

# Egmus: country report The Netherlands, 2019

Report by Robert Oosterhuis, Nico Heerschap and Elisa Goudriaan

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and Statistics Netherlands, October 1, 2019

Contact: [r.e.j.a.oosterhuis@minocw.nl](mailto:r.e.j.a.oosterhuis@minocw.nl)

## A. Museum Policy

Dutch cultural policy is based on the premise that the state should distance itself from judgements regarding the value of art. Artistic development has therefore largely been the result of the initiatives of private citizens and a large number of foundations dedicated to culture. Over the years, the government has gradually assumed the role of a moderator of cultural activities, apart from being the largest patron of public art and culture.

In 1993, the Privatisation of National Museums Act was passed by the Netherlands Parliament. After completion of the privatisation project, 24 National Museums were all accommodated into foundations. These museums are still subsidised by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Other Ministries, such as the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Defence fund 11 other museums. The buildings and collections remained State property. Some retained the predicate Rijksmuseum (national museum) after completion of the privatisation project, while others decided to drop it. Together, the museums depend on government subsidies for more than 70% of their total budget.<sup>1</sup>

At the moment, 27 of the 697 museums in the Netherlands are subsidised by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. This group includes the biggest and most visited museums in the country, such as the Van Gogh Museum and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam or the Netherlands' Open Air Museum in Arnhem.

In accordance with the Cultural Policy Act (1993)<sup>2</sup>, the Dutch government guarantees a financial contribution to a selection of cultural institutions and six public funds. These cultural institutions form the so-called national basic infrastructure (BIS) and can be seen as the organisations that ensure the supply and development of high quality cultural output. Especially the museums in the BIS are often former state owned museums that were privatized in the last decades of the 20th century. They are in the possession of a state collection and therefore sure of their position in the BIS. Since the implementation of the Heritage Act in 2016 (see later), the preservation of the state collection is ensured and no longer plays a role in selecting museums for the BIS.

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to guarantee continuity of ministerial responsibility in the future, the articles of incorporation of all the foundations stipulate that they cannot be amended without the Minister's permission. Even after completion of the privatisation process, the Minister will continue to assume responsibility for the mission of the institute, the administrative structure according to the supervisory board model, termination of the foundation (when applicable) and the appointment of the members of the supervisory board. Although appointed by the Minister, the members of the supervisory board are by no means supposed to receive instructions from the Minister. The articles of the association of the museum foundations expressly stipulate that the supervisory board, in the execution of its duties, should promote the interests of the foundation.

<sup>2</sup> The Cultural Policy Act (1993) states that the Minister of Culture is responsible for preserving, developing and disseminating cultural expressions.

Until 2008, the financing of the museums was largely similar to other subsidised cultural institutions, such as orchestras or theatre companies. All subsidised cultural organizations received grants from the Ministry for the duration of four years, the so called "Cultural Plan Period". From 2009 on, there were plans to change this situation. This was a consequence of a policy paper on museums: *The Future of the Past (Bewaren om teweeg te brengen)* presented to the Parliament by the then State Secretary for Culture, Medy van der Laan, in November 2005 and of new regulations for financing cultural institutions in general. Museums that were subsidised by the Ministry should leave the 4 year funding system. Instead, the Ministry should settle management contracts with the museums, stipulating the conditions for long-term funding (30 years). The grants had to cover the running costs of the museums, such as staff, housing, upkeep of the collections, new acquisitions and exhibitions. Management contracts had to include also a periodical assessment of the performance of the museums by a visiting committee of (inter)national experts. Apart from the running costs, additional funding was planned to be available for specific activities of the museums aiming at, *inter alia*, increasing participation of target groups (youth, ethnical minorities), upkeep and presentation of the cultural heritage of minorities, heritage education programmes for school children and additional programmes for improving the museum collection. An earmarked budget for such activities had to be transferred to the public cultural Fund Mondriaan Foundation [*Mondriaan Fonds*]. The plan was that all museums in the country, and thus not only museums subsidised by the Ministry, could qualify for grants from this budget. This development was considered as the next step in the process of the privatisation of national museums.

