

Maximizing the Potential of the Creative Cities Network: Reflections & Advice

Executive Summary

The Abridged Report:

Contents

Creativity & Social Development Goals

Expectations

The Lifecycle of Networks

Catalytic Impact

Addressing the Faultlines

Recommendations

The Supplements

One: Rationale of the Survey & Process

Two: The Bigger Global Context

Three: A Colourful Canvas of Member Views

Four: Expectations

Expectations from the title

Expectations of UNESCO

Expectations from UNESCO

Expectations from city and media

Five: Catalytic Impact

Six: Organizational Mechanics

Seven: A Vision for Creativity & Creative Cities

Eight: Networks & their Lifecycles

Nine: Connections & Synergies

Executive Summary

The collaborative project between UNESCO, Charles Landry and his team reviewed UNESCO's Creative Cities Network in summer and autumn 2016. This involved 133 interviews, including 103 of the 116 network member cities and 19 external people of significance. Its aim is to be a helpful discussion document. Readers who immediately want to go to its essence can look at pages 14-17 where the inevitable faultlines of a global organization dealing with local urban creativity and the subsequent recommendations are explored.

This report has three parts: this summary; second a condensed report highlighting the main observations, analysis, conclusions and recommendations; and finally nine lengthier supplements that elaborate and deepen the arguments, including: the rationale of the report and issues explored; the bigger context for creative city making; a canvas of views from the network; expectations from UNESCO of the network and of UNESCO; the catalytic impact; organizational mechanics; a vision for creative city making; the changing world of networks and learning; and connections and synergies.

To give more life to the report the supplements in particular extensively bring out the voices of interviewees. This provides UNESCO and the Secretariat with a rich source of material to consider and explore. The main observations, conclusions and recommendations are:

The *raison d'être of the network* is to celebrate contemporary manifestations of creativity. Creativity at its simplest is multi-faceted resourcefulness and openness and flexibility are its most important qualities. This allows people and organization to think, plan and act with imagination in solving problems and creating opportunities. Now as the UCCN Secretariat seeks to align itself to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) it needs to clarify its vision and restate its mission. Therefore the focus on art forms and cultural creative fields needs an explicit argument and justification.

UNESCO, its Secretariat and network members exist in a tight symbiosis and everyone agrees that the network is a positive initiative, as noted: "UNESCO has given cities a gift, and it gives you more than it takes". Designation has been an organizing device for certain cities at a point in their development and had a strong impact increasingly on smaller cities.

Yet there are substantive worries about its explosive growth. This has shifted the mood for many and changed the network's spirit. Some cities are becoming disengaged, although newcomers are positive.

Clarity about where next and how with the network becomes more urgent as old certainties crumble and systems break at escalating speed in this period of history involving mass transformation. Cities want creative guidance or inspiration.

Cities have had differing aims and personal expectations yet ideally they want a transforming impact. The title, for some is seen as recognition and for others as a catalyst to be ambitious and aspirational, especially once UNESCO shifted the criteria from "why you deserve this to what do you hope to achieve". For all it is an element of their strategy repertoire. Yet not all have made the most of its potential. One reason is a disparity in resources, another is navigating the complexities of productive global networking.

Sometimes the creative field chosen is a perfect fit at others to shift perception. Many ask why there are only seven creative fields so excluding the performing and visual arts and the idea of rewarding comprehensive creativity is rising up the agenda.

Synergy can unleash other potentials such as linking heritage and innovation and highlighting partnerships for the application process has triggered a useful connecting process in cities. This requires a networking mindset perhaps more difficult for UNESCO.

Expectations of and from UNESCO inevitably touch upon broader governance issues and designation confers both responsibilities and rights. The Secretariat is inserted into a heavy structure so a central message is that it needs to become a stronger professional organization less subject to political pressures. A arm's length, structure can bring out the best of what UNESCO, participating cities, creative actors and expert outsiders together can bring to the table. Cities want the Secretariat to operate at its best and to use its strongest assets and to be more a connector than an administrator and more an active broker, ideas generator, quality controller and convenor. Such a structure can address difficult issues more easily, such as financial contributions from members, raising external resources or creating award schemes or discussing deselection.

