

**Open Society Institute
Arts and Culture Network Program**

Assessment/mapping of activities of the Soros Centers for Contemporary Arts

Budapest, May 6, 2002

Content

I. Introduction	2
II. SCCAs History	3
III Summary of findings	8
1. SCCAs impact on the status of contemporary art and culture	9
2. Influence on public policy in the area of arts and culture	10
3. Additional value the centers add to the society	11
4. Perception of quality of the centers programs	11
5. Reputation and level of visibility	12
6. Relations between the centers and national Soros Foundations	13
7. Relations with the Arts and Culture Network Program	15
8. Organizational structure and management	16
9. Level of sustainability and fundraising efforts	16
10. Areas for improvement	18
11. Future Scenarios	20
IV. Conclusions	20
V. Attachments	23

1. Introduction

Following the decision of its Sub-board, in November 2001, the Network Arts and Culture Program commissioned the assessment of the 19¹ former Soros Centers of Contemporary Arts (SCCAs) with the following objectives:

- To map and evaluate current performance of these centers with the focus on relations with the national Soros foundations, quality of programs, their sustainability and public visibility.
- To identify feasibility of further support of these centers.

Key questions raised by the OSI Board and Arts and Culture Network Program Sub-board

- How former SCCAs contribute to the development of open society values?
- Do they have any influence in the process of building open societies, and if yes, in what ways?
- What models of relations exist between the national foundations and SCCAs? How these links should evolve in the future?
- What common problems are the SCCAs facing? What is their future SCCAs? What could be suggested?

Assessment scope

- Contribution to the promotion of open society values and impact on cultural policies
- Relations between the SCCAs and national Soros Foundations
- Quality of current programs and projects of former SCCAs
- Degree of their financial sustainability
- Reputation and level of visibility of SCCAs in their respective countries

Time span

From the time of each center's establishment till the end of 2001. Particular focus was on the centers' activities after becoming an independent institution..

Data sources

The data sources and data gathering methods outlined below, were preliminary determined by the Arts and Culture Sub-board²:

¹Polish SCCA was closed in 1994. Some of its activities connected with international cooperation were first included into national foundation cultural program and then moved to public cultural institution with a grant that expired in 2000.

² Due to its predetermined framework, the assessment utilized rather limited sources of data and information. For instance, centers' clients/beneficiaries, partners, other donors were not involved in the assessment. Such methods of data gathering as survey, observation, and focus groups were not utilized. Also, project of such scale would definitely need more manpower. The objectivity of opinion of independent experts can also be questioned since some of the experts had received financial or other kind of support from the centers.

- Self-assessment by an SCCA Director: Questionnaire and follow up interviews
- Assessment by a national Soros foundation Executive Director (NF ED): Questionnaire
- Assessment by an independent expert: Questionnaire
- Semi-structured interviews with SCCAs Directors
- Some documents e.g. business plans, strategic plans, etc.

Current assessment is the first systemic effort to gain a better understanding of the past contribution, current status, and issues for the future of the former SCCAs. 19 out of 20³ centers were assessed and a lot valuable and comprehensive information was collected. All the questionnaires are compiled into a two-volume binder and these materials are already appreciated as the most comprehensive and organized source of information on the centers' activities.

II. SCCAs' history

Currently, there are 19 former SCCAs operating in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Kazakhstan. The oldest of them is the Hungarian center C³, the successor of the Soros Foundation Fine Arts Documentation Center founded in 1985. From the end of 1991 until 1999, 18 additional SCCAs were opened in 17 Central and Eastern European countries, with goals and activities similar to the Budapest SCCA: to promote, develop and support contemporary art.

The SCCAs were part of the OSI's network and acted as open arts centers that collected and disseminated information on contemporary arts and artists, international grants, scholarships, arts programs, competitions, exhibitions and other events. They also offered the visual arts community a library of exhibition catalogues of local artists' work and a collection of contemporary arts publications. Most SCCAs organized annual exhibitions of local contemporary art and offered grants for artists.

In 1999 and 2000, following the restructuring of the Soros Foundations, all Soros Centers for Contemporary Arts started a spun-off process and were transformed into independent NGOs or like in case of Lithuania and Poland, were transferred to the public institutions. The centers were required to present business plans, which would take into account diminishing financial support from the national Soros foundations. It was envisaged that by 2003 the centers would become self-sustainable.

3

?

Mainly for fundraising and communication purposes, the new NGOs formed the association ICAN (International Contemporary Art Network) based in Amsterdam. ICAN's mission is to be an open platform for cross-cultural exchange and collaboration in the field of contemporary art, involving artists, critics, curators and other art professionals and institutions from Central and Eastern Europe⁴.

The association pursues the following objectives:

- to foster the exchange of information both among ICAN members and internationally
- to actively participate in the international contemporary art discourse
- to promote contemporary art from the CEE region
- to provide professional advocacy for ICAN members and utilize the joint strength of the network in influencing local and international cultural policy

The association is governed by the Board elected by the members.

The annual ICAN meeting in December 2001 demonstrated that the centers are very motivated to work together and have already some very good examples of regional projects that have been initiated with the help of ICAN. The association has a very well designed and run web-site which facilitates the communication and knowledge exchange. At the same time, the meeting revealed that the centers are still not very much clear about the potential of the association and some important questions were raised. Admittedly, the meeting demonstrated that most of centers take their participation in the association very seriously. They also value and protect its independent nature. As the centers will learn how to manage the association to their, other members, and broader audience benefit, we will see more funds being raised through this organization and more common projects.

Since 1999, all the centers have gone through the change process which included spinning-off and registration of an independent NGO, change in the scope of activities, significant reduction of national foundation funding, staff reduction, etc. From being a well-funded program with secure budget and operations, the centers have to turn into independent sustainable institutions. Most importantly, the centers are now facing a new reality – market environment and its rules.

Although conceived according to the same model, the centers vary greatly by the size of operating budgets and number of staff. The centers that operate with the largest budgets are in Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Russia-St. Petersburg,. The are followed by the centers in Slovakia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Romania, Slovenia. The smallest budgets are in Ukraine-Odessa, Lithuania, and Moldova.

⁴ Source: <http://www.ican.artnet.org/ican/>

In terms of staff, the largest number of full-time employees are in Hungary and Russia- St. Petersburg. Most of the centers have between from 2 to 6 full-time staff. Many centers use part-time or contract staff, as well as volunteers. The centers that did not report the use of volunteers are in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia.

Table 1: Annual operating budget in 2001 and # of staff

Country	Annual operating budget in 2001	# of full time staff	# of part time staff	# of volunteers
Bosnia and Herzegovina	264,514	4	N/a	N/a
Bulgaria	531,553	6	4	-
Croatia	107,000	2	1	varies
Czech Republic	170,448	6 ⁵	4	3
Estonia	495,327 ⁶	3	2	-
Hungary	430,000	15	10	2
Kazakhstan	109,497	5	3	10
Latvia	490,000	3	3	-
Lithuania	51,089	3	-	-
Macedonia	102,845	4	1	2
Moldova	62,260	4	7	10
Romania	177,630	3	4 ⁷	4
Russia-Moscow	138,200	4	3	3
Russia-St. Petersburg	450,000	16	5-10	10-20
Slovakia	281,400	3	4	2-3
Slovenia	179,291	2	3 ⁸	-
Ukraine-Kyiv ⁹	75,000	3	19	6
Ukraine-Odessa	40,000	20 ¹⁰	10	70
Yugoslavia	76,700	4	5	50

It is more difficult to cluster the centers by the type of programs and services. Due to the initial concept, level of expertise, and existing needs, the centers run more or less similar type of programs: art production support (workshops, exchange programs, access to technical and information resources, small grants, etc.), exhibitions, documentation and archiving, information dissemination, and education. The prevailing tendency is to reduce or shut the grant-giving programs and to run own programs and services.

Table 2: Core programs

Country	Core programs
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Creating of up-to-date documentation-information center, providing information services and promoting international art in Bosnia and Herzegovina Connecting artists from Bosnia and Herzegovina with the artists in diaspora, and former

⁵ Includes 3 civil service workers

⁶ Includes 132,588 from OSI Arts and Culture Network Program

⁷ There are also eight regular collaborators who work on a contract basis.

⁸ The Director and two program co-ordinators are compensated on a honorarium basis.

