STAGE PROJECT

A TBILISI CITY CULTURAL STRATEGY: THE NEXT STEPS

Experts' Report
by Charles Landry

Cultural Policy and Action Department
Directorate General IV – Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport

Members of the group of experts:

Charles Landry
Director COMEDIA, Green near Stroud, United Kingdom

Maria Theodorou
Head, Architecture Network, Ministry of Culture, Athens, Greece

Corina Raceanu
Counsellor, Directorate for Culture, Religious Affairs and National Cultural Heritage of Timis County, Romania
Representing the "associated" city Timisoara

Council of Europe:

Domenico Ronconi
Head of the Cultural Action Division

Dorina Bodea
STAGE Project Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Summary

The Council of Europe expert group proposes that Tbilisi undertake a cultural strategy, building on previous cultural policy work, as a means of deciding priorities and maximizing the cultural potential of the city. In order for this to be effective background work needs to be undertaken. To bring this into focus it is proposed that a cultural task force is set up that is managed by a co-ordinator. The initial goal is to work towards a well prepared event in about a year perhaps called: 'Culture and Cultural Institutions: Surviving the Transition'. By that stage much of the advocacy work to make interested parties aware of the necessary change agenda will have been undertaken. In parallel a number of more easily achieved objectives could already be underway such as developing a cultural management programme and other initiatives such as tourism information centre, a heritage and planning programme or international connections strategy well under discussion.

The group feels the best way to move forward is to develop a partnership between international organizations such as the Council of Europe and the European Cultural Foundation and locally operating foundations such as Horizonti, Eurasia and Soros as well as the municipality all of whom should contribute to the initiative.

The first step is for a preliminary local team that could develop into the task force, to make a proposal to suggested partners.

Purpose of report

This report is a summary of conclusions reached by a Council of Europe expert group who visited Tbilisi for one week in July 2003. Its purpose is to propose how collaboration between the City of Tbilisi and future potential partners and the Council of Europe and other international partners can develop to help strengthen the cultural situation in the city. It is not a detailed policy document, nor a worked out strategy for the city, nor is it an audit of possibilities. And in any case it would be completely inappropriate for outsiders to undertake this work. These are tasks for future work to be undertaken largely by local people.

Setting the stage

The Council of Europe has for many years undertaken National Cultural Policy reviews whereby experts in a chosen country undertake an assessment of policy, which is then commented upon by external experts. This happened in Georgia in 2002. It then decided to undertake an experiment within its programme called STAGE to look at the cultural situation in cities and chose Tbilisi, Baku and Yerevan as examples. The reason for focusing on cities was fivefold. Implementing cultural policy at the city level remains far easier than on the national level. First, the geographic remit is smaller; second it is less complex for a city to develop a vision for itself given the number of key stakeholders involved is fewer; third many cities have more resources or access to them including those of the government and indeed the budget for culture in the Tbilisi

municipality equals that of the Ministry of Culture; fourth the impact of initiatives are more visible in a city and so can inspire a virtuous cycle of cultural development; and finally there is proportionately a greater critical mass of cultural workers, ideas and connections in the city to make things happen.

The expert group in Tbilisi was Charles Landry, Corina Raceanu, Maria Theodorou and Domenico Ronconi who took the results of the national review of Georgia as a given as it recognized that its main conclusions clearly applied to Tbilisi as well.

The national report highlighted a range of issues that are common to countries in transition, such as:

- Legal structures that are not completely in tune with European best practice
- The fact that when laws exist they are often not applied
- The general lack of financial resources
- The focus in spending public funds on salaries so leaving very little room to fund programming and projects
- Average incomes of around $25 per month which makes it extremely difficult to increase levels of earned income
- Little clarity on the criteria for funding specific institutions and projects
- Given the overall pressures a tendency to respond reactively to circumstances and not strategically and therefore not being able to stand back and ask 'why are we funding culture?'
- Overstaffing in most cultural institutions
- A traditional idea of culture focused almost exclusively on the arts
- A tendency to see contemporary popular culture in negative terms
- A lack of understanding of the concept of marketing
- No tax incentives for arts and cultural sponsorship
- A tendency for cultural institutions to be self-referential and focused on their own needs rather than also in parallel assessing the needs of the broader population
- A lack of collaboration between different sectors and especially tourism and the Ministry of Culture

Overlaying these culturally specific issues are the well known problems in Georgia that mirror other countries in transition.