The world of networks is changing very fast in a digitized world. There is a lifecycle to all networks and many are reconsidering how they operate.

Networks are a human endeavour and ultimately revolve around people, the experience of collaborating and trust. Thus how meetings are conducted is crucial and they are seen as too formal and lacking in verve.

There are some faultlines to address and they shape the recommendations. UNESCO is a global, politically shaped entity largely used to dealing with nation states. Cities are different as are creative actors. Can therefore a global bureaucracy run a creativity network and can those working in the Secretariat fully express their capabilities. There is a need to bridge the gap between the formal world and necessities of government and the world of creatives and this raises the question of setting up an arm's length entity. The UCCN can stay as it is, it will survive whatever given UNESCO's reputation, but will it be vibrant. Changing the operating conditions and even the culture becomes key.

The recommendations propose that this report should be used to initiate a structured discussion process over the next year, whereby UCCN restates its vision with clarity, purpose, specific aims and targets. The UCCN Secretariat should sub-contract as many activities as possible to leave space to do those things it could do best so moving to being an enabler, a connector, a broker of opportunities and resources.

In parallel it should explore creating a hybrid, arm's length, entity jointly managed by the Secretariat, the network's steering group with some outsiders involved. Finance for this professional entity should come from a mix of sources. It should consider employing outside experts to undertake evaluations of cities' performance.

The seven creative fields should be enlarged to include the performing and visual arts and cities should be designated as comprehensive creative cities with an option to focus on a specific field. To enhance the Secretariat's own capacities and image it should review its communications strategy. To repeat it should clarify its targets for growth as consolidation is the watchword.

Charles Landry

Maximizing the Potential of the Creative Cities Network: The Abridged Report

The UNESCO Creative Cities Network founded in 2004 now has 116 members focused on seven fields literature, music, design, film, crafts and folk art, gastronomy and media arts. 133 people were interviewed in this survey.

Creativity & Social Development Goals

Celebrating contemporary manifestations of creativity is the *raison d'être* of the network. Creativity is a powerful renewable resource and heritage a non-renewable resource, although its interpretation and meaning might change through time. Together they shape, make and co-create the evolving culture of places in a process that is continually negotiated. Harmonizing the potentially diverging priorities or even tensions of **past achievement and contemporary exploration** is a wider aim of UNESCO. Yet in the global imagination UNESCO remains mostly associated with heritage and its tangible and intangible forms.

The UCCN Secretariat now **needs to clarify its vision and restate its mission** as it is changing with its aim to link to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). Within this process **UNESCO needs to define creativity** and how you can become more creative. Equally what a creative city is and also its qualities and characteristics or how a city can become creative.

Creativity at its simplest is multi-faceted resourcefulness. Creativity requires certain qualities of mind, dispositions and attitudes of which **openness and flexibility are the most important.** Yet not everyone, every organization or city is equally creative, yet **all can become more creative.** At its simplest a creative city provides opportunities for people, organizations and the city as an amalgam of entities **to think, plan and act with imagination** in solving problems and creating opportunities and addressing the issues that really matter to them and the world. These are places where people can express their expertise, talents and ambitions which are harnessed, exploited and promoted for the common good. A means of measuring and monitoring a city's creativity would focus on how does the city nurture and identify its creative potential, enable and support this creative capacity, exploit and harness its creative assets and how the lived experience of the city expresses this in order to encourage a virtuous cycle. Thus a high level of urban design and planning needs to inspire, stimulate and generate pride and affection.

The focus on art forms and cultural creative fields needs an explicit argument and justification as a creative city encompasses many manifestations. It needs to express in a coherent way how these forms lie at the heart of social and economic development and in achieving SDG goals. **A way to square the circle is** for UNESCO to describe the special qualities and roles the artistic forms that make up the network have in shaping cities creatively and that make a unique contribution to solve global problems in a sustainable way.

