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<td>ESA</td>
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<td>MinC</td>
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<td>R$</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

For the purpose of synthesis, the expression *open call for sponsorship proposals* is also referred to, in this work, as *call for proposals, open call*, or simply *call*. In all cases, the meaning is the same.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. CONTEXT

“I would invite you to take a closer look at the virtues of classic corporate sponsorship. Which is no philanthropy, it is a marketing tool.” These words were addressed by Péter Inkei, director of the Budapest Observatory, at a public hearing on cultural sponsorship of the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport of the European Parliament in Brussels on September 30, 2003.

Corporate sponsorship began to flourish in the early to mid-1980s (Shanklin & Kuzma, 1992), increased dramatically over the following years (Cornwell & Maignan, 1998) and has become a popular communication vehicle (Meenaghan, 1996, as cited in Lings & Owen, 2007; Cornwell, Roy & Steinard, 2001; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009) and the fastest-growing marketing tool worldwide (Ukman, 2010; Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008).

So why did Mr. Inkei still need to invite his audience "to take a closer look at the virtues of corporate sponsorship” in the 21st century? It can be explained by two factors.

First, companies are at very different stages of sponsorship. Sarkovas (2001) and Meenaghan (1991, as cited in Thjømøe, Olson & Brønn, 2002) observe that the first stage is simply a donor giving money to a sponsored object, generally influenced by the chief executive officer’s (CEO’s) need for ego gratification and their personal interest in a specific activity (Cornwell, 2008, as cited in Johnston, 2010; Oneal, Finch, Hamilton & Hammonds, 1987, as cited in Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996). Here, sponsorship may be labeled as charity, patronage or philanthropy (Sarkovas, 2001; Wilkinson, 1993, as cited in Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996). In the second stage, the sponsor develops some specific goals and becomes interested in receiving proposals that offer more benefits and fit with the corporate values or brand attributes. In the third stage, the firm finally views sponsorship through a strategic perspective and develops a sponsorship policy which is fully connected to its marketing strategy (Sarkovas, 2001; Cornwell & Maignan, 1998, as cited in Thjømøe, Olson & Brønn, 2002).
Second, academic research on sponsorship as a marketing tool has been limited (Cornwell & Maignan, 1998; Dolphin, 2003; Smith, 2004; Poon & Prendergast, 2006; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Johnston, 2010). One of the areas of greater precariousness is the managerial process of sponsorship (Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996; Cornwell, Roy & Steinard, 2001; Aguilar, Manjarrez, Thwaites & Maule, 1997, as cited in Johnston & Paulsen, 2007), which includes setting objectives, selecting, organizing, executing the sponsorship, and controlling its outcome (Arthur, Scott & Woods, 1997; Walliser, 2003). Miles and Huberman (1984, as cited in McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997) suggest that most research has focused on "what" the companies sponsor, rather than the "how" (how one got to what), which makes difficult the use of processes and tools for effective management of sponsorship programs (Speed & Thompson, 2000; Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009).

All in all, “the rapid growth of sponsorship has not been paralleled by increased sophistication in management practices” (Hoek, 1999, p. 1). Regarding the decision making process (how companies screen, assess and select their sponsorships), managers experience numerous problems (Speed & Thompson, 2000; Wishart, 2006) and tend to show lack of rigor and intuition in their approaches (Kover, 2002, and Clancy & Belmont, 2004, as cited in Johnston & Paulsen, 2007).

1.2. THEME

The decision making process in sponsorship is the central theme of this work. This choice was motivated by:

A. The need for companies to have instruments with which to manage their sponsorship policies in one of its most crucial areas - the screening, assessment and selection of sponsorship proposals -, as shown above; and

B. The belief that a peculiar practice - open call for sponsorship proposals - the author had the opportunity to employ in Brazil with some of the most significant corporate sponsors may be a benchmark for researchers and practitioners in other countries.
1.3. RESEARCH QUESTION

How to convert the practice of open calls for proposals into a methodology that can be used as a reference in decision making process of corporate sponsorship?

1.4. OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this work is to contribute to the study and practice of decision making in corporate sponsorship, presenting a methodology for planning a call for proposals made from theoretical studies, best practices and opinions of the most diverse actors involved in the theme.

1.5. APPROACH AND STRUCTURE

In accordance to the objective proposed above, the dissertation is divided into two main parts: literature review and analysis of the practical problem.

The first part refers to chapter 2 - Theoretical Background. Here, the international literature is reviewed and presented as a “Matryoshka”. Like the nested dolls, each section of the chapter can be considered as a part of the section presented before, as illustrated in Figure 1. In this sense, the first section is a general overview of corporate sponsorship, followed by one of its components: sponsorship strategy. The next section presents the concept of sponsorship policy, a crucial element of the sponsorship strategy. Finally, a zoom is given on sponsorship decision making, which includes attraction, screening, assessment and selection of proposals, and then on one of the alternatives of this process: open call for sponsorship proposals.
FIGURE 1
Structure of the Theoretical Background – The Matryoshka Metaphor

The second part consists of chapter 3 – Exploratory Research. Based on a model of public selection suggested by the Brazil’s Ministry of Culture (MinC), and some existing submission guides for open calls, secondary and primary information were obtained through a qualitative research in order to present elements of systematization of each step of a corporate open call for sponsorship proposals.

Finally, in chapters 4 and 5, the main conclusions of the whole dissertation are presented, as well as the limitations and directions for further research.
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Sponsorship is a potentially powerful method of conveying corporate and organisational identity, affecting reputations, managing stakeholder perceptions and establishing a brand promise where it lies at the heart of corporate communications. (Alexander, 2009, p. 348)

2.1. PURPOSES

Through a literature review, the theoretical part of this work aims to:
- Present the overall characteristics of strategic corporate sponsorship;
- Identify existing alternatives of sponsorship decision making process; and
- Present the open call as a model adopted by some companies in Brazil in order to attract, screen, assess and select sponsorship proposals.

2.2. CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP

2.2.1. Overview

This introductory topic presents a brief outline of corporate sponsorship - definitions, the increasing size of its market and the reasons that explain the growth, besides the main aspects that guide the first steps of its conception: the choice of areas, target audiences and objectives.

As of yet, there is not a generally accepted definition of sponsorship (Walliser, 2003, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011). The most popular one was stated by Meenaghan in 1983 (Cornwell & Maignan 1998). This and other relevant definitions are presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meenaghan, 1983</td>
<td>“… can be regarded as the provision of assistance either financial or in-kind to an activity by a commercial organization for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner and Shuman, 1987</td>
<td>“Sponsorship is investments in causes or events to support corporate objectives (e.g. enhance company image) or marketing objectives (e.g. increase brand awareness), and are usually not made through traditional media-buying channels”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler and Shani, 1989</td>
<td>“The provision of resources (e.g. money, people, equipment) by an organization directly to an event or activity in exchange for a direct association to the event or activity. The providing organization can then use this direct association to achieve either their corporate, marketing, or media objectives”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meenaghan, 1991</td>
<td>“… sponsorship is an investment, in cash or in kind, in any activity, in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that activity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwell, 1995</td>
<td>“… the orchestration and implementation of marketing activities for the purpose of building and communicating an association (link) to a sponsorship”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Events Group, 1999</td>
<td>“... a cash and/or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically a sports, entertainment, non-profit event or organization) in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that property”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullin et al., 2000</td>
<td>“… the acquisition of rights to affiliate or directly associate with a product or event for the purpose of deriving benefits related to that affiliation or association”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a Cornwell (1995) is defining sponsorship-linked marketing, and not sponsorship, per se. The definition is important however, and therefore is included.


The authors agree that sponsorship is based on an exchange that seeks marketing communication objectives by exploiting the association between two players: a sponsor and a sponsored property or object (Walliser, 2003). The exchange occurs through a sponsorship agreement on a reciprocal basis, yielding mutual benefits to both parties (Lamont & Dowell, 2008). Hence, instead of a simple monetary transaction, the relationship between sponsors and those being sponsored has evolved to the development of real partnerships, characterized by high level of engagement (Mermiri, 2010). We consider that this sense of partnership and engagement is better translated in the definition of Cornwell (1995), which uses words like association and link. The other definitions seem to focus on the sponsor's side, highlighting its corporate, commercials, marketing or media objectives.

Worldwide, sponsorship investments had grown from US$ 0,5 billion in 1982 (IEG, 2007, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011) to US$ 48,6 billion in 2011 (IEG,
As shown in Figure 2, even during the recent periods of economic uncertainty, the investment in sponsorship has not stopped growing. One estimate suggests that corporate sponsorship represents 22% of the total marketing communications budget (Sneath, Finney & Close, 2006, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011).

**FIGURE 2**
Total Global Sponsorship Spending 2007-2011

Sources: Based on IEG Sponsorship Report (2011) and IEG (2012).

Note: Values in US$ billion.

Figure 2 only presents sponsorship fees. It does not consider philanthropic contributions and all the additional expenditures incurred to leverage the initial investment, like advertising, promotion, client entertainment (Cornwell, 2008; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Ukman, 2010). An example of sponsorship leverage is Audi’s campaigns to communicate its sponsorship of the Salzburg Festival (Schwaiger, Sarstedt & Taylor, 2010). It is generally assumed that this additional investment represents at least the same amount of the original property rights fee (Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009). In many cases, however, it reaches several times the initial sponsorship fee (Quester & Thompson, 2001).
At least seven factors appear to contribute to the growth in sponsorship investments worldwide:

A. The increasing importance of brands in the global and competitive market, which benefits the surrounding forms of communication that convey emotion and express attributes authentically (Sarkovas, 2000; Reis, 2003; Vardy, 2011; Collett & Fenton, 2011);

B. The decreasing efficiency and progressive costs of the traditional media (Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008);

C. The ability that sponsorship has to target particular consumer segments (Cornwell & Maignan, 1998; Sarkovas, 2000; Quester & Thompson 2001; Reis, 2003; Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Ukman, 2010) and to link the message and the medium together (Meenaghan, 1996, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011);

D. The fragmentation of the traditional mass market and mass media (Ukman, 1996, as cited in Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008; Vardy, 2011);

E. The technological revolution and the consequent increasing need for two-way communication (Ukman, 2010; Vardy, 2011; Collett & Fenton, 2011);

F. The high consumer acceptance (Ukman, 2010), who is increasingly interested in entertainment (Reis, 2003; Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008), sports and arts (Quester & Thompson 2001); and

G. The growing interest of consumers and other stakeholders to know where the companies stand on various social issues (Sarkovas, 2000; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Ukman, 2010; Collett & Fenton, 2011), as a consequence of the higher consumer engagement (Edelman, 2010; Vardy, 2011) in a more active and critical society (Reis, 2003).
The set of factors mentioned above is inserted into the concept of Consumer Decision Journey (CDJ) coined by Edelman (2010). The author identified that the consumer decision making process nowadays is much more interactive, comprising four stages: consider, evaluate, buy and enjoy/advocate/bond (p. 64). The engagement obtained at the fourth stage (enjoy/advocate/bond) can occur through causes and contents, an approach referred to as Brand Attitude, which includes corporate sponsorship (Sarkovas, 2008).

Related specifically to the last factor (G), Ukman (2010) highlights that sponsorship is the only marketing activity that can mutually benefit the company and the community of its consumers. Hence, when combining economic and social benefits, sponsorship is not pure business and not pure philanthropy; it can be placed in the convergence area illustrated by Porter and Kramer (2002) in Figure 3, where “philanthropy is truly strategic” (p. 59).

![FIGURE 3](image)


The International Events Group (IEG) classifies sponsorship into four areas: sports, arts/culture, entertainment and cause (Ukman, 2010). Within these areas, sponsorship may take form in many different ways including programs, venues, fairs, events,
concerts, festivals, tours, performances, exhibitions, tournaments, etc. (Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Ukman, 2010).

Sponsorships may be addressed toward a variety of targets like clients, consumers, suppliers, shareholders, employees, government, NGOs, communities, opinion leaders and even the media (Gardner & Shuman, 1988, as cited in Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Collett & Fenton, 2011).

The European Sponsorship Association (ESA) identified an extensive (but not exhaustive) list of possible objectives for sponsorship, and separated them into three groups, as presented in Figure 4 (Collett & Fenton, 2011).

**FIGURE 4**
Possible Sponsorship Objectives

As illustrated in Figure 4, there are several alternatives of sponsor objectives and they depend on many specific factors (Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996, as cited in Walliser, 2003), such as sponsorship type and area as well as sponsor size and industry
(Walliser, 2003), and also the sponsor’s stage regarding sponsorship (Meenaghan, 1991, as cited in Thjømøe, Olson & Brønn, 2002).

Anyway, Collett and Fenton (2011) highlight that “the essential key to successful sponsorship lies ultimately in having clearly defined sponsorship objectives” (p. 11). Since sponsorship provides the opportunity of reaching multiple goals at once (Ukman, 2010), Grey and Skildum-Reid (2001) recommend that sponsors define at least five different objectives to be achieved.

Within the framework of this study, one of the most important objectives related to the practice of corporate open calls for sponsorship proposals is reputation. As stated by Schwaiger, Sarstedt and Taylor (2010), “corporate reputation is regarded as an intangible asset, which is scarce, valuable, and sustainable. Consequently, it is suitable for the building and expanding of strategic competitive advantages” (p. 79). The authors cite some researchers who have presented the positive impact of reputation in the recruitment and retention of employees (Nakra, 2000; Turban and Cable, 2003), confidence among customers (Fombrun and Van Riel, 1998; Lafferty and Goldsmith, 1999), and the possibility to set higher prices (Milgrom and Roberts, 1986; Eberl, 2006). The good acceptance of the public in relation to sponsorship and its ability to involve stakeholders - in many cases providing a face-to-face interaction - are also mentioned by Arens, Weigold and Arens (2008). The authors note that in several circumstances these benefits are even translated into increased sales.

Kuzma and Kuzma (2009) defend that sponsorship can be adopted by any company. As already discussed in this section, there are numerous objectives, target groups and areas to be chosen. Hence, “the form that the sponsorship takes is only limited by the imagination” (p. 3).

In order to define the way to perform in sponsorship, a company has to, first and foremost, address the issue strategically, “creating an environment of proactive sponsorship management” (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005, p. 35). To be strategic means that sponsorship must be one element of an integrated communication strategy (Walliser, 2003; Cornwell & Maignan, 1998; Thjømøe, Olson & Brønn, 2002; Kuzma & Kuzma, 2009; Costa, 2012). As Walshe (2008) asserts, “sponsorship, or associative
marketing, is one of the key ingredients in many marketing recipes and how it complements, contrasts and adds to the whole is vital if a successful ‘dish’ is to be created” (pp. 43-44). This observation may seem obvious, but the ESA European Sponsorship Survey 2007 (ESA, 2007), conducted with 385 respondents from sponsors, rights holders and agencies involved in the sponsorship industry across Europe, concluded that “sponsorship is welcomed to the marketing mix”, however it is necessary “a more strategic role for sponsorship leading to more integration within marketing and communications” (p. 6).

In practice, the way that major sponsors have adopted to define their strategic role in sponsorship, fully linked to the marketing/communication/corporate strategy, is by designing a sponsorship strategy and a sponsorship policy, the themes of the next two sections.

### 2.2.2. Sponsorship strategy

The sponsorship strategy is a document for the internal company use that presents how its objectives will be reached through sponsorship (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001).

