematic exhibition displaying different aspects of life in camps, as well as an archive with a library which has open access.

#### [London Museum](#)-United Kingdom

Within a 5 year curatorial programme Curating London, the museum implemented practices of co-curation with various communities and contemporary collecting based on inclusivity and democratization. The programme consisted of thematic objects and stories collection, research projects, exhibitions and numerous activities outside the museum. The goal of the programme was to explore and document what it means to be a Londoner in the 21st century

directly from those whose voices are usually not represented in traditional museology practices.

#### [Estonian National Museum](#)-Estonia

Through the DIY exhibition programme, the museum empowers citizens' critical thinking and engagement by implementing co-curation practices. Once a year, the museum initiates an exhibition open call meant for individuals or organisations outside of CCI field. Through public voting the best project is being selected and later displayed within a permanent exhibition. These collaborations are crucial for achieving wider goals of the museum's strategy of development, especially the research department, enabling benefits for both sides.

#### [Intercultural Museum](#)-Norway

As a response to the rising immigrant population in Oslo at the beginning of 90s, the museum was firstly initiated as a place for social contact. Today, as part of Oslo Museum, it serves as a platform for sharing culture and experiences of different marginalized groups, through immersive events and participatory exhibitions. The community representatives are taking part in all stages of decision and exhibition making.

### **Initiatives**

#### [Oral History Groups](#)-Greece

The network was initiated in 2011 as a bottom-up and self-organized initiative with the goal of collecting and disseminating both historical and contemporary personal stories, through horizontal governance and collaborative content creation. All groups and the coordinating body are informal (without legal status), functioning under collective rules and common methodology for gathering stories, maintaining the archives and organizing activities.

#### [The New Patrons](#)-France

Protocol for artworks commission, started by the Le Consortium, in collaboration with Fondation de France in the 1990s. The protocol enables patrons-citizens (individuals/groups/associations) to take part in the art making process, by firstly reaching out to the mediator, who will find the artist based on their needs/wishes and further coordinate discussions and negotiations. Besides France, Protocol has been implemented in Belgium, Italy, Germany, Spain and Switzerland.

### [SciArt-International](#)

Project of the Joint Research Centre which connects actors from art, science and policymaking in the process of knowledge sharing. Professionals are gathering around important social issues with the goal of finding new ways of dealing with important social issues. Their approach leans on experimentation and providing equal roles for all parties in final contributions, opening new perspectives for both creatives and scientists.

### [Society of Joint Responsibility-Serbia](#)

Experimental and multidisciplinary collective gathered around the idea of art and research production through open structure and horizontal decision making. Their project *Impossible that is impossible* was a 12 week program which was co-curated on three levels. Program took place in a non-profit gallery of another collective, transforming it into an office, meeting place, exhibition displays and a platform for numerous collaborations with different communities.

## **Libraries**

### [Ekatarina Pavlovic Library-Serbia](#)

As part of the commonly shared space of Rural Cultural Center Markovac, the library encourages critical thinking, creativity, and civic awareness through numerous activities. Besides space, books are a common resource as well- collected by donations of individuals and publishing houses. The library plays an important role in the empowerment of the local community, especially by employing residents of surrounding villages from all age groups as librarians.

### [Park Library Pankow-Germany](#)

Summer library with the collection which consists of publishing houses donations, run by 70 volunteers through non hierarchical and self governed form. There are no membership cards, the only requirement for users is to leave a 1€ deposit. The library was reopened in 2019 under civic organization, similarly to other libraries which had primarily been public libraries.

## **Cultural Centres**

### [Magacin Cultural Center-Serbia](#)

Self-organized space, mostly run by members of the independent art scene, which nurtures cultural exchange and social cohesion. Magacin provides free access to spatial and technical resources for various art and social activities, through the Open Calendar Model. It was initiated in 2007 by a joint initiative of cultural collectives and artists in the former storage space

of the publishing house. Since then it's run by Users Assembly, main governing body and five working groups, also compromised from the members.

## **Galleries**

### [Vrij Paleis](#) (Free Palace)-Netherlands

Organization devoted to empowerment of alternative culture, which provides common space for exhibitions and events, run by around 30 creatives from the CCI sector. Besides co-creation of artistic productions, members are sharing all responsibilities and tasks regarding maintenance and management of the space-building of the former printing house. From the late 70s when it was initiated, Free Palace has played a crucial role in the Amsterdam cultural scene by supporting independent artistic expression and movements and resisting commercialization.