⁹ This number does not include some of the costs that were covered by Center's donors. Annual budget including the value of costs covered by the donors is reported as \$ 239,654.

¹⁰ This number is misleading and needs further clarification.

	Yugoslavia Support of production Educational projects
Bulgaria	Support for innovative forms of art Training, expertise, and information dissemination Bringing arts and culture to marginalized groups Stimulation of debates
Croatia	Exhibition Workshop Symposium Side Events
Czech Republic	Residency program for international artists Exhibitions Public art projects Archives, communication Grants Collection of contemporary art
Estonia	Information center Exhibition program Publication and art research OSI Arts and Culture Network Program
Hungary	Production and dissemination of electronic media arts and culture Web content development Research and development Technological innovations Net access and content development for /about NGOs International networking and exchange C3 Lab Grant and artist-in-residency program
Kazakhstan	Access to information Cultural events Educational programs Multimedia Center International activities
Latvia	Database, information, archives, library Exhibitions, projects Museum of Contemporary Art – concept, development Culture policy
Lithuania	Collection and dissemination of information on Lithuanian contemporary art Curating and managing contemporary art projects International collaboration Concept of modern art museum in Vilnius
Macedonia	National and international exhibitions Skopje Electronic Art Festival Internet database support for Macedonian art institutions Symposia, seminars, etc Special programs on social and cultural issues Programs for special social groups
Moldova	Exhibitions, symposia, festivals Web-site, archives Information and education Video production Publications Small grants for artists
Romania	Contemporary art database Production of catalogs, art magazines, videotapes, CD-ROMs, etc on Romanian

	contemporary art Organizing and financing cultural projects Organizing and financing educational programs for university and post-graduate levels Participating in international cultural programs/events
Russia-Moscow	Post-graduate program for artists and art dealers Contemporary arts archives Videotaping and dissemination of art events “Moscow Discussion Art Club”
Russia-St. Petersburg	Educational programs in visual arts, music and dance of the 20 th century Collaboration projects with museums Grant competitions for visual artists, museums, and music professionals Concerts, workshops for artists, festivals
Slovakia	Educational and training programs Grant programs Documentation and information Exhibition activities Network programs
Slovenia	Annual 8-months curatorial course, workshops, and public lectures Internet-based information service Research, documentation, and study archives development of video art in Slovenia Cultural Link, Cultural Policy, Bridge of Understanding & Arts Link
Ukraine-Kyiv	Exhibitions and presentation of contemporary art Development of contemporary art resource base Resource support for independent projects/researchers Educational activities
Ukraine-Odessa	Exhibitions Documentation and archives Education Publishing
Yugoslavia	Exhibitions and cultural exchange Education and documentation Media and publishing Design and multimedia studio

According to the economic, political, and social factors in their environment, the centers can be grouped in the following way:

Category	Country
Accession countries	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia
Stability Pact countries	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Yugoslavia
Unstable democracy countries	Ukraine, Russia, Moldova, Kazakhstan

In general, the SCCAs started their activities in more or less the same conditions in terms of politics, economy, and the status of arts and culture. Now, when the post-soviet countries have gone different distances on the way to market economy and democratic transformation, the situation in Kazakhstan, for instance, cannot be even closely compared with the situation in Estonia. The ED of the Kazakhstan center describes the situation as very hard: “... the third sector in art is not exists, the market sector has very low level, the quantity of contemporary intellectuals are very small, changes are going slowly. And regarding feedback of our programs: the strong side of soviet

mentality – not analytical approach to the any directions: if government erect the monument – it's art, if newspaper said that contemporary art is bad or good – it's the same as well. But we can't provoke the public discussions now, because without money we are depend just opinion of society, its means – from the Board of Soros Foundation. There are no other donors in Kazakhstan.

The conditions of the external environment push some centers to address not only the issues of contemporary art, but also societal problems. This is reflected in the activities of the centers in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, and Yugoslavia. These centers bring the art to marginilized groups, initiate and lead socially important discussions, etc.

In some countries, where the governments became more progressive and open, the centers seized quite good opportunities for co-operation and influence on public policy, e.g. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia, Croatia, Romania, Russia, Czech Republic, and Yugoslavia. The centers in Ukraine, Slovenia, and Kazakhstan report difficulties in establishing co-operation relationships with the Ministries of Culture.

III. Summary of findings

The results of the assessment consistently show that the centers accomplished several significant achievements in the professional area of contemporary art and in managing and developing themselves as institutions. In addition to their significant contribution to the areas of contemporary, the centers also succeeded in:

- Becoming more independent and financially sustainable institutions
- Keeping the high quality of programs during the changes
- Devoting time, and financial and human resources to fundraising activities
- Diversifying activities, channels of communication, and funder base
- Prioritizing the activities and keeping major activities viable
- Establishing partnerships with other institutions
- Providing a partnership model: NGO, business, local and central governments

1. SCCAs' impact on the status of contemporary art and culture

At first stages, the environment in which the centers operated was characterized by practically total absence of infrastructure for contemporary art, limited professional information, total collapse of the state centralized funding, and either unawareness or hostile attitude towards everything nonconformist and different. Therefore, the centers first aimed to *create, preserve, develop, and promote* the content of contemporary art both locally and internationally. This activity was reflected in their mission and the types of activities. Projects common to all SCCAs at that time: documentation, annual exhibitions, publishing, collaborative projects within the OSI network. In most cases, the centers were the only institutions providing support to contemporary art.

Most of the experts and NF EDs acknowledged that the center's impact on the status of contemporary art in their countries was quite significant. The respondents mentioned, for instance, that the center helped in "strengthening the independent position of contemporary art", "changing the paradigm of contemporary art during the first post-revolutionary years", "promoting ideas about an open, flexible, innovative, and heterogeneous culture". Some centers were defined by the experts as "an irritator and stimulator of search", "islands of open society", or "the best reputed and the most influential institution in the country aimed at supporting contemporary art".

The following main achievements were mentioned by the respondents:

- Presentation and support of the newest tendencies in contemporary art
- Growth of the interest towards contemporary arts¹¹
- Contemporary art has acquired a legitimate status (Kazakhstan, Bulgaria)
- Art speaks about social themes
- Significant exhibitions and events: e.g. "Contemporary Utopia" Latvia, MAGNUM, "The butterfly effect", "Orbis fictus", etc
- Unique educational programs
- Cooperation of intellectuals from different countries, regions, and cities
- Significant publication e.g. "The Anthology of the Artistic Mind in the second half of the XX century" (Moscow)
- Analytical research projects e.g. "Manifest in our Background" (Slovenia)
- Established links between national and international artists
- Promotion of a new model of a non-profit organization, based on volunteers' activities

¹¹ The center in Kiyv reported, for instance, a 400% growth in the number of audience for the last two years.

In Ukraine, the Executive Director of the national foundation believes that “ the Center changed the general public’s attitude to contemporary art that was previously seen as "outsider", strange and non-understandable. At the same time, it also made government officials recognize contemporary art as a part of modern Ukrainian culture. The Executive Director of the national foundation in Bosnia and Herzegovina believes that “the main contribution of Sarajevo SCCA was/is that it managed to “give back” Sarajevo to its artists-citizens...In “appropriating” again their own city that artists finally felt as citizens”. In Kazakhstan, in 1998-1999, the titles of the articles about the center’s activity were: “Where is the end of a naked ass and the beginning of art?”, “ Satanic supper during Easter”, “Sewerage system of Soros Foundation-Kazakhstan”. The titles of 200-2001 are of a different character: “For love you need to see”, “Art is closer and closer to the people”, “Dialog with art”, “Don’t afraid of Soros who bring you the gifts”.

Almost 80% of the centers were marked by the respondents as having some unique elements, e.g.:

- The only organization providing professional support to the contemporary art
- Unique resources available for artists
- Impact on cultural policy
- Role model to other NGOs
- The most professional staff
- Open place for an exchange of opinions

2. Influences on public policy in the area of arts and culture

The centers that were reported by both experts and NF Eds to influence the public policy are in the following countries: Bosnia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Yugoslavia. They achieved it by:

- Creating public awareness of the contemporary art
- Stirring professional and in some cases public debate
- Helping the emergence of other similar NGOs
- Providing leadership role in tackling the art issues
- Challenging or aligning with governments

Weaker influence can be inferred from the answers regarding the centers Moldova, Ukraine-Odessa (it is a regional center). In Bulgarian case, the respondents marked that the center did not provide enough influence on the public policy.