Grey and Skildum-Reid (2001) and Collett and Fenton (2011) recommend that the sponsorship strategy should contain the following components: the role of sponsorship linked to the marketing/communication strategy and to the brand/corporate values, philosophies and attributes; the desired objectives and target audiences; a clear focus in terms of types, themes and areas of sponsorship; the geographical extent; number of sponsorships; rights and benefits to be acquired from those who are sponsored; audit of current sponsorships; systems and tools for management; departments, professionals and consultants responsible for the management; budget to be allocated; implementation plan; communication plan; and research, evaluation and review.

A survey conducted by ESA indicates that the development of a sponsorship strategy is the main factor for successful performance in sponsorship (Figure 5).
Araújo (2011) states that there are nine factors for the development of an effective sponsorship strategy: connection to the business; alignment with the brand; relevance to stakeholders; internal involvement; clarity, focus and positioning; proper activation; reliable partnerships; measurement of results; and long-term vision. The author cites that after the deployment of a sponsorship strategy, sponsors can also structure programs or platforms in order to organize all the sponsorships, ensuring the perspective of focus and long-term vision (Araújo, 2012). As an example, Figure 6 shows the hierarchy of strategy, platforms and sponsorship projects for Heineken. The company remarks that “our sponsorship strategy for the Heineken brand is to build brand equity through relevant associations with high-impact, high-profile sports and music events, films and the world of Hollywood” (Heineken, 2004).
FIGURE 6
Hierarchy of Strategy, Programs and Projects on Heineken's Sponsorships


Note: The figure represents a simplified overview, containing examples of old and new properties, under the three platforms of the sponsorship strategy in 2004. The intention is only to illustrate a hierarchy of sponsorships.

The Heineken example illustrates a global strategy that can give coherence and align not only global properties (like the film examples), but also local ones (like the music examples). A global sponsorship strategy that meets the local needs of the brands matches to the so-called "optimal mix of global and local" advocated by marketing strategists (Majer, 2012).

In summary, Collett and Fenton (2011) point out that:

The main argument in favour of developing a [sponsorship] strategy is that alignment and a focus on contributing to longer term goals means that sponsorship becomes much more embedded in the organization, more relevant and better appreciated as a marketing discipline. (p. 45)
2.2.3. Sponsorship policy

The sponsorship policy can be understood as the translation of the sponsorship strategy in managerial and practical terms (Collett & Fenton, 2011). If the sponsorship strategy is compared to a game plan, the sponsorship policy represents its rules (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001).

Unlike the sponsorship strategy and other internal company instruments, sponsorship policies are the most likely to be made public (Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009). However, a research conducted by the authors in 2009 from the 500 largest companies listed on Fortune 500 ranking found that only 146 (29.2%) had sponsorship policies available on their web sites.

Treated also as an external document, the sponsorship policy may contain some elements of the sponsorship strategy that should be communicated to the external public, like the company’s history with sponsorship (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001), the target audiences and the types and number of sponsorships (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005), and other pragmatic information related to managerial issues, like the desired level of sponsorship - title sponsor, presenting sponsor, category-exclusive sponsor or sponsor with no special rights (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005; Collett & Fenton, 2011), forms of investment (cash, provision of technology or skills), exclusions and restrictions, specific rights and benefits, and evaluation method (Collett & Fenton, 2011). The policy also details the steps of the decision making process, presents the selection criteria and defines who is involved in each phase of the process (Collett & Fenton, 2011).

During the last years there has been a proliferation of sponsorship policies (Cornwell, 2008, as cited in Johnston, 2010). This phenomenon can be explained by three main factors. First, the policy specifies the characteristics of projects that can be sponsored and those that cannot, which ensures consistency and reduces the risk of image conflict (Cunningham, Cornwell & Coote, 2009). Second, instead of sponsoring one single project, a multiple sponsorship strategy is becoming more popular (Chien, Cornwell & Pappu, 2011) and, according to the authors, sponsorships in a portfolio may influence each other in terms of perception. In this sense, a sponsorship policy can support a
portfolio creation, ensuring that the audience can build a “web of connectivity among a firm’s various sponsorship activities” (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005, p. 35). Third, the sponsorship policies have been created to support the decision making process (Thjømøe, Olson & Brønn, 2002; Farrelly, Quester & Burton, 2006, as cited in Johnston, 2010), since “sponsorship engagement has historically hinged on some rather unsophisticated, near random matching of sponsor and sponsee” (Cornwell, 2008, p. 52).

With regard to the third factor above, Collett and Fenton (2011) remarks that:

> With sponsorship policy, clarifying the company’s position to the external market should have the benefit of reducing the number of speculative approaches that are not on target for the business. It makes the assessment of proposals easier and rejections to be unequivocal where opportunities do not meet the policy’s selection criteria. (pp. 45-46)

The decision making process regarding corporate sponsorship is the subject of the next topic.

### 2.2.4. Sponsorship decision making

As shown so far, corporate sponsorship has solidly increased over the past decades and has become more strategic for companies and brands worldwide. Following this trend, on one hand, the development of sponsorship strategies and policies has become popular among sponsors. On the other hand, however, sponsorship decision making is a practice not yet studied and applied properly.

In the academic area, as observed in 1.1, works on sponsorship decision making are rare. In fact, Wierenga (2011) observes that the lack of academic studies on decision making occurs in the field of marketing as a whole.

In business, as remarked by Thjømøe, Olson and Brønn (2002), “… many firms have a variety of complex goals for their sponsorship efforts but not terribly high-quality management practices when it comes to decision making surrounding sponsorship” (p.
6). The need for companies to develop best practices in decision making process regarding sponsorship proposals seems to be evident for several reasons. First, due to the increased number of sponsorship requests (McCarville & Copeland, 1994, and Shelton, 1991, as cited in Arthur, Scott & Woods, 1997; Shanklin & Kusma, 1992; Ensor, 1987, as cited in McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997). Second, because most of the sponsorship proposals are unsolicited (Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011; Arthur, Scott & Woods, 1997; Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996) - Ukman (2010) observes that seven out of 10 sponsorships are initiated by those being sponsored. Third, owing to the demand for greater accountability of all corporate spending (Kuzma, Shanklin & McCally, 1993, as cited in Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996).

The set of selection criteria used to evaluate sponsorship proposals is large and depends on each sponsor (McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997). However, some priorities have been observed by Johnston & Paulsen (2007): fit with brand objectives; duration of sponsorship; partner relationship; geographic reach; sponsorship type; level of ownership/exclusivity; payment type; and exposure level. Other authors add some additional criteria, such as: affinity between target audiences of sponsor and sponsored; the popularity and image of the potential sponsored party; expected sponsorship costs/benefits; type of rights/benefits received; and possibility to integrate the sponsorship into the communication/marketing strategy (Hermanns, Drees & Püttermann (1986), Püttermann (1991) and Thwaites, Aguilar, Manjarrez & Kidd (1998), all cited in Walliser, 2003). Ukman (2010) reinforces some commercial criteria (ability to incent retailers, product showcase and impact on sales), besides the potential of measurability. Reis (2003) includes the potential to involve other stakeholders, like employees and community.

Among all these criteria, the most important is the fit (also called link, association, connection, congruence) between sponsor and sponsored (Chien, Cornwell & Pappu, 2011; Olson & Thjømøe, 2011; Arens, Weigold & Arens, 2008; Johnston & Paulsen, 2007; Farrelly & Quester, 1997; Cornwell, Humphreys, Maguire, Weeks & Tellegen, 2006, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011; Fleck & Quester, 2007, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011; Gwinner & Eaton, 1999, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011; Rifon, Choi, Trimble & Li, 2004, as cited in Nickell, Cornwell & Johnston, 2011). If both sponsor and sponsored are perceived as discordant,
there may be a negative effect for the sponsor (McDonald, 1991, as cited in Poon & Prendergast, 2006): “It can blur a company’s positioning and negatively influence the elaboration of the sponsorship, which may then contribute to a dilution of the company’s equity” (Simmons, Becker & Olsen, 2006, as cited in Schwaiger, Sarstedt & Taylor, 2010, p. 87). Cornwell, Weeks and Roy (2005) defend that the fit is one of the keys to achieving impact through sponsorship: “Mere exposure to a brand through such vehicles as on-site signage may create awareness, but awareness alone may not capture a unique position in consumer’s minds” (p. 36).

At this point it is worth reminding that the decision making process and criteria are a result and a component of the sponsorship policy, as illustrated on Figure 1 (The Matryoshka Metaphor). This means they cannot be planned before or off the policy and should be publicly publicized, mainly for those that can be potentially sponsored: “If you want proposals that meet your needs, you have to be prepared to tell sponsorship seekers what those needs are” (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001, p. 66). Confirming that criteria and the decision making should come later, Irwin and Asimakopoulos (1992, as cited in McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997) suggest six steps for the evaluation of sport sponsorships: i) A review of the corporate marketing plan; ii) The establishment of specific sponsorship objectives; iii) The identification and weighing of evaluation criteria; iv) The screening and selection process; v) The implementation of the selected sponsorship; and vi) The post-event evaluation.

The first three steps have already been addressed. Steps five and six are not part of this work. Hence, from now the focus will be on the options that sponsors have to choose their sponsorships (step four above).

2.2.5. Alternatives to decision making

As mentioned in 1.1, companies can be on three different stages of sponsorship. Sponsors on the first and second stages select the proposals in a reactive way, according to the offer and/or personal interests. On the third stage, however, after designing their sponsorship strategies, policies and programs, the firms can adopt a proactive attitude
towards sponsorship decision making (Sarkovas, 2001). In practice, these sponsors have four different alternatives for choosing their sponsorships:

A. **Own project** - The company creates a sponsorship property or buys an existing one. This alternative is applied when the company does not find the desired project out of the existing sponsorships that will meet the objectives defined in its sponsorship strategy (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001). The authors defend that this solution has advantages (e.g. complete control and real ownership over the property/event) but some disadvantages as well, such as a big financial commitment, large consumption of time and effort, lack of expertise, risk, etc. A clear example of project ownership is Red Bull Racing, the Formula One team owned by Red Bull (“Sponsorship Product Ownership”, 2007);

B. **Direct choice** - The sponsor receives several projects and selects those that meet the criteria defined by its sponsorship policy (Votorantim, 2007). Being proactive in this type of selection means that the sponsor can, for example, develop some proposal guidelines based on the sponsorship policy and make them public (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001);

C. **Closed selection** - Projects are identified by the sponsor through prospecting (Votorantim, 2007). In other words, “you [sponsor] have to identify properties that may be strong partners and request proposals from them.” (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001, p. 71). This alternative occurs when the company knows that some entities may have projects that can meet the sponsorship policy; and

D. **Public selection** - The company selects projects through open calls for sponsorship proposals, which are available for all sponsorship seekers (Votorantim, 2007). Royal Purple, an American lubricant producer, can be illustrated as an example of this alternative. On August 29, 2011, the company put out:

Royal Purple announces open call for sponsorship proposals. Proposals will be accepted until September 30, 2011, for all genres of racing (individuals and teams), event organizers and project builds… for the 2012 year…. Proposals may be submitted via email or mail. For more
Public selections through open calls for sponsorship proposals have become popular in Brazil over the last decade and are the core topic of this work. So, from now, the final section of this theoretical background and the entire practical part are both totally dedicated to the theme.

2.3. OPEN CALLS FOR SPONSORSHIP PROPOSALS IN BRAZIL

2.3.1. Background

The advent of corporate calls for proposals in Brazil is linked to the global trend of lower participation in government funding of sponsored activities. This trend, especially in culture and arts, has been noted by many authors and researchers:

Sponsorship has replaced other forms of funding (especially government support) in some countries to the point that some sponsored activities depend on corporate funding for their existence. (Cornwell & Maignan, 1998, p. 18)

The states have abandoned their obligations to finance culture in a proper way; therefore it is the duty of businesses to fill the gap. (Inkei, 2003, n.d.)

The support from government is gradually being reduced [in Germany]. (Schwaiger, Sarstedt & Taylor, 2010, p. 77)

Wu (2003) observed that the conservative administrations of Ronald Reagan (United States) and Margaret Thatcher (Britain) were responsible for the creation of the first incentive mechanisms to attract private investment for the arts. In the form of laws, these incentives imply the resignation of the State of its revenue from taxes, which is used by sponsors to finance activities that cannot be implemented without support from external sources (Olivieri, 2004). As a consequence, many governments have introduced tax incentives to fuel corporate sponsorship during the following years, including Brazil (Durand, 2000).
In Brazil, the most important law to stimulate corporate sponsorship is the so-called Lei Rouanet [Rouanet Law]. It was established in 1991 as successor to the Lei Sarney [Sarney Law], "the first to withdraw the decision power of the state, even if the resources used are mostly public, and put it in the hands of private initiative" (Rubin, 2008, quoted in Sousa, 2008, p. 62).

Hess (2008) explains that the Rouanet Law is grounded in three funding models. Two of them (Fundo Nacional de Cultura [National Fund for Culture] and Fundos de Investimento Cultural e Artístico [Cultural and Artistic Investment Funds]) involve direct government funding - but have never been regulated. The third one (the tax incentive model) prevailed and its importance has expanded year after year. This model has a particularity in relation to many other countries, allowing the sponsor to deduct the total spent on culture from the total amount of tax to be paid: “So, if a company spends R$ 1 million on a cultural project, it can deduct R$ 1 million of its payable taxes, and consequently the government loses R$ 1 million of tax revenue”1 (p. 5).

The Brazilian model has received widespread criticism by many different sectors of the Brazilian society. Olivieri (2004) comments the main objective of the Rouanet Law, which is the establishment of partnership between government and business: “Partnership presupposes that each party is involved in achieving the ultimate goal, not the Government alone providing an amount that will be managed by the private” (p. 77). In other words, this means public money for private interests (Sarkovas, 2004).

The Brazil's Ministry of Culture (MinC) recognizes this problem and has been trying, for several years, to promote changes in the Rouanet Law in order to increase the participation of private resources in cultural sponsorships (Menezes, 2012; Ferreira, 2008; Volpato & Caldeira, 2008).

In practice, therefore, what is observed now in Brazil in the cultural area is a situation of total dependence on incentive laws. As stated by Dória (2003), there is an unwelcome inversion: “The privatization of cultural policy with increasing public funds (tax

---

1 The deduction of 100% is applicable to most of the cultural categories (performing arts; book editions; touring arts exhibitions; classical and instrumental music; and donations for libraries and museums), but not to all. However, even for categories not covered in 100% of deduction, the final savings to the sponsor can reach up to 70% of the amount spent in the project (Hess, 2008).
exemptions), while private resources attached to them are decreasing” (p. 106). A census conducted by the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises - GIFE Census 2009-2010 - reveals that between 70% and 80% of corporate investment in cultural projects was done through tax incentives (GIFE, 2010). Most companies sponsor cultural projects only if they can use public funds derived from tax incentives. After all, why should a sponsor invest its own money if the laws allow 100% tax exemption?

This scenario was the motivating factor for the expansion of corporate calls for proposals early in 2000 in Brazil². Aware that their cultural sponsorships had been financed by public resources, some companies (primarily state and later also private) began to adopt open calls as a way to make more transparent their decision making processes (Sousa, 2008).

2.3.2. Definition

MinC states that one public selection is a mechanism used by public entities, institutions and companies for choosing the best projects/proposals in form of contests, grants, awards and supports to projects (MinC, 2008). Within the scope of this work, it is considered that a corporate open call for sponsorship proposals belongs to the last category (supports to projects).

According to MinC (2008), the characteristics of an open call for sponsorship proposals are the following: i) Communication by public notice or submission guide; ii) Specific object; iii) Enrollment open to all; iv) Clear rules; v) Evaluation criteria previously published; vi) Presence of a selection committee; and vii) The projects to be supported will be held at a future date. Furthermore, considering that a call for proposals is a result of the sponsorship strategy of a company, it is worth including another characteristic: viii) It must meet the sponsorship policy of the company.

