**CREATIVE COMMUNITIES PROGRAMME**  
**END OF PROJECT REPORT**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT NAME:** | Playing the Bridge |
| **PROJECT LEAD:** | Nye Parry |
| **REPORT DATE:** | 15 May 2017 |

**INTRODUCTION**

Everyone who receives a grant from the Creative Communities Programme must complete this End of Project Report. Please read it straight away – you will need to collect the information throughout the lifetime of your project.

Please refer to your Agreement, and any changes you agreed with us, when you complete this Report.

This End of Project Report tells us:

* What has happened during your project as a whole;
* Your final income and expenditure figures;
* What you have learned from the project, how you have adapted to these learnings, and what you plan to do with this learning in future.

We will send you a separate online survey about your experience of the Creative Communities Programme as a grant recipient. We will process the information you give us to understand:

* The outcomes and impacts of our grant and support on your organisation;
* The effectiveness of our services and grants administration; and
* What key things the city needs to be aware of in future, when supporting community level arts and culture projects.

We also use this information to report to our funders.

Please email this activity report to: creativecommunities@hull2017.co.uk

1. **PROJECT REPORT**

Please provide a brief update (3 or 4) sentences on each of the following areas to let us know how your project went, what you’ve learnt and how well we supported you.

**EVENT PLANNING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

Project management fell largely on the project lead Nye Parry with on the ground support from Laurence Rugg and input from Jonathan McDowell at Matter Architecture. The use of a non-traditional venue increased the workload significantly in terms of liaison with the bridge operators, Police, Fire Officers and council. This all ran smoothly and the project was delivered on time and on budget although no specific budget had been allocated to the project lead for these tasks beyond the artists fee. The fees for Laurence Rugg were increased in response for his increased workload as local liaison: attending meetings and workshops and running the installation. Jonathan McDowell’s time was donated in kind by Matter Architecture.

**MARKETING AND COMMUNCIATIONS, PARTICIPATION AND LEARNING**

The project presented some challenges in terms of how best to deal with marketing, as for much of the run up we were still awaiting decisions from third parties regarding such issues as opening times and crucially number restrictions on the space. A sudden flurry of media interest ahead of the workshops in the space (live interviews on Radio Humberside, a feature on look north and interviews with Calendar and KCFM) brought in a good flow of participants for these. All age groups were represented and it was possible to incorporate the keenest into the performance regardless of age without impeding the the experience of more casual drop-in participants. Recruitment for the gamelan workshops was mostly through word of mouth and through Hull University as a high level of commitment was required. The gamelan group that performed at the concert covered a wide age range between 18 – 60.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**

The main risks to the project came from external sources regarding use of the primary venue, the Scale Lane Bridge itself. In particular, there was a worry around December last year that the space would be required by a commercial client, during the period of our installation. After meeting the client and the managers of the space it transpired that this would not be an issue and we set our installation dates to ensure availability of the space from May. Risks associated with the venue were dealt with in consultation with the Police via Paul Hurrell and Fire Service who visited the site ahead of the concert, and the bridge operators Hull Street Scene who supplied safety barriers for the venue. A detailed event plan was produced for the concert covering stewarding arrangements, access and emergency procedures.

**BUDGET**

In this section we ask for a final summary of the income and expenditure of your activity to date.

Pleasecomplete the Budget Template provided. The template includes instructions on how to complete it.

**Please use the space below for any comments and supporting information.**

The project was run entirely on the funding received from CCP. It benefitted from sponsorship in kind from Hull university who covered sound equipment, York University who supplied services of two performing groups, the University Gamelan and the Assembled, Hull Muisc Service who donated use of the Gamelan and rehearsal space at the Albermarle, Hull City council who licensed the Bridge Hub space for £1.00 and Matter Architecture who donated the services of their marketing consultants Rob Fiehn Architectural Communication as well as the time of Director Jonathan McDowell. Fees for Laurence Rugg were increased to reflect his increased role as our representative in Hull. A little of Nye Parry’s Artist fee has been reallocated to cover this. Some hardware costs were reallocated – in particular the Computer spec was increased, paid for by a reduction in the number of projectors and the reallocation of sound budget that was covered by in kind sponsorship.