In 2010, however, the newly elected minority government of Christian Democrats (CDA) and Liberals (VVD), supported in parliament by the anti-Islam party (PVV), started an unprecedented series of budget cuts on culture mounting up to 22% in 2014. Since then, several institutions disappeared due to the corresponding budget cuts. Fortunately, the Coalition Agreement stated that libraries, heritage and the *National Archive* should be relatively spared. But one of the consequences of the budget cuts was that the 2016 government (consisting of Liberals (VVD) and Social Democrats (PvdA)) was forced to readapt the national system for subsidising cultural institutions and to return to the Cultural Plan Period for all kinds of cultural institutions, including museums and other major cultural organizations. In short, the new plans formed in 2009 to change the subsidy system were never realised.

Instead, since 2011, cultural institutions were urged by the state government to increase their self-generated revenue and show more entrepreneurship if they wanted to get funded. This development finds its roots in the 1980s. It was put on the agenda strongly by State Secretary Rick van der Ploeg (1998-2002), who introduced the term cultural entrepreneurship in cultural policy. The development culminated in the policy of State Secretary Halbe Zijlstra in the Rutte I Cabinet (2010-2012). This cabinet initiated the Cultural Entrepreneurship Programme (2012-2016). Reports about the museum statistics from 2017 and 2018 show that, among other cultural institutions, especially the larger museums have proven themselves capable of expanding their own income. Smaller museums were less successful in this respect. However, this focus on entrepreneurship has caused the diminished number of institutions to produce more output, causing negative effects on, amongst others, the cultural labour market and budgets for maintaining archival activities and the care for collections.

In the summer of 2013, the then Minister of Education, Culture and Science, dr Jet Bussemaker,

presented her plans concerning museums and cultural policy in general to the Parliament, stating the key issues of the national museum policy at that moment in the Netherlands. The leading principle of her approach was to promote the cooperation of museums in order to improve the understanding, conservation, organisation and public access of public collections. Basically, this approach was based on two notions. Firstly, the ambition to improve cooperation to be profitable for museums, the public and society in general. Secondly, the conviction that museums themselves know the best way how to achieve this. One of the main plans was to draft a Heritage Act, intended to protect collections of national significance.

Based on minister Bussemaker's plan, a new Cultural Heritage Act was implemented in our national legislation and in force since 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016. From a Cultural heritage perspective in general this Act regulates the national public responsibility for museums and collections. More specifically this Act provides rules concerning:

- Conservation and registration of public collections,
- financial relations with state financed museums,
- De-assessing of objects from public collections,
- Protection of public monuments and archaeology on land and underwater
- Restitution of looted art
- Finance and governance
- Cultural Heritage Inspection

The Heritage Act replaces six laws and regulations in the field of cultural heritage, including the Monuments and Historic Buildings Act (1988) and the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (1984). The Heritage Act regulates matters for both movable and immovable heritage and is an integral part of the Environment Act. In this new legal context state financed museums are financed concerning the collection and housing based on the Cultural Heritage Act. This financial basis is supplemented by subsidies for the public activities like exhibitions regulated by the four year subsidy cycle in the national cultural political level (BIS). In the guidelines for the cultural policy in 2021-2024 (2019), Minister Van Engelshoven expresses her desire to follow the advice of the Council for Culture to include also the public activities of state financed museums in the Heritage Act as well.

Around 2012/2013, some of our major museums re-opened again after years of reconstruction. For example the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam and the Rijksmuseum, but also several regional oriented museums in Leeuwarden, Den Bosch, and Zwolle. These re-openings stimulated the number of visits in the Netherlands in the last years. In 2017 museums in the Netherlands welcomed 33,2 million visits, including 30% by tourists from abroad. This resulted in a growth of more than 7,3 million visits compared to the total number of visits in 2014.

