

Dear Joep, Dear Karin and Dear All,

Thank you so much for your feedbacks and questions on the BBI, which I believe, are vital to improve our proposal towards a stronger formulation.

Certainly, we started the idea of creating funds from the point of facilitating the under-expenditures of 2008 for some good purposes and we thought that it would be wonderful if we could channelize it to the public programme that we have already aimed at developing for 2009. However, as we all have been undergoing through the accelerated side effects of the credit crisis since September 2008, we decided to expand the limits of the funds to include the projects-in-need as a precaution for the upcoming periods.

As a possible result of the credit crisis (including its psychological impacts), we are experiencing a tendency of withdrawal on the side of the commissioners for the projects that are in process of realization or negotiation. Since we have already had a few examples, we took such incidents as potential indications for undesirable future developments. Consequently, we decided to create a “Red Cross” for our projects-in-need as well as a strong public programme to increase the visibility and status of SKOR to attract more commissioners. For that reason, although we did not discuss in the last board meeting about a fund for the projects-in-need for the upcoming years, we thought that creating such an “emergency” fund for projects carries an utmost importance in order to be prepared against the inevitable repercussions of the credit crisis.

Following Joep’s line of argument that proposes finding solutions for “uncovered” situations by any other institutions or government bodies, maybe we can extend the limits of the emergency fund to other projects than ours.

As we briefly explained, the “Red Cross” aid for the projects should have the condition that the fund will be the last resort after trying other sources and all the projects that will be evaluated under this category should be approved by the Advisory Committee and, if it is over 50.000 Euro, by the Board. I believe that SKOR can be an exemplary institution for the OCW, which develops strategies against

the adverse effects of the crisis.

Certainly, the information provided in the chart about the public programme, especially on the “Annual International SKOR Lecture Series” is quite insufficient and rough so that does not really give an idea about what it can be. Actually, we take it a public service that opens up new discussions in this field like “Emerging Forms and New Strategies of Engagement in Public Space Under Transformation”, which can be unfolded in many different dimensions from critical theory to display practices and to the urban politics. The diversity of dimensions can also provide a base for new collaborations for SKOR with the national and international fellow institutions. For this series, we are planning to invite the internationally acclaimed figures like Hans Ulrich Obrist and Hou Hanru, who were the curators of the iconic exhibition called “Cities on the Move” in 1999 reflecting on the new urbanism appearing in the East, especially in China through the artists’ works. They can be matched with Rem Koolhaas, who made a project on the Gulf Course in the last Istanbul Biennial curated by Hou Hanru. All of them know each other very well as they have been collaborating with each other in different contexts like exhibitions or interviews for quite some time. The series can be concluded with a publication as a record of the discussions.

The “Annual International SKOR Lecture Series” is a rough draft and if there is a green light, then, it will be fully developed. It is intended to be realized in collaboration (also financially) with partner institutions such as Stedelijk Museum, NAI or Witte de Wit (Trouwens, such collaborations are highly appreciated and encouraged by the OCW). Although this kind of international events do not have immediate effects on the rise of the number of commissions, certainly they help SKOR to take its place in the international art map as well as raise its status nationally as an institution, not only produce projects but also ideas on art in public space. The interest for such international events is quite intense as we witnessed during the “Now is the Time” lecture series organized in collaboration with several institutions like de Appel, Stedelijk, Amsterdam University, W139 and Metropolis art magazine.

For the technical questions like the 183.500 Euro for the public programme that is already in our budget, we can tell that it is for

project related public programme and its budget isn't included in the funds, but directly included in the project budgets. For the translation and travel costs, as suggested by Karin, we need to take them out from the fund's budget.

For the next Board meeting, it would be great if we can discuss on the issue of the crisis and what kind of other strategies we can develop to stimulate the field and the possible commissioners.

Looking forward to hearing from you on the BBI at your earliest convenience.

Warm regards,

Fulya Erdemci