Analyzing the role of the centers in public policy making, one should probably consider the complexity of this process. Policy-related activity ranges from creating cases for support, public awareness building,

advocacy, policy analysis, and policy advice. And in order to make a change, all these aspects should be covered. Also, without professional reputation, policy-making skills, participation and support of other players, and at least some openness and willingness of the government, it is hard to attain any significant influence on policy. What **all** the centers demonstrate to have achieved so far, is a high level of professionalism, strong presence in the field of arts, better relationships with other organizations, and better awareness of the public about contemporary art.

3. Additional value the centers add to the society

For a long time, the centers believed that by supporting the artists and their work that challenges existing dogma and totalitarian thinking, they would thus contribute to the democratization of their societies. When asked about any additional value that the centers contribute to the society, the most of the respondents indicated the contribution to the culture. It probably indicates that development of arts and culture is perceived as the main mission of the centers. The exceptions are Bosnia and Macedonia where the respondents particularly underscored the role of the centers in tackling broader societal problems.

However, out of 19 centers, 12 reported that they have changed their mission in the course of time. At the same time, only the mission statements of the centers in Bulgaria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Kazakhstan, Poland, and Ukraine –Kyiv reflect the pursuit of something more than just the development and popularization of the art: e.g. “new models of cooperation among stakeholders”, “benefit to the society”, “social impact of art”, “idea of tolerance”, resistance to xenophobia”. Some centers even if reported changes, still have mission statements that are focussed almost exclusively on art: Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Russia – St. Petersburg, Slovakia, Ukraine-Odessa, Yugoslavia. For example, the center in Hungary strikes first of all as a high tech laboratory for experimental art. In case of Latvia and Lithuania, the centers see their ultimate goal in creating a museum of contemporary arts.

4. Perception of quality of the centers’ programs/services

The assessment shows that the quality of the centers’ activities is considered as from being good to excellent. The experts and the NF EDs rated the quality of the centers’ activities in the following way:

Low	Satisfactory	Good	Very good	Excellent
Ukraine-Odessa (with previous director)		Kazakhstan Moldova Romania Russia-St. Petersburg Russia-Moscow Slovakia Ukraine-Kyiv ¹²	Hungary Croatia Slovenia Yugoslavia Estonia	Bosnia Bulgaria Czech Republic Latvia Macedonia

Another indicator of the high level of centers' activities is the recognition by the partners, media, artistic community in other countries. Grants from such donors as Ford Foundation, Pro Helvetia Foundation, KulturKontakt, The European Commission, embassies, etc. are another proof of the centers' professionalism.

Rewards, prizes at different festivals, invitations to participate in international exhibitions also argue for high quality of centers' activities. For example, due to its curatorial program World of Art the Slovenian center was invited to become a founding member of the Network of Non-Formal education based in Vienna and Belgrade, awards from different professional associations.

High quality of the centers' activities can be explained by the importance the centers pay to the quality planning and measuring. The following factors help the centers to achieve this:

- Careful selection and planning of projects
- Involvement of experts into planning
- Knowledge and deep understanding of economic and political situation, current and emerging needs
- Seeking feedback from beneficiaries, partners, and experts: evaluation forms for some programs, surveys, expert opinion, case studies, monitoring media coverage, monitoring the number of visitors, feedback sheets, etc.
- Development of quantitative and qualitative indicators
- Strategic planning

Some of the best practices in quality monitoring: Yugoslavia, Kiev, Moscow, St.Petersburg, Romania, Hungary, and Slovenia. These centers developed systems for monitoring participation in their events, use of their web-sites, media coverage, etc.

5. Reputation and level of visibility

The assessment shows that **all** the centers developed a significant level of influence and visibility in their countries. The lists of partners are very lengthy and include not only artistic circles, but also municipalities, governmental institutions, universities, NGOs, international organizations, other donors. As mentioned earlier, some centers developed very strong relationships with governments and their expertise is used for policy development.

¹² Ukraine-Kyiv was ranked as “satisfactory +” or “good –“ with a comment: “All exhibition programs undertaken in the Center are designed professionally, although it is difficult to state the same regarding its activities connected with the projects aimed at art community development/consolidation actions.”

Earlier, the centers were sometimes criticized as being not transparent and serving only a narrow group of beneficiaries. To identify the level of centers' openness, the experts were asked if the centers can be defined as "closed clubs for closed friends" or "open spaces for interested people". The results in the table below demonstrate that this criticism is not applicable today:

A closed club for close friends	An open place for interested people
Ukraine-Kyiv ¹³ , Moldova, Ukraine-Odessa	Bosnia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Macedonia, Romania, Russia-Moscow, Russia-St. Petersburg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Latvia

Experts and NF EDs in the following countries mentioned that general public is quite aware of the activities of the center: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Macedonia, Russia-St. Petersburg, Ukraine-Kyiv, Slovenia, and Yugoslavia.

All the centers are reported to undertake significant efforts to publicize themselves. They do it through own and ICAN's web-sites, newsletters, media presentations, press-conferences, screening parties, information booklets, mailing lists. All the information and PR materials are very creative and can compete with the products of business sector. However, not all the centers have formal PR plans and use most effective tools to publicize themselves strategically. The good news is that the centers recognize the importance of public image and visibility for success.

6. Relations between the centers and National Soros Foundations

After becoming independent, most centers continue productive partnership relations with national Soros foundations. The following table reflects the nature of cooperation between the center and foundation:

Country	Nature of co-operation	Level of dependency
Bosnia and Herzegovina	The center is treated as any other NGO and may apply for grants	Gets financial support as a spin-off for different projects. 50% of its budget in 2001. Increasingly fundraising network.
Bulgaria	Discussion about future strategy and potential areas of cooperation beyond financing.	60-70% in 2001

¹³ Expert's comment: I would call it "a SEMI-closed club for VERY close friends", or an "in-crowd" (it is noticeable that the Center's website does not even boast a Ukrainian version, and, thus, is by definition meant for the very limited access only). The circle of artists united around the Center is narrow enough and does not exhaust even the most interesting artistic figures working outside Kiev; neither proved the Center to be efficient in providing the artistic community with the information on "what's going on" in contemporary art around the country (the latter, especially under the total lack of special journals in the field, could not be regarded otherwise but a serious limitation). -NF ED

Croatia	No co-operation	
Czech Republic	Grantee, the center cooperates in many different projects of the OSF Prague	Dependent to limited extent towards the core bud
Estonia	The Center administers the Cultural Links program for the foundation	Not dependent at all
Hungary	Contacts, information exchange, references, joint projects and informal relationships. Foundation will finish to provide core funding after 2002.	
Kazakhstan		Dependent
Latvia	NF is one of the three founders and the major founder. Foundation also provides rent-free office space.	Very dependent. NF provided 75,000USD in 200
Lithuania	N/a	
Macedonia	Applies for grants. Reports on all the grants from other donors. The center was very successful in applying External Match Fund for its new activities.	Still dependent, especially in financing its admini
Moldova	Foundation approves the Center's plan of activity, decides on funding, and monitors its current activity	Fully
Romania	The Center sends sporadic information out its activities, seems reluctant to build partnerships projects.	Not very dependent. Manages to identify addition
Russia - Moscow	The Center is a grantee	Still not very6 much dependent
Russia- St. Petersburg	Partner organization of the NF	By now not very much dependent. A larger part o other sources.
Slovakia	Close cooperation in strategic issues and some program areas.	High
Slovenia	N/a	N/a
Ukraine - Kyiv	Gets funding for administrative expenses and partly for program activities. Center's satellites are more financially independent	Depends a lot on the money from the foundation. Due to its status Center cannot tun any income-ge
Ukraine - Odessa	Funding	High
Yugoslavia	Close ties with NF and OSI. Receives grants. The relationship is sustainable and mutually beneficial.	May survive without NF support, but its program

Level of financial dependency on the foundations as reported by the NF EDs can be established as the following:

Independent	Low	Medium	High
Estonia, Slovevia (no foundation)	Romania (not very dependent)	Bosnia, Russia- St. Petersburg, Yugoslavia	Bulgaria, Czech Republic (core budget), Hungary Kazakhstan, Latvia (especially core), Macedonia, Moldova, Russia-Moscow, Slovakia, Ukraine-Kyiv.