**Specific Requirements - VAT**

If you are registered for VAT, your expenditure figures should not include VAT that you can claim back. If you are not registered for VAT, your figures should include VAT. You may need to get advice from your own accountant or the relevant tax office. For information about VAT and other taxes, contact HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) through their website at [www.hmrc.gov.uk](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk)

**B. MONITORING & EVALUATION REPORT**

1. **Event Delivery**

**How did you do on reaching the targets laid out for project activity?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ORIGINAL TARGET\*** | **REVISED TARGET\*** | **TOTAL\*** |
| **PROJECT VENUE/LOCATION** | | |  |
| HU1 – HU9 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Not HU1 – HU9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **ACTIVITY** | | |  |
| Number of performances | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of exhibition days | N/A | 16 | 12 |
| Number of commissions\* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of sessions for education, training or taking part\* | 12 | 12 | 14 |
| Number of accessible activities | N/A | N/A | N/A |

**\*Original target: target(s) listed within your contract  
\*Revised target: new suggested targets now that your project planning and delivery is underway  
\*Total: final figures for the project as a whole  
\*Commissions: a commission is defined as the hiring or payment to an artist / artistic company to create an art work or performance. A commission can be wholly or partly funded by you / your organisation.  
\*Sessions for education, training or taking part: includes guided sessions, learning sessions, skills development workshops, formal training of volunteers, practical workshops, all other community/public facing workshops.**

If your project incorporated heritage, please briefly say how you developed, presented and / or told people about heritage or historical content, e.g. using heritage buildings or sites, collecting oral history (stories and memories), displaying historical artworks or collections, working with museums or archives, sharing or presenting historical stories or events.

In the original proposal Heritage was only really addressed by the focus on a Hull landmark, the Scale Lane Bridge. This focus was developed considerably as the project developed, in particular in the installation in the bridge hub space. This was originally intended to focus on the mechanisms and hidden engineering of the bridge but became much more about its construction. A visit to Qualter Hall Engineering in Barnsley, who constructed the bridge yielded much useful material in the form of construction images, interviews with steel workers who had contributed to the construction on site and recordings of the machinery used to assemble the parts. These fragments of Oral History were incorporated in the installation which also drew on a large library of construction images supplied by Matter Architecture and Qualter Hall. The successful communication of heritage is reflected in a number of comments gathered during the installation

1. **Project Delivery Team**

**Who was involved in delivering your project? Please include yourself, employees and any freelancers that you contracted for this project.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL NO. INDIVIDUALS** | **TOTAL NO. OF DAYS WORKED** | **TOTAL NO. OF HU1-HU9 RESIDENTS** | **TOTAL NO. OF DAYS WORKED BY HU1-HU9 RESIDENTS** |
| **CATEGORY OR ROLE** | | | | |
| Project Manager(s) | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Artists | 2 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| Production/exhibition staff | 1 | 30 | 1 | 30 |
| Other staff |  |  |  |  |
| Volunteers | 37 | 15 | 37 | 37 |