#### *Culture in an open society (2018)*

In her 2018 policy letter *Cultuur in een open samenleving* ([Culture in an open society](#)), Minister Van Engelshoven sets out her cultural agenda. In her plans for the period 2021-2024 (Uitgangspunten Cultuurbeleid, 2021-2024, only in Dutch), Van Engelshoven prioritises fair pay in the cultural sector, accessibility of culture for as wide a variety of Dutch inhabitants as possible, cooperation between the different tiers of government and a broad range of cultural offerings to reflect the different preferences that exist in both society and the cultural field itself.

'Heritage', Van Engelshoven writes in her policy letter (2018), 'things like monuments and museums, shows where we come from, what we are today and how we are developing. Culture is significant for the future of our nation, in the public debate about identity and in the search for what connects us all. The Dutch government therefore considers it important to build knowledge of our shared history, values and freedoms.' 'But above all', she writes, 'our monuments, historic city centres, cultural landscapes and museums have an intrinsic value in themselves: they are the messengers of our past, cherished for their beauty and the powerful stories they tell. We are therefore committed to passing them down to future generations.'

Van Engelshoven thinks heritage is a good example of how culture can act as a unifying force in our society, especially in an age when it seems as if social ties are becoming more superficial. Therefore she thinks it is important that as many people as possible engage actively with culture, and from as early an age as possible.

Culture is by and for everyone. Regardless of where you live, who your family are or what your own cultural background is. Therefore the government has announced a number of policy measures intended to encourage diversity in the cultural domain. By extending its focus to include "alternative" forms of art and new generations, the government particularly hopes to reach groups that may not currently engage with the stories being told in "traditional" theatres, concert halls and museums.

#### *National identity*

In the coalition agreement for 2017-2021 (Confidence in the Future), the current government emphasises the value of culture for the Dutch identity. The knowledge on shared history, values and liberties – "the anchors of Dutch identity in times of globalisation and uncertainty" – should be increased and actively propagated. In school, children will learn the national anthem and it should be possible for them to visit the Rijksmuseum (the largest national museum) in Amsterdam and the Dutch parliament in The Hague. Important historical places need to be more visible and accessible, as they tell the story of Dutch history. The Canon of the Netherlands (established in 2006) will be distributed to young people who reach the age of 18 and to people who acquire the Dutch nationality. This *Canon of the Netherlands* consists of 50 key facts and key collection items of Dutch history and culture and includes important events, people, texts, artworks and objects. The Canon can be accessed digitally (see [www.entoen.nu](http://www.entoen.nu)); 50 "windows" open to short stories that illustrate the significance of the relevant component of the canon. The *Canon of the Netherlands* is part of the 10 point cultural participation plan Minister Plasterk introduced in his policy memorandum *Art for Life's Sake (Kunst van leven, 2007)*. The Canon of the Netherlands is currently being redeveloped by an independent commission in order to include 'the darker sides' of Dutch history and more diverse perspectives, as requested by the current Minister of Education, Culture and Science Ingrid van Engelshoven. The new canon is expected to be presented in spring 2020.

#### *National History Museum*

In 2006, the government, following the example of *Deutsches Historisches Museum*, decided to create a *National History Museum*. Three municipalities – Amsterdam, Arnhem and The Hague – were invited to develop plans for such a museum that – based on the canon – should give all

inhabitants of the country an overview of Dutch history. The *Netherlands Open Air Museum* (*Nederlands Openluchtmuseum*) in Arnhem won the competition. Subsequently the then Minister of Education, Culture and Science, Ronald Plasterk chose to found the *National History Museum* in that city. His successor, secretary of state Halbe Zijlstra, however, decided at the end of 2010 that the government would not provide the money for the building. Then the government decided to stop financing the project completely due to increasing budget cuts. In 2017 the Netherlands Open Air Museum presented a more limited version of the idea, in a [presentation](#) of the Dutch Canon. It also initiated a the Canon-network, a collaboration of a group of museums in the Netherlands.