Many foundations still mark a rather high level of centers' financial and organizational dependency on the foundations. In some cases, e.g Bulgaria, Slovakia, Estonia the foundation outsourced to the center its Arts and Culture programs.

Since 1999, all national foundations significantly reduced the level of financial support to the centers. In some cases, in-kind support e.g. rent-free office space, Internet connection, etc. is still significant. In other cases, foundations are major founders of centers e.g. Bulgaria, Moldova, Slovakia, Macedonia, Kazakhstan, and they are expected to provide support.

Out of 17 assessments of the NF Eds only three indicated varying degree of dissatisfaction with the activity of the Directors of the centers: Bulgaria, Moldova, Ukraine-Kyiv. In case of Bulgaria the NF ED feels that the center's director is not suited for the emerging mission to work in the area of public policy. In case of Moldova, the NFED does not believe in managerial and leadership capabilities of the centers director. The director of Ukrainian center in Kyiv is perceived as a high professional and democratic figure, but the NF ED believes that he should be more strategic and diplomatic. In Czech republic, the expert suggested that the center's director should be involved in public debate and be more active player in public arena. However, the majority of the assessors view the centers' directors as very committed, professional, and quite successful: Bosnia, St. Petersburg, Latvia, Croatia, Estonia, etc._

7. Relations with the Arts and Culture Network Program

Out of 19 centers, five serve as national operators of A&CNP and their employees serve as network program operators: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Slovenia and Slovakia.

From this group, the role of Estonian CCA and Slovenian SCCA should be emphasized. In 2000 and 2001, they collected from local organizers and submitted to A&CNP competitions the greatest number of projects that were later awarded, in comparison to the countries' population. Additionally, Estonian coordinator Anu Kivilo has participated in the work of Assessment Team (advisory body that evaluates projects in Cultural Link competitions) for more than two years, now. Latvian CCA is also a reliable partner of the network program.

Lower quality of operation of Bulgarian SCCAs can be explained by the difficult status of this organization during last two years caused by bad relationship with OSI-Bulgaria.

Slovakia's participation in the network program is less active in general compared to other countries. Low quality of Slovakian projects submitted to our competitions reflects the status of local cultural organizations. However, the communication between coordinator and network program manager is very good.

Most of former SCCAs participate in A&CNP events and in competitions by submitting their own projects. Staff of former SCCAs is well trained and involved in the intellectual exchange on international art market. It results in fact that projects prepared and submitted to Cultural Link competitions by employees of former

SCCAs are of best quality and very professional. In total, 26 projects submitted by SCCAs were awarded in the past two years. This number could be higher but Sub Board decided to stop supporting SCCAs' projects in Cultural Policy competitions until the evaluation of their activity is complete.

Some SCCAs have recently become partners of our new program Looking Inside and declared to take up the duty of being hosts for interns from the region (SCCA Skopje, SCCA Kyiv).

8. Organizational structure and management

In most cases, Centers have flexible structures with an enthusiastic staff of 2-6 persons where everyone does everything (exceptions with much higher number of full-time and part-time personnel are Hungary, Russia-St.Petersburg, and Ukraine-Odessa). Most of Centers' directors are reported to be good and recognized professionals, dynamic and well-known public figures. The respondents mark the centers' staff as very professional, motivated, and enthusiastic.

All the centers have a supervisory or/and an expert board, and involve the board members into planning of the activities, evaluation, and fundraising. However, the assessment shows that not all the centers are utilizing the potential of their boards, especially in strategic planning and fundraising.

9. Level of sustainability and fundraising efforts

Since 1999, all the centers undertook significant efforts in fundraising. It was not an easy task since there were only few donors supporting art, the centers were perceived as rich institutions and rather a donor themselves. Additionally, successful fundraising required its staff and directors a shift in thinking and behavior. In 2001, there was no a single center that would not have attracted funding from additional sources. The most significant results are achieved by the centers in Bosnia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Russia-St.Petersburg, Ukraine-Kyiv, Yugoslavia. Sometimes, the centers receive very significant support as in-kind donations or direct coverage of the center's expenses, e.g. Macedonia, Kyiv-Ukraine.

NF's assessment of the current sustainability of the centers :

Has not become sustainable, and has very little chances for survival	Moldova
Has not become sustainable, but has a big potential	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia

	Russia-Moscow
Has become a sustainable organization so far, but may lose its effectiveness in the future	Bosnia and Herzegovina ¹⁴ , Kazakhstan, Latvia ¹⁵ , Romania, Ukraine
Has become a sustainable organization, and will most likely succeed in the future	Estonia, Russia-St. Petersburg, Slovakia ¹⁶ , Slovenia, Yugoslavia ¹⁷

In some cases the fundraising efforts of the centers are undermined by a very unfavorable situation with giving for arts and also by legal restrictions. In Ukraine, for example, the law forbids NGOs to undertake any income-generating activity. The governments in many countries are still passive and are not willing or able to invest in contemporary art: Kazakhstan, Romania, Ukraine, Macedonia, Bulgaria. However, most of the foundations are finding ways to cooperate with central and local governments and get significant support: Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland. Czech center, for example, received an unprecedented endowment of \$500,000 from the government. Hungarian center found good cooperation model with the major telecom company. Sponsorship for contemporary arts is still non-existing practice in most of the cases.

Most centers have become skillful in attracting funds from other donors: foreign governments, foreign private foundations, even from their own governments. A good example is Pro Arte, St.Petersburg, attracting sustainable funding from the Ford foundation. The next step for all SCCAs would be to learn how to fundraise from businesses and how to increase their self-generated incomes, but for this they need more entrepreneurship thinking and marketing skills. It is certainly difficult for all SCCAs to generate matching funds for their operational budgets. This is also the area where the OSI could offer some capacity building support.

10. Areas for improvement

In the assessment, the centers were asked to identify the areas where they feel they did not meet their goals.

The respondents mentioned the following goals that were not met:

- To raise artists's social awareness
- Better administrative and managerial efficiency
- Time management
- Lack of office space
- Bridging the gap in educational activities

¹⁴ "Their position is fragile and very much depends on the environment on which the center does not have influence"

¹⁵ "It is sustainable so far as it is able to receive co-financing from its founders. Given the fact that one founder has not met its core financing obligation, the situation may have negative impact in the future"

¹⁶ This comment contradicts high level of funding national foundation

¹⁷ "It is organizationally sustainable, but not yet fully financially sustainable."

- Financial sustainability
- Becoming a meeting point of the art community
- More productive cooperation with the universities
- Long term cooperation with the ministry of culture
- Level of funding

The experts' suggestions regarding the improvement of the centers work ranged from “ nothing, just endure current performance” (Latvia) to “... in this case it is quite hopeless situation, seems the only way is to change administrative team. This team has no good energy and spirit, no intuition and desire to find interesting individuals and projects, they are closed on themselves but have certain power, what create unhealthy impact on the whole Odessa art community” (Ukraine-Odessa). Other suggestions: to increase the number of artists to work with, to enhance the promotion of own activities; to actively involve in the cultural life of the country. Several times the experts repeat the following suggestions: to get closer to the communities, to be more open and transparent towards outside environment, to improve their strategies, to involve board members more actively (especially in fundraising activities), to become better managers, etc. The centers themselves identified the following areas than need to be addressed:

- Market orientation,
- Organization of volunteers work
- Develop “ownership” attitude of the staff
- Use of volunteers
- Membership services
- Fundraising, involvement of the Board
- Human resources management
- PR management
- Marketing of products

Overall patterns in the answers reflect the need for the following improvements in the centers' activity: (Answering of the question “how the following things should be done” is missing)

- Impact on the status of contemporary art and culture:
 - Reach/involve broader audiences
 - Move activities to the regions/peripheries
 - Involve more artists
 - Become more visible and transparent