**Using the equal opportunities form provided in the Toolkit, please complete the Total column within the tables below for all people involved in the Delivery Team for your project. We recommend that you ask all members of the project Delivery Team to complete this form at the start of the project, and include it as part of the contracting process for any new staff or freelancers going forward.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL** |  |  | **TOTAL** |
| **AGE GROUPS – DELIVERY TEAM** | |  | **DISABILITY/LONG TERM ILLNESS – DELIVERY TEAM** | |
| 16-17 years |  |  | Yes |  |
| 18-19 years |  |  | No |  |
| 20-24 years |  |  | Prefer not to say |  |
| 25-29 years |  |  | **CONDITIONS – DELIVERY TEAM** | |
| 30-34 years |  |  | Learning disability |  |
| 35-39 years |  |  | Long-term illness/condition |  |
| 40-44 years |  |  | Sensory impairment |  |
| 45-49 years |  |  | Mental Health condition |  |
| 50-54 years |  |  | Physical impairment |  |
| 55-59 years |  |  | Cognitive impairment |  |
| 60-64 years |  |  | Other |  |
| 65-69 years |  |  |  |  |
| 70-74 years |  |  |  |  |
| 75+ years |  |  |  |  |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **TOTAL** |  |  | | **TOTAL** |
| **GENDER - DELIVERY TEAM** | | |  | **ETHNICITY – DELIVERY TEAM** | | |
| Male |  | |  | Welsh/English/Scottish/Northern Irish/British |  | |
| Female |  | |  | Irish |  | |
| Transgender |  | |  | Gypsy or Irish Traveller |  | |
| Other |  | |  | Any other White background |  | |
| Prefer not to say |  | |  | White and Black Caribbean |  | |
|  |  | |  | White and Black African |  | |
|  |  | |  | White and Asian |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background |  | |
|  |  | |  | Indian |  | |
|  |  | |  | Pakistani |  | |
|  |  | |  | Bangladeshi |  | |
|  | | |  | Chinese |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Asian background |  | |
|  |  | |  | African |  | |
|  |  | |  | Caribbean |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Black/African/Caribbean background |  | |
|  |  | |  | Arab |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other ethnic group |  | |
|  |  | |  | Prefer not to say |  | |

**Thinking about your project as a whole, what would you say have been the main successes and challenges for you and your project delivery team (approximately 500 words):**

**This can include formal and informal feedback given to you by staff and / or your own observations. You can use notes or minutes from project team meetings; informal conversations; emails; etc. to inform this.**

**Successes:**

Range of opportunities

We were able to provide an range of unique artistic opportunities and engaged a wide variety of participants at many levels, from inquisitive bystanders who happened upon the installation to committed participants who were able to make a regular contribution to gamelan workshops and participate in the performance performance.

Budget and schedule

We brought in a multi-phased project on budget and on schedule. Despite early questions about the availability of the venue we were able to stick to the schedule as presented in the original proposal with the exception of moving one weekend workshop by a week.

We successfully liaised with the council, the bridge operators, the fire service and police and generally received very positive and friendly feedback from these authorities.

Volunteers

While there were certain organizational issues with the volunteers, all those who worked on out projects were excellent and contributed hugely to the success of the project. The production volunteers were extremely able and contributed ideas and solutions and the front of house volunteers were invaluable in attracting passers by to the installation and ensuring a safe and pleasurable audience experience at the concert.

Press

The bridge workshops were well covered by press with interviews with Nye Parry on KCFM, Radio Humberside and BBC look north as well as features on a wide variety of websites, from Architectural review to ITV. Hull Daily Mail and Yorkshire Life.

**Challenges:**

clearance

Early in the development of the project doubts were raised by the mangaers of the Hub space in the bridge about the availability on the proposed dates due to a commercial interest. After meetings with all parties concerned it transpired that there was no conflict however the timing of this uncertainty prevented us from meeting a few press deadlines and caused the organization of the project to feel a little rushed thereafter.

Certain safety issues regarding allowed visitor numbers were unresolved until quite close to the concert event making planning more difficult.

Press

While press interest was satisfying, it was focused on the workshop phase of the project and not rekindled ahead of the concert and installation. This highlighted a wider issue around the multi-phased nature of the project (see audiences below) and the difficulty of distinguishing between the different kinds of experience offered. There was also some confusion around our project and the Humber Bridge project which had some features in common and received a lot of coverage around the time of our installation. Had we known about this in advance we could perhaps have made more of the coincidence

Volunteers

The installation phase of the project was quite reliant on assistance from the volunteer organization. All the volunteers we used were excellent (see above) and contributed hugely to the success of the project. However there were a number communication problems with the volunteer organizers around the scope of volunteer involvement and the cancellation of shifts at very short notice.