The benefits of cultural policy making

Whilst the process of undertaking the national review in Georgia was not perfect, as noted in other reviews, it has additional unsuspected benefits. It was the first time that Georgia was asked to bring together facts, statistics, analysis, interpretation and opinion on its cultural situation. When this is done well, with honesty and enthusiasm it can act as a catalyst. It can clarify options and burst the bubble of unrealistic expectations that might either by held by official bodies or cultural actors. Producing the report is in itself can be a lesson in acquiring the necessary skills for cultural policy making, leaving aside its role to communicate. There are varying views as to whether the cultural policy

exercise in Georgia has so far been useful. Nevertheless developing the National Report should ideally be conceived as an on-going process, the result of which is a live document that is regularly up-dated and added to and in this process help strategy making. The latter in turn helps define priorities for implementation. Importantly it helps to:

- Build an up to date picture of the current and past cultural situation in factual, statistical and policy terms.
- Act as a structured mechanism to share information between and within entities and provides a core activity of the proposed cultural task force.
- Provide the basis upon which the various cultural stakeholders can set broad aims, objectives and targets.
- Clarify the dynamics and strengths and weaknesses of the cultural system.
- Identify the strategic dilemmas in culture that the country faces so helping to determine priorities and roles for the different cultural actors.
- Highlight new agendas, such as the importance of the cultural industries or the social inclusion debate.
- Create greater understanding of how a national culture is connected to the global cultural system.
- Clarify the different approaches to cultural policy making and their applicability to a country such as Georgia.
- Focus on what European best practice is and the extent to which it is replicable.
- Establish the need for collaborative partnerships within and outside of the public sector.
- Offer a template and monitoring tool for future updating and evaluation
- Provide the basic data sources for national-decision making and international organisations.
- Serve as the reference for future up-dates and starting point for any future researchers, policy makers and government officials.
- Be the basis for informed conversation nationally and internationally.

Moving beyond policy to thinking through a strategy for Tbilisi

We urge both the national government and the city of Tbilisi to continue efforts in thinking through its broad policies, as these should shape the direction of future effort and funding. The expert group rapidly concluded that now the primary issue and need for Tbilisi was to develop a cultural strategy as distinct from a policy and furthermore it felt that within this strategy a series of implementable, catalytic projects should be identified that can embody the changes that the city desires. Whereas a policy describes the broad direction, goals and aims a strategy by contrast outlines how a policy is to be implemented and the steps required to get there. In the context of Tbilisi a strategy involves making hard choices.

As guidance the group felt that the following policy priorities are key and should frame strategic directions:

- o Rebuild the argument for investment in arts and culture given that existing institutions and projects have no intrinsic right to be funded out public resources. This involves thinking through in contemporary terms 'what is the purpose of funding culture and what is it good for' and 'how can cultural institutions play a role'.
- o Establish what the cultural needs and desires of the citizens of Tbilisi are in order to encourage participation and involvement.
- o Link cultural funding priorities to the development of a stronger civil society.
- o Encourage the development of greater self-sufficiency by enhancing the skills base of cultural managers developing the management and organizational skills to run efficient and effective institutions and projects
- o Focus on how the distinctiveness of Georgian and Tbilisi culture can be encouraged
- o Focusing on integrated urban development as a cultural initiative

In addition the broad policy should focus on:
- Changing the mindsets of cultural institutions and actors
- Ensuring that culture contributes to the creation of a vibrant Tbilisi
- Developing a more international profile for Tbilisi especially through cultural tourism

Colleagues in Tbilisi further highlighted that policy should involve the following:
- Generating more resources for culture
- Maintaining and resourcing cultural heritage and in particular the built heritage of Tbilisi such as the old town
- Stabilizing the financial situation of the main cultural institutions

The strategy making process is intended to help find priorities within these differing views and assess how to move forward. The difficulty in only focusing on policy is that the resulting documents are usually seen as worthy and are not acted upon whereas strategy gives decision makers precise choices upon which to act. It involves a different process. Given the broad range of interviews held both within the national review and our week long visit in Tbilisi the broad policy outlines are reasonably clear although there is not unanimous agreement on where to start and where to focus.