Of UCCN's seven fields it is at first sight design and especially social design and its link to urban planning that stands out. Equally gastronomy with its focus on local production, healthy living or addressing food miles issues connects well to SDG goals as does media arts with its linkages to the new economy and start-up world. Crafts and folk art clearly highlights the need to safeguard local distinctiveness. With music, film and literature the association to SDG needs to be explained more fully. Overall, though, all have a strong role in social development.

It is the bigger context that determines what this could be as **old certainties crumble and systems are breaking at escalating speed** where unfulfilled are the promises of a better world and dissatisfaction is growing. Apprehension is in the air. **Periods of history involving mass transformation**, like the industrial or technological revolution of the past fifty years, can produce confusion. Most cities are looking for creative change yet **want creative guidance or inspiration**.

Everyone agrees that the network is a positive initiative and that most cities have benefitted from the designation during the course of their membership. So, most places are proud and grateful. Indeed a crisp encapsulation is that "UNESCO has **given cities a gift, and it gives you more than it takes**.

Yet there are substantive, nearly pervasive, **worries about the explosive growth of the network**. This growth has consequences. It both increases global recognition and equally dilutes its credibility. Operating as a nation driven global organization the UN and UNESCO perspective is that UCCN needs to reflect the diversity of regions North, South, East and West. Indeed **addressing cultural complexity** lie at the core of what UNESCO does and is one of UNESCO's major aims.

Many members feel disempowered by the growth feeling they were not sufficiently consulted about '**where next with the network and how**'. There are no targets, they are unclear about ultimate numbers for the

network. Is it to be 150, 250 or more cities? They want to have a paced and purposeful approach to growth and development. **They want more clarity.** Thus the mood changes for many cities as it makes it difficult to stay close to the original spirit of the network. Indeed a number are disengaging. Cities understand that the **UCCN will survive whatever,** given UNESCO's reputation, but they ask will it be meaningful and vibrant. This then raised questions about how UCCN operates and is managed. Cities are asking **what type of network UCCN should be** and what image UNESCO and the members have in mind. Is it a hierarchical network driven from above or is responsibility shared. Four themes emerged: Expectations from and of UNESCO; the operational dynamics of the network and relations between the cities and UNESCO, such as what kind of steering group should exist, collecting fees for membership, evaluating performance or cancelling membership; the fields covered by the network and establishing synergies; the changing nature of networking. Each is covered in turn.

Expectations of the Network

Cities have had differing aims and personal expectations for joining the network and mixed motivations and there is a spectrum of how it has and is being used. This includes: To gain recognition to operate better on a wider stage; to enhance image, international presence, economic prospects or tourism impacts; to get insiders and outsiders to appreciate their city more; to make contacts; to create opportunities; to share good project ideas; to persuade local decision makers that creative fields are important by highlighting and legitimizing the status and importance of art forms and the creative economy. In sum: "**Transformational impact** locally was what we wanted and beyond that we wanted to be part of a global network".

Some saw the title as recognition and others as a catalyst to be ambitious and aspirational. Of course being part of UCCN helps cities suffering from political difficulties such as Baghdad or Zahle.

The UCCN title for many cities **is an element of their strategy repertoire;** perhaps a **'must have' title.** Cities in the midst of transformation like Torino, Detroit or Dakar by contrast realize they need ambitious goals and the designation provides a context within which to express these. The title then helps regeneration or rethinking. Others see the need to keep up momentum, for instance Helsinki, which had been a World Design Capital in 2012. So the title provides continuity and **rather than being one-off it is 'forever'.**

Many city leaderships and especially those in the cultural field, had **a clear view of why they wanted the title** wishing to use it as a trigger for action. Unfortunately not that many cities have been able to make the most of opportunities and regrettably a number have let things drift. This has several reasons including: A lack of resources rather than ideas; a lack of broader commitment at the local level or political difficulties and a realization that productive networking at a global level is complex, time consuming and costly. A city like Austin currently has no budget; Mannheim 30,000 euros per annum; Katowice one million euros and Shenzhen with seven full time employees dedicated to the task even more. **Disparity in resources** will ultimately become a factor for the network to become sustainable.