#### *Digitization of audiovisual heritage*

In 2007, a major project aimed at improving the digital accessibility of culture was started. It was called *Images for the Future* (*Beelden voor de toekomst*, see also [www.beeldenvoordetekomst.nl](http://www.beeldenvoordetekomst.nl)) From 2007 onwards, a total of 91 183 hours of video, 22 086 hours of film, 98 734 hours of audio and 2.5 million photos from the audiovisual sector was restored, preserved, digitised and distributed through various services. The project was completed in late 2014. The main participants in this project were the EYE Filmmuseum in Amsterdam, the *Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision* (*Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid*) in Hilversum, which is in fact the museum and archive of the national public broadcasting service, and the *National Archive* (*Nationaal Archief*) in The Hague.

Research by DEN (Digitaal Erfgoed Nederland, the National Knowledge Institute for Culture and Digitalisation) shows that museums, archives, libraries and other heritage institutions digitised 35 percent of their collections in 2017, while 46 percent still needs to be digitised. Of their metadata (or catalogue data), 74 percent is digitised and 58 percent is accessible online. In total, 43 percent of all metadata and 13 percent of all heritage objects are available online. These percentages are above the EU-average.

In her 2018 policy letter *Cultuur in een open samenleving* ([Culture in an open society](#)), Minister Van Engelshoven stresses the importance of the accessibility of culture. Therefore, the digital accessibility of heritage, archives and collections is supported with extra investments (EUR 12 million for 2019 and 2020). The focus in government policy shifted from the digitisation of content to stimulating the use and re-use of digital content by citizens. This resulted, among others things, in extra attention for the use of digital heritage content for primary and secondary schools, and in funding possibilities for heritage institutions to stimulate access and re-use of their collection. The Digital Heritage Network is coordinating an extensive programme within the network of Dutch heritage institutions to support this focus in line with the principles of the National Strategy Digital Heritage. This strategy is aimed at the development of a national, cross-sectoral IT infrastructure of digital heritage. The overall goal is to strengthen the societal value of the collections of archives, libraries, museums and other heritage organisations.

#### *Youth*

As in other countries, most Dutch primary schools organise visits to museums. In the fall of 2008, the Dutch parliament agreed on free entrance to all museums in the country for children up to 12 years old. It was hoped that this step would stimulate visits to museums, especially by children from underprivileged social strata. Due to government changes however, free entrance is now no longer obligatory for museums. Instead, they have freedom of choice regarding their entrance

fees. A lot of museums still decided to provide free access to young people until 12 or 18 years of age. In 2017, 37% of the museums provided free access to young people until 12 years old, while 14% of the museums provided free access also to young people until 18 years old.

In the policy letter *Culture in an Open Society* (March 12th 2018), Minister Ingrid van Engelshoven stated that the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science will stimulate cultural engagement at a young age with additional resources for primary schools in order to visit museums and cultural heritage. According to Van Engelshoven, every citizen has the right to cultural engagement, which is seen as an essential aspect of good citizenship.

In 2019, more than 750.000 secondary school students received a Culture Card. This card was introduced in 2008 in order to stimulate cultural participation as part of the newly introduced course Cultural and Artistic Education (*Culturele en Kunstzinnige Vorming, CKV*). Secondary schools can use the Culture Card to pay for cultural activities for their students. Students can also use the card to get a discount on cultural activities they undertake in their spare time.

In 2016, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science introduced the MBO Card. With this card, students in intermediate vocational education (MBO) receive a discount on tickets for museums, musicals, theatres and festivals.

#### *Cultural diversity*

Besides the youth, (non-western) ethnic minorities, which make up about 10 % of the population, are a target group in museum policy. In this context, the Museum Association (*Museumvereniging*) developed an *Intercultural Museum Programme* to introduce more variety into the presentations of Dutch museums as well as introducing the museums to a wider public. Fostering of cultural diversity is also a priority of the Mondriaan Foundation.