Monitoring

For the purposes of this form the monitoring requirements were almost impossible to implement successfully. Monitoring forms were sent to workshop participants but were received too late to actually fill in during workshops so few were returned. The installation space was dark and there was no possibility of a suitable outside space for form filling. Visitors who were only in the installation for ten to twenty minutes or less were reluctant to fill in a long form and volunteers also preferred the visitors book as it could be filled in quickly. All paper forms were returned directly to the office and are therefor unavailable for analysis. Visitor numbers were recorded accurately using a mechanical counter.

1. **Audiences & Participants**

**How many people, in total, attended or participated in the project as a whole?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT** | **TOTAL** | **% FROM HU1-HU9** |
| Number of audience members\* | 5735 |  |
| Number of participants\* | 200 |  |
| **TOTAL BENEFICIARIES** |  |  |

**\*The % can be taken from the results of your audience and participant surveys or box office reports  
\*‘Audience members’ includes people going to an exhibition or performance, and people getting access to work that is printed, recorded, broadcast or on the internet.**  
**\*‘Participants’ means those doing the activity.**

**Please complete the Total column within the tables below. You should collect this information using the Audience Survey (which will be designed with support from the Hull 2017 team) and / or via the Participant Equal Opportunities Form provided in the Toolkit.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL** |  |  | **TOTAL** |
| **AGE GROUPS – AUD. & PART.** | |  | **DISABILITY/LONG TERM ILLNESS – AUD. & PART.** | |
| 0-2 years |  |  | Yes |  |
| 3-5 years |  |  | No |  |
| 6-10 years |  |  | Prefer not to say |  |
| 11-15 years |  |  | **CONDITIONS – AUD. & PART.** | |
| 16-17 years |  |  | Learning disability |  |
| 18-19 years |  |  | Long-term illness/condition |  |
| 20-24 years |  |  | Sensory impairment |  |
| 25-29 years |  |  | Mental Health condition |  |
| 30-34 years |  |  | Physical impairment |  |
| 35-39 years |  |  | Cognitive impairment |  |
| 40-44 years |  |  | Other |  |
| 45-49 years |  |  |  |  |
| 50-54 years |  |  |  |  |
| 55-59 years |  |  |  |  |
| 60-64 years |  |  |  |  |
| 65-69 years |  |  |  |  |
| 70-74 years |  |  |  |  |
| 75+ years |  |  |  |  |
| Prefer not to say |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **TOTAL** |  |  | | **TOTAL** |
| **GENDER - AUDIENCES** | | |  | **ETHNICITY – AUDIENCES** | | |
| Male |  | |  | Welsh/English/Scottish/Northern Irish/British |  | |
| Female |  | |  | Irish |  | |
| Transgender |  | |  | Gypsy or Irish Traveller |  | |
| Other |  | |  | Any other White background |  | |
| Prefer not to say |  | |  | White and Black Caribbean |  | |
|  |  | |  | White and Black African |  | |
|  |  | |  | White and Asian |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background |  | |
|  |  | |  | Indian |  | |
|  |  | |  | Pakistani |  | |
|  |  | |  | Bangladeshi |  | |
|  | | |  | Chinese |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Asian background |  | |
|  |  | |  | African |  | |
|  |  | |  | Caribbean |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other Black/African/Caribbean background |  | |
|  |  | |  | Arab |  | |
|  |  | |  | Any other ethnic group |  | |
|  |  | |  | Prefer not to say |  | |

**Thinking about your project as a whole, what would you say have been the main successes and challenges for your audience members / participants:**

**This can include formal and informal feedback given to you by staff and / or your own observations. You can use comments books; informal conversations; emails; etc. to inform this. It must also include any findings from your Audience/Participant Survey (A Question Bank is provided for the Audience/Participant Survey, from which you will build your own project questionnaire with support from Hull 2017 staff).**

**Successes:**

Gamelan Workshops

The audience and participants benefitted from a variety of types of engagement at all levels. Gamelan workshops at the Albermarle provided an intensive experience for 18 participants who were able to study the Javanese Gamelan tradition through weekly engagement and also participated in group composition and improvisation activities. Participating in a concert that also features the experienced players from York University was welcomed as a fitting finale to these workshops.