- Further improve the quality of the activities/services by undertaking new initiatives and becoming more “cross-cultural” rather than concentrated only on visual arts, media arts and publishing.
- Playing the role of “mediators”, “meeting points” between contemporary artists, audiences, politicians, business circles, rather than only promoting contemporary art
- Influence on public policy and transformations in the society:
 - Better and more efficient co-operation with (or involvement of) the state and regional public authorities
 - Bigger practical role in cultural policy analysis and policy advice
 - Broader alliances and partnerships with other NGOs and media
 - Assess the possibilities and undertake more projects to voice public problems: e.g. minority rights, xenophobia, AIDS, ethnic conflicts, crime, etc.,
 - Nearer to every day life, closer contact with communities, not only with certain artistic circles.
- Sustainability:
 - More rigorous approach to marketing and business planning
 - Decrease dependency on the Soros foundations and OSI by utilization of a broader donor base
 - More active experimentation with income-generating activities, if permitted by the legislation
 - Better involvement of the boards in fundraising and advising
 - Involve more volunteers, especially among young people and students.
 - Receive practical assistance by the NFs and OSI when negotiating on funding with national and local authorities

11. Future scenarios

Thinking about the future of their organizations in 10 years from now, some centers would like to preserve their current status and just improve the results. Others, identifies the following scenarios for their centers:

- As an umbrella type of organization implementing own programs and providing support to others (Yugoslavia)
- A high quality University Art Center developing a well-educated audience (Ukraine-Kyiv)
- Become a contemporary multi-cultural center which ever existed before, with its own space (Slovenia)
- Different scenarios from closing to merging with a state institution (St.Petersburg)
- Become a Museum of Contemporary Art (Latvia and Lithuania)

- Develop into a foundation similar to Frame in Finland as the center for comprehensive information and activities (Estonia)

IV. Conclusions

The answers provided in the questionnaires, information from some additional documents and personal interviews allow to make a firm assumption that all the centers have made a significant, relevant to their funding, size, and context, contribution to the status of contemporary art in their countries. Most of them are viewed as professional, dedicated, and open institutions. All the centers accumulated very valuable collections of modern art, and informational, technical, and other resources. Some centers are becoming more influential and are accepted, recognized, and listened to by the public authorities in the area of culture. Most of the centers provide high quality services and set high standards for other similar organizations. In such countries as Bosnia, Kazakhstan, and Macedonia the centers are still the only institution that not only supports the contemporary art, but also tackle societal issues.

Based, on the overall picture of the assessment, it is possible to group the centers in the following way:



Attachment 1: Annual operating budgets in 1999-2003

Country	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 (Forecast)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/a	395,738	264,514	200,000	200,000
Bulgaria	954,075	716,867	716,867	250,000	200,000
Croatia	158,000	127,000	107,000	90,000	100,000
Czech Republic	323,545	296,114	170,448	204,000	79,000
Estonia	239,899	339,508	495, 327	314, 942	N/a
Hungary	690,000	480,000	430,000	420,000	420,000
Kazakhstan	144,485	154,178	109,497	100,000	80,000
Latvia	N/a	230,000	490,000	265,000	350,000
Lithuania	156,980	46,245	51,089	119,540	N/a
Macedonia	175,726	116,151	102,845	122,000	222,000 (with in-kind)
Moldova	N/a	78,520	62,260	75,000	90,000
Romania	187,373	195,000	177,630.00	150,000.00	150.000.00
Russia Moscow	N/a	40,000	138,200	86,000	155,000
Russia-St.Petersburg	150 000	350 000	450 000	400 000	375 000
Slovakia	587,000	334,800	281,400	247,200	725, 633
Slovenia	223,000	163,880	179,291*	276,840*	242,000
Ukraine-Kyiv	267,608	248,963	239,654	125,000	150,000
Ukraine-Odessa	100,000	85,000	40,000	50,000	50,000
Yugoslavia	N/a	88,755	76,700	96,700	85,063,

Attachment 2: NF financial support for the centers in 1999-2003

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Bosnia and Herzegovina	116,600	92,000	60,000	50,000	Under consideration
Bulgaria	642,200	515,000	506,718	393,385	0,00
Czech Republic	246,903	103,502	75,000	50,000	N/A
Estonia	100,00	100,000	12,000	12,000	N/A
Hungary	623,048	128,000	127,000	100,000	N/A
Kazakhstan	116,000	161,448	100,000	80,000	56,500
Latvia	100,000	100,000	75,000	75,000	50,000
Lithuania	94,980	27,960	25,273	26,000	N/A
Macedonia	138,907	80,000	78,555	30,000	N/A
Moldova	77,136	64,672	74,000	30,000	20,000
Romania	110,000	90,000	85,000	50,000	30,000
Russia Moscow	N/a	40,000	50,000	50,000	N/a
Russia-St. Petersburg	N/a	168,750	150,000	50,000	N/a
Slovakia	368,000	295,000	218,000	121,500	N/a
Ukraine Kyiv	175,000	100,000	104,527	37,500	0
Yugoslavia	208,000	44,000	42,000	32,000	12,000

Attachment 4: Center's impact on the status of contemporary art and possibly culture

Country	Foundation	Expert
Bosnia and Herzegovina	It is huge. SCCA establishes the effective communication with BH artists living abroad, as well as artists and related centers in the neighboring countries and those in the region. SCCA tries to identify, articulate, support and stimulate new phenomena and needs in the contemporary art.	Before the recent war Sarajevo had several public galleries, one museum and the Art Academy where very few artists having some real experience in contemporary art (such as conceptual art, video and performance) had teaching positions. Therefore, the biennial exhibition "Yugoslav Documenta" (1997 and 1998) was organized on the initiative of the Sarajevo artists themselves. With this show they wanted to really "bring" contemporary art to the city. Exclusively due to the program orientation of SCCA, contemporary art finally became an integral part of city culture and life.
Bulgaria	The Center played important role in introducing, establishing and securing the acceptance of a multitude of artistic and cultural forms.	In respect of the artists and the cultural organizations occupied in contemporary art, the Soros Center for the Arts has great merit. Its role through the years was rather important, at least in two directions. First, in the financial support of many artists and independent cultural organizations who have created the environment for development of the contemporary arts in Bulgaria. Second, in the moral support of the contemporary arts, the organization of a multitude of art forums and the attempts to legitimate the independent art stage (having in mind all the arts). From the point of view of the society and the state, though, the activity of the Center remained to a great extent misunderstood. One could say that the Center worked in isolation from the public institutions, led by its own mission and too weakly engaged with the promotion and defending of the cultural policy in which a place for the contemporary arts would be provided. Of course, when we discuss the public attitude, we should also keep in mind the specifics of the media situation in Bulgaria that does not allow sensible talking about arts and culture. By the way, this problem was identified by the Center and it was worked on in the framework of the program "New Publicity"
Croatia	In the second half of the nineties there was not a single important contemporary art exhibition/event that was not organized without their help. Their impact was and still is enormous	Strengthening of independent position of contemporary art and cultural opening towards different modes of existence and functioning of the "world of art".

Czech Republic	I think that the status of the Center in the post-totalitarian society has been unique: it contributes to promoting new ideas, approaches and international cooperation.	Undoubtedly, the Center played a significant role in changing the status and paradigm of contemporary art during the first post-revolutionary years. Although there exists now a number of other non-profit institutions focused on contemporary art (galleries, museums, art schools, foundations) operating in the Czech Republic and the Center has lost its privileged position of an “arbiter,” it still fundamentally contributes to promoting new, challenging ideas about art and culture, interdisciplinarity, and multiculturalism. It should be noted, though, that despite of this, the Center’s collaboration with other institutions and communication with people from other areas of culture (both academic and non-academic) inside of the country is still not fully explored and developed, which also limits its impact on the Czech culture in general.
Estonia	Enormous	In my opinion there has been a great impact, particularly because the art events organized by the Center have been initiating discussions among artists, art critics and wider audience. As a result, the status of contemporary art has certainly risen. As one of the results here can be mentioned one of the new activities of the Center: the biggest commercial bank of Estonia, the HANSAPANK, has choused the Center to be responsible for exhibitions in their gallery and supported by them
Hungary	C3 became an institution of reference in media art and a center of excellence of high quality	The center’s main impact is in high quality media art production and presentation. Further areas of impact: raising media awareness within and beyond the art scene; giving a professional status/reference for media art.
Kazakhstan	As an irritator and stimulator of a search	We have some official Museums calling Museums of Contemporary Art. But what we can see there? Traditional Fine Art by young artists. As I said before, Center provides experiments in Art, opening new names, provide help to young talents, educate them. Unfortunately our Government helps only tradition artists, nor advance-guard. Thanks to Center activities cultural life in Kazakhstan very often are exciting.