These varying objectives are not incompatible, but depending on what you emphasize it determines how you go about matters. For example, there is nothing wrong with highlighting the need to stabilize the financial situation of cultural institutions. However in the end this objective is more likely to end up with demands for more funding by cultural institutions rather than emphasizing the need for cultural institutions themselves to re-assess their roles and how they operate. A quote by a leading cultural figure shows how urgent this discussion is. When asked about adapting his programme to generate more income, he said: 'You probably know how much culture costs, but do you know how much it costs not to have culture'. Of course the point is taken, but it is circular, it does not take us forward.

Interestingly there seems to be an issue with priority setting in the Georgian context given the competing claims on time and resources; as one important interviewee noted: 'How can you ask me about priorities, how many children do you have and which one do you prefer?'

We understand the frustration of people in Tbilisi with outsiders who do not immediately jump into implementing projects and instead emphasize the need for strategy, clarity and a degree of certainty that resources will not disappear. But this work is half of the effort and resources are much more likely to flow from external sources if outsiders feel problems are being tackled as well as opportunities rather than merely shoring up an unstable structure.

A snapshot of Tbilisi impressions

We list below a series of points that the expert group discussed during our visit as a means clarifying for ourselves key questions and issues in order to help us make suggestions for a way forward. They mirror many of the conclusions from the Georgian national policy review. This was not a scholarly exercise, but is useful as it encapsulates what we as outsiders saw as important.

PART I:
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

A. Opportunities

1. The idea of Georgia and Tbilisi resonates strongly in the rest of Europe and even the world. Many of these impressions are clichés and stereotypes some of which are good and others negative (e.g. Georgia as an exotic place, the place where Stalin came from, good music, a long tradition of wine, a mountain people with a tribal culture). Nevertheless in contrast to many other places at least it has a presence in the world imagination.
2. Tbilisi is potentially a very beautiful place, the drama of its setting and the presence of historic fabric are substantial assets to work with as is the distinctiveness of Georgian culture. Georgians seem to be different in a positive way
3. Tbilisi's geographical position, situated at the cross-roads between Europe and Asia, is a potential selling point especially if the inter-cultural agenda can be highlighted, even though other countries can also project this image.
4. A tradition of independence that has reinforced a cultural distinctiveness
5. Georgia has potential for cultural tourism given that it has important infrastructure built up in former times. There is a group of visitors who know the country and new visitors can be attracted by its nature and its physical heritage.
6. The existence of international foundations (most of them American) that are already financing cultural and artistic projects as well as the development of civil society
7. The decentralisation process means there is an increasing role of local communities in funding the cultural activities. It means that Tbilisi Town Hall can play a major role in funding cultural and artistic activities and interventions in physical heritage;
8. The existence of private financial resources for the restoration of emblematic buildings of the city such as the Rustvehli Theatre.

B. Risks

1. The Government is focused on what they see as solving the major problems and therefore does not confer importance to the potential role and positive impact of cultural development
2. Reform is oscillating between the need for dramatic overall restructuring and urgent social demands simply to keep the country going which pushes cultural issues to the sidelines
3. The country has reduced financial resources and resulting in limited resources for culture. This is allowing cultural heritage to degrade and cultural and artistic activities to suffer
4. The mentality of some decision-makers, determined by the communist past, at times can mean that they consider culture as a propaganda tool. The switch from feudalism to communism, without little knowledge of the historically intervening values of the enlightenment, we were told, can exacerbate this problem.

5. A problem identified is the focus on the short term. Some Georgians even say it is a tendency in the mindset. Whatever the case the idea of the power of long term thinking and strategy making can be prioritised and practiced

6. Some people argue that at times cultural foundations are set up for more political purposes rather than purely cultural goals.

7. The level of poverty means the population is more concerned with survival and therefore is inward looking and less concerned with issues of culture. This can lead to a lack of confidence in their own values and possibilities

8. The lack of respect for law – laws exist but are nor enforced, there seems no will or power to make implementation mechanisms and tools work. The system therefore appears to be inert and static.