---

² There are few cases of open calls performed before 2000, as Concorrência Fiat, conducted in the 80s and 90s without the use of public resources (Fiat, 1990).
As synthesized by the State Youth Coordination of the Secretariat of Institutional Relations of the State of São Paulo, Brazil, a call for proposals is an official notice released publicly, containing all indications of how to enroll projects, such as rules, deadlines, evaluation criteria etc. (State Youth Coordination of the Secretariat of Institutional Relations of the State of São Paulo, 2008). Oliveira (2010) concludes that it represents “a modality that has, among its foundations, the purpose of making totally objective the choice of one or another project, leaving all applicants (or ‘competitors’) in equal conditions of dispute” (p. 108).

2.3.3. Operation

Among the four alternatives for choosing sponsorships (see 2.2.5), the most usual is the direct choice (Arthur, Scott & Woods, 1997), in which the company receives proposals and selects those that best suit the predefined criteria. As discussed in that topic, the sponsor can create and disseminate some proposal guidelines in order to have a proactive approach:

If you use proposal guidelines religiously, you will find that sponsorship seekers who are not genuine prospects for your sponsorship will realize that and stop submitting proposals. On the other hand, genuine prospects will provide you with proposals that are customized, more partnership-oriented, more comprehensive, and more professional. (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001, p. 67)

Other authors have also noted the existence of instruments to support the selection of sponsorship proposals: “The sponsorship industry has become more professional through the development of online documents that provide prospective properties with clear information about the decision process” (Johnston, 2010, p.374). Arthur, Scott and Woods (1997) agree, but make an important caveat: “Some tools designed to expedite the screening and selection process do exist…. However, none of them detail the actual processes of corporate decision making…” (p. 224).
It is this context that can best explain the functioning of a corporate call for proposals. It represents a whole process of sponsorship decision making (Figure 7) and, according to MinC (2008), it is formed by the following steps:

**FIGURE 7**

Steps of an Open Call for Sponsorship Proposals

A. Definition - The planning process of a call for proposals should start with the stipulation of important issues such as HR, IT, budget, etc. This first step does not appear in the original version developed by MinC, but it was included due to our experience and the importance of the planning phase for corporate sponsorship, confirmed by the research conducted by ESA in 2007. As seen in Figure 5, "good planning" is the second most important factor for successful sponsorship;

B. Formulation - It implies the development of the submission guide for the call, which represents the main communication channel between the sponsors and those who can potentially be sponsored. The submission guide should contain the whole description of the call – the stages of selection, deadlines, rules, evaluation criteria, etc. Together with the guide, the sponsor should create the registration form, used by the sponsorship seekers to enroll their proposals and may even develop other tools to assist the applicants;

C. Enrollment - This step involves the launch of the call by the dissemination of its submission guide (not only put it online, but also communicate it in order to attract a large number of sponsorship seekers) and the receipt of applications;

---

3 The model suggested by MinC (2008) is broad because it was designed to be used in selections of public agencies, institutions, and companies. Hence, the author presents only the information that is relevant to a corporate open call for sponsorship proposals.
D. **Selection** - This stage begins with the initial screening of proposals, eliminating those that do not meet the minimum requirements set in the submission guide. Then, the proposals are assessed by an external committee, formed by experts of the subject area of selection (e.g. pop music, nautical sports, education, visual arts, cinema, rights of children and adolescents, literature, immaterial heritage, etc.)⁴. The company then announces the list of proposals that were approved for implementation; and

E. **Realization** - Finally, some issues between the sponsor and the sponsored property can be negotiated, the contract is formalized, the transfer of resources is made, and the relationship effectively starts through the execution of a sponsorship project.

### 2.3.4. Actors involved

Weppler and McCarville (1994, as cited in McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997) observe the presence of four agents involved on the sponsorship decision making process: “Gatekeepers” (individuals who receive the initial sponsorship proposals, which can include receptionists, assistants, and even consulting firms); "Influencers" (individuals who have some sort of connection or information regarding the sponsorship requesters; "Deciders" (individuals who take the final decision on which proposals will be chosen); and “Buyers” (individuals who undertake negotiations with the sponsored property in order to ensure that the corporation’s interests are being met).

Compared with this model above, experience indicates that in a corporate open call for sponsorship proposals:

- Consulting firms often play the role of “gatekeepers”. They are usually responsible for the general management of the entire process, the formulation of the submission guide and the registration form, and the initial screening of proposals;

---

⁴ As will be seen in the practical part of this work, on a corporate open call, the proposals assessed by the external committee are forwarded to an internal committee, consisting of executives of the company who will be responsible for the final selection of the projects to be sponsored.
- The external committee represents the “influencers”. Due to the expertise of its members, the committee is responsible for assessing the proposals and for submitting the best ones for the internal committee;

- The internal committee is the “deciders”. Based on the choices of the “influencers”, the internal committee selects the properties that will be sponsored; and

- The internal area which promotes the open call can be considered the “buyers”. After the final decision of the internal committee, they will announce the results, establish the negotiation with the sponsored entities, and deal with all other issues necessary for the beginning of the execution of the sponsorship projects.

2.3.5. Benefits to the sponsor

As cited in 2.3.2, there are eight characteristics that define a corporate open call for sponsorship proposals. These characteristics may represent benefits for sponsors, when compared with observations and findings of researchers and professionals, as follows:

A. Sponsorship policy disclosure. As shown in 2.2.3, some authors emphasize that sponsorship policies are likely to be made public; however few policies are easily located on the sponsors’ websites. In contrast, in calls for proposals the submission guide represents a piece of communication that disseminates the policy. This is evident by comparing the items that comprise a sponsorship policy (see 2.2.3) with the topics of an open call submission guide (see 3.6.1).

B. Encouragement for communication. It is unanimous among the authors that the investment in sponsorship cannot be limited to the acquisition of a property. Two researches, one conducted by Quester and Thompson (2001) and another by Nickell, Cornwell and Johnston (2011), concluded that sponsorship success is directly related to the investment on additional communication activities in order to leverage the potentiality of sponsorship. As mentioned in 2.2.1, in many cases, this extra expenditure reaches several times the initial sponsorship fee. Sleight (1989, quoted in Lamont & Dowell, 2008) points out that “it is rare sponsorship indeed that can
provide anything more than a temporary effect… unless run over a long period and supported by all communications tools at the marketer’s disposal…” (p. 256). Crimmings and Horn (1996, quoted in Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005) are even more emphatic: “If the brand cannot afford to spend to communicate its sponsorship, then the brand cannot afford sponsorship at all” (p. 36). Given that, it is important to underline that open calls for proposals have some relevant characteristics: a) Dissemination not only of the company's sponsorships, but mainly its sponsorship policy; b) Gain of free publicity for the sponsor, since many media channels are likely to disseminate the call as a service to their audience; and c) Opportunities for communication on several occasions, especially on the opening of the enrollment period and to announce the selected proposals. Regarding the second characteristic (gain of free publicity), the Royal Purple’s call (see 2.2.5) was publicized spontaneously by several web sites5, such as: Honda Tuning6, UTV Guide Net7, After Market News8, New Mexico Off-road9, Exo Cars10, Honda Horsepower11, etc. In agreement with the third characteristic, Schwaiger, Sarstedt and Taylor (2010) state:

It is likely that it is more feasible for companies to get more sustained publicity for annual or ongoing events as opposed to “one-shot” events wherein publicity would likely be limited to a short period. In this regard, our results suggest that companies who sponsor events should make significant efforts to inform the media about ongoing cultural sponsorships they are involved in.

(p. 87)

5 Source: Google search performed on April 05, 2012.
C. Greater quality in sponsorship selection by:

- Establishing a decision making process and defining its decision makers. As already discussed, a call for proposals is performed by specific phases/steps (see 2.3.3), each one with defined actors (see 2.3.4). Making a parallel with the sport sponsorship acquisition model suggested by Arthur, Scott and Woods (1997) – which consists of four stages: proposal acquisition, buying center composition, purchase decision, and selection of preferred sponsorship property – one can observe that these four stages are covered by the phases of the open call. The first stage (proposal acquisition) is embedded on the enrollment phase, which involves the receipt of applications. The other three stages (buying center composition, purchase decision, and selection of preferred sponsorship property) are all part of the selection phase of an open call.

- Communicating guidelines for the submission of proposals. The importance of making the guidelines public - in a call this is done by the submission guide - was observed by Grey and Skildum-Reid (2001):

  If your proposal guidelines are going to work, you need to ensure that it is easy for sponsorship seekers to get their hands on them…. This does not mean that you need to spend every waking moment on the phone with sponsorship seekers, it just means that you need to have a mechanism in place to get that information across easily. (p. 66)

The authors emphasize that the dissemination of guidelines is also beneficial to sponsorship seekers: “They want to have the best possible shot at becoming partners with you [sponsor]. And if it isn’t going to happen, they would much rather know before they wasted their time and effort on presenting a proposal” (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001, p. 67). Knowing the motivations of sponsors’ decision making, sponsorship seekers can adapt their proposals more effectively (Johnston & Paulsen, 2007) and even develop something new especially to meet specific business needs (McCook, Turco & Riley, 1997).
- Facilitating the management of sponsorship proposals. Copeland, Frisby and McCarville (1996) conducted a research in Canada and found that the mean number of requests received by 75 companies surveyed was 484 yearly. There was one case of a company receiving 2,600 in one year. In addition, McCook, Turco and Riley (1997) states that most sponsors prefer to see the same type of information in different sponsorship proposals. These issues are easily addressed by calls for proposals, since all solicitations are standardized (presented according to a registration form) and are received at the same time interval, which assists the comparison between the requests and the negative response to rejected ones.

D. Formation of a sponsorship portfolio and a sponsorship ‘umbrella’. As observed in 2.2.3, companies often sponsor multiple properties at the same time. In this light, one of the characteristics of open calls is that they are usually used to select a large number of properties, with the advantage that they are all tied to the same concept (as they were selected from the same selection criteria):

Such umbrellas are built around a common theme – often a particular type of sponsorship; for example, youth sports, contemporary art, or music festivals…. Using an umbrella strategy creates a situation where the strategically developed whole is far greater than the sum of the parts. (Grey & Skildum-Reid, 2001, p. 157)

E. Positive image associated to equality and transparency. The dissemination of a submission guide, with the definition of a clear process, with rules, instances and decision criteria, demonstrates independence and promotes equal chances to all competitors (Oliveira, 2010). In this sense, the presence of an external committee is particularly important, due to some issues raised by Johnston (2010) and Cornwell (2008):

… firms are increasingly seeking a more independent approach to sponsorship selection that focuses firmly on the bottom line rather than on goodwill or personal factors. The downside of a decision process lacking in rigour and transparency is the potential for managers to make sponsorship decisions that are flawed, risky and uncompetitive. Personal biases, risk tolerance
and overconfidence can interfere with the ability to make good decisions. (Johnston, 2010, pp. 367-368)

Despite the proliferation of sponsorship policies..., commentators in the business press continue to suggest that sponsorship decision is unduly influenced by the personal interests and egos of senior management. (Cornwell, 2008, as cited in Johnston, 2010, p. 366)

2.3.6. Examples

As already discussed in 2.3.1, the incentive laws were the main stimulus for the booming of the corporate open calls for sponsorship proposals in Brazil. By relying on this mechanism for over 20 years, most of the calls are available to the cultural area. On the other hand, as the first federal law to stimulate sports was regulated in 2007, there are still few companies promoting open calls in this area. Hence, the practice of open calls for proposals in Brazil is illustrated in Table 2 through five major examples - four of culture and one of sports.

The five companies mentioned in Table 2 are just some of several that carry out open calls for sponsorship proposals in Brazil. Looking at some recent calls promoted by these sponsors\(^\text{12}\), one can notice clear differences between their submission guides – not only in content but also in format and structure of the text. For example, Petrobras has two different submission guides: a general one (for all the calls that the company launched in 2011) and another specific for each call. Unlike the others, Natura, Votorantim and BNB introduce their submission guides with a brief summary of their sponsorship policies. The submission guide of Oi is quite short (4 pages) when compared to all others, each one containing not less than 11 pages.

Therefore, in order to achieve the main goal of this work, the analysis of submission guides and registration forms of these five sponsors were considered in the exploratory research, which is the subject of the next chapter. Combined with primary data, the analysis provides a practical view of corporate open calls for sponsorship proposals.

\(^{12}\) Petrobras Cultural Program 2011 (Petrobras, 2011a, 2011b); National call for proposals 2012 of Musical Natura (Natura, 2012b); 3\(^{rd}\) call for proposals of Votorantim Cultural Democratization Program (Votorantim, 2008a); Call for proposals 2011 of Oi Program of Incentivized Sports Sponsorship (Oi, 2011a); and Call for proposals 2012 of BNB / BNDES Cultural Program (BNB, 2012b).
TABLE 2
Examples of Sponsors Adopting Open Calls for Sponsorship Proposals in Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Main ownership</th>
<th>Net income (2010)</th>
<th>Sponsorship highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petrobras</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>The biggest company in Brazil and the third biggest energy company in the world</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>EUR 15.1 billion</td>
<td>The company holds the largest cultural sponsorship program in Brazil, the Programa Petrobras Cultural [Petrobras Cultural Program], launched in 2003. It is structured to meet the entire chain of the economy of culture. In 2011 the program promoted three calls: one for music festivals, other for film festivals, and the third for distribution of feature films for movie theaters. Altogether 41 proposals were selected (of 304 enrolled), with an investment of EUR 3,8 million. For being the largest and oldest, the Petrobras’ calls for proposals had served as a model for other sponsors (Sousa, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natura</td>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>A strong presence in Latin America with more than 1,2 million consultants in a direct sales business model</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>EUR 313 million</td>
<td>Natura launched in 2005 the Natura Musical [Musical Natura] program, which sponsors projects that are aligned with the concept of music of Natura - an essentially Brazilian music, but that is renewed in touch with universal ideas and sounds. In 2011 the program promoted two calls: one national and another in the state of Minas Gerais. The national call selected six projects, out of 1300 enrolled. In 2012 two other states are getting a local call (Bahia and Pará) and the total investment on all the calls will be EUR 2,1 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votorantim</td>
<td>Capital-intensive</td>
<td>A Brazilian group with operations in 24 countries worldwide</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>EUR 2.1 billion</td>
<td>Managed by the Instituto Votorantim [Votorantim Institute], the calls for proposals of the Programa de Democratização Cultural Votorantim [Votorantim Cultural Democratization Program] select projects that promote access to cultural goods in its different expressions (film, video, visual arts, performing arts, literature, music, heritage, etc.) in all regions of the country. Since 2006, when the sponsorship program was launched, the company has already held four calls. The last one, in 2010, selected 15 projects (of 1780 enrolled), with an investment of EUR 1,3 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Main ownership</td>
<td>Net income (2010)</td>
<td>Sponsorship highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oi</strong></td>
<td>Telecom</td>
<td>The leading provider of telecom services in Brazil</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>EUR 735 million</td>
<td>The company maintains an institute (<em>Oi Futuro</em>) which is responsible for social responsibility programs and performs calls for proposals in the fields of culture, social, sports and environment. In sports, the <em>Programa Oi de Patrocínio Esportivo Incentivado</em> [Oi Program of Incentivized Sports Sponsorship] focuses on projects of any discipline (football, judo, cycling, golf, etc.) that promotes the socio-educational development of youth. The first call was conducted in 2010. The second one, conducted in 2011, selected 15 projects with investment of EUR $945,000$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Banco do Nordeste do Brasil (BNB)</strong></td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>The largest financial institution in Latin America focused on regional development</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>EUR 132 million</td>
<td>The bank holds, since 2005, the <em>Programa Banco do Nordeste de Cultura</em> [BNB Cultural Program], whose calls have already sponsored 1.371 projects in 350 municipalities in the region of operation (nine states in the northeast of the country, northern Minas Gerais and northern Espírito Santo). Since 2009 the Brazilian Development Bank (BNDES) has been a partner of the program and its current 2012 edition will sponsor at least 303 projects with the investment of EUR $3,4$ million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: All the values presented in the table were converted from Reais (the Brazilian currency) to Euro at the rate of 0,42, retrieved on April 5, 2012, from http://www4.bcb.gov.br/pec/conversao/conversao.asp
3. EXPLORATORY RESEARCH

Our experience with open calls for sponsorship proposals in Brazil, both for companies and government agencies, shows that this type of selection encourages the refinement and upgrading of cultural projects, reinforces the objectiveness of selection, reduces cronyism and favoritism, and tends to generate professionalism on both sides of the equation: on the side of the companies (and the public institutions), in their relationship with the cultural world, and also tends to generate professionalism and upgrading on the other side, that of the artists, creators and cultural producers. (J. Ferreira, former Minister of Culture)

3.1. PURPOSES

Through an exploratory study, the practical part of this work aims to:
- Distinguish in which situations open calls for proposals may represent a suitable alternative to sponsorship decision making;
- Raise principles for the elaboration and management of corporate open calls; and
- Present corporate open calls for sponsorship proposals as a methodology for researchers and sponsors.