Bridge workshops

An unexpected surge in press interest at the time of the weekend bridge workshops led to a greater number of casual drop-in participants than expected and around 200 attended across the weekend. We were able to respond to this creatively allowing many levels of engagement from allowing free experimentation to small composer led group sessions of approx. 20 minutes while still achieving our practical goals of devising a performance piece for the concert and recording material for the installation. Due to the structure of the piece we were able to incorporate all interested participants in the subsequent performance regardless of age (between 10-60) and how much of the workshop they were able to attend.

Performance

The performance was also attended by some 200 people on the bridge with around 50 staying for the performance in the hub space. This was in line with the capacity agreed with Humberside fire officer John Broadley, who attended with his family, later emailing us “Just a quick email to say how I enjoyed the performance on Sunday. I took a few photos and wondered if you might like them ….”. The success of the performance was undoubtedly enhanced by the glorious sunshine on the first really warm day of the year.

Installation

The installation was attended by 5435 people, vastly exceeding our original targets despite only opening at weekends. Comments left highlight the atmospheric use of sound and projection (“lost myself for a bit, wonderful”) as well as the opportunity to interact with the artwork (see below). Many combine these aspects: “Love it – total playfulness and a delightful place to make noises – the interplay that (sic) the film and music ranged from majestic to ethereal – adding my own voice and noise with drumming things was ace – well done”,”Enjoyed the use of space and sound, enabled you to play with your own sound. Great spaces for further installation”,”Informative and musical”. Others linked the experience to the wider success of the City of Culture: “Visiting City of Culture & blown away by “playing the Bridge” – a real city of culture experience, thank you. Hull is lovely too. Sian & Ian Todd, Bristol”, “ Absolutely Brilliant, Love Hull” .

**Challenges:**

Distinguishing the phases

The main challenge faced by audience members concerned the various phases of the project. There was confusion among a few who attended the installation for example, who were expecting a concert or a public workshop. This was partly down to the level of press coverage for the workshop weekend in the bridge which gave a false impression of what could be expected later in the project and also to the fact that the Hull 2017 website had one page covering all the activities in the project and these were hard to tell apart. For example the webpage said the installation was “sold out” on the last weekend despite not being ticketed.

Interaction in Installation

Partly in response to this situation the team tried to increase the audience participation aspect of the installation by incorporating the possibility of actively “playing the Bridge” during the installation as well as in the workshop phase. This proved popular among participants, eliciting a number of favorable comments in the visitor book such as: “Great innovative idea, got the boys participating in a piece of artwork” but was also felt, on busy days, to undermine the carefully constructed atmosphere of the soundscape. It would be possible to develop this in future but would require more training of volunteers to guide the visitors contributions.

Art and Information

The incorporation of spoken word in the soundscape was a challenge for some members of the installation audience as the acoustic of the space made it hard to understand the words. One comment simply said: “Couldn’t understand a word they said in there” (perhaps the only really negative remark in the comments book) This was anticipated but the decision was made to keep the voices of steel workers who worked on the bridge as they complemented the construction images and brought a human voice to the engineering aspect of the installation. The comment also relates to visitor expectations as a few visitors having been told at the door that the installation was “about” the bridge were expecting more of an information resource rather than an artwork. Comments such as: “Surreal experience, very interesting and informative. Great piece of history captured”, “Informative and musical”, “Brilliant installation, Industrial history as art.” and “Fascinating translation of experiences of residents and the city into a poetic exploration and new vision of a construction that defines the city” suggest that on the whole this balance was successfully struck.