Latvia	Contemporary art in Latvia would be unimaginable without the Center – individual art galleries cannot fill this type of niche, while local and national cultural institutions are inherently too conservative to ensure vibrancy.	Significant. Many (the most of) developments in contemporary visual arts have been started and influenced by LCCA (SCCA). On all levels: artistic vision and concept of contemporary arts, organization wise, introducing new production models. Mainly because of their activities the field of contemporary visual arts has presently become so disperse with many different activities and projects taking place. In a way this has become the weakest point of LCCA at the moment: they do not manage to unify and be a co-ordinator comprising the whole field of contemporary visual arts. However I doubt it is possible because of the quality standards LCCA has set up. And also because of the fact the most important task of LCCA is the one of an organizer not passive information center. Thus LCCA becomes not only a service organization but also a competitor for many other players in the field of contemporary visual arts.
Lithuania	N/a	N/a
Macedonia	It proved that the margins in the arts could be more important than the institutionalized core. While the infrastructure of the official culture was in a collapse, CCA – Skopje is developing. It was/is the first achievement of the effort for creation new institutions, islands of the open society in Macedonia. I also have to say that CCA – Skopje found ways to overcome the isolation of the country establishing cooperation throughout the region and Europe. Even its Board is an international one, for example. ¹⁸	Generally speaking, I think that there's quite positive impact. However, in the evaluation of this impact it should be stressed I think that opinions are still mixed with the activity of the SCCA and its strong impact in the community in a slightly different period for the Macedonian art and culture (when there was completely disoriented cultural policy, considerable lack of financial support, almost non-existent management skills etc). Since the change of its structure, the Center has moved its focus to different goals and different kind of activities, which are not anymore dealing with basic levels, but rather with building more complex structures. For such structures I am sure that it takes longer period of time to feel the impact, than these three years since the Center's new position. Therefore, I find that the question of its impact is necessarily connected with the issue of survival of this kind of institutions in an environment that is not always very friendly with their independence from the political or local power.
Moldova	We can say about a larger interest and a better information of the artistic community as regards the contemporary art.	The main Center's impact on the status of Moldova's art and culture concerns the implementation of the new expression possibilities, often alternative ones, regarding the traditional visual art, taught for decades on Moldova's territory. The other aspect of this impact would be introducing of new untraditional values, of a new alternative esthetics and new well-known western publications but unknown in Moldova

¹⁸ This answer was provided for question about the most significant achievements of the center.

Romania	It promotes new trends of contemporary art and, in case of long-term, well-articulated activities, it determines new approaches on the contemporary issues. It plays an important role in keeping contemporary art phenomena as a topic on the cultural scene.	Positive. Some time essential, some time insignificant, but positive.
Russia-Moscow	In this particular aspect the impact of the Center is quite significant. It is due to the Center's activity that contemporary art has become an equal part on the Russian artistic scene not only in Moscow, but in many provincial cities as well, a number of contemporary art galleries appeared, contemporary art exhibitions in major art museums became a common event (unlike a decade ago), artistic community has become much more active and well-known. More general achievement – tolerant attitude to contemporary art in the society. Many new journals and books on contemporary art appeared in recent years.	The Art Projects is just in the beginning of its way. They are trying to do the best. The real impact of the Art Projects on the status of contemporary art in Russia depends on the creativity and managerial quality of the professional corporation they are trying to form now.
Russia-St.Petersburg	In this particular aspect the impact of the Center is quite significant. It is working a lot with big and small state museums propagating contemporary art as an important component requiring professional attention of art museums Public lectures on contemporary art arranged by the Centre together with the Russian Museum are of great social and cultural importance. It is due to the Centre's activity (as well as the SCAC in Moscow) that contemporary art has become an equal part on the Russian artistic scene not only in two capitals but in many provincial cities as well, a number of contemporary art galleries appeared, contemporary art exhibitions in major art museums became a common event (unlike a decade ago), artistic community has become much more active and well-known. More general achievement – tolerant attitude to contemporary art in the society.	The Pro Arte Institute proved not only the public but the local authorities as well that an institution of contemporary art might be active, even aggressive, open for the wide public and partnership. The Institute proved that the organization like this might heighten the public interest to the traditional cultural enterprise.
Slovakia	Strengthening "independent" thinking and alternative solutions. Bringing Slovak arts closer to the rest of the world	The main impact is on the part of artistic public and culture, which did comprehend the mission and way of working of the Centre.

Slovenia	I am constantly using the expression "arts and culture" (abbreviated in a/c) when writing this evaluation precisely because I want to stress that Center's activities are not limited only to artistic (or even fine arts) practices. Quite to the opposite, many Center's projects influence cultural policy in Slovenia, are open to multimedia and multicultural approaches, are in favor of critical thinking and are not orthodox in interpretation of (not only artistic but also) cultural phenomena.	Center strongly contributes to the more general awareness of contemporary art; it helps creating informed audiences and professionals; also, it is important for promoting ideas about an open, flexible, innovative, and heterogeneous culture
Ukraine-Kyiv	The Center changed the general public's attitude to contemporary art that was previously seen as "outsider", strange and non-understandable. At the same time, it also made government officials recognize contemporary art as a part of modern Ukrainian culture. If the Ministers of Culture did it before, even the President of Ukraine was forced by the exhibition's high popularity to attend the last Center's exhibition "Ukrainian Brand" demonstrating their respect and interest in contemporary art as well as in Soros' center (Note: The point is that beginning from last June the GS name is not too popular for the President because of GS' critical letter in FT).	As yet, the Center remains the best reputed and the most influential institution in the country aimed at supporting contemporary art. It did succeed in changing the very attitude towards contemporary art both among the general public and among governmental officials, too many of whom still stick, even if not deliberately, to the old Soviet "academic" standards of evaluating arts. The Center's activities helped a lot to liberate the artistic atmosphere – if not in the country altogether, then at least in the capital, which I regard as their major accomplishment until now.
Ukraine-Odessa	N/a	I think they create rather negative impact on the situation, their projects and promotional activity are too subjective, still influenced by the conflict, the exhibitions catalogues, articles for foreign art magazines are mostly focused on few artists, which are not the best professionals
Yugoslavia	CCAB has become a major actor among others (Remont, Rex) in the contemporary visual arts scene. It endeavors to enrich both the plurality of actors in the cultural field as well as overall quality of cultural life. Its impact is important on art and culture because of its pro-active role in promoting a professionally engaged, organizationally responsible, and socially aware institutional cultural and artistic policy, at the service of artistic freedom.	N/a

Attachment 5: Perception of value the centers adds to the society

Country	Comments
Bosnia and Herzegovina	The Center raises questions that go beyond artistic ones, and thus create an atmosphere favorable for organizing different activities.
Bulgaria	To put it shortly, in some ways the Center had accepted the challenge of complementing and replacing the Ministry of Culture in areas, where governmental support was coming short.
Croatia	N/a
Czech Republic	The Center has grown into an important venue for both local and international artists and art professionals.
Estonia	Center is a client-friendly organization from here the good ideas and discussions were born.
Hungary	It complements the hire education of arts; it introduces a new and low cost way of community radio broadcasting; providing service for the digitalization of historic video recordings. C3 is the biggest Hungarian provider of free e-mail service: Freemail.
Kazakhstan	Effective support of the musical, literature and artistic underground
Latvia	The LCCA is also an active voice in cultural policy, giving support and credibility to independent initiatives.
Lithuania	N/a
Macedonia	It is one of the “islands of multiculturalism” in Macedonia. It is also a model for a small and vivid cultural institution, opposite to the dominating model of big and bureaucratic cultural institutions. I would say that it is an efficient and convincing example that “the small is beautiful” and that the change of cultural institutions is needed.
Moldova	Hard to say
Romania	It stimulates contemporary artists’ sense of belonging to a community.
Russia-Moscow	The Centre is doing a lot to de-marginalise contemporary art and to turn the artists towards society through the series of public discussions, publications in mass-media, other public events. A new program addressed to the journalists specializing in contemporary art field will be of great social importance. Not less important contribution of the Center to the recognition of contemporary Russian art on the international level.
Russia-St. Petersburg	The Centre is doing a lot to de-marginalise contemporary art and to turn the artists towards society through the series of public discussions, publications in mass-media, other public events. A new programme on contemporary music will add to the education of the audience of contemporary music, which will be of great social importance
Slovakia	Alternative, opening the minds
Slovenia	Involvement in the recent process of linking of cultural NGOs under the auspices of a newly established NGO resource and umbrella association.
Ukraine-Kyiv	The Center contributes to the development and promotion of modern Ukrainian culture, i.e., it demonstrates that Ukrainian tradition colored culture is able to produce modernistic patterns of it.
Ukraine-Odessa	N/a
Yugoslavia	CCAB strives for a socially relevant cultural, educational and artistic community that can one of the factors in creating an open and tolerant society in this country. In order to accomplish that it is important to facilitate interaction and meaningful cooperation between the individuals, public, governmental and independent organizations

Attachment 6: Is there anything unique about the Center's activity?