9. The existence in general of an administrative system that the civil society representatives describe as "lacking professionalism, decision making transparency, bureaucratic and endemically corrupt"

10. Some business people are more concerned with 'getting rich quick' rather long term investment. This hinders economic development and tends to create a climate where the potential of the city's physical heritage is underestimated. This means that external agencies are less willing to invest

11. Isolation from international cultural networks and exchanges and some nostalgia for the past (USSR) when international cultural cooperation was more intense

12. A lack of inter-ministerial discussions or agreements on common and complementary activities such as culture, education, economic development, tourism

13. The need to maintain interest by the Government in ethnic minority problems, In fact projecting Georgia as an intercultural hot-spots could reclaim some of the glory of Tbilisi in the 1920's

14. The lack of a strong civil society to protect and promote cultural development and civic education that focuses on the protection of cultural heritage

15. The lack of involvement and detachment of the Church in civil society development and social affairs.

16. Reduced involvement of foreign embassies in offering opportunities for international cultural exchanges

17. The destruction or dispersion of cultural heritage through natural causes over which people in Tbilisi have no control such as earthquakes.

PART II:
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

A. Strengths

1. A rich cultural tradition that particularly produced important achievements in the performing arts and cinema. A memory of a period of cultural blossoming in the 1920's where Tbilisi was seen a European hub. During the communist period, culture represented a „refuge" generating a special form of creativity given that cultural expression was the only way to protest against those realities.
2. An ancient cultural heritage, rich in historic monuments (mainly churches) that can be reintroduced into the country's tourism offer
3. The existence of a number of NGOs active in research, protection and the promotion of cultural heritage
4. Over the past years, new independent cultural entities have been set-up, such as the Georgian Arts and Cultural Centre and performing groups mainly through civil society and private initiative. Some of these are well connected and entrepreneurial and offer real hope for the future
5. The establishment of the Fund for Saving Culture as a mechanism to support culture
6. The interest expressed by Tbilisi's cultural department in saving and including into the tourist circuits houses and artist workshops that used to belong to important cultural personalities.
7. The existence in Tbilisi of cultural resources that are able to focus the interest of the entire South Caucasus and internationally, such as „Caucasian House", or the international interest for cinema, theatre and jazz festivals

B. Weaknesses

1. A re-confirmation of what the Georgian national report discovered namely a common assumption that the mere existence of cultural entities is in itself a sufficient purpose and not a vehicle to satisfy broader social needs. The danger is that cultural institutions or projects can become self-referential
2. The management of cultural institutions is in majority over 60 years old, due to the fact that the country in confronted with dramatic emigration of young and potentially well qualified people
3. Reduced financial resources given by State, which is often helped out by Tbilisi municipality, which in turn leaves the cultural department of the city with little room for manoeuvre.
4. Low incomes mean that it is very difficult for cultural institutions to increase their level of self-generated income
5. Limited knowledge concerning modern and effective cultural management, project management, management of heritage etc.
6. A reluctance to develop cultural strategies that make difficult choices, which could identify and prioritize needs and the related allocation of financial resources

7. A predominance of funding for traditional cultural offerings which makes it difficult to support contemporary, innovative, modern and experimental culture that is also the future for Georgian culture
8. A seeming lack of interest in some major cultural institutions in increasing the degree of participation in their programmes.
9. A tendency to focus on culture at the "centre" (e.g. of the city) and a relative lack of interest of culture for the "margins"
10. A relatively under developed educational outreach programme
11. A difficulty in seeing the broader cultural context that includes issues of urbanism, contemporary design or architecture
12. A lack of dialogue and collaboration with institutions from complementary areas such as education, tourism, urbanism, local development

PART III:
NEXT STEPS:

Opening the debate on Tbilisi culture

The leading actor for culture in Tbilisi is the city's cultural department. Over the last 4 years it has been responsible for creating a substantial record of achievement. It has been able to double its budget. It has stabilized a number of cultural institutions, such as the Elene Akhvlediani Memorial Museum, and indeed taken over some funding of national entities that the Ministry of Culture could no longer afford. It has cleverly argued that the economic impact of closing a series of music schools is so marginal that it was not worthwhile to do. It has found resources to help fund 50 or so retired artists. Perhaps most importantly it has set up a Fund for Saving Culture, which has a series of priority programmes, such as on: Cultural Policy Strategic Research, Creative Development, Social Problems, the Protection and Popularization of Cultural Heritage and International Relations. The municipality has also overcome some problems that are faced by national institutions. For example, the City Museum is able to keep resources that it generates itself such as for renting out rooms rather than returning them to the central budget. The implication is that being enterprising is rewarded rather than discouraged.