1. **Online Engagement**

**How did your project impact upon your online presence?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL PAGE VIEWS** | **UNIQUE PAGE VEIWS** |
| Website views relating to project | **n/a** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **LIKES/FOLLOWERS AT START** | **LIKES/FOLLOWERS AT END** | **IMPRESSIONS ON POSTS RELATING TO THE PROJECT** | **ENGAGEMENTS WITH POSTS RELATING TO THE PROJECT** |
| Facebook | **0** | **85** | **9051** | **340** |
| Twitter |  |  |  |  |
| Instagram |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |

**DEFINITIONS**

* **Followers include:** Facebook Page Likes / Profile Friends; Twitter Followers; YouTube Subscribers; etc.
* **Impressions:** impressions (“views”) of Facebook posts linked to CCP project; impressions (“views”) of Twitter tweets linked to CCP project; views of YouTube videos linked to CCP project; etc.
* **Engagements:** Facebook posts, likes, shares, comments; Twitter tweets, retweets, likes; YouTube shares, comments; etc.

**In the boxes below, please share a selection of audience comments or quotes from social media made about your project. Please provide different examples to those in your Project Update Report:**

Such a lovely day [Playing The Bridge](https://www.facebook.com/PlayingTheBridge/?fref=mentions) yesterday!

 I was there I have had a go at playing this too... There today for the installation showing you the inside workings of the bridge.

 Wonderful!!!

[Playing The Bridge](https://www.facebook.com/PlayingTheBridge/?fref=mentions) - cool collaboration for [Hull UK City of Culture 2017](https://www.facebook.com/HullCityofCulture/?fref=mentions) Rich's photographs<https://loudhailer.net/2017/02/26/playing-the-bridge/>

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/34726901@N07/albums/72157681794696456>

1. **Partners**

**How many partners were involved with the project?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL BASED IN**  **HU1 – HU9** | **TOTAL BASED OUTSIDE**  **HU1 – HU9** |
| **PARTNER TYPE** | | |
| Artistic partner (e.g. theatre, art gallery, music venue) | 1 |  |
| Heritage partner (e.g. museum, archive) |  |  |
| Funder (e.g. Arts Council England, business, private trust) |  |  |
| Public Sector partner (e.g. libraries, GPs) |  |  |
| Voluntary sector partner (e.g. community group, charity) |  |  |
| Education (e.g. school, college, university) | 2 |  |
| Other |  |  |
| **PARTNERSHIP STAGE** | | |
| Number of new partnerships established via this project |  |  |
| Number of existing partners involved in this project |  |  |

**Thinking about your project as a whole, what would you say have been the main successes and challenges for your partners:**  
**This can include formal and informal feedback given to you by staff and / or your own observations. You can use notes or minutes from partner meetings; informal conversations; emails; etc. to inform this.**

**Successes:**

Raising awareness of the bridge and the space

The project served to raise awareness of the Scale Lane Bridge as an important local landmark. Having also featured in Spencer Tunnick’s Hull photograph it is hoped that the idea of the bridge as a venue for performance, art and community activity has been planted in the minds of Hull residents. A number of comments have focused on the potential space itself: “Great to see this space being utilized”, “What a fantastic space! Would love to see it used as a theatre space…”

Raising awareness of gamelan in Hull

The Hull music service’s Gamelan housed at the Albermarle is an important resource, providing unique workshop opportunities for the community. Gamelan is known for its accessibility and ability to enable ensemble music making to those with no prior experience. It is widely used in prisons, schools and colleges. The project served to raise awareness of the existence of this resource in Hull and many workshop participants have expressed the desire for more activities.

Performance opportunities

For the York University performing groups the project provided exposure as part of the City of Culture project, raising their profile and their reach in the north of England as well as providing an opportunity to work with a composer on new work and perform in a unique setting.

Recording experience and research

As well as gaining experience of recording in an unusual environment, the team from Hull University Media School were able to further their research into 3D sound spatialization by recording impulse responses of the hub space, capturing the acoustic for research and composition.

**Challenges:**

Recruitment

Recruitment for the gamelan workshops was gradual and built as the project developed, so a lot of ground needed to be covered repeatedly. While this was a challenge it was also satisfying to see the people joining the group from across the project, including one Volunteer from the bridge workshops, one drop-in participant and a number of Hull media students.

Unforeseen timetable clashes

The involvement of students in the project brought up a some timetabling issues with clashes with other events on planned bridge workshop days. This was dealt with by splitting the workshop into two distinct phases, one to devise the concert work and one to focus on recording.