3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

Malhotra (2007) classifies research designs according to Figure 8. In order to meet the objectives of the practical part of this dissertation (shown above), the use of exploratory research was deemed the most appropriate alternative, since its main objective is “to provide insights and understanding” (p. 80).
Among the methods of exploratory research suggested by the author (p. 81), two of them were applied, one based on secondary data and the other based on primary data\textsuperscript{13}:

### 3.2.1. Secondary data analyzed qualitatively

The basis for the research was the analysis of the submission guides and registration forms disclosed by the five companies mentioned in 2.3.6 – *Petrobras, Natura, Votorantim, Oi* and *BNB* (see Table 2).

The choice of these five sponsors was motivated by:

- The great experience and importance of all of them in sponsorship;
- The diversity of segments, ownership and focus area of the call (see Figure 9); and
- The clear and significant differences between their submission guides and registration forms, as discussed in 2.3.6.

\textsuperscript{13} Malhotra (2007) explains that "primary data are originated by a researcher for the specific purpose of addressing the problem at hand" and "secondary data are data that have already been collected for purposes other than the problem at hand" (p. 106).
TABLE 3
Open Calls for Sponsorship Proposals Analyzed in this Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Sponsorship program</th>
<th>Open call for sponsorship proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrobras</td>
<td>Petrobras Cultural Program</td>
<td>Petrobras Cultural Program 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natura</td>
<td>Musical Natura</td>
<td>National call for proposals 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votorantim</td>
<td>Votorantim Cultural Democratization Program</td>
<td>3rd call for proposals 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oi</td>
<td>Oi Program of Incentivized Sports Sponsorship</td>
<td>Call for proposals 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNB</td>
<td>BNB / BNDES Cultural Program</td>
<td>Call for proposals 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Based on Petrobras (2011a, 2011b), Natura (2012b), Votorantim (2008a), Oi (2011a) and BNB (2012b).

The submission guides were compared with each other and also with the model suggested by MinC (2008). This analysis served as a starting point for the design of the primary research (3.2.2), to complement the analysis of results (3.4 and 3.5) and mainly for the recommendations presented at the end of this work (3.6).

3.2.2. Qualitative research (primary data)

Malhotra (2007) defines qualitative research as an unstructured and non-statistical method conducted "to gain a qualitative understanding of the underlying reasons and motivations" (p. 144).
The procedure adopted in this work was the direct approach - "one type of qualitative research in which the purposes of the project are disclosed to the respondent" (p. 145) - through the use of email questionnaires. The intention was to draw up a suggestion for systematization of an open call from opinions of the most different actors involved directly and indirectly with the subject in Brazil.

The sample consisted of 107 professionals, carefully selected for the recognition in their areas of expertise. 97 accepted and received the questionnaire, of which 80 were returned and usable. From 80 respondents, 35% were sponsors or consultants; 40% were sponsorship seekers or professionals of cultural or sportive areas not directly involved with fund-raising; and 25% members of external committees, networks, academy, government and press.

The participants were asked to express their point of view on general aspects and/or on one or more steps of an open call for proposals (Step A: Definition; Step B: Formulation; Step C: Enrollment; Step D: Selection; and Step E: Realization – as shown in Figure 7). A total of 17 questions were divided among the different groups of respondents. Thus, each participant received only some of the questions (one to five questions) that make up the completed questionnaire. Considering the whole group of respondents, all steps of the process were covered.

The great majority of professionals contacted for the primary research have experience related to culture/arts, as well as from five calls analyzed in the secondary research only one is of sports. As already explained in 2.3.6, the reason for this choice is that the history of corporate calls for proposals in Brazil for cultural/artistic proposals is much larger.

---

14 Email questionnaires were used instead of depth interviews due to logistic limitations - the interviewer was located in Hungary and the respondents in Brazil. However, since the email questionnaire does not allow a great interaction with each respondent, but can be used with larger numbers of participants, the sample size was considerably larger than would be possible by depth interviews.

15 The complete list of questions and respondents can be seen in Appendix A and Appendix B respectively. Both the questionnaire and the answers were originally written in Portuguese and translated into English at the time of inclusion in this work. All questionnaires were returned between June 22 and September 26, 2012.
3.3. RESULTS: OVERVIEW

In general, all groups of respondents - with or without direct experience with the subject - are enthusiastic about open calls for sponsorship proposals, noting that this practice is related to professionalism, integrity, consistency, efficiency, etc. as observed in these examples:

A company that makes an open call for sponsorship proposals gives the impression of being more advanced, structured and organized in their communication and marketing. And if the call is a reflection or a consequence of its corporate operations, aimed at their publics of interest, the company shows it is handling sponsorship in a strategic and sustainable manner. (A. C. Gonçalves, director of the sponsorship department of the Secretariat for Social Communication of the Presidency of Brazil)

In some cases, in my view, [the open call] is a good way of conveying the earnestness of the company. (C. Hamburger, movie director nominated for the Golden Bear of the Berlin Film Festival in 2007)

In most of the cases that I’ve seen, a company that makes a call for proposals has a well-defined investment platform. A call for proposals normally stipulates parameters for the projects; such as a focus on a specific region/city, preferential target audience, main criteria/strategies sought after, amount of funding for the project, etc. It positions the company more clearly in the mind of the public and democratizes access to participation in the call. (A. Moser, president of the Instituto Esporte & Educação and volleyball player medalist at the 1996 Olympic Games)

Because [the call for proposals] is a competition, with rules, criteria, a technical committee and systems that standardize and equalize the proposals, the choice ends up being the natural consequence of a process, and not a subjective decision. (K. Cavalcanti, institutional marketing manager for Natura)

The use of open calls for sponsorship proposals, which were initially found more often in government-owned companies, also ended up being adopted by some private companies, which I see as progress in the field of cultural sponsorship. This is because it provides transparency and defines criteria, problems always present in any selection process. This does not mean to say that the approach is that successful and that calls for proposals, today almost synonymous with cultural policy, should not be criticized. (R. B. Costa, journalist)
This last quotation of R. B. Costa illustrates the criticism of some respondents in relation to several calls for proposals existing in Brazil. The comments suggest that the reason for these criticisms is related to the two stages of a call. The first concerns the planning:

The choice to use an open call for proposals must be based on a policy for cultural investment or sponsorship. In this sense, the reasons can vary from company to company or be determined by a set of strategic and operational factors. (R. Gioielli, manager at the Votorantim Institute)

There are those [calls] that are consistent and well put together and there are those that are instruments devoid of strategy. In my view, it is fundamental to analyze how the call is drafted - whether it is in line with the company’s cultural policy; the alignment of the assessment and selection criteria, and the objectives that it proposes to achieve; the pertinence of the formulation of the call and the public that it is designed to reach, etc. (A. C. F. Reis, consultant in culture, economics and cities)

What is evident from both the statements above is that the call for proposals cannot arise randomly, but as consequence of (and anchored to) a corporate sponsorship policy - also reinforced by L. Brant (president of Brant Associados) and Y. Sarkovas (CEO of Edelman Significa) -, which confirms what has already been discussed throughout this work. H. Katz (professor at PUC-SP and the Federal University of Bahia) was even more emphatic, noting that: “From instruments to carry out finance policy, they [open calls for sponsorship proposals] have been transformed into the policies themselves.”

Therefore, as also already stated in 2.2.5, the open call is not the only, nor the best, alternative for all sponsors:

I don't see approaches to sponsorship [decision making] in terms of better or worse. I believe it depends on the objective of the company and, therefore, each one has its own idea. (C. Thompson, manager of sports sponsorship at Petrobras)

I don't believe that there is any standardization [between the different types of sponsorship decision making]. The motivations of the companies for sponsoring a project vary. (F. Meirelles, Brazilian filmmaker, director of the Oscar-nominated City of God)
The call for proposals is a democratic tool, but does not serve to all. More important than the call itself is that the company adopts qualified criteria in any choice. (A. Manevy, executive secretary of MinC 2008-2010)

The second reason of the criticisms can be credited to the implementation of the calls, summarized as follows:

... the fact that a company uses a call for proposals does not mean anything. It depends on the call. The same thing happens with the other [decision making] approaches… None of them are necessarily good or bad. It always depends on the way they are implemented. (J. L. Filho, founder of J.Leiva Cultura & Esporte)

... a poorly constructed or conducted open call for sponsorship proposals can put the company in a negative light, with the risk of giving the impression that the call is just a way of publicly justifying activities that would have been sponsored anyway, reducing the credibility of the company in the eyes of society. (H. Menezes, Secretariat for Promotion and Incentive of Culture under the Ministry of Culture)

... the issue of open calls is not about their essence, but about the way their rules are created, which can restrict elements that could drive the creativity of the sponsor in opportunities that it does not always perceive. (H. Possolo, clown, actor, playwright, theater producer and director)

With regard to open calls for sponsorship proposals, they are filter mechanisms that may or may not be based on merit. (I. C. Costa, retired professor from the University of São Paulo)

Therefore, in order to help sponsors decide whether to use calls for proposals or not, the circumstances that make them the best alternative shall be discussed next, as well as a compilation of principles to guide the practice.

In practical terms, the circumstances point in what situations a company should make use of open calls for proposals; on the other hand, the principles indicate under what conditions.
3.4. RESULTS: OPTING FOR A CALL FOR PROPOSALS

3.4.1. Circumstances

The use of an open call for sponsorship proposals is risky when it is not justified. (L. Brant, president of Brant Associados)

The research questionnaire begins by inquiring the respondents regarding the situations in which a sponsor should choose to use open calls (Appendix A - question # 1). This question was directed to professionals with practical or theoretical experience in designing sponsorship policies and the subsequent decision making alternatives. Additionally, since some answers to other questions also addressed the same theme, these responses were also considered in the analysis.

As a result, Table 4 provides four different intentions potentially included in a sponsorship policy which suggest favorable conditions for the adoption of open calls for proposals.
### TABLE 4
Favorable Circumstances for the Use of Calls for Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible intentions expressed in a sponsorship policy</th>
<th>How the call can meet the intentions</th>
<th>Benefits to the sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Organization and qualification of the whole decision making process</td>
<td>Predetermined activities and deadlines for registration, evaluation, selection, dissemination of results and contracting. Utilization of technical criteria and presence of an external committee for the evaluation of proposals, avoiding influence of personal interests. Public information about rules, conditions, selection criteria, deadlines, instances of decision and feedbacks available to all participants. Selection based on meritocracy.</td>
<td>Greater quality in sponsorship selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mapping a large quantity and variety of proposals appropriate to the focus pre-defined by the policy</td>
<td>Communication plan aimed at the capillary spreading of the initiative, not only to the usual players. The submission guide indicates what exactly the company expects to receive and the registration form defines a single format for the enrollment of proposals. So, the proposals may be comparable and appropriate to the focus desired by the sponsor. By attracting a high number of proposals, the open call allows the selection of projects of different types and characteristics, all connected by the same concept.</td>
<td>Formation of a sponsorship portfolio and a sponsorship ‘umbrella’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responsible use of public resources arising from incentive laws</td>
<td>Participation open to everyone and equal relationship with all applicants.</td>
<td>Positive image associated to equality and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible intentions expressed in a sponsorship policy</td>
<td>How the call can meet the intentions</td>
<td>Benefits to the sponsor (see 2.3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility for the sponsorship policy and reputation among a wide range of stakeholders</td>
<td>More than the visibility associated with individual properties, the open call communicates the sponsorship policy as a whole.</td>
<td>Sponsorship policy disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open calls for proposals can be used as a way of relationship with a variety of target audiences.</td>
<td>Encouragement for communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Costa summarizes the contents of Table 4 and advocates that open calls for proposals should be adopted (solely or combined with other forms of selection) by any sponsor:

In my opinion, [a company should use open calls for proposals] always. Even if associated with only a part of the sponsorship budget, a call for proposals helps to manage the demands placed on a company, democratizes access to funding (primarily in the case of tax incentive funding), contributes to ethnic and regional diversity, adds transparency to the processes of the company, contributes to the public perception of its social commitment and its cultural responsibility, adding value to its reputation, and bringing, indirectly, value to the brand, one of the most important assets of an organization. (E. Costa, former sponsorship manager at Petrobras)

### 3.4.2. Principles

This section exposes conditions for the call to comply with the attendance of the purposes of a sponsorship policy, as shown in Table 4 of the previous section.

The basis for the elaboration of these conditions was essentially the answers to the questions that address the overall impression of companies that use open calls for proposals, besides the positive and negative aspects of the practice for sponsors and sponsorship seekers (Appendix A - questions # 2, 3 and 4)\(^\text{16}\).

The responses were grouped into common themes and the definitions of seven different principles was resulted in order to secure or leverage the favorable aspects and minimize or eliminate the adverse ones.

Sponsors may or may not follow the principles (Table 5). However, if adopted, they shall maximize the potential of a call for proposals and increase the chances of a successful implementation.