The main issue for the cultural department is that it continuously needs to respond to problems rather than finding the space to create opportunities based on strategic thinking. As a consequence the majority of its resources are used to maintain the existing infrastructure. This in turn makes it difficult to fund the new emerging culture of Tbilisi. For example it funds 13 theatres and 12 museums and a number of these provide excellent services in their context. However if the municipality were to start with a blank sheet they would not all be a priority as they themselves noted. Those that work well have become more focused on their audiences and have undergone a mindshift change whilst others remain anchored into attitudes of the past and effectively are a drain on municipal resources. Taking a strategic perspective the task would then be to develop a longer term funding programme that challenges such institutions to change as they are in effect bringing the cultural infrastructure of Tbilisi as a whole down and drawing potential resources away from new initiatives. We understand that this is difficult for the cultural department to address especially given that everyone knows each other and there are bonds of loyalty and so on, but it is essential and in the longer term of great benefit.

The first step is to open a debate on Tbilisi's cultural future to ensure that there is a degree of common ownership of the change process. It is not expected that everyone will agree with the conclusions reached This might culminate in a well prepared event for cultural institutions, actors, funders and sponsors called something like: 'Culture and Cultural Institutions: Surviving the Transition', where these issues are openly and frankly discussed. This might take place in the summer of 2004. Here of particular help would be examples from other former post-communist countries, which have managed a transition. At the end the municipality could announce its new programme policy. This would outline a series of targets that institutions that receive public funds would

have to meet over a pre-determined time scale. Meeting these targets would determine future funding.

The change agenda

In order for this event to work effectively substantial background work needs to be undertaken, bearing in mind that the goal is to get some real projects off the ground. This might involve the following:

o Gather together a group of interested parties concerned with Tbilisi's cultural future. This might be called: **'The Tbilisi cultural taskforce'** in order to indicate that it has a specific, time dated task to achieve. Once it has been deemed by parties involved to have fulfilled its initial objective its role should be re-assessed and it might either dissolve itself or move onto another task.

This grouping should involve the three sectors – public, private and community based, including a proportion of cultural actors, but not exclusively in order to avoid the criticism that it is only the cultural domain. It might include a university representative(s), business leaders with credibility as well as the mayor and public officials as appropriate. Ideally an independent person with real authority should chair it.

Its role should be initially to develop the cultural change agenda; secondly to begin to highlight emerging issues of importance such as enhancing cultural tourism potential and thirdly to increase debate on questions such as contemporary architecture.

o This group should appoint someone to organize and manage proceedings as well as organize the necessary research and background information required to develop a considered debate, create momentum, to get real projects started and implemented and to get more people involved.

o   It will be useful for the task group to have access to international expertise. This should cover three main areas: Capacity building to develop and run a task force; knowledge of appropriate good examples of revitalizing cities through culture especially from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe; knowledge of cultural management. If the process outlined above is acceptable the first step might be to gather a group of external experts to help launch the task force.

o In addition the task force should have the support of a range of international entities such as the Council of Europe, the European Cultural Foundation and others to be identified. This will give both prestige and credibility to the initiative as well as provide useful international connections.

o The range of background work to be undertaken prior to the event is varied as it needs to address the broad policy priorities, for example:
   1. Establishing some sense of what the population thinks of current cultural provision either public or private. Is it relevant to their lives, how could it

2. How well do exist cultural institutions really doing? Are they coasting along, are they resting on past laurels, are they making real efforts to engage with broader audiences? How well are they managed? These assessments may be helpfully undertaken in collaboration with an external expert. The results should provide the focus for discussions about future funding and programming.
3. What is the potential for culture in Tbilisi? Which objectives can be achieved in the short, medium or longer term? Which are under your relative control and which are desirable but unrealistic?
4. How well is cultural tourism doing? What has tangibly been achieved? Are the organizations responsible sufficiently competent? Could it be better in spite of the known difficulties?
5. What are the catalytic initiatives that would make a difference and are achievable? This might involve a series of more easily achieved objectives to give confidence and provide momentum, such as increasing visitation at specific venues, holding a successful festival or getting cultural management programme started. Equally there need to be more challenging initiatives one of which is setting up the task force itself and another the assessment of how well cultural institutions are doing.