## REFERENCES

- Avdikos, V., Dragouni, M., Michailidou, M., & Pettas, D. (2024). *Rethinking GLAMs as commons: A conceptual framework* [Version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *Open Research Europe*, 3, 157. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16473.2>
- Bailey, S. J., Marcucci, E. (2014). *Designing Urban Commons: The Politics of Cultural Production in Public Space*. In *Space and Culture*, 17(3), 236–250.
- Bauwens, M., Niaros, V. (2017). *Value in the Commons Economy: Developments in Open and Contributory Value Accounting*. Heinrich Böll Foundation.
- Bertacchini, E. E. (Ed.). (2012). *Cultural commons: A new perspective on the production and evolution of cultures*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Björgvinsson, E. (2014). The Making of Cultural Commons: Nasty Old Film Distribution and Funding. In P. Ehn, E. Nilsson, & R. Topgaard (Eds.), *Making Futures: Marginal Notes on Innovation, Design, and Democracy* (pp. 187-226). MIT Press.
- Bollier, D. (2020). Commoning as a Transformative Social Paradigm. In J. G. Speth & K. Courrier (Eds.), *The New Systems Reader. Alternatives to a Failed Economy*. Routledge.
- Bollier, D., Helfrich, S. (2015). *Patterns of commoning*. London, Commons Strategy Group and Off the Common Press.
- De Angelis, M. (2014). The commons: a brief life journey. *Community Development Journal*, 49: 68-80.
- De Angelis, M., Harvie, D. (2013). The commons. In: M. Parker, G. Cheney, V. Fournier. & C. Land (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. Routledge, pp. 280-294.
- De Angelis, M. (2017). *Omnia Sunt Communia - On the Commons and the Transformation to Postcapitalism*. Zed Books.
- De Tulio, M. F. (2020) Commons as ecosystems for culture. Available at: <https://instituteofradicalimagination.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Commons-as-Ecosystems-for-Culture-Ready-for-the-website.pdf>
- Euler, J. (2018). Conceptualizing the commons: Moving beyond the goods-based definition by introducing the social practices of commoning as vital determinant. *Ecological Economics*, 143, 10-16.
- Eskelinen, T. (2020). The conception of value in community economies. In: T. Eskelinen, T. Hirvilammi & J. Venäläinen (Eds.), *Enacting Community Economies within a Welfare State. International mayfly*. pp. 23-46.
- Federici, S. (2012) Feminism and the politics of the commons. In Bollier, David and Silke Helfrich (eds.) *The Wealth of the Commons: A World Beyond Market and State*. Levellers Press, Amherst, 45–54.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K., J. Cameron, & Healy, S. (2016). Commoning as a Postcapitalist Politics. In A. Amin & N. Y. R. P. Howell (Eds.), *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking the Future of the Commons*. Routledge, pp. 192–212.
- Hardin, G. (1968). *The Tragedy of the Commons*. *Science*, 162(3859)
- Hardt, M., Negri, A. (2009). *Commonwealth*. Harvard University Press.
- Hess, C., & Ostrom, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Understanding Knowledge as Commons*. The MIT Press.
- Hofmann, V., Euler, J., Zurmühlen, L. & Helfrich, S. (2022). *Commoning Art – Die transformativen Potenziale von Commons in der Kunst*. transcript.

Madison, M. J., Frischmann, B. M., & Strandburg, K. J. (2010). Constructing commons in the cultural environment. *Cornell Law Review*, 95 (4), 657-709.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.

Ridge, M. M. (Ed.). (2014). *Crowdsourcing our Cultural Heritage*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Singh, N. (2017). Becoming a commoner: The commons as sites for affective socio-nature encounters and co-becomings, *Ephemera theory & politics in organization* 17 (4): 751-776.

\*Titles of all used public Glammons working papers will be added after all deliverables are submitted

Bastian Lange, Ares Kalandides, Georgios Thodos (2025). *D5.1 Code Of Conduct for GLAMons* [version 1.0]

Stelios Lekakis, Mina Dragouni, Katerina Konstantinou (2025). *D5.4 Blueprint: Digital Strategies for GLAMs under Commons* [version 1.0]

Iva Čukić (2025). *D5.7 Skills-Development Toolkit For The Glams Of The Commons* [version 1.0]