\(^\text{16}\) Since this theme is a crucial issue for the success of an open call and its public acceptance (as discussed in 3.3), it is worth noting that of all the 80 participants of the primary research, 61 (76%) responded to at least one of the three questions concerning the topic.
### TABLE 5
Principles for the Elaboration and Management of a Corporate Call for Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle (What)</th>
<th>Success drivers (How)</th>
<th>Testimonials that reinforce its importance for sponsor or sponsorship seeker (Why)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension</strong></td>
<td>Planning of all aspects of the open call in order to meet the sponsorship policy and to be successfully implemented.</td>
<td>In theory, the use of an open call conveys the professionalism of the company, which probably adopts cultural sponsorships as a clear and consistent communication strategy to position its brand or brands, in addition to showing concern with the transparency, ethics and efficiency of the selection processes. (C. Harasawa, director of marketing for the São Paulo Symphony Orchestra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Allocation of resources for investment in sponsorship properties, management, communication and evaluation.</td>
<td>Depending on the clarity of the selection criteria and public interest defined in the open call for sponsorship proposals, I believe that the image of the company can be reinforced very positively, since it will be linked with a collectively built societal effort and not just appropriation of a product to reinforce its brand. (C. Frateschi, actor and theater director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient resources for the selection of an appropriate number of sponsorship proposals.</td>
<td>We decided to use open calls for sponsorship proposals when the amount of resources enabled the support of a larger number of projects. (C. Picon, director of the Votorantim Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle (What)</td>
<td>Success drivers (How)</td>
<td>Testimonials that reinforce its importance for sponsor or sponsorship seeker (Why)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Narrow, clear and precise definition of areas, causes or themes to be sponsored, as well as target audience, geographic location and other characteristics.</td>
<td>An open call for sponsorship proposals allows the participant to identify whether his project will interest the company. This enables him to save time and money, by selecting potential sponsors more precisely. (A. Labaki, playwright, director and consultant in scenic arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 <em>The call should be specific</em></td>
<td>Example: The Petrobras' open call for the sponsorship of film festivals is focused on events that last not less than five days, exhibiting a minimum of a third of Brazilian films, which offer parallel activities such as discussions, workshops etc., and which have already been performed at least three previous editions (Petrobras, 2011b).</td>
<td>[A call for proposals] establishes a type of relationship between the applicant and the company, which leads the former to immerse himself in the objectives of the latter and see whether they are palatable or not. (A. C. F. Reis, consultant in culture, economics and cities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>Setting technical and clear selection criteria and careful formation of the external committee responsible for assessing the proposals.</td>
<td>The main positive aspect of an open call for sponsorship proposals for the applicants is the selection of projects based on pre-established criteria and the &quot;meritocracy&quot; vein that permeates the selection processes. It seems to me that an open call that does not respect these issues and presents excessively subjective criteria in the analysis of projects does not fulfill its fundamental mission… (J. M. Fittipaldi, consultant in culture, media and entertainment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 <em>The call should be committed with meritocracy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[An open call for sponsorship proposals] should not be used as rhetoric for democratization that unjustly excludes those that deserve a chance based on their history of work and innovation. (P. Nassar, director president of Brazilian Association of Business Communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Success drivers</td>
<td>Testimonials that reinforce its importance for sponsor or sponsorship seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Within the chosen focus, the call should harness the potential of the offered opportunities</td>
<td>Decision on merit, but attempting to promote a mixture of differences that together enrich the final portfolio. Example: The Natura's call has a very specific focus: Brazilian music that works &quot;infinite combination of Brazilian rhythms with universal musicality.&quot; Within this focus, diversity occurs by sponsoring projects of all kinds, such as &quot;recording a disc, conducting a research, producing a book, performing a concert or festival, producing a film or an educational activity.&quot; (Natura, 2012b, p. 4).</td>
<td>It tends to be a fair and democratic way of distributing sponsorship funds, but the selection process must also be, since anyone can make an open call for sponsorship proposals, while always selecting the same ones or the best known. (F. Rossetti, general secretary of the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Success drivers</td>
<td>Testimonials that reinforce its importance for sponsor or sponsorship seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Planning and making explicit all the characteristics and information that are</td>
<td>The disadvantage is that, being in Brazil, there are always questions surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to participation, such as rules, conditions, selection criteria,</td>
<td>the good faith of the process, that is, it could be used merely to justify a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deadlines, instances of decision, feedback, etc.</td>
<td>demagogic and marketing discourse that hides a game of marked cards. (A. Labaki,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>playwright, director and consultant in scenic arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A call for proposals provides a legal form that favors good repute. But it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not enough for it to be reputable, because it depends both on the process of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creating the selection committees and the clarity of the funding objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expressed by the companies in the call. (H. Katz professor at PUC-SP and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal University of Bahia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some calls give the false impression of being democratic. It is common for us to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submit proposals and not receive any feedback. The company broadly publicizes the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>call, generating great expectations among the applicants, who invest their time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and effort, and in the end don't receive any information about whether the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was approved or not, or if it is still being considered. (S. Guimarães, president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the NGO Vaga Lume)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5

The call should be reliable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Success drivers</th>
<th>Testimonials that reinforce its importance for sponsor or sponsorship seeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Development and implementation of a communication plan, as well as the provision of assistance and tools as a submission guide, registration form, handbooks, scripts, spreadsheets, FAQ, support staff etc.</td>
<td>An open call for sponsorship proposals not only creates broader access to resources for project creators, it shows them what is considered a good project, helping to professionalize the sector. (F. Rossetti, general secretary of the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality</strong></td>
<td>The same information, assistance and tools available for all, including those who have no intermediaries or no contacts in the company.</td>
<td>I believe that the success of the call for proposals is directly related to investment in training, upgrading of management and its dissemination, with the qualification of the professionals that draft the projects. (M. C. T. M. Santos, retired professor from the Federal University of Bahia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality</strong></td>
<td>The call should promote the same conditions to all participants</td>
<td>As a part of the plan to implement this methodology, the company must design and apply a program of information, instruction and communication, with a view to facilitating the use of the method, adjusting it to the different profiles of the participants, such as managers, producers, artists and intellectuals. (K. Marco, president-founder of the Brazilian Association of Cultural Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality</strong></td>
<td>The call should promote the same conditions to all participants</td>
<td>The main risk [of a call for proposals] - a nightmare for organizers [sponsors] - is to not receive a significant number of projects, or, at least, of quality projects. (M. H. P. Martins, retired professor from the University of São Paulo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth emphasizing that these principles become even more important when the company uses resources from incentive laws, as observed by W. Moura:

... the use of open calls for proposals appears more democratic to me, especially when the company in question uses public funds. However, one obviously has to consider the criteria adopted by the company for the selection. The call is a competition and the criteria used by the private company may not be exactly what one would expect from a selection of cultural projects... If, however, the company uses so-called "good money" for sponsorship, without the use of tax incentives, which is rarer today, then it can use whatever criteria it pleases in its call for proposals. (W. Moura, actor of theater, cinema and TV)

Anyway, regardless of the origin of resources of the sponsorship, the importance of the adoption of principles can be summarized in:

Starting from the moment in which the open call for sponsorship proposals is published, the company is publicly committed to culture... By making its selection open to all those interested, the company is opening itself up to attacks and criticism that could harm its image. This can, however, be avoided by carefully structuring the call and making the results as transparent as possible. (A. P. Sousa, journalist specializing in cultural policies)

Before starting to develop a call for proposals, the practitioner must validate the strategy with the top management of the sponsoring company, since it represents an internal change of culture. Then, aware of the principles, the sponsor must incorporate them in all steps of the planning process, as shall be discussed next.

3.5. RESULTS: PLANNING A CALL FOR PROPOSALS

This chapter discusses specific aspects of the planning of open calls. Hence, the questions of the primary research were addressed to professionals with practical experience in each step of the process.
3.5.1. Step A: Definition

... the risks of adopting open calls for sponsorship proposals are due to their own complexity...

(A. C. Gônçalves, director of the sponsorship department of the Secretariat for Social Communication of the Presidency of Brazil)

A call for sponsorship proposals in itself suggests maturity, but is no guarantee. (L. Bolognesi, cultural producer)

The answers to questions # 5, 6 and 10 of the questionnaire (see Appendix A), addressed to sponsors and consultants with experience in planning open calls for proposals,17 indicate that the process should start with the stipulation of important aspects related to the dimension of the call (principle # 1 in Table 5) that will impact all other steps:

- **Budget.** Although it has to be refined and adjusted during and after all the steps of planning of the call, it is important for the manager to have, early on, an overview of the available resources and to make an appropriate allocation of investments in sponsorship properties, communication, management and evaluation. This allocation should consider not only incentivized but mainly own resources: "It doesn't seem very ethical to me for companies to structure their cultural policies using public money, even though the system is legal" (A. Fonseca, cultural activities consultant).

- **Selection.** The company must determine the steps and decision makers of the call for proposals. The most usual way (adopted by companies whose submission guides were analyzed in this work) is the enrollment of proposals by the applicants, followed by screening, assessment and selection, conducted by consultants, external committee and internal committee, respectively (as shown in 2.3.4). However, many respondents complained about the proliferation of open calls in Brazil, as noted by S. Hess (vice-president at Edelman Significa): "This is because [the sponsorship seekers] have a lot of work to do when submitting proposals, each one in the format

---

requested by each company, and only a few projects are benefited." The workload is actually larger when each company uses different formats of submission guide and registration forms (this issue will be addressed in 3.5.2 - Step B: Formulation), but the participation in a single call for proposals is also laborious. In this context, some respondents suggested a simplification in the decision making process: a preliminary phase of enrollment, screening and assessment based only on a few and most important information about each sponsorship proposal. Hence, only the proposals approved in this preliminary phase would be detailed in a full registration form for the definitive assessment and final selection.\(^1\)

- **Communication.** The sponsor shall develop a communication plan for the call, containing target audiences (e.g. sponsorship seekers, shareholders, employees, government, opinion leaders, etc.), goals, objects, touch-points, messages, tools, frequency and costs, taking into consideration that "not everyone needs to know everything, with the same degree of depth, in the same way and at the same time" (D. Quitério, coordinator at the Votorantim Institute). A well-structured communication plan is a condition to gain visibility and reputation, and is critical to attracting sponsorship proposals, ensuring compliance with principles # 3 (Quality), 4 (Diversity) and 6 (Access), shown in Table 5.

- **Articulations.** It is advisable that the sponsor conducts benchmarking with other companies that already have experience with open calls and establishes partnerships with public or private institutions that can contribute to the dissemination of the selection. For cultural sponsors using public resources, articulation with the government is essential for the alignment of various issues. For example, in the case of Rouanet Law, MinC requests the submission guide to be put forward for approval, offers the presence of an evaluator of projects to compose the call's external committee and recommends that the sponsor requires the approval of the project by the Ministry only after being selected by the call. This partnership occurred in Natura's call.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) This suggestion was not further explored in this work since the purpose here is to systematize the existing practices.

\(^2\) "From a Cooperation Agreement signed between Natura and the Ministry of Culture in May 2012, the opportunities for applicants to enroll their projects in the national open call of Musical Natura program were expanded.... As of now there is no requirement for prior approval or registration at the Ministry of
- **IT.** The company has to establish the computing needs required to support the call. To do so, it must define basically four issues: the platform to make available the open call submission guide; tools and channels of assistance and communication with participants; the system for the registration of proposals and for submission of supplementary materials; and the needs for data manipulation and report generation. Among the five companies analyzed in this work, they all offer their submission guides on a specific page on their web sites, as well as other supporting documents for download. Most of them offer telephone and/or e-mail for contact, and the system for enrollment is online - except for the BNB, which is by mail or personal delivery. To meet the principles # 6 (Access) and 7 (Equality), discussed in Table 5, it is recommended to design these issues targeting a broad reach, which is detailed in 3.5.2 (Step B: Formulation).

- **Human resources.** The company must also determine internal areas/professionals and external consultants-suppliers who will be in charge of the activities at all steps of the call, such as: general management of the process, communication plan, formulation of the submission guide and registration form, enrollment, IT technicians, staff to support the participants, and members of the external and internal committees. The number and profile of the members of the external committee usually vary with the characteristics of each call. However, it is essential that the choice of its members is done responsibly, because the external committee will have a decisive role in achieving the principles # 3 (Quality) and 4 (Diversity), as emphasized by A. Moser (president of the Instituto Esporte & Educação and volleyball player medalist at the 1996 Olympic Games) “…there is the issue of the selection process, which, depending on the quality of the assessors, may not effectively appreciate and select the best projects.”

- **Timeline.** Finally, a detailed time schedule containing all steps, activities, periods, deadlines and key dates should be prepared, in order to ensure that the deployment of the call for proposals occurs as desired and predicted.

---

Culture at the time of enrollment in the national open call, and the approval process with MinC may occur at the end of the selection process…” (Natura, 2012b, p. 4).
3.5.2. Step B: Formulation

The ideal submission guide is that one which clearly and precisely reveal the motivations and objectives of the sponsor in order to avoid the applicant from wasting his effort. (R. Benedetti, video artist and film editor)

I have the impression that each company has their own registration forms, with different fields, different nomenclatures for the same questions. Those who submit proposals to more than one call find themselves in the difficult situation of having to "decipher" the questions before filling them out. (C. Rangel, audiovisual specialist at the Federal University of Espírito Santo)

... I believe open calls for sponsorship proposals are excessively bureaucratic, despite being democratic and necessary. (M. Dantas, curator, museum designer and cultural producer)

... the technical and bureaucratic requirements involved in submitting proposals drive away and disempower many artists… (R. Martinho, cultural manager and agent)

As mentioned in 2.3.3, this step consists of the development of the submission guide, which contains the whole description of the call, the registration form, for enrollment of the proposals, and other tools to assist the applicants.

Respondents of questions # 7, 8 and 10 of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) pointed out, almost unanimously, that the experience of reading/understanding the submission guides and filling out the form is arduous - as stated by S. Hess (vice-president at Edelman Significa) in 3.5.1.

Thus, the recommendations presented in Table 6, based mainly on answers to the three questions above, aim to simplify the process, facilitating the enrollment and assessment of proposals, thus benefiting the image of the sponsor. After all, the sponsor should be aware that the submission guide, the registration form and other tools are all pieces of communication. They are the issuers "who talk to the artists" (G. Sol, actor and researcher) and therefore should provide "a dialogue less impositive and more flexible" (T. Alixandre, dance artist). For this, they must be formulated in order to "look the applicant as a partner and as a key player in achieving the goals of the call for proposals" (M. C. T. M. Santos, retired professor from the Federal University of Bahia).
**TABLE 6**

**Characteristics of the Submission Guide, Registration Form and other Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Main principles associated (see Table 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission Guide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Secure</strong>: The submission guide must be reviewed by the legal department of the company in order to avoid further questioning and attempts of disqualification.</td>
<td># 1 (Dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Connected</strong>: Introduced with a text that contextualizes the call within the company's sponsorship policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complete</strong>: Detailing all the information necessary and important for the submission of proposals.</td>
<td># 5 (Transparency) and 7 (Equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Positioned</strong>: Clarity regarding the objectives, the desired types of projects and the selection criteria to be adopted in order to encourage the enrollment of suitable proposals, inhibit those out of focus, and to facilitate the assessment.</td>
<td># 2 (Focus), 3 (Quality) and 4 (Diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Logic</strong>: Text organized and ordered following the step-by-step of the decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Simple</strong>: Attractive format and language to be clear, easy and straightforward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Available</strong>: Easily located in the sponsor's website (preferably on a specific web-page) with the option of reading not only online but also in a downloadable PDF file.</td>
<td># 6 (Access)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Object

### Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Main principles associated (see Table 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Form</td>
<td>- <strong>Coherent</strong>: The selection criteria stated in the submission guide must be translated into questions in the registration form.</td>
<td># 2 (Focus) and 3 (Quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Brief</strong>: Succinct, assertive and non-bureaucratic. Ask only what is necessary. Set mandatory questions and limit the number of characters for the answers (but make sure that are sufficient). Additional information may be required later, at the request of the external or internal committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Not restrictive</strong>: Encouraging sending attachments and supplemental materials (resumes, portfolios, clippings, certificates, etc.) to stimulate and enhance the presentation of the particularities of each project.</td>
<td># 4 (Diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>User friendly</strong>: Creative format. Use of terms and language that are customary and established. Explanation of what is asked. Providing templates, worksheets and references. If the form is online, enabling the participant to know all the questions before start to fill it. Possibility to fill in several steps, in any order, to stop and continue, to make changes until the end of the registration period, and to save the content in a text file for personal archive.</td>
<td># 6 (Access) and 7 (Equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Safe</strong>: Reliable system (if online) that supports the volume of applications and the handling of the enrolled proposals.</td>
<td># 1 (Dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>- <strong>Helpful</strong>: The sponsor should provide assistance and tools that facilitate and qualify the enrollment of proposals, such as: attendance team by phone and/or e-mail, document of frequently asked questions (FAQ), glossary of important terms, guide to filling out the form, or a guide for the development of proposals.</td>
<td># 1 (Dimension), 6 (Access), 3 (Quality) and 7 (Equality)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: a Appendix C shows the introduction of the BNB's submission guide containing a summary of the sponsorship program. b Appendix D shows a figure in Natura's submission guide that illustrates the stages of the decision process. c Appendix E contains an extract of a guide offered by Petrobras. d Votorantim developed a complete guidance for developing projects, which is mentioned in this work as Votorantim, 2007.
3.5.3. Step C: Enrollment

It is possible to attract high quality projects if the open call for sponsorship proposals is publicized widely enough. The more submissions, the higher the chance that the approved proposals will be ‘the best’. (V. Queiroz, manager of cultural financing at BNB)

This stage represents the beginning of the implementation of what was planned by the sponsor in the previous steps. The suggestions presented below were collected mainly on responses to questions # 9 and 10 of the primary research (see Appendix A), addressed to sponsors and consultants, although some answers to questions # 5 and 6 also discussed issues related to enrollment. The answers were grouped into two main activities of this step: the launch of the call with the dissemination of its submission guide and the receipt of applications. The proper deployment of these two activities complies with principles # 1 (Dimension), 6 (Access) and 7 (Equality), discussed in Table 5.

