Sticking point
The varied nature of insurance for museums
By Sara Heft

In an overarching perspective of risk management, the needs of museums in terms of insurance are multifaceted, ranging from the coverage of the basic risks associated with establishments open to the public to the highly specific risks associated with rare and valuable artworks and works of art. Insurance is under no circumstances a tool for preventing the damage or loss of objects and facilities or injury to individuals, but rather, a measure for ensuring suitable financial compensation in the case of unfortunate events that occur. The coverage concerning the day-to-day functioning of museums ranges from general liability and property insurance to staff and visitor insurance—needs shared to varying degrees with a number of other non-museum entities ranging from hotels to offices.

However, in referring to insurance within the museum sector, the type of insurance that often comes to mind first is collections insurance—coverage providing financial protection for those objects at the very heart of the museum’s mission and identity. This is a complex domain marked by extremely precise needs in terms of insurance coverage, which vary greatly from country to country and from museum to museum, determined by the diverse nature of museum collections as well as national and international practices and regulations. But universally, the financial guarantees granted by insurance coverage of unique artefacts and works of art in the event of damage or loss are no substitute for the irreplaceable objects themselves; in a number of countries it is common practice for state-run museums not to insure their collections, instead choosing to focus on security and preventive conservation measures.

Objects on loan
When objects are loaned out or travelling exhibitions held, however, for state as well as private museums, the borrowing institution is called upon to provide insurance coverage for the course of the exhibition. Transport is also covered for what is known as a “tail-to-tail” policy, which, according to Marc Rome, exhibitions underwriter at French art insurer Axa Art, is opted for “as a general rule” in the exhibitions that the company covers. Commercial insurers and brokers specialised in the coverage of artworks occupy a niche market of varying importance on the global landscape: according to Jacques Lemoine, Director of Gras Savoye Fine Arts, a specialised broker working with Axa Art in providing insurance policies for some 2,000 exhibitions annually in France and abroad, they represent a “micro-market” in France, while in the UK, where the government provides an insurance guarantee for the vast majority of exhibitions, “the market is even smaller.” The broker is the museum’s interlocutor in determining insurance requirements and the conditions that best meet its needs for a given exhibition, “determined hand in hand with the museum’s legal department, curators and registrars,” says Lemoine.

In response to the often-prohibitive costs associated with such exchanges, as insurance costs soar worldwide in the face of ballooning art market values, government indemnity programmes exist in a number of countries to facilitate the borrowing and lending of collections both among museums of a given country and for exhibitions travelling across national borders. The US Arts and Antiquities Program, for example, has covered over 1,000 exhibitions since being created in 1975, providing coverage of up to $1.2bn for a single exhibition of works on loan from a foreign or American institution—a measure that allows museums to place maximum investment in the exhibition production in the absence of having to purchase a pricey insurance policy. The UK Government Indemnity Scheme, similarly, was founded in 1980 to optimise conditions for the degeneration of an artwork,” says Lemoine.

With the need for a transparent flow of information and expertise concerning works is consistently highlighted by insurance and museum professionals.

Ethical issues
These guarantees and subsequent financial compensation or replacement in the face of claims are contingent upon the declaration of accurate values of collection pieces, which are often subject to constant fluctuation, making the regular updating of valuation records a necessity in order for claims to be properly compensated. The need for a transparent flow of information and expertise concerning works is consistently highlighted by insurance and museum professionals to be able to carry out these updates, thus ensuring an adequate response to loss or damage. For Lemoine, “museums must be able to play the role of filler in the analysis of value, in order to stave off severe inflation. The inventorying of pre-existing damage or fragility also raises delicate legal and ethical questions of ‘where to draw the line in terms of responsibility for the degeneration of an artwork,” he says.

Ethical implications are an integral aspect of another line of insurance solicited by museums: that of title insurance, specifically affecting the fine arts and valuable collectibles market as a tool for guaranteeing that the object possessed is rightfully owned by the insured party. According to Sherri North Cohen, Director of underwriting for New York-based Aris Title Insurance Corporation, a major actor in this domain, such coverage helps museums in facing shared challenges that arise when they buy objects [... in the marketplace, sell or deaccession objects through auction or private sale, accept donations and gifts of objects; and accept objects for exhibition purposes.” Such measures are consistent with the ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums pertaining to the acquisition of collections and notably article 2.3: “Every effort must be made before acquisition to ensure that any object or specimen offered for purchase, gift, loan, bequest, or exchange [... has been legally obtained, using [... due diligence [...] to establish the full history of the item since discovery or production.”

Given the current context of economic crisis, the art insurance markets have not seen a marked decline, and major international exhibitions continue to crosscrass the museum landscape. When exhibitions travel abroad, upping the country-specific nature of insurance, linguistic and legal discrepancies and points of contention inevitably emerge, optimising conditions for such exchanges goes hand in hand with ongoing dialogue between museum and insurance professionals.