#### *Returning works of art*

A special committee of independent experts was set up in 2004 to survey some 4000 works of art that were returned to the Netherlands after World War II. The works were in custody of the state. This committee tried to trace the original owners and consequently advised the government on the return of cultural property from the war. The most important case until now was the return of 202 paintings of old masters to the heirs of Jacques Goudstikker (1897-1940) in 2006. Although this matter has been legally settled after the war, the government decided to return the paintings not on judicial but on moral grounds.

#### *Intangible heritage / UNESCO*

In order to protect the intangible heritage, UNESCO drafted the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) in 2003. The Netherlands ratified the Convention in 2012. The Dutch Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage (Kenniscentrum Immaterieel Erfgoed Nederland), funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, coordinates the national inventory of the Dutch intangible heritage based on nominations drawn up by communities that safeguard this heritage. In 2017, the craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills was the first Dutch inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. In June 2018, the Netherlands was selected to be a member of the Intergovernmental Committee of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Intangible Heritage, for a period of four years.

### *Museum Association and Museum Pass*

The activities of the Museum Association (Museum Vereniging, MV) are aimed at the development and improvement of professional museum standards. The MV also maintains a network of museum consultants in the provinces. These consultants support and facilitate the work of small museums in their province, usually run by volunteers. In 2018, 410 museums were member of the MV, among which approximately 26 associated members. These are non-museum institutions that play an important role in de the field of Dutch museums. The members of the MV have to observe the Code of Professional Ethics for Museums in the Netherlands. This Code, based on the ICOM Code of Professional Ethics, was introduced in 1989 and revised in 1999.

Other activities of Museum Association include the distribution of the annual *Museum Pass* (for adults 64,90 euros a year, for young people 32,45), holders of which have free admission to some 400 museums in the country. In 2005, 315 000 people possessed a Museum Pass; by 2018, that number had risen too almost 1.4 million. In total, they visited a museum 8.9 million times, an increase of 2.3 percent compared to 2017.

## **B. Statistical issues**

The next information is structured on the basis of the *Proposal for a revised template Version 0.2*, September 2019, Marta Zimolag and Marta Beck-Domzalska (Eurostat), Nico Heerschap (Statistics Netherlands)

### **1. General information on museum statistics**

#### *1.1 Responsible authority for gathering statistics of museums in the country*

Statistics Netherlands (CBS) in collaboration with the Museum Association (MA) and the Cultural Heritage Agency (RCE). The MA and RCE are responsible for the population of museums, respectively the registered and non-registered museums. CBS and the MA are responsible for the data collection. This is coordinated with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science

#### *1.2 Provider of data to EGMUS*

Statistics Netherlands in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science

#### *1.3 Data collection mode(s) of the museum statistics*

The data is collected by electronic survey. One part is done by the Museum Association and one part by Statistics Netherlands. The data collection of these two parts are very closely aligned.

#### *1.4 Periodicity of data collection of the museum statistics*

Annual

#### *1.5 Existence of museum-related laws*

The next law is related to museums (see also the policy-paragraph):

A new Cultural Heritage Act was drafted and implemented in our national legislation and in force since 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016. From a Cultural heritage perspective in general this Act regulates the national public responsibility for museums and collections. More specifically this Act provides rules concerning:

- Conservation and registration of public collections,
- Financial relations with state financed museums,
- De-assessing of objects from public collections,
- Protection of public monuments and archaeology on land and underwater
- Restitution of looted art
- Finance and governance
- Cultural Heritage Inspection

The Heritage Act replaces six laws and regulations in the field of cultural heritage, including the Monuments and Historic Buildings Act (1988) and the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act (1984). The Heritage Act regulates matters for both movable and immovable heritage and is an integral part of the Environment Act. In this new legal context state financed museums are financed concerning the collection and housing based on the Cultural Heritage Act. This financial basis is supplemented by subsidies for the public activities like exhibitions regulated by the four year subsidy cycle in the national cultural political level (BIS).

In the guidelines for the cultural policy in 2021-2024 (2019), Minister Van Engelshoven expresses her desire to follow the advice of the Council for Culture to include the public activities of those museums in the Heritage Act as well.