As noted by M. C. T. M. Santos (retired professor from the Federal University of Bahia) in 3.5.2, the main actor here is the applicant, whose participation in this step of enrollment is decisive for the success of the call. After all, no proposals enrolled, no proposals to be selected.

The answers given by the respondents confirm this. Regarding the launch of the call, the sponsor must implement the actions set out in the communication plan developed in Step A, not failing to consider:

- Communication channels best suited to the specific profile of the applicants who are expected to attend the call;

- Public relations, Internet (specialized blogs), social networking and direct communication with institutions that have database of potential applicants, cited as examples of communications commonly used to engage sponsorship seekers;

---

- Area of focus of the call, registration deadline and link to the web page containing the submission guide, as the key messages to be prioritized; and

- Disclosure of the launch of the call only when the submission guide is already available online.

For the receipt of proposals, it is recommended for the manager to:

- Provide an adequate period for the inscriptions\(^{21}\);

- Define and limit the channels of receipt of proposals (online, mail and personal delivery)\(^{22}\);

- Allocate and train the attendance team, ensuring that responses are given properly and quickly, and that doubts about the inscriptions are not directed to other areas of the company. Doubts must feed continuously the available support tools, such as FAQ, glossary and guide;

- Allocate an adequate team of computer technicians, and a reliable and tested IT system;

- Define a mechanism for confirmation of the registered proposals, providing a protocol number associated to each one. This number is a useful tool for tracking the proposal during the whole process;

- Monitor the inscriptions daily and solve any problems quickly. Such problems should be recorded for future improvements;

\(^{21}\) In order to determine how long applicants have to submit their proposals, the sponsor should consider whether the submission guide stimulates the enrollment of tailored or already existing proposals. Anyway, MinC (2008) recommends that the inscriptions are open for not less than 45 days. Among the analyzed submission guides, the periods available are: Petrobras, 64 days; Natura, 82 days; Votorantim, 106 days; Oi, 30 days; and BNB, 45 days.

\(^{22}\) It is suggested not accept applications by email, since this channel can generate problems such as: proposals out of the standard model, outside the time limit, and possible failures in the message delivery.
- A few days before the closing of the registrations, send an email message to participants who submitted proposals partially, informing the status of registration and the deadline for completion;

- Be aware that most applicants enroll in the last days of the deadline. For this, the IT and attendance teams may be increased during the critical period; and

- Form a database with contacts of enrolled applicants in order to invite them to future calls for proposals.

The suggestions listed above are incorporated in the recommendation of a model of submission guide presented at the end of this work, in 3.6.

3.5.4. Step D: Selection

Having your proposal chosen [in an open call] is a way of ensuring your work will be seen by many people… [There is] a certain amount of anxiety knowing that you are competing with other high quality projects. And this is very good, since it democratizes the process and makes this selection model more positive. (Lenine, Brazilian musician selected in the Natura’s 2007 call for proposals)

This phase covers all activities concerning the choice of the proposals to be sponsored by the company. It is related to principles # 1, 3 and 4 (Dimension, Quality and Diversity), shown in Table 5.

The process may vary for each company. However, regardless of the steps that will be followed, it is important to let them clear in the submission guide.

Through the analysis of the five submission guides concerned and the responses to questions # 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 (see Appendix A) it can be assumed that this step comprises

23 The following respondents contributed to this section: A. Aragão, A. Labaki, B. Araújo, C. Flores, C. Rangel, D. Moretti, D. Quitério, E. Costa, F. M. Falcão, H. Possolo, L. Frateschi, L. Magalhães, M. C.
- **Screening.** It consists of validation of the proposals, eliminating those that do not meet the basic requirements (e.g. mandatory fields not filled in the form), besides the organization of the inscriptions (e.g. handling of attachments, printing). This activity can be done by the team responsible for managing the call and should be started during the subscription period (Step C - Enrollment);

- **Pre-assessment.** The proposals validated in the previous stage are confronted with the eliminatory criteria defined in the submission guide. The proposals that do not attend these basic criteria are eliminated. As remarked by C. Flores (director of Espaço Livre Consultoria), “respect for the submission guide and their rules is key. Flexibility… does not work well in practice; it can create privileges and hamper the work.” Depending on the criteria, this activity can be conducted by professionals from the previous stage (Screening) or from the next one (Assessment);

- **Assessment.** At this stage the proposals are evaluated by an external committee formed by specialists in the field of the call. This activity could be the first in the selection process; however, the two previous stages (Screening and Pre-assessment) are recommended so that the members of the external committee do not waste time and effort with proposals that do not have minimum requirements for participation in the selection. As already discussed in 2.3.3, the role of the committee is to evaluate all proposals and, by consensus, indicate the best for the sponsor to make the final decision. Table 7 provides factors and characteristics expected for the success of work of the committee:

---

## TABLE 7
Factors and Characteristics Expected for the Success of Work of the External Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Key factors</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Qualification and Representativeness</td>
<td>Professionals who are recognized and specialists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complementary profiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate number of members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate remuneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enough time to conduct the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Organization, Interaction and Autonomy</td>
<td>Initial alignment among members and with the sponsor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding regarding the company's values, sponsorship strategy, objectives of the call, submission guide and selection criteria (if possible involvement in the establishment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamics for the assessment suggested by the sponsor and validated by the committee, aiming high interaction between the members and containing: remote and face activities, and analysis/discussion by thematic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of an appropriate IT system which provides all the required information, such as: executive summaries of each proposal, reports and statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support staff throughout the entire process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Real independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Compliance with selection criteria</td>
<td>Two lists of recommended proposals: preferred (totaling the amount of investment for the call) and alternates *.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For each proposal: suggestion of adequacy of budget and/or scope (if necessary), and points of emphasis to justify the choices to the internal committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Based on questionnaire responses of the professionals mentioned in this section 3.5.4.

Note: * As observed by R. Gioielli (manager at the Votorantim Institute), “it is important that the number of projects selected by the external committee be diverse and larger than the total amount stipulated in the open call, thus making it possible for the internal committee to assemble a final basket of projects with greater autonomy.”

The importance of the external committee is highlighted by E. Costa (former sponsorship manager at Petrobras): “It should be observed that the external committees, in addition to boosting the reputation of the process, can also, after the selection, be powerful opinion shapers about the company.”
On the other hand, M. Dantas stresses the importance to the sponsor define and align with the external committee the selection criteria that reflect the objectives expressed in the sponsorship policy:

An external committee legitimizes the selection process, but can also create an unusual situation with the company sponsoring projects outside its focus of interest. This may be healthy for society but innocuous as a cultural marketing tool. A company should express its vision in the sponsorship choices it makes. Society expects this from the company. And it cannot delegate this vision to others. If others perform an independent analysis of the projects and are still able to maintain the vision of the values that the company would like to support, then all right. (M. Dantas, curator, museum designer and cultural producer)

Another relevant aspect to the assessment conducted by the committee refers to the equality of a call. As discussed in Table 5, equality (principle # 7) means offering the same conditions to each participant, and "... not necessarily imply that all the proposals compete with each other. It is possible that the submission guide contains rules which organize the competition, for example, according to the dimensions of the proposals, through the establishment of different levels or ranges of values" (MinC, 2008, p. 11);

- **Registration/approval by the incentive law.** If the call is based on investment with public funds, the participants have to submit their projects to the government agency responsible for the referred incentive law, requesting approval for raising funds from the private sector. The need for such approval must occur at some point of the call\(^\text{24}\). However, as already discussed, MinC recommends that the sponsor require approval close to the end of the selection process - only for the projects recommended by the external committee or even selected by the internal committee. For this, there should be a prior articulation between the two parties - sponsor and government – in order to define the steps and align the schedules (see 3.5.1);

- **Certification.** This task may happen simultaneously with the previous and involves the checking and/or request of information and documents, and suggestions for adaptation of budget and/or scope – indicated by the external committee (see Table

\(^{24}\text{Each of the companies analyzed in the secondary research requires approval at different moments, as will be seen in 3.6.}\)
The advantage of adopting this step is that only those proposals will be forwarded that are really able to be sponsored. Usually the sponsors make this check at the end of the process and select projects from a list of substitutes if there are any declassifications; and

- **Final selection.** After being certificated and approved by the incentive law (if it is required), the proposals recommended by the external committee are forwarded to the final decision of the internal committee, generally formed by executives from the sponsoring company and even other professionals, like consultants. These decision makers will add to the technical analysis conducted by the external committee, corporate and communication aspects such as brand fit, potential visibility, target audiences, geographic reach, relationship opportunities, etc. For the full success of the selection it is critical that this step is also supported by the management team of the call, which will plan and conduct all activities of the committee until the final choice. Although this is the last stage of selection, it is recommended that the committee indicate some alternate projects in case there is any failure during the contracting process (Step E below).

The selection process is finalized with the announcement of the chosen proposals. Like the launch of the call (Step C), “the dissemination of post-selection results should be guided by communication planning” (P. Fernandes, journalist and content consultant), developed in Step A. However, it is worth mentioning some peculiarities that the plan should consider at this stage:

- While in the disclosure of the launch the selection was more focused on tenderers of sponsorship proposals (to invite them to join the call), here the communication should be much broader in order to give light to the approved projects and also to the company's sponsorship policy to its various stakeholders. Therefore, in addition to public relations, Internet and social networking, the communication plan may include other tools, such as advertising: “It is an opportunity where the company can reinforce its investment focus and consolidate its performance” (A. Aragão, former coordinator of communication at the Votorantim Institute). In the opinion of H. Possolo, this opportunity is not maximized by many sponsors:
... the sponsoring companies do not derive value from their own calls, where the merit of being sponsored, after a selection, becomes value added to the sponsorship invested. The dissemination of the calls is aimed at producers and then forgotten. If directed at the public at large it would add the value of merit to the cultural activity, making the sponsor’s brand also the one endorsing the quality of the artistic activity. (H. Possolo, clown, actor, playwright, theater producer and director)

- Firstly, before the public announcement, the results should be reported to partners who contributed directly or indirectly in the selection, as members of the external committee and government;

- The announcement is usually made public on the Internet, on the web-page of the call. Additionally, it is recommended to send a message to all enrolled applicants, thanking the participation; and

- Besides the complete list of the selected projects, it is expected that the sponsor also report the total value of the investment and the names of the members of the external committee. As observed by B. Araújo (consultant), “... the names of the specialists... should remain confidential until the final results are released, in order to prevent... contact with or pressure on these professionals.”

3.5.5. Step E: Realization

Key factors for a successful open call for sponsorship proposals... sign clear and precise contracts with the sponsee so that the partnership is successful and serves to encourage and ensure the longevity of the open call. (K. Cavalcanti, institutional marketing manager for Natura)

This is the last step of the planning process of an open call for sponsorship proposals and it concerns principle # 1 (Dimension), shown in Table 5.

The activities presented here were extracted from MinC (2008) and from the responses to questions # 16 and 17, as well as some answers to questions # 5 and 6 (see Appendix
A)\textsuperscript{25}, and they can be placed in four groups: contracting, disbursement, monitoring and evaluation.

The activities related to contracting are:

- Solicitation, if necessary, of additional information and documentation for registration and contract;

- Negotiations regarding counterparts (rights and benefits to the sponsor)\textsuperscript{26} and monitoring tools, and

- Preparation and signing of the contract, containing the terms of the partnership and the obligations of both parties. S. Hess (vice-president at Edelman Significa) stresses the importance of “establishing contract rules in line with the spirit of the sponsorship: creating a win-win situation. It has to be advantageous for the company as well as the one they chose to sponsor, without the company invading their space or those sponsored keeping the brand from benefiting.”

For the disbursement:

- Consummation of the contribution/fees - single payment or installments as the compliance of the stages of completion of the project -, through the issuance of a receipt by the sponsored entity\textsuperscript{27}.

Regarding the monitoring:

- Development of a guide for those sponsored containing all the information necessary for implementing the partnership (e.g. application of logos, channels of

\textsuperscript{25} The respondents who contributed to this section were: A. Cardozo, B. Araújo, C. Flores, K. Cavalcanti, R. Gioielli, S. Hess and V. Queiroz.

\textsuperscript{26} Usually, the submission guide lists the basic counterparts. Here, sponsor and the sponsored should review this list considering the specificities of each proposal.

\textsuperscript{27} In the case of incentivized resources, the sponsored must issue a receipt in accordance with the terms required by the law in question.
communicating with the sponsor, methods and instruments for monitoring, which can include spot visits, indicators for evaluation, etc.; and

- Forwarding the guide, which can be done at a welcome meeting with all those selected for receiving the sponsorship.\(^{28}\)

Finally, the evaluation consists of:

- Review of the entire process (Steps A to E), seeking improvements for future calls;

- Monitoring and evaluation of all sponsorships (individual and consolidated) during the period of the partnership, to ensure the completion of all projects in the manner in which they were approved; and

- Strategic evaluation of the call, considering its long-term insertion in the sponsorship policy.

In conclusion, when the call for proposals is conducted in a structured and careful way - consistent with principle # 1 (Dimension) since the beginning of its planning until the end of the relationship with the sponsored -, as a result the company consolidates the practice of sponsorship within the organization and obtains recognition among the various stakeholders:

... Natura has achieved so much prestige with its program that, for the artist, to be selected in one of its open calls for sponsorship proposals is a type of quality seal of approval. (R. Sá, Brazilian singer selected in the Natura’s 2010 call for proposals)

### 3.5.6. Summary table

Finally, Table 8 below provides a checklist containing an overview of the major issues seen previously in Steps A to E.