The purpose of this first phase of work is to get the major issues circulating and to begin to highlight others that are more complex. Some are purely practical, others are to do with changing mindsets and yet others more conceptual. For example, it will relatively easy to set up a cultural management initiative within the next year. The approach here should be to help people change. Those organizations that are responding well to the difficult change agenda should be assisted through dedicated help and by providing opportunities. Whilst it is desirable for everyone to adapt their mindset the reality is that only a proportion will do so. Changing mindset does not mean assuming that the market economy has got everything right. Far from it. It implies understanding how it works, working with it for what it is good at and finding ways to circumvent it when inappropriate. It implies not assuming that the world owes any particular cultural institution a living, but rather more understanding that any entity in whatever field has to argue the case for public support. This change process will take time and cannot be legislated. Its results will reveal themselves in due course through changed approaches to management, addressing the audience and connecting with outside institutions and opportunities.

Beyond the first step

There are some areas that well developed city cultural strategies address that are more difficult both to discuss and implement. For example, a clear priority is to safeguard much of the heritage fabric of the city. This is for many reasons including sustaining local identity and beauty. But crucially it will ultimately be the asset that attracts tourists to Tbilisi in the first place. This is not to argue that cultural tourism is the saviour of Tbilisi, but it will be a significant component in attracting resources to and interest in the city. This means decision makers must look to the long-term benefits of caring for

the historic fabric. As noted: 'Tbilisi is in the process of destroying the assets that make it unique and attractive' or 'cultural heritage is the pre-condition for cultural tourism and the basis for economic and social development and making private profit by tearing down old buildings is short term thinking'.

Visitors will not want come to a Tbilisi that has second rate modern architecture that they can already see in their own home city. Whilst we all agree that the physical heritage is a cultural issue, we often forget that modern or contemporary architecture and building is also a cultural question. Here it is important to begin a debate on urban quality and what the city should look like. Quality does not necessarily imply more resources, but more thoughtfulness. The heritage lobby in Tbilisi is relatively strong and active, but that which could argue for good contemporary architecture relatively weak.

One problem is that developed cultural policy and strategy is rather broad whereas the remit of the Tbilisi cultural department is more narrow, focusing largely on museums, the performing and visual arts. Physical heritage issues are the responsibility of the planning and urban development departments. Yet there is no tradition of working together across departments a vital pre-condition to address some of the more subtle issues of aesthetics, beauty and urban design.

A similar area where working together is essential is with economic development. The change process our expert group is suggesting highlights greater moves towards self-sufficiency and this means that each cultural institution or project also sees itself as a business, even though they may get subsidy. It does not imply that each entity sees itself as profit maximizing, but it does imply holding to managerial and organizational principles that foster effectiveness and efficiency. There are many cultural projects that are essentially small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) yet the legal and other obstacles (corruption) mentioned to us make it difficult to set up SMEs. In the long-term smaller craft companies, graphic designers, recording companies and so on will be the entities that develop a contemporary Tbilisi culture.

A third area of necessary collaboration is tourism. Tourism in Georgia let alone Tbilisi is nothing without local culture. The Ministry of Tourism claims it wants to collaborate but said: 'that so many problems were drawing them backwards'. What these problems were was never elaborated. It is surprising to say the least that some of the easier basics of cultural tourism are not yet in place. For example, where are the contemporary postcards of Tbilisi? Why is there no tourism information centre or at least where are the discussions about setting one up?

Overall what seems to happen is that departments occasionally talk together but do not act together. One challenge of the task force is to initiate these joint discussions perhaps brokered by outside partners. The reason for highlighting partnership and collaboration so strongly is that success and increased opportunities depends on it as all experience in Western and successful Eastern European cities show.