Sometimes the creative field chosen is **a perfect fit** like for Linz with media arts for others they aim to shift perceptions like York, which wanted to balance its heritage image with a focus on new media. Yet others like Barcelona chose literature as a means of highlighting an industry in some difficulty. Curitiba wanted to shift from its urban planning renown to a focus on design. The choice can even be driven by the interests of politicians as with the choice of music in Bologna.

Globally recognized comprehensively creative cities like Bandung have **adjusted their expectations to squeeze their application** into a specific field and could be regarded as a general creative city. Indeed Canada, Japan and South East Asia have their own wider creative cities networks and one is emerging in Argentina. None of their cities are members for a specific art form. Italian cities were especially vocal in designating cities for their overall creativity. Yet not all agree with this perspective especially those designated as crafts and folk art cities.

Many ask **why there are only seven creative fields**. There appears to be no logic in excluding the performing and visual arts except that is has always been so. Only a few cities disagree. This links to the debate about **rewarding comprehensive creativity** given the increased **understanding of spillover effects and spin-offs** where increasing blending is happening between arts forms, across culture and non-cultural activities and into business and social life. Indeed the creative economy sectors and art forms are central **to the evolutionary process of the economy and society as a whole**, we could not operate without them. "The landscape of culture is now differently discussed. The network is in danger of remaining old-fashioned". Yet a number of smaller cities especially those within the crafts and folk art field are keener on art form designations.

The synergy goes further as this can unleash other potentials. UCCN should **pay special attention to linking heritage and innovation** so experts and visitors can explore, re-experience and re-interpret heritage both to enhance heritage encounters and to safeguard sites from visitor overload. Augmented reality experiences are increasingly common. There are other possible synergies too within UNESCO itself as between UCCN and education.

UCCN has rightly given importance to creating partnerships for the application process and the designation has often **triggered a useful connecting process in cities**, yet it can go further. This connecting approach **requires a networking mindset**, which is essentially entrepreneurial and opportunity seeking, something extremely difficult for a state sponsored organization like UNESCO.

Once Unesco shifted the criteria from “why you deserve this to what do you hope to achieve” expectations rose for newer potential applicants and unexpected candidates emerged like Obidos. Some creative places with a strong existing track record found this difficult. The network has **greater impact for smaller cities** and these are mostly very enthusiastic and active take Pekalongan or Denia as examples. The principles of creativity are the same for smaller and larger cities, but the expression is inevitably different. Indeed a smaller place may achieve more.

Wider ethical considerations or global concerns like those of SDG were mostly far from the mind of cities initially, but there is hardly any resistance to adapt to UNESCO’s new purposes.

Expectations of and from UNESCO inevitably touch upon broader governance issues and there is an understanding that network members and UNESCO are in a tight, complex symbiosis and that UNESCO operates within limitations. The perspectives of city organizations and the creative actors in cities differ, the latter wants more agility and flexibility. Yet both want UCCN, and this is the key message, to be **a stronger professional organization** less subject to the inevitable politics that global nationally driven organizations can work under. The Secretariat is inserted into a heavy structure, it has leadership in some sense, but they are not free to manage as they could given the pressures which effects their organizational ethos and operating environment. Most cities and especially creative actors want the network to be protected from this.

UNESCO and the Secretariat needs to create a organizational form, and this is different from the past 2012/13 discussions, that allows them to be **strategic principled about its central ideas and tactically flexible** in how this is implemented. This will allow the network to maintain energy and relevance.