---

\(^{28}\) MinC (2008) recommends this type of meeting as a way to also promote training and exchange of experiences between sponsees.
### TABLE 8
Checklist of Topics and Issues for Planning an Open Call for Sponsorship Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sponsorship properties, communication, management and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Own and incentivized resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Steps and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulations</td>
<td>- Benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partnerships, including Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>- Platform to make the submission guide available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interface with applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Registration system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Data manipulation and report generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>- Internal: areas and professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- External: suppliers, consultants and external committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>- Time schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Positioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulation</td>
<td>- Coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration form</td>
<td>- Non-restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- User friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>- Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Launch of the call</td>
<td>Communication plan, mainly targeting potential applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receipt of proposals</td>
<td>Appropriate period, Support and assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Validation, Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-assessment</td>
<td>Eliminatory criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Qualification and representativeness, Organization, interaction and autonomy, Compliance with selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Approval in the incentive law (if applicable)</td>
<td>Interface with applicants and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Information and documents, Adaptations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final selection</td>
<td>Corporate and communication point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement of the chosen proposals</td>
<td>Communication plan, targeting a wide range of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>Counterparts (rights and benefits), Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disbursement</td>
<td>Contribution/fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Guide of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Process (Steps A to E), Sponsorships (individual and consolidated), Insertion in the sponsorship policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the author.
3.6. RECOMMENDATION – A MODEL OF SUBMISSION GUIDE FOR A CALL FOR PROPOSALS

This final chapter presents a suggestion for a standard structure of a submission guide for a call for proposals. It was developed from the aspects that were raised previously (in 3.5, mainly Table 6) and the strengths of each one of the submission guides under review.

The suggested model does not represent a breakthrough. It fits in all samples analyzed for this work\textsuperscript{29}, and therefore it is believed that it can be adopted by any sponsor as a practical guide, containing all necessary information arranged in a simple and logical way:

**Index** – A table of contents helps quick reference to information, since the submission guide is usually a long document\textsuperscript{30} with a huge amount of information. Among the five submission guides analyzed, only *Natura’s* has an index. All topics must be numbered, to help locate and reference\textsuperscript{31}.

1. **Presentation** – The first part of the submission guide should provide, in 1-2 pages maximum, the main characteristics of the open call and place it within the company's sponsorship policy or program.

1.1. **Sponsorship policy and/or sponsorship program** – As observed in 2.3.5, the submission guide represents an opportunity for the sponsor to communicate its role in sponsorship. *Natura* introduces the submission guide with texts explaining the relationship of the brand with the music and the sponsorship program itself. *BNB* gives a brief background of its program, especially its principles and its partnership with The Brazilian Development Bank (BNDES) – see Appendix C. *Votorantim* also shows the main traits of its program with

\textsuperscript{29} The references to the submission guides cited in this section are: Petrobras, 2011a; Petrobras, 2011b; Natura, 2012b; Votorantim, 2008a; Oi, 2011a and BNB, 2012b.

\textsuperscript{30} Number of pages of each submission guide when downloaded as PDF files: *Petrobras*, 11 pages (considering the general and the specific submission guides); *Natura*, 16 pages; *Votorantim*, 13 pages; *Oi*, 4 pages; and *BNB*, 17 pages.

\textsuperscript{31} For this reason, the numbering of topics of the suggested model does not follow the numbering order of the whole work.
emphasis in the focus adopted and the target audience benefited from the sponsorships.

1.2. **The current call for proposals** – Like an executive summary, this topic outlines all the main characteristics of the entire submission guide on just one page. Usually, sponsors disclose a summary of the call in other communication tools, such as press releases (Appendix F shows an extract of Oi’s press release); however it is recommended to provide it within the submission guide itself, like Votorantim (see Appendix G).

2. **Participation** – All the characteristics and requirements of the submission guide that define the conditions for the sponsorship seeker attend the call.

2.1. **Applicants** – All those interested must be aware of who can and who cannot participate. For example: Is it only legal entities or individuals as well? Both nonprofits and for-profit? Only the residents of the country? Must they have some kind of specialization? What about those currently being sponsored - can they participate?

2.2. **Areas and types of projects** – This topic presents the sorts of projects the company is willing to sponsor. According to principles # 2 (Focus), 3 (Quality) and 4 (Diversity) in Table 5, it is recommended to be very clear and precise - even using examples - in order to receive proposals that best meet the sponsor’s interests.

2.3. **Values and number of projects** – This has information on the total amount to be allocated to the call and the amount (maximum or by range) for each project. BNB allocated R$ 8 million for its call (approximately EUR 3,4 million\(^\text{32}\)). Of this amount, R$ 1 million will be for the audiovisual sector, for the selection of at least 22 projects. The projects compete in bands of value, and the bands with lower values have greater number of projects selected. The sponsor should also mention if it would accept applications for projects that want to raise funds.

\(^{32}\) On April 5, 2012, the value of R$ 1 was EUR 0.42
beyond that established in the call. *Natura*, for example, says that “shall be accepted projects which value to be raised exceeds R$ 700.000 [the limit determined by the company], provided that the investment requested to *Natura* does not exceed this sum, and the surpluses needed to carry out the project come from other funding sources” (*Natura*, 2012b, pp. 7-8).

2.4. **Incentive laws and funding** – The sponsor should inform the source of funds (own and/or incentive laws) to be allocated to the call. If there are resources from incentive laws, it is necessary to inform: the name and the number of the law concerned; the applicant's obligations in relation to the proceedings of the law; and especially at what moment of the selection process the project must be registered and approved by the law. *BNB* allocates only own resources on its call. The other four companies use resources from incentive laws. *Oi* only accepts the participation on its call for projects already approved by the law. *Votorantim* requires that the projects are registered by the end of the enrollment phase, and are approved by the law before the end of the selection process. For *Petrobras*, the projects must be approved by the law before the moment of contracting, after the selection phase. Due to the cooperation agreement signed with MinC, the projects enrolled in the *Natura* call only need to be submitted to the law after being selected by the sponsor.

2.5. **Dates** – In this topic, applicants can get information about periods and deadlines of all stages of the call:

- **Enrollment** – When the enrollment is by mail, the sponsor shall notify the start and end dates of enrollment, noting that the envelope may arrive after the deadline, as long as the mail had stamped it within the established period. When it is online or by personal delivery, it is recommended to set the time limit. For example: “From 10.00 of September 20, 2011 up to 17.00 of October 20, 2011” (*Oi*, 2011a, p. 2);

- **Selection** – “From May to August 2012” (*Natura*, 2012b, p. 5). There is no need to set days and times, because this step involves activities without the participation of the applicant. The sponsor may also inform the periods of
all the steps related to the entire selection process, such as screening, assessment and final selection;

- **Results** – Since this is the most awaited moment by the applicants, it is suggested to inform a specific date – examples: “On March 29, 2011” (Petrobras, 2011a, p. 6) or “Until November 4, 2008” (Votorantim, 2008a, p. 5) – and where they will be announced (usually on the same web-page of the call); and

- **Realization** – Period in which the contract between the sponsor and the selected applicants should be signed and disbursed, and also the period in which the projects must be performed. For example: “The sponsorship agreements will be signed and disbursed imperatively in the period from June 1 to December 31, 2012; its implementation may extend until December 31, 2013” (BNB, 2012b, p. 12).

3. **Enrollment** – After knowing if he or she can attend the call, the applicant now needs to know all the information regarding the application process.

3.1. **Registration** – How to submit the proposal:

- **How to apply** – How the proposal can and cannot be inscribed. Applications are always free and can be made online (Petrobras, Natura, Votorantim and Oi) or by mail and even personal delivery (BNB). None of the five sponsors were accepting applications by email;

- **What to submit** – Usually, there are at least three different forms to be filled by the participants in order to forward their proposals: information about the applicant (legal entity or individual), information about the professional responsible for the project, and information about the project itself. The forms can be electronic (Petrobras, Natura, Votorantim and Oi) or text files (BNB). In addition, the sponsor may provide other materials to be filled (as a budget worksheet for Natura) or to support the enrollment (such as the guide of Petrobras - Appendix E). Then, the sponsor should
recommend or require submission of attachments to better describe and illustrate the proposal, such as schedules, resumes, portfolios, audio or video records, clippings, certificates and authorizations. Regarding these attachments, Petrobras only accepts PDF files, sent by the enrollment webpage. Natura accepts other formats, by mail or online - in this case the total lot cannot exceed 4Mb;

- **Confirmation** – Finally, the submission guide should state how the applicant is informed if its proposal was successfully enrolled. For example: it can be the receipt of mail (BNB) or a protocol number issued at the end of the online registration (Oi) or by e-mail (Petrobras).

3.2. **Attendance** – How to provide support and clarify doubts. It is recommended to establish a channel of communication with the applicants during the entire period of enrollment. It may be by telephone and/or e-mail. In the first case, it is important to set a time ("the service will operate from Monday to Friday from 9.00 to 12.30 and from 13.30 to 18.00, between April 24 and August 8" - Votorantim, 2008a, p. 7). As seen in 3.5.3, the sponsor should keep in mind that the number of entries - and potential doubts - is much higher in the last days of the deadline. Therefore, Petrobras reinforces that "consultations... should be sent until 96 hours before the closing date" (Petrobras, 2011a, p. 7). Aiming to reduce the number of applications, prospective applicants shall be provided support tools such as links to a FAQ section and to a glossary of key terms of the submission guide.

3.3. **Important information** – All other important information regarding the enrollment should be mentioned in this topic, for example: budgeting, number of projects that can be inscribed, copyright, prohibition of the participation of employees of the sponsor and relatives of the professionals involved in the selection, etc. Generally, this information is listed at the end of submission guide, given as "additional information". It is suggested that this be placed together along with all other instructions regarding the Enrollment step.
3.4. **Tips** – The sponsor may also include recommendations for the applicants. Examples: “For added security, prepare in advance your project in a simple text editor… store a copy on your computer and then copy the information into the enrollment form. It is essential that a written copy of the project is maintained in your possession as a backup” (Petrobras, 2011a, p. 3). “We recommend that the applicants do not let the enrollment for the last days, in order to prevent overloading the system. *Votorantim* is not responsible for any technology failures caused by excessive system access” (Votorantim, 2008a, p. 7).

4. **Selection** – After knowing all the information regarding the enrollment, the applicant needs to be informed about the whole decision making process.

4.1. **Process** – A complete description of all steps and instances of decision. Through the analysis of five submission guides in question, it is recommended that the decision making process should consist of at least the following different phases:

- **Screening** – The sponsor should explain how the validation process works and who is responsible for this step – as seen in 3.5.4, from all entered projects, those that do not meet the minimum requirements of the submission guide or whose form fields are not filled in correctly are eliminated. *BNB* discloses a public list of all projects approved in this step. Not only for this first step, *Petrobras* announces to each applicant, at the end of each stage, if its proposal has been disqualified or is approved for the next step. All other companies only report the results of the final selection. *Natura* divides this step into two: the first is the validation itself and in the second the consultants conduct a preliminary analysis of the projects, eliminating those not suitable to the concept of the program;

- **Pre-assessment** – The submission guide should present the eliminatory criteria that will be used to define which proposals are able to be evaluated in the following stage. As an example, the eliminatory criteria adopted by *Petrobras* are merit and feasibility. Without these traits, the proposal does not follow to the next stage;
- **Assessment** – The remaining proposals are evaluated by the external committee formed by experts in the field of the call. The submission guide should inform the number of members of the committee and emphasize that their names will only be published when the selection process ends. The committee for *Natura* is formed by three professionals. At *BNB* there are eight different committees (one for each area of the call), and each one is composed of five experts. At *Petrobras*, there are five to seven people. *Votorantim* and *Oi* do not report the number of professionals involved. The final outcome of the committee's work is a list of proposals recommended for funding. This list must always overcome the possibility of sponsorship, because the proposals will go through other stages of selection - in the case of *Petrobras*, for example, the projects recommended by the committee correspond to "up to approximately twice the amount allocated to the call for proposals" (*Petrobras*, 2011a, p. 5);

- **Certification** – *Natura* adopts an intermediate step in which the projects indicated by the external committee are certified before they are submitted for final selection. If this activity is adopted, the submission guide should inform what types of requests the sponsor may ask;

- **Final selection** – This has information as to who will be in charge of the final choice from the approved proposals. Only executives of the company or also outside guests, like consultants (*Natura*) or government representatives (*Petrobras*)?

4.2. **Criteria** – A complete list and description of all the criteria for the selection of sponsorship proposals. The list varies according to the characteristics of each sponsorship policy. *Petrobras, Natura* and *Votorantim* have eliminatory criteria (the proposal is disqualified in the pre-assessment phase if it does not meet) and selection criteria (to help evaluators' analysis and to facilitate comparison between the proposals). *Natura* has weighted criteria, ranging from one (least important) to three (most important).
4.3. **Important information** – All other relevant information regarding the selection should be mentioned here, such as: materials submitted for selection will not be returned, no justification will be given for projects not selected, etc. As stated above, in Enrollment, this kind of instruction is usually listed as "additional information” at the end of the submission guide. It is suggested that this be placed together with all other information about the Selection step.

5. **Realization** – Procedures to be adopted after the selection of proposals.

5.1. **Contracting** – The sponsor should inform the requirements and restrictions for the contract to be signed with the selected applicant, and also a list of required documents. In the case of *Natura*, as already mentioned, the documents are required at the stage of Certification, which makes the contracting more agile;

5.2. **Disbursement** – The applicants should be informed how and when they will get the financial resources from the sponsorship. In a single payment after signing the agreement, such as *Oi* and *BNB*? Or in installments linked to project execution, like *Petrobras*? *BNB* refers to cases in which the sponsored entity should repay the amount disbursed in sponsorship.

5.3. **Monitoring** – The sponsor can also specify how it intends to supervise the implementation of the project. *Petrobras* informs that it may request information about the project's progress at any time. *BNB* provides a form that must be delivered within 30 days after completion of each phase of the project. *Natura* and *Votorantim* also expect to receive reports on the progress of the projects and say that the frequency of sending will be mutually agreed.

6. **Counterparts** – The minimum rights and benefits the sponsor expects to receive from those they will possibly sponsor. The items vary according to the objectives of each sponsorship strategy and the desired level of sponsorship (title sponsor, etc.). Sponsors often present a basic list of rights – referring to naming/titling, logos, media, press, Internet, merchandising, services, access to tickets, products and database, endorsement, hospitality, etc. - emphasizing that others might be added according to the specificities of each project.
4. CONCLUSION

As illustrated in the Introduction part of this work, the planning of corporate sponsorship can be compared to a "Matryoshka", in which all components must be connected and integrated in accordance with an order of priority. In this sense, the decision making process a company will adopt is a result of the prior planning, being shaped by the previous (and bigger) “dolls”. Thus, there is not a better alternative from own project, direct choice, closed selection and call for proposals per se - it depends on factors such as objectives, target audiences, geographic extent, brand attributes, budget, etc. and, consequently, varies from company to company. This aspect was confirmed in the primary research and resulted in Table 4, which presents possible intentions expressed in a sponsorship policy that may suggest the adoption of open calls for sponsorship proposals.

Although not a common practice outside Brazil, the public selection through open calls provides important benefits to the sponsor and meets the expectations of several international authors, since it disseminates the company's sponsorship policy, encourages communication, establishes process and those responsible for decision making, communicates guidelines for submitting proposals, facilitates the management of proposals received, forms a sponsorship portfolio and a sponsorship 'umbrella', conveys a positive image associated with equality and transparency, and, as a result, may provide reputation for the sponsor.

Obviously, the mere conduct of a call does not imply the achievement of all these benefits. The results of the research indicate that, to be successful, the planning of an open call for sponsorship proposals should consider:

- Seven principles (Dimension, Focus, Quality, Diversity, Transparency, Access, and Equality) that represent conditions for the elaboration and management of the selection, shown in Table 5; and
- Five steps (Definition, Formulation, Enrollment, Selection, and Realization) that must be carefully planned, taking into account all topics and issues summarized in Table 8.