Country	Foundation		Expert	
	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	That is the only institution in BH that systematically supports the contemporary art (by organizing exhibitions, and giving support to the production)	Yes	I believe the main contribution of Satajevo SCCA was/is that it managed to "give back" Sarajevo to its artists-citizens...In "appropriating" again their own city that artists finally felt as citizens.
Bulgaria	Yes	The Bulgarian SCCA is the only one who had developed a comprehensive strategy and action plan of supporting not only the contemporary visual arts but all forms of artistic expression; the institutional support, the training of cultural managers; the exchange of artists and ideas.	Yes	Unique is the experience accumulated in the work directed to the contemporary arts in Bugaria. The role of the Center as an attractive and contact point, inclusive for exchange of information, is one of its main features. The Center is distinguished also through the professionalism and the motivation of the team that seems united an purposeful, which really differentiates it from a multitude of other non-governmental organizations in Bulgaria. Except this high professionalism, although, there is also the feeling of self-sufficiency and elitism which I am going to discuss below.
Croatia	Yes*	Distribution and availability of information (for instance, information about contests for local and international exhibitions, workshops, scholarships, seminars...)	Yes	Their unquestionable devotion to the contemporary art scene and fairness
Czech Republic	Yes		Yes	The residential program is the not the most active, but also the most international program in this country and has no comparison among other Centers in East Europe
Estonia	Yes	The only well managed and well functioning institution of modern art	Yes	In context of Estonian art scene has been a unique and innovative organization
Hungary	Yes	-	Yes	...no other institution has similar new media art production support program; digital video art archive international grant program bringing artists to work in Huingary systematic effort to connect contemporary aspect with

*19 Expert's evaluation

				historical, i.e. focuses on media archeology
Kazakhstan	Yes	In the Central Asia region	Yes	The unique structure for our country Has the board, is open and transparent, Does not have any samples in Kazakhstan and in Central Asia
Latvia	Yes	Their first point of contact for Latvia's international art activities, serves as a model for a public-private partnership involving both the national and local government, the NGO sector and private corporate donors	Yes	Intersectoral approach in the field Putting together work of local and international artists LCCA results in creating context for local visual art in the field
Lithuania	N/a		N/a	
Macedonia	Yes		Yes	Attempt to broaden the field of what is considered contemporary art and contemporary culture Dedication to opening possibilities for regional co-operation Contacts and networks Technical facilities
Moldova	No	Its unique feature comes from the specificity of the contemporary art	Yes	The exhibitions and vernishing activities organised by KSA:K gave to the Moldovan audience the unique opportunity of the first knowledge of the possibilities that alternative art can offer. KSAK was and is the only institution in Moldova that could involve the Visual Artists Union of Moldova in a competition.
Romania	Yes	The first institution in Romania which developed and promoted contemporary art projects	Yes	The best contemporary art database (catalogues, magazines, video tapes) in the country.
Russia-Moscow	Yes	International introduction of the new media in the art, educational programs covering wide range of theoretical and philosophical aspects of contemporary art for participating artists as well as art historians	Yes	The educational New Artistic Strategies which unites philosophical, international and managerial approaches to the contemporary art ... The program involves students and some practical activities....
Russia-St.Petersburg	Yes	Educational program presented for general public in the Russian Museum Participation in big events Practical studies at the seminars and workshops which are applicable for practicing artists as well as art historians (unique programmes on contemporary music, video-art, cinema)....	Yes	The establishment of partnership between the institution of contemporary art (ProArte) and traditional museums (big and small) and the Committee for Cultural Policy of the city is absolutely unique for Russia
Slovakia	Yes	Complex of arts (not solely fine arts) Focus on introducing changes in Slovak educational system Bridge between the West, Slovakia and the East	Yes	

Slovenia	Yes	<p>Center is unique combination of a contemporary, project oriented, research, policy, educational and resource organization. It is referential and visible in Slovene media. To my best knowledge, the Center gained good reputation in Slovene a/c community. Center is open for various kinds of joint projects and productive collaborations (an instructive example is Center's collaboration with an excellent and in recent years maybe even the best local independent academic publisher called "Založba CF"). Center's efforts (also thanks to its affiliation with the OSI a&c network program) in popularization of the region and its human resources, good practices and a/c production are quite unique as well. These activities have specific weight in a country where the EU accession process is absolutely prioritized not only by officials and media but also by a great majority of the most influential a/c players. Special story is of course Center's documentation and library - collection development is focused on publications, journals and other info material from the region. Many of those publications are available only in Center's public accessible library (due to an imperative to cut down rental costs it is unfortunately squeezed in too small space). It is the only organization systematically collecting, researching and presenting video production from Slovenia. In fact, all the projects mentioned under # 3 are unique in Slovenia, as well as education program for artists in using new technologies (presentation on the web, international communication etc.).</p>	Yes	Curatorial training programs, the Platforma SCCA magazine
Ukraine-Kyiv	Yes	<p>Though the Center is mainly acts as a well-established gallery, its latest project called ""Case Study" - participation in international cultural events" has somewhat different focus. It is new educational initiative aimed at improving qualification of Ukrainian art critics and journalists. In 2001 the "case study" was made during Venice Biennial. In case the initiative develops, it will have a serious impact on traditions of art journalism in Ukraine. Now, because of the political context reasons, the Center is being involved into various issues related to the problem of the independent art community formation in Ukraine. It demands the Center to develop</p>	No	Generally speaking, it works as an exceptionally well-standing gallery (which none of the existing galleries could ever dream to compete with) - or an attempted substitute for the as yet non-existing Contemporary Art Museum.

		the policy related part of its activity.		
Ukraine-Odessa	N/a		No	Professional activity is quite formal and oversubjective, administrative group is not active and not creative, they are not interested in creative spirit in the city and development of cultural flow.
Yugoslavia	Yes	CCAB especially focuses on educational programs [School for History and Theory of Images, School Network, etc] but the most unique feature of the CCAB is that after the political sea change in October 2000 in this country part of its key staff were called upon to reconstruct the Museum of Contemporary Art-Belgrade.		

Attachment 7: Do you think the center influences public policy in the area of culture in your country?

Country	Foundation		Expert	
	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	It does, in the measure that general public and authorities is interested in culture policy.	Yes	The Center's programs taking place in the city are directed towards a large public and thus shifts the usual understanding what contemporary art is, and what is its role in a society.
Bulgaria	No		No	Definitely not, even indirectly. One could expect that the support of Soros Center would stimulate the public authorities to also direct their attention to the contemporary art, but this does not really happen. Apparently, and this is one of the great mistakes of the Center, the opportunities to influence directly or indirectly the public policy are not used. In the recent years the Center often mentions "the cultural policy" in its program documents but this is in fact its weak spot. Here I also include the necessity to communicate with the public structures and institutions, among them at the first place the Ministry of Culture.
Croatia	N/a		Yes	It made contemporary art practice more visible to the general public through its numerous sight specific or open air projects or publications. The public and media success of their project made official institutions more aware of the vitality of the local contemporary practice.
Czech Republic	Yes		Yes	
Estonia	Yes	Many ideas have come from the center.	Yes	The initiatives of the center have successful.
Hungary	Yes	IT is probing the frames of the state's conservatism and gives an example how audacity in art can gain international acclaim.	Yes	The C3 with its broad and efficient activities, with its cooperation raised the level professionalism within the field of managing curating supporting contemporary art, culture, and critical attitude.
Kazakhstan	Yes	Sure.	Yes	Every action of the center get a big discussion in society and mass media. These discussions start about art and go to big and important questions such as society