Getting the strategy making process started

To get the cultural task force going will take time and resources, some can come internal sources, but they will be insufficient. Someone in Tbilisi (the proposed co-ordinator?) needs to act as a liaison person to make a proposal to the Council of Europe, the European Cultural Foundation and the embassies or cultural centres of those countries providing experts to assist the initiative. We need to bear in mind the strengths of each participating institution. Therefore the international group itself needs to be a partnership. For example the Council of Europe has strong international credibility, but few financial resources. The European Cultural Foundation by contrast may be interested in supporting a strategy initiative given its good work with Timosoara and Plovdiv. The Greek Foreign Ministry has a particular interest in the region so may be open to suggestions and equally the British Council may support some of the experts who have already been involved in Georgia. This support might provide the funds for the external experts to help in capacity building and to undertake the background research. Thus the first step is to establish whether these resources will be forthcoming.

The local team in Tbilisi needs its own resources. These are most likely, initially at least, to come from foundations already operating within Georgia. Initial discussions with Horizonti, the Eurasia and the Soros foundations sounded hopeful especially if there is also international commitment.

It is impossible to predict precisely how things will unfold. What both Tbilisi colleagues and the expert group want to achieve is some tangible projects. This will require a longer term commitment to a process from all partners concerned. The study visit phase is largely completed and the most helpful thing is to work together on a project so people can learn by doing. Perhaps the easiest way to start is to gather the resources to both set up the cultural task force and to develop a cultural management initiative that everyone feels would be useful. That process will in itself have spin-offs such as developing international connections, preparing people to take up cultural exchange programmes and beginning to refocus on how culture could be run. In addition it will provide the opportunity to explore initiatives such as a tourism information centre; an international image campaign to project the fact that Tbilisi is relatively safe; or whether it is viable to focus on a particular part of the city in order to regenerate it through a cultural approach, for example in Mtatsminda, Vera or Sololaki. Here we need to bear in mind the difficulties experienced by the recent World Bank project where a masterplan was drawn up, but was very difficult to implement.

APPENDIX I

<u>PROGRAMME OF THE VISIT</u>

Saturday 19 July 2003
Arrival and accommodation

Sunday 20 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast in the hotel
10.30 – 14.00	Visit to Mtskheta
14.00 – 15.00	Lunch in Mtskheta
16.00 – 17.00	A short rest in the hotel
17.15 – 19.00	Sightseeing tour (Mtatsminda Pantheon, Open Air Ethnographic Museum of Georgia)
19.30	Dinner

Monday 21 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.30 – 12.20	Reception at the Tbilisi Municipal City Service of Culture (meeting with Mr D. Okitashvili, Head of the Municipal City Service of Culture, and Board of Directors of the "Fund for Saving Culture")
12.30 – 14.00	Meeting with the Georgian Scientists (representatives of the Institutes of Psychology, History and Philosophy, and Mr Z. Karumidze, Head of the America-Caucasus Institute of Strategic Researches)
14.00 – 15.00	Lunch
16.00 – 17.00	Reception at the Bank of Georgia
17.15 – 18.15	Reception at the Ministry of Culture of Georgia (Minister S. Gogiberidze, First Deputy Minister N. Kobajhidze, Deputy Ministers Z. Oikashvili, G. Tskitishvili)
18.15 – 19.00	Visit to Elene Akhvlediani Memorial Museum
19.15	Dinner

Tuesday 22 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.15 – 12.00	Meeting with the heads of art academies financed by the State (G. Lortdkipanidze, Shota Rustaveli University of Theatre and Film; S. Koyava, State Academy of Arts; M. Doijashvili, V. Sarajishvili State Conservatory)

12.15 – 14.00	Visiting the Art Galleries and meeting with the representatives of NGOs ("Old Gallery", M. Vadachkoria; "Orient", B. Tsikoridze; "Gallery of Enamel Painting", S. Babunashvili; "Modern Art Centre", M. Dvalishvili; G. Janberidze, Chairman of the Union of Georgian Artists; Gallery "Hobby", V. Mujiri; "N Gallery", N. Metreveli; N. Kipiani, Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research; National Gallery of Children's Art)
14.30 – 15.30	Lunch
16.00 – 17.00	Reception at the State Chancellery of Georgia (Mr K. Imedashvili)
17.15 – 19.00	Reception at the Caucasian House (Ms N. Gelashvili, Director); meeting with the culture associations of national minorities
19.30	Dinner