The effect of this law is that the museums which fall under this law are part of the population of museums.

#### *1.6 Existence of a register of museums*

The Museum Association introduced a national registration scheme for museums in 1997: the Netherlands Museum Register. This register, inspired by the national Registration Scheme in the United Kingdom, is founded on a number of basic requirements drawn up by the museum sector itself. Authoritative representatives of the sector subsequently assess the performance of the museums. Museums wanting to be incorporated in the Museum Register have to meet, among others, the following basic requirements (2015 norm):

- Endorses the ethnical code for museums
- Has an institutional basis and a written museum objective
- Has a stable financial basic
- Has a written policy plan
- Has a security plan
- Has qualified staff
- Has a collection, of which 50 percent is owned by the museum or is in long term loan
- Has a collection and preservation plan
- Has the collection researched
- Has basic public amenities, also for disabled persons
- Is open on regular times

In 2017 493 museums were registered. This means that about 80 percent of all professionally run museums are incorporated in the MR.

In fact the criteria that are used by the MR are more strict than those used for non-registered museums.



### *1.7 Integral survey or a sample survey*

Integral survey

### *1.8 Non-response handling*

There are two types of non-response:

- Total non-response, meaning that the respondent did not respond: if data of last year are available then they are used, including the correction on the basis of trends for the specific variables. If data of last year are not available then imputed data are used of the average of the class the museum is in;
- Item non-response, meaning that a respondent did not fill in a certain question. Here the same estimation is used as for total non-response.

### *1.9 Other, not mentioned, difficulties in the collection and production of statistics*

No

### *1.10 Other statistics on museums*

Besides the supply side statistic (Museum statistics) we have statistics related to museums on the demand side:

- Survey on leisure time ('Vrijetijdsomnibus; VTO'): once every 5 years. Until now this survey was conducted in cooperation between Statistics Netherlands (data collection) and Institution of social research (Sociaal Plan Bureau). However, the SCP has withdrawn from the research since 2019. Questions were asked about culture and sport participation of people (6 years and older), including their visits to museums.
- Time use survey (Tijdsbestedingsonderzoek). Conducted by Statistics Netherlands. This survey describes the way people spend their time, including the participation in culture activities
- Continuous leisure time survey (Continu vrijetijdsonderzoek). Every year. Conducted by NBTC-Kantar. This survey focuses on the day trips people make outside their home. Visits to museums are included.
- (Big) museums often conduct their own surveys. These are usually directed to their visitors. It would be an idea to merge these surveys and see if it is possible with modern technologies to set up a broad visitors survey.
- Museums under FRIBS (EU-obligation to gather data): from of 2023 statistical institutes of the member states of the European Union are obliged to collect financial data and employment data of culture establishments, including museums.
- Also data are collected in the context of the EU (EU-SILC and Eurobarometer). In most cases these statistics also produce figures per member state.

### *1.11 Web scraping and other new data sources*

At the moment Statistics Netherlands does not use web scraping or other new data sources/techniques for museum statistics. However it has used web scraped data in the past. For example to look at the use of social media by museums. Options for big data sources are, for example:

- Register of museum card holders
- Research in the context of digitalized objects
- Research in the context of visitors within a museum (Bluetooth and Wifi)
- Web scraping of information from websites (for example to minimize the survey burden). It only accounts for 700 museums.

### *1.12 Existence of an account on the macro-economic importance of museums within a country's economy*

In 2019 Statistics Netherlands published a first Satellite Account on culture and media. In this satellite account cultural heritage is visible as a separate group. Figures are produced on, among others, consumption, production, trade and employment. Museums are part of the group cultural heritage and not a separate group. In theory also museums could be treated and published this way. However, within the satellite account museums are a relatively small group. To produce economic figures on museums in relation to the economy as a whole additional research is necessary and additional data sources are needed. Only then it is possible to see if this is feasible.