Cities understand that **designation confers both responsibilities and rights**. Many cities say **they want UNESCO to operate at its best** and to use its strongest assets. These are its ability to designate; to give credibility; to be in effect a 'licensing authority'; to manage quality standards; to award prizes and to reward achievement; to have an overview; to use its convening power when appropriate. By moving away from a more directive role they believe the Secretariat, now embedded into formal UNESCO structures, can free itself from those things it is less good at. **A different, arm's length, structure** can bring out the best of what UNESCO, participating cities, creative actors and expert outsiders can bring to the table. The arm's length principle is well established across the globe. The new steering group process is a beginning as it formally involves more voices, but it still within the old structure. Clearly UNESCO is less good at being an active networker, an agile operator or an opportunity creator, but in partnership it could be.

Bigger and smaller cities have differing expectations. Bigger cities expect more entrepreneurial guile and less privileged cities from the South want more practical things. They even had expectations that UNESCO cannot fulfil such as being funded or help in gathering resources. Both want a more a more responsive central entity. Cities want "**UNESCO to be more a connector than an administrator**", and the Secretariat could **see its role as an active broker** especially to link members to institutional opportunities. In sum they want the Secretariat to be more active in coming up with ideas and especially several wanted UCCN to raise its international influence and to propose concrete collaboration programmes that have tangible impact on cultural exchange and economic development.

A new structure can address difficult issues more easily, such as paying fees for membership or raising money from sponsors or others. To operate at a higher level and in a more sophisticated and active way requires resources. The majority are in fact willing to **pay some equitable membership fee** provided there is a more equal and clearer decision making process between the Secretariat and member cities. In fact if the

network saw itself more as an association based on an equal partnership paying a subscription is commonplace. The main concern is that cities will be able to buy influence. Surely, developing a fair and transparent contribution system that balances what members can contribute is possible.

Revoking membership and **de-designation is a hot topic**. For many cities it is the threat of losing the title that creates the necessary political commitment to play a full part in the network. Yet views differ and unsurprisingly several members prefer to encourage the laggards into action. The network can do without sleepers, they weaken the network and its credibility suffers. When member cities are not even contactable and have done nothing and show little if no evidence of creativity how can they be deemed to be 'creative cities'. UNESCO procedures here are cumbersome and very lengthy and this issue again can be better addressed in a more arm's length structure. Active networks have requirements and simpler de-designation processes.

The self-evaluation and action planning process is important, but it only goes so far. Given how public the evaluations are cities will not bare their real weaknesses and failures and there is a tendency to do self-marketing. It is not objective enough. Outsiders should undertake the evaluations, as happens for instance with the Intercultural Cities network, yet this requires resourcing.

Three strong themes are: how meetings are conducted, the need for inspiration from UNESCO and UNESCO's own image. Meetings are seen as too formal and lack verve. **'We meet in a creative cities network but there is no creativity'**. To generate commitment and engagement makes the atmosphere of joint meetings vitally important. This might, as an instance, even mean developing a fringe or a kind of creative city festival at the summits.

UNESCO needs to **retell a compelling story or to describe a vision** for the network that is simple, focused, relevant and ambitious for a global audience. This **needs a touch of realism and magic**. Sharing good practices and creating a learning environment is fine as far as it goes as is encouraging artist exchanges. But are these aims aspirational enough?

These are the reasons why **cities would love guidance and inspiration**. They want UNESCO to create calls and incentives, for instance, to encourage cross discipline collaboration; there should be award schemes for good projects and better-performing cities should get rewards; there

should even be a creative city award. Apparently the latter causes a dilemma for UNESCO, yet in an arm's length structure far less so.

All the above, affect UNESCO's image in the outside world in a vicious cycle. By loosening up the perception that UNESCO "has bad self-marketing" or is very bureaucratic will decline.

Expectations, finally, from the media are often under-informed or false, such as that the title confers money to cities. This highlights that the Secretariat needs a stronger communications strategy.

The Lifecycle of Networks

The network is the institution of our time. It is a new culture, yet **the world of networks is changing and very fast**. This becomes an issue in exploring UCCN and its potential as UCCN needs to re-assess its networking capacities. The core aim of sharing and learning remains, but there is the old and the new networking. Digitally capacities and potential means networking is increasingly mirroring social networking with its focus on the informal and personalization. Think of how social networks and sharing platforms shape behaviour and organizational patterns.