				and state, person and public, citizen and his responsibility to the society.
Latvia	Yes		Yes	as effectively operating non-governmental organization ranging or participating in cultural policy debate in conferences, round tables, mass media launching the leading case of 3 side collaboration between Soros Foundation, City Council of Riga and the Ministry of Culture and representing the development of this collaboration and its failure in permanent publicity campaign in the major mass media (dailies “The Day”, “Independent Morning Newspaper”, evening news broadcasts on the leading TVs, not to mention less significant mass media)
Lithuania	N/a		N/a	
Macedonia	Yes		Yes	Together with the previous activity of the SCCA, it has definitely influenced the perception of the necessity for professionalism, working standards, management, mobility, and diversity.
Moldova	No	Only if we consider as influence the fact that the state authorities accept the existence of “un-controlled” art.	Yes	There is some Center’s influence but it regards a small area of the civil society underdevelopment. On state institutions level or social associations like the Artitsts’ Union of Moldova, the Center’s activity are not seriously taken into consideration and appreciated.
Romania	Yes	The Center assumed the position of ”watch dog” for contemporary art. It keeps contemporary art among the topics of culture in Romania.	Yes	Contemporary art practice, mediums, and theory are not longer UFO concepts. Improvement in government thinking in contemporary art (the practice of Ministry of Culture in regarding Romanian participation in Venice Biennial based on curatorial contest).
Russia-Moscow	Yes	The pool of Center’s experts, lecturers, and authors consists of the most authoritative professionals in the field who very often deliver their message through the main national mass media channels.	No	Not yet. But it should influence. In general there is no special public policy in the area of culture. There are some practices in the area of culture(state, commercial, etc., and there are some programs).
Russia-St.Petersburg	Yes	The pool of Center’s experts, lecturers, and authors consists of the most authoritative professionals in the field who very often	Yes	

		deliver their message through the main national mass media channels.		
Slovakia	Yes	Provoking debates, analysis, providing alternatives.	Yes.	
Slovenia	Yes	It is rather lateral influence through various events, media coverage, Center's own journal, offering verified and well-functioning education projects or other services as possible models for either national or local cultural policy. Higher involvement in the above mentioned NGO umbrella association will result in obtaining more influential position of the Center on the map of unavoidable (although not always desirable) partners of the governmental bodies dealing with cultural policy.	Yes	
Ukraine-Kyiv	Yes	But it is only the beginning of the process of the real influencing. One of the Center's last year initiatives called Art Forum and initiated in fact the IRF strategy in the culture area aims at lobbying interests of artistic NGO's so they become active players on Ukrainian cultural scene. Art Forum is going to be a partner of government institutions in elaborating and implementing the modern culture policy. In case the Forum worked, it would influence positively the general situation in culture and significantly improve policy-making process. There should be another policy related projects which could be change the situation in the area.	No	Up to now, the Center has not shown much of visible efforts to take an initiative in the field. (their latest project aimed at changing the position of the artistic NGOs in the country is truly ambitious and quite promising, but comes, in my view, a little bit too late for the FIRST real attempt at the priorities shift.
Ukraine-Odessa			Yes	In a way today's politics has destroyed previous achievements
Yugoslavia	Yes	Several CCAB representatives are actively participating in the definition of a new cultural policy as members and initiators of the expert team established by the Serbian Ministry of Culture. It also should be mentioned that one of the CCAB's major projects was the "cultural policy" and cultural production in Serbia "conference". Furthermore, CCAB has negotiated a strategic partnership with Museum of Contemporary Art ,Belgrade.		

Attachment 8: Do you think the Center publicizes itself effectively?

Country	Foundation		Expert	
	Yes/ No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	The Center's activities are always noted in the dailies and magazines.	Yes	Any action undertaken by the Center is extremely well-covered in local press.
Bulgaria	Yes	Its publication have wide circulation.	Yes	Among the art circles, but more efforts are necessary to present the mission and the work of the Center among the broader public.
Croatia	N/a		Yes	Not only they published their own publication, they cooperated closely with all the media. Their projects always raised the interest of both published and electronic media.
Czech Republic	Yes		No	Unfortunately there is no significant and highly visible coverage of the Center's activity. If we consider how many miscellaneous, often inter disciplinary projects the Center organizes or collaborates on, it has a much higher potential for publicity.
Estonia	Yes and No	The Center could promote their activities even more actively.	Yes	The Center publicizes/informs about every even they have been initiating or managing.
Hungary	No	They have no energy to deal with PR issues.	No	It is mainly because of the low quality of cultural attention in electronic and print media. In a strange way, there is no serious art criticism in Hungary. C3 has to find its own ways to publicize its own activity because until now the publication were too sporadic and too representative.
Kazakhstan	Yes		Yes	As I can see in media, there is a quite a lot of publication and discussions in press and TV. Some of journalists are involved in the Center's activity and have the opportunity to make interesting projects, but due to complex situation in our media (commercialization, black PR, articles for money)it is rather hard to work on it effectively.
Latvia	Yes		Yes	IT has very good collaboration with the leading arts critics and journalists & they organize

				significant events to be marketed.
Lithuania	N/a			
Macedonia	Yes		Yes	Together with the previous activity of the SCCA , it has definitely influenced the perception of the necessity for professionalism, working standards, management, mobility and diversity.
Moldova	Yes	Yes, if we consider the publication of quarterly journal “Art-Hoc), as well as the existence of the Center’s Internet site.	No	All the publicity boils down to the “Art Hoc” magazine, but none of the them directed to promote the strategic activity of the center and there is almost no publicity on TV and radio.
Romania	NO	It has good collaborations with cultural magazines still, they should address other categories, too not only the public education in the direction of contemporary art. It is too elite-oriented.	Yes and No	Yes because of good media partnership with some cultural weekly magazines, no because of total absence of vbisual media.
Russia-Moscow	Yes	But not enough, it’s a lot of things more to do in this field and especially for fund-raising purposes.	No	
Russia-St. Petersburg	Yes	But not enough, it is a lot of things to do more in this field and especially for find-raising purposes. Although it has designed the recognizable style of all its marketing hand-outs, print-outs, publications, merchandizing products.	Yes	
Slovakia	Yes		Yes	
Slovenia	Yes	In general, yes.	Yes	Center takes care of promoting its activities and programs. Their public relation activities are good and they have a broad network for spreading information.
Ukraine-Kyiv	Yes	The Center usually gets a good press, places announcements in the most popular newspapers and magazines, holds press conferences to attract attention to the most significant events. All Centers’ exhibitions are preceded by well-organized openings.	Yes	It has good contacts with the press and media, holds press conferences whenever the situation requires, the broad public attention (as was e.g., the case with the notorious conflict around Ukrainian participation in Venetian Bienalle –2001-then the Center’s PR policy even if for once proved to be efficient enough to bring the issue into the spotlight of the general public interest). On the whole, one may say that each event organized by the Center gets quite a sufficient media coverage.
Ukraine-Odessa	N/a	This part of activity, as self promotion, is really professional.	N/a	
Yugoslavia	N/a		Yes	

Attachment 9: From your perspective, to which extent is the general public in your country aware of the Center's activity?

Not aware		Somewhat aware		Quite aware		Very well aware	
NF	Expert	NF	Expert	NF	Expert	NF	Expert
		Bulgaria Czech Republic Hungary Moldova Romania Russia-Moscow Slovakia	Bulgaria Czech Republic Hungary Moldova Romania Russia-St. Petersburg Ukraine-Kyiv Ukraine-Odessa	Estonia Kazakhstan Latvia Macedonia Russia-St. Petersburg Ukraine-Kyiv Slovenia	Estonia Kazakhstan Latvia Macedonia Slovenia Yugoslavia	Bosnia	Bosnia Croatia

Attachment 10: Relations between Centers and National Foundations

Country	Foundation				Center			
	Unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Bosnia and Herzegovina				X	N/a			
Bulgaria		X					X	
Croatia	N/a					Far from satisfied, but getting better		
Czech Republic				X			X	
Estonia			X					
Hungary			X					
Kazakhstan			X					
Latvia				X				
Lithuania								
Macedonia				X				
Moldova	X							
Romania			X					
Russia-Moscow			X					
Russia-St.Petersburg			X					
Slovakia			X					
Slovenia	N/a							
Ukraine-Kyiv			X					
Ukraine-Odessa	N/a							
Yugoslavia			X					