## **2. The definition of a museum (criteria)**

### *2.1 Unit of observation*

The unit of observation is the site/address. If this is not possible in incidental cases the administrative unit is used.

### *2.2. Definition of a museum*

The ICOM definition of museums is generally accepted in The Netherlands. Zoological gardens, exhibition spaces, planetariums, science centres and nature reserves are excluded from museums statistics (see section 3).

As the ICOM-definition is rather general, in 2017 Statistics Netherlands, in collaboration with the Museum Association and Cultural Heritage Agency, developed a decision tree on the basis of which museums were selected for the population. Since 2019 the criteria in the decision tree were sharpened in some ways.

In fact the population of museums has two parts. The first part are the registered museums in the Museum Register of the Museums Association. These museums are all included in the data collection. For museums in the Museum Register rather strict criteria are applied, which include all aspects of the ICOM-definition. See section 1.6. Besides registered museums, also non-registered museums are included in the population. The criteria used for selection also follow the ICOM-definition, but these criteria are less strict. The main criteria are:

- Museums must have a so called ANBI status or must be a foundation. That means that museums cannot have a goal to make profit. They must serve the public interest.
- Museums must be open for at least 28 weeks a year and three days a week.
- Museums have their own collection and do research into their collection.
- Museums must have a permanent location.

The Dutch museum statistics distinguishes the following categories: visual arts, history, science/natural history, ethnography, business and technology, mixed collection.

### *2.3 Exceptions*

See section 3

#### *1.4 Economic profile*

In the Museum Statistic rather detailed questions are asked about the financial situation of museums, as well as the employment, including volunteers. The financial questions include different kinds of income, like fees, subsidies and income from shop and restaurants, and different kinds of costs.

A criterion to be included in the population is that a museum must have a yearly account.

#### *1.5 Ownership and subsidies*

In the Museum Statistic questions are asked about type of ownership. This criterion is not used to distinguish museums. However, as said, to be included in the population, museums must have a so called ANBI status or be a foundation.

### *2.6 Permanency of the institution*

A museum must have a permanent location. A travelling exhibition is not a museum.

### *2.7 Societal role of museums*

In the framework of the ANBI status a museum must serve the public interest and not the private interest (like a theatre association or singing club)

### *2.8 Access to the 'public'*

To be included in the population, the museum must be open for at least 28 weeks a year and 3 days a week.

### *2.9 Acquiring collections*

A museum must have their own collection. It is not further specified what is meant with 'own collection'. For example if this includes or excludes long time loans

Acquiring collections is not used to distinguish museums

### *2.10 Conserving collections*

This criterion is not used to distinguish museums

### *2.11 Exhibition of collections*

This criterion is not used to distinguish museums

### *2.12 Communication*

This criterion is not used to distinguish museums

### *2.13 Research*

Museums must research their collections. However this criterion is not further specified.

### *2.14 Educational purpose*

This criterion is not used to distinguish museums

### 2.15 Staff

This criterion is not used to distinguish museums. Museums could be run by qualified staff or volunteers or both.

### 2.17 Other criteria

Museums must have a website or be part of a third parties website.

### 2.18 Apply a core definition of EGMUS

Would you be prepared to set up your museum statistics in such a way that it could fit a core definition of EGMUS? Yes

## 2. Museum-like institutions covered by the scope

Generally speaking the next "museum-like" institutions are excluded from the population, however with some exceptions. That is when the general public sees those institutions clearly as museums, although they have not their own collection.

Conservation institutes: no

Exhibition galleries in libraries: no

Archives centres: no

Archaeological and ethnographic sites/monuments: no

Historical sites/monuments: no

Churches: no, with the exception of Nieuwe and Oude Kerk in Amsterdam

Exhibition halls/temporary exhibitions: no, with the exception of de Kunsthal in Rotterdam, KADE in Amersfoort and Hermitage in Amsterdam.