Additionally the rise of big data and more sophisticated web platforms challenges UNESCO to perform better. It needs to be far more adept at social media with a concerted effort to make its website more interactive. Inevitably the **Secretariat will need to undertake a major review of its communications**. The outcomes will become different from older formal networks where cities often just want to showcase or do self-promotion. This dynamic challenges institutions and **throws the idea of an institutional network up into the air**. Everywhere people are re-considering the effectiveness of their networks and seeking to reinvent them for the new age.

Crucially they are **re-considering how peer to peer learning is developing** and what methods work and how deeper exchanges can be established with so much less face to face and more through virtual platforms. This means physical meetings have to generate an extra quality and value added. It might be through inspirational speakers, masterclasses, one to one mentoring schemes. These are areas for UCCN to consider.

There is a lifecycle to all networks. If UNESCO wants to encourage transformative exchanges and deep learning it needs to **encourage an arms' length entity or bridge** between the formal world and necessities of government and the quicker world of creatives and social activists. Such a

hybrid intermediary would be able to speak the language of both parties and should be given the authority to broker between government and non-government as neither party can achieve the full impact without the other. There are good examples of this and it requires new attitudes and competences from public institutions.

The effective networks are increasingly fluid structures and processes through which ideas and values flow and come alive with network nodes providing the energy rather than a centre. Their coherence comes from the multiple relationships, interactions, joint projects and crosshatches of activity that are bound together by common values and aims. They are alert and responsive, where difference and diversity is encouraged, yet consensus is a common goal. They are more driven by principles than tight guidelines. This raises questions as **UNESCO would need to trade its power for creative influence**. This might be difficult for UNESCO when its designation provides the value and status to cities.

In fact, it is **more the person who collaborates** rather than the abstraction that is the city. Networks are a human endeavour. Their engine is shared values, agreed aims, co-created ideas and programmes, joint planning and ventures. These pre-conditions get people to exchange information, knowledge and their potentially powerful tacit and unexpressed insights. This can generate the desire to create time and extra effort, in spite of other obligations, to develop projects. "We would love to do more, especially with the South, but we have no time to put in the extra effort and there needs to be a tangible benefit".

It is often easier to meet in regional groups or thematic clusters and these are beginning to find good purposes and energy with new groupings emerging in Latin and North America, as well China, Korea and Japan. This helps simplify the complexities of a global network into more manageable forms. Here people can mostly communicate in their language and form alliances that are easier to organize and less expensive.

UCCN **ultimately revolves around people and trust** even though the network might be institutionally anchored and driven by UNESCO's policy guidelines or written agreements. In the 'what next' phase of the UCCN **UNESCO must build, perhaps even rebuild, trust** and it cannot be mechanical or formulaic.

Catalytic impact

Taking everything into account UCCN has some solid achievements, yet it could do more if conditions were right. The cache of the title acts as a **badge of honour** and can have multiple impacts if cities understand the title as a flexible tool and what it can do. Then it can be an accelerator of opportunities. Drawing the threads together we can see that the **designation is an organizing device** for certain cities at a point in their development and related to their size. Increasingly now the label has far more impact on 2nd and 3rd tier cities, even though a number of 1st tier cities have joined or are joining like Rome and Paris. "It was the right step at the right time, but that not mean it still has the same value for us". "It provided the opportunity to bring the start-up world and media arts community together" as noted Tel-Aviv and it was "incredibly important to overcome jealousy and to put people together as said Parma. "It gave us a good press" so Adelaide; "the brand is valued in applications" as Bradford witnessed often and it has directly triggered regeneration as in Florianopolis.

Asian cities saw UNESCO as a solid brand, **powerful yet underused and an undervalued asset**. Thus across the continents cities emphasized the constant pressure to demonstrate the value of the network.