Wednesday 23 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.30 – 11.30	Reception at the Parliament Committee of Science, Education, Culture and Sports (Mr D. Koguashvili, Mr G. Shaishmelashvili)
12.45 – 14.00	Visit to Ilya Chavchavadze Memorial Museum. Reception at the Music College of Tbilisi
14.45 – 15.15	Lunch
15.30 – 17.00	Reception at the State Department of Sports and Tourism of Georgia (Mr V. Shubladze, Head of the Department; Mr G. Baliashvili, Head of the Municipal City Service of Sports and Tourism)
17.15 – 18.45	Meeting with the representatives of tour companies and NGOs carrying out their activities in the sphere of tourism (Facilitator Mr K. Arabuli)
19.00	Dinner

Thursday 24 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.30 – 12.30	Meeting with the representatives of Georgian media
12.30 – 14.00	Meeting with the independent art workers and heads of organisations financed by the Municipality of Tbilisi
14.15 – 15.30	Lunch
16.00 – 17.00	Meeting with the representatives of various foundations
17.30 – 18.30	Reception at the "New Georgian Foundation"
19.00	Dinner

Friday 25 July 2003

9.00 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.15 – 11.30	Reception at the Municipality of Tbilisi (Mayor of Tbilisi, Chief Architect of Tbilisi, Chief Artist of the City, representatives of the City Council of Tbilisi, Municipality Service of Economy)
11.30 – 14.00	Sightseeing tour (visiting the museum of Tbilisi: Karvasla, State St Museum, State Museum of History, National Gallery of Art)
14.45 – 15.15	Lunch
15.30 – 18.30	Visiting the theatres of Tbilisi (Independent Theatre, Royal Theatre, Vake Theatre, Tumanishvili Theatre of Film Actors, Georgian and Russian Young People's Theatre)
19.00	Dinner

APPENDIX II

<u>**PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS THE EXPERTS KINDLY REQUESTED TO MEET**</u>

a) <u>**National and local institutions in Tbilisi:**</u>

<u>**If possible:**</u>

- The Mayor and Members of the City Council of Tbilisi who are especially in charge of cultural affairs.

- The Minister and Deputy Minister of Culture of the Ministry of Culture,

- Official representatives in charge of tourism issues (City Council, Ministry of Tourism, other officials).

- Head and Deputy Chief of Cultural Policy Department from the Ministry of Culture (in charge of theatre, music, dance, museums, artistic programmes).

- The Head and Deputy Chief of the Permanent Parliamentary Committee on Cultural Issues.

- The Head and Deputy Chief of the Department of Science, Culture, National Education and Social Issues of the Cabinet of Ministers.

- Directors of different cultural institutions (for example conservatories for music and theatre or cultural houses) – one from each category:
  1. institutions financed by the state,
  2. institutions financially supported by the city council,
  3. and privatly funded cultural institutions.

- Representatives of the public media, especially TV and radio stations.

b) <u>**Non-governmental Organisations:**</u>

- The Soros Foundation.
- Eurasia Foundation.
- Persons in charge of cultural trust funds, if this exists.
- The persons in charge of the private TV stations and radio channels especially for a cultural channel/ programme if it exists.
- Other art unions and associations, as for example womens' cultural associations, associations four young artistis.

- Cultural Minorities' Associations.

- NGOs having special projects in cultural tourism.

c) **Independent artists, creative workers, persons involved in the diverse cultural sectors:**

- Key economic players whose activities impact on culture, for example through scholarships, sponsoring or foundations.

- Key persons involved in the tourism sector.

- Important members of the intellectual scene in Tibilisi especially with knowledge of the city's history.

- Young creative talents receiving municipal or governmental stipends.

- Persons working independently and receive financial support by the City Council.

- Gallery Owners.

d) **Institutes setting up cultural statistics :**

- It would be very helpful for the experts if figures about the demand and offer of cultural products could be provided for different years in order to see the evolution.

- Also, tourism statistics about the cities' visitors would be helpful.