Zoo's: no

Natural sites and reserves: no

Planetariums: no

Open air museums: yes

Science centres: yes

## 3. General situation

Until 2015, the situation in the Netherlands for the collection of data, analysis and publication was rather spread over several organizations. This led, among others, to the use of different populations, different figures and extra survey burden for museums. In 2015, a process was set in to enlarge the co-operation between the parties involved: Museums Association, Statistics Netherlands, Ministry and the Cultural Heritage Institution. The main goals were: yearly data, one figure policy, the minimisation of the survey burden for museums, more efficient processes (less costly) and if possible one publication.

The co-operation between the main parties has led to some major steps in the right direction. Now there is one accepted population of museums. This population is based on the ICOM-definition. To determine whether an organisation is a museum or not, the basic prerequisites of the ICOM-definition were operationalized in a decision tree. The data-collection is still a separate process: one part is carried out by the Museums Association (their members) and one part by Statistics

Netherlands (the rest). However, these two data collections are now very closely aligned with each other. This includes the questionnaire and the data collection process. This has, among others, led to a substantial improvement of the response for the part of the Museums Association. Also there are still separate trajectories for the analysis and publication for the Museums Association (about their members) and Statistics Netherlands (the total population, including those of the Museums Association). Another positive step is that the parties involved, including the Ministry, have regular meetings with each other during the year to let the process run smoothly and to coordinate activities.

#### **4. Key figures of the Netherlands**

As the figures of the Museum Statistic of Statistics Netherlands is under revision at the moment Statistics Netherlands is not able to publish data. It is expected that figures are ready at the end of November 2019. See Statistics section of the Egmus website for the most recent statistics.

#### **5. References**

For a concise outline of the museum policy in the Netherlands see: *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands*. The Hague/Amsterdam: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science/ Boekmanstudies, 2009. Available at Boekmanstichting: <http://www.boekman.nl>

Different aspects of museum policy are also included in the Netherlands chapter of *Compendium on Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*: [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net) / [https://www.culturalpolicies.net/download/240719\\_netherlands.pdf](https://www.culturalpolicies.net/download/240719_netherlands.pdf)

[www.museumserver.nl](http://www.museumserver.nl)

Is the platform for Dutch museums on the Internet. Currently 582 websites of the Dutch museums are included in Dutch and most of those also in English.

<https://museumvereniging.nl/english>

Is the website of the Museum Association in Dutch and English.

[www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ocw](http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ocw) / <https://www.government.nl>

Is the website of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in Dutch and English. Extensive information on cultural policy, including policy documents is available online.

[www.cbs.nl](http://www.cbs.nl) / [www.statline.nl](http://www.statline.nl)

Is the website of the Statistics Netherlands in Dutch and English. This website includes the central electronic database, called StatLine. At present, however, the English version of StatLine contains only a few matrices; it is to be expanded in the near future.

[www.scp.nl](http://www.scp.nl)

Is the website of the Netherlands Institute of Social Research (SCP) in Dutch and English. The SCP conducts an ongoing survey on cultural participation in The Netherlands. Museums visits are included in the survey. Practically all publications of the SCP are available online

<http://kennisvoorcollecties.nl/en/showcases-en/dimcon>

Digital Museale Collectie Nederland (DiMCoN) / Digital Museum Collection of the Netherlands

Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands

<https://english.cultureelerfgoed.nl>

<https://www.erfgoedmonitor.nl/en>

Is The Heritage Monitor of the Netherlands made by the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands with facts and figures about the Dutch heritage.

Cultuur in Beeld 2017 (Culture in the picture - only in Dutch) and Cultuur in Cijfers 2013-2016 (Culture in Figures – only in Dutch) give some basic statistics about each of the museums subsidised by the Dutch central government (visits, subsidies and other types of income)

<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2017/10/23/cultuur-in-beeld-2017>

<https://www.ocwincijfers.nl/cultuur-media/documenten/publicaties/2017/10/06/cultuur-in-cijfers>

Dongen, E.A. van, and Heerschap, N.M. (2016). Pilot research: museums and internet data. Only available in Dutch.

### Appendix: decision tree