Finally, besides principles and steps, a model of a submission guide for an open call was suggested (in 3.6), also based on the primary and secondary researches.

All these outcomes may be used as a guide for sponsors. Those who already make use of calls for proposals can find in this methodology some ways to improve their current practices, besides testing new possibilities. On the other hand, companies that do not yet adopt open calls can start promoting a pilot test – for example, leading the first selection without public announcement of the submission guide (considering only the proposals received spontaneously), but applying all the other steps described in this work.

In both cases, it is expected that this work can contribute to the practice of corporate sponsorship, as an attempt to qualify the decision making process and strengthen the relationship between sponsors and sponsorship seekers.

5. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The results of this study were obtained with the participation, in the primary research, of 80 respondents. Like a ‘puzzle’, each participant contributed some pieces that, analyzed qualitatively, resulted in a final figure which is summarized in Table 8.

In this context, the findings cannot be generalized, nor for the sample (who placed ‘one piece in the puzzle’ does not necessarily agree with all the others) and neither to an entire population.

It is expected, therefore, that such a limitation stimulates further academic studies - for example, a conclusive research regarding some step of the systematization suggested in this work - and can also contribute to the discussion of the practice of open calls for proposals by the sponsoring companies.
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7. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaire of the primary research

Introduction - Basically, companies have four different ways for selecting sponsorship projects. They can: (1) directly choose what to sponsor, (2) create their own projects, (3) invite some sponsorship seekers to submit proposals, or (4) use calls for proposals (public selection process available for all sponsorship seekers interested).

General aspects

1. In which situations should a company use the 4th option above (call for proposals)? - For sponsors (managers), consultants and members of networks.

2. What is your impression of companies that use the 4th option (call for proposals) for selecting sponsorship projects? What does the use of open calls say about the sponsoring company? - For professionals of cultural or sportive areas, consultants and members of networks, academy, government and press.

3. What benefits can a call for proposals provide the sponsor? On the other hand, what are the risks or possible problems? - For sponsors (managers), consultants and members of networks, academy, government and press.

4. What are the positive aspects of a call for proposals to a sponsorship seeker? In which way does it help and is useful? On the other hand, what are the disadvantages? - For professionals of cultural or sportive areas, consultants and members of external committees, networks, academy, government and press.

Step A: Definition

5. When deciding to use an open call for proposals, how should the sponsor plan it? What are the most important aspects to be considered? What are the key factors in a call to be successful? - For sponsors (managers) and consultants (involved directly in open calls).
6. What are the steps of planning and implementation of an open call for proposals? Briefly describe each step, mentioning the most important aspects that the sponsor cannot fail to consider - For sponsors (professionals involved directly in open calls).

**Step B: Formulation**

7. When an open call for proposals is launched, the sponsor usually provides a submission guide and a registration form. In your opinion, how would an ideal submission guide be? Hint: think practically what you would change in the submission guides you’ve ever met - For sponsors (professionals involved directly in open calls), sponsorship seekers (who have already submitted proposals in an open call) and members of external committees.

8. And what about the registration form? How would it be? - For sponsors (professionals involved directly in open calls), sponsorship seekers (who have already submitted proposals in an open call) and members of external committees.

**Step C: Enrollment**

9. What is the ideal way for the sponsor to launch an open call for proposals? What audiences should be achieved? What communication tools/actions should the sponsor promote to reach these audiences and to attract sponsorship proposals expected in quantity and quality? - For sponsors (professionals involved directly in open calls) and consultants (involved directly in open calls).

10. When launching an open call for proposals, a sponsor may receive the enrollment of hundreds or even some thousands of proposals. In your experience, what concrete and practical tips would you give the company in order to manage the entire enrollment process easily? - For consultants (involved directly in open calls).

**Step D: Selection**

11. In an open call for proposals, after the end of the period of enrollment, the decision making stage begins, from screening to evaluation and selection of the best proposals. If you would redesign this whole process, how would it be? Describe
briefly the steps, the main activities and those responsible - *For consultants (involved directly in open calls)*.

12. In your opinion, what factors are most important to the success of the work of the external committee responsible for assessing the proposal enrolled in an open call for proposals? - *For members of external committees*.

13. Beyond what you already mentioned above, would you have suggestions for improvement of the work of the external committee? Think freely in processes, dynamics, stages, activities etc. - *For members of external committees*.

14. After being evaluated by the external committee, the recommended proposals tend to be submitted to an internal committee of the sponsoring company, which is responsible for the final selection of the proposals that will be sponsored. In your opinion, what are the key factors to ensure full success in this stage? - *For sponsors (managers)*.

15. After the selection, what is the ideal way for a sponsor to communicate the results of an open call for proposals? What audiences should be achieved? What tools/actions should be used? - *For sponsors (professionals involved directly in open calls) and consultants (involved directly in open calls)*.

**Step E: Realization**

16. After the selection, what are the steps to formalize the relationship between the sponsor and the sponsored property? Briefly describe each step, mentioning the most important aspects that the sponsor cannot fail to consider - *For consultants (involved directly in open calls)*.

17. What does it mean for an artist to be selected in an open call for proposals? Are there differences, positive or negative, on other forms of selection? - *For artists (who have already been selected in an open call)*.
Appendix B: Respondents to the questionnaire

Aimar Labaki
Playwright, soap opera author, director, translator, essayist, curator and consultant in the field of scenic arts

Alessandra Trindade
Cultural consultant

Alfredo Manevy
Executive secretary of MinC from 2008 to 2010

Amanda Aragão
A graduate of ECA-USP in public relations, she has worked as social investment manager and communication coordinator for the Votorantim Institute

Amaury Cacciacarro Filho
General director of the São Paulo Contemporary Dance Festival, director of Fractal Produção Cultural and producer of a variety of national and international dance troupes

Ana Carla Fonseca Reis
Business administrator, economist and urbanist, author/editor of reference books for culture, economics and cities, consultant and international lecturer in 22 countries

Ana Moser
President of the Esporte & Educação Institute, Social Esporte & Educação Institute and Atletas pela Cidadania. Volleyball player medalist at the 1996 Olympic Games

Ana Paula Sousa
Journalist specializing in policies for culture and cinema, served as culture editor for the magazine CartaCapital and reporter of the newspaper Folha de S. Paulo

Ana Saito
Institutional relations coordinator for Gullane
André Sturm
Executive director of MIS-SP. Movie director and producer. President of SIAESP and of the Cinema do Brasil Program. Director of Pandora Filmes

André Fonseca
Director of Projecta and consultant in planning, implementation and management of cultural activities

Antonio Cardozo
Administrative finance coordinator for the Votorantim Institute

Antonio Carlos Gonçalves
Director of the sponsorship department of the Secretariat for Social Communication (SECOM) of the Presidency of Brazil

Beatriz Araújo
Freelance planning consultant, with experience in selection processes and project monitoring for the Votorantim Institute and Natura

Cao Hamburger
Brazilian movie director, whose works include Xingu and The Year My Parents Went on Vacation, nominated for the Golden Bear of the Berlin Film Festival in 2007

Carlos Harasawa
Director of marketing at the Osesp Foundation since 2005. A graduate of FGV in Business Administration and of USP in Law. Executive MBA from USP-Fipe

Celia Picon
Director of the Votorantim Institute for 10 years

Celso Frateschi
Actor, director and teacher of theater
Chico Pelúcio
Actor, director and cultural manager. Founder and member of the Grupo Galpão, and current general director of Galpão Cine Horto

Claudia Rangel
A journalist with master’s degree in Education, and audiovisual specialist at the Federal University of Espírito Santo

Claudio Thompson
Sports sponsorships manager for Petrobras

Cristine Flores
Director of Espaco Livre Consultoria

Di Moretti
Movie script writer, teacher and script consultant

Diogo Quitério
Coordinator at the Votorantim Institute. A graduate in public administration, he has worked eight years in the management of corporate social investment policies

Eduardo Saron
Director-superintendent of Itaú Cultural and member of the National Commission on Cultural Incentives (CNIC)

Eliane Costa
Consultant and coach/mentor in cultural management. Sponsorships manager at Petrobras from 2003 to May 2012. Master’s degree in Cultural Goods from FGV-Rio

Élida Marques
Public reader, actress and cultural producer, she is the creator and coordinator of a project to promote reading called Ler é uma Viagem [Reading is a Journey] since 2003
Eugenio Puppo
Founding partner/director of Heco Produções Ltda., which develops cultural projects in art and cinema education for TV, publications and exhibitions

Fátima Monteiro Falcão
A journalist, graduate of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (1976), who has worked in the fields of corporate communication, social responsibility and sustainability

Fernando Meirelles
Brazilian movie director, whose work includes *City of God* and *The Constant Gardener*, both nominated for 4 Oscars each, as well as *Maids, Blindness* and *360*

Fernando Rossetti
A journalist with a background in social sciences, he has worked since 2005 as general secretary of the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises (GIFE)

Grasiela Manzano
Cultural producer and visual artist

Gustavo Sol
Actor and researcher with a bachelor’s degree in Performing Arts from UNICAMP and a master’s in Communication and Semiotics from PUC-SP

Helena Katz
Professor at PUC-SP and UFBA. Coordinator of the Dance Studies Center (CED). Dance critic for the newspaper O Estado de S. Paulo

Henilton Menezes
Secretariat for Promotion and Incentive of Culture under the Ministry of Culture

Hugo Possolo
Clown, actor, playwright, director and producer of the theater group Parlapatões, Espaço Parlapatões and Circo Roda. Coordinator of the theater festival Festa do Teatro
Iná Camargo Costa
Retired professor of the Faculty of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences at the University of Sao Paulo (FFLCH-USP)

Isabella Prata
Director of Escola São Paulo and the Escola São Paulo Institute

João Leiva Filho
Head of J.Leiva Cultura & Esporte, a consultancy specializing in serving companies and public and private institutions in the areas of culture and sport

José Maurício Fittipaldi
Attorney, partner at Cesnik, Quintino e Salinas, he has worked for 10 years in the areas of culture, media and entertainment

Juca Ferreira
Sociologist, special ambassador for Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB), Minister of Culture of Brazil during the Lula administration

Karen Cavalcanti
Institutional marketing manager for Natura

Kátia de Marco
Coordinator for the Cultural and Social Studies Program at Candido Mendes University and the president-founder of the Brazilian Cultural Management Association

Leonardo Brant
President of Brant Associados, a corporate group that operates companies like Casa8, Cemec and Deusdará

Lenine
Brazilian singer, composer, arranger and musician, selected in the Natura’s 2007 call for proposals
Liliana Magalhães
Partner-director of SOMOS, vice-president of the Brazilian Cultural Management Association and board member for the Mercosul Biennial Foundation

Ludmila Frateschi
Brand attitude manager for Edelman Significa

Luiz Bolognesi
Cultural producer

Marcello Dantas
Curator, museum designer and cultural producer

Marcelo Mendonça
General Manager of the Bank of Brazil Cultural Center

Marcelo Camargo Nonato
An architect, graduate of the University of São Paulo (FAU-USP), with experience in projects in the areas of youth, education, local development and the environment

Marco Griesi
A graduate in Advertising and Marketing, Design and Scenic Arts, he is cultural coordinator for Porto Seguro

Marcos Librantz
Supervisor of marketing/relationship for the Osesp Foundation and partner at the agency NTZ Comunicação e Marketing, with 8 years of experience in the area of culture

Maria Célia T. Moura Santos
Retired professor from the Museology Program of UFBA. Director of museums for the Institute of Artistic and Cultural Heritage of the State of Bahia
Maria Helena Cunha
Specialist in cultural management, director of Inspire Gestão Cultural and author of *Gestão Cultural: profissão em formação* [Cultural Management: profession under development]

Maria Helena Pires Martins
Former professor at ECA-USP, coordinator of the MASP School and consultant. Former director of the Department of Cultural Education and Action at MAC-USP

Mateus Furlanetto
Manager of public relations at the Brazilian Association of Business Communication (Aberje) and professor at Cásper Líbero College

Minom Pinho
Partner-director of Casa Redonda Cultural and Casa Redonda Sustainable Sponsorship. Cultural manager, lecturer and consultant in private social and cultural investment

Paulo Nassar
Director President of Brazilian Association of Business Communication (Aberje) and professor at ECA-USP

Pedro Brandão
Impresario, creator of the Salvador Jazz Festival, founder of a business networking organization and a portal about the luxury market and TV host

Priscila Fernandes
A journalist with a master’s degree in Literary Criticism from PUC-SP and director of Salve Jorge!, a content positioning agency

Priscila Martoni
Partner and executive producer of Talk Filmes
Rafael Gioielli
Research and development manager at the Votorantim Institute, with a PhD and master’s degree from ECA-USP

Rafael Oliva
Director of projects and programs at Oi Futuro

Raimo Benedetti
Video artist, teacher, editor and producer of film and video

Roberta Martinho
Cultural manager and agent, and partner in the production company Studiintro

Roberta Sá
Brazilian singer selected in the Natura’s 2010 call for proposals

Robinson Borges Costa
Journalist with master’s degree in Communication Sciences

Romulo Avelar
Cultural manager. Consultant for cultural organizations and author of *O Avesso da Cena: Notas sobre Produção e Gestão Cultural* [The Other Side of the Scene: Notes on Production and Cultural Management]

Ruy Filho
Editor of the magazine Antro Positivo, art director for Cia. de Teatro Antro Exposto and essayist on theatre and cultural policy

Selma Cristina Silva
Manager of the Observatory and the Documentation Center at Itaú Cultural. Holds degrees in Philosophy, Library Economics and Letters

Sharon Hess
Senior vice-president of brand attitude and activation at Edelman Significa
Silvio Oksman
Bachelor’s and master’s degree in architecture (1998 and 2011) from FAU-USP, professor at the Escola da Cidade SP and partner of Oksman Arquitetos Associados

Sylvia Guimarães
Historian, founder and current president of Vaga Lume, a nonprofit organization that promotes education and culture in communities of the Brazilian Amazon

Thiago Alixandre
Dance artist, cofounder of Coletivo O¹² in Votorantim, SP, cultural producer and researcher on dance

Vera Bicalho
General Director and partner-founder of Quasar Dance Company, psychologist, cultural manager and producer

Vivian Rubia
Institutional development analyst at Vaga Lume

Viviane Queiroz
Master’s degree in Cultural Management from the University of Barcelona and manager of cultural financing for the Banco do Nordeste (BNB)

Wagner Moura
Brazilian actor of theater, cinema and TV, winner of the Cinema Brazil Grand Prize in 2008 for the *Elite Squad*, Golden Bear winner at the Berlin Film Festival in 2008

Yacoff Sarkovas
CEO of Edelman Significa
Appendix C: Highlight of BNB’s call for proposals

Presenting the sponsorship program in the introduction of the submission guide.

Source: BNB (2012d).
Appendix D: Highlight of Natura’s call for proposals

The steps of the selection process presented clearly, with the use of figures.

Source: Natura (2012b).
Appendix E: Highlight of *Petrobras*’ call for proposals

Extract of a guide to help participants filling in the registration form.

Source: Petrobras (2011d).
Appendix F: Highlight of Oi’s call for proposals

Extract of the press release.

Source: Oi (2011c).
Appendix G: Highlight of Votorantim’s call for proposals

All relevant information of the entire submission guide in just four paragraphs.

Source: Votorantim (2008a).