Addressing the Faultlines

In drawing towards a summary, conclusions and recommendations a reminder that UNESCO, its Secretariat and network members **are tightly bound together**. The one cannot exist without the other. Each has responsibilities and rights. A number of major faultlines condition how UCCN in its current form operates and they make the recommendations below more urgent if the network is to become more vital and self-sustaining.

Faultline one: UNESCO is a global, politically shaped entity. This determines its organizational culture and modes of operating as political exigencies are ever present. Inevitably this puts more politically charged negotiations, procedures, processes and policy at the forefront and so containing and controlling can become the organizational default position. Member cities understand this bigger context, but encouraging creativity requires an organizational ethos and style which creates the pre-conditions for network members collectively to think, plan and act with imagination within agreed aims. This is dramatically different from protecting heritage or other UNESCO priorities.

Faultline Two: UNESCO is largely used to dealing with nation states. Priorities differ when dealing with member countries. In an interconnected world negotiating the global rules systems is key as are inter-governmental agreements. This is why for UNESCO conventions provide its operating framework. These establish the broader national guidance within which cities operate. This shapes UNESCO's thinking and modus operandi. The citizen or specific projects are inevitably more distant. Cities are different. City leaderships are more pragmatic. They need to solve problems and they need to deliver. This is why they like projects.

Faultline Three: The network is the institution of our time and its dynamics are changing driven by social media potential and digitization. In a digitized world more formal institutional networks are suffering and seen as cumbersome and unwieldy compared to the quicker world of social media savvy creatives who thrive more on fluid structures, codes of behaviour and quick responses. When old and new networking worlds clash as in UCCN the question is: "who has authority". This changes the internal dynamics and puts pressure on the balance of power between network nodes, the cities, and the network's Secretariat. Who provides the drive, energy and ideas?

Faultline Four: Can a global bureaucracy can run a creativity network remembering how different this is from managing a heritage designation. Can UNESCO fulfil the roles that UCCN members and especially creative actors wish from it or is it merely to remain a licensing authority or the franchise holder. **What is the best organizational form or relationship** that gets the best out of UNESCO's drawing power, status and authority and the energy of cities. Solving this lies at the heart of the new relationship.

Faultline Five: Will UNESCO's ethos as an inter-governmentally run bureaucracy allow those already employed or who they might recruit to display the necessary competences and capabilities to operate in the more modern ways a contemporary network demands.

Faultline Six: There is a potential tension between UNESCO broadly stated vision for a sustainable world and its operations focused on seven creative fields and the cultural creative economy. How these fields can help wider SDG goals needs to be clarified.

Faultline Seven: There is a need to bridge the gap between the formal world and necessities of government and the world of creatives who want the enabling conditions for them to act with greater fluidity. Is **a more**

arm's length arrangement the best way for all parties to give of their best?

Faultline Eight: UNESCO can stay as it is and **UCCN will survive whatever**. UNESCO's name value remains too strong and some cities will always find value in being associated with it. UNESCO can tinker at the edges and for some that will be fine, but will the cities with higher ambitions or global reputations continue to play their part. To change the performance of UNESCO it needs to change the culture and its operating conditions

The recommendations proposed suggest some ways forward.

Recommendation One: This review is a comprehensive report, which incorporates more than one hundred interviews, additional research and expert opinion from a large number of other networks. In the review people wanted to be honest. It should be used to initiate a structured process over the next year to discuss its contents since the report is a summary of their views. Internally it should be explored by the Secretariat and steering group in consultation with all members as well as outside experts with serious experience of networks and of implementing creative projects.

Recommendation Two: The Secretariat and UCCN as a whole needs to restate its vision with clarity, purpose, specific aims and targets. This **should combine realism and idealism**. Currently there is a misalignment and many issues remain too loosely defined and priorities are shifting, such as linkages to UN Habitat III's New Urban Agenda. This includes what we mean by creativity, whether it only includes the seven fields or what a creative city is and how you become one and how you can monitor it. Ultimately it is about unleashing the potential of creative citizens.

Recommendation Three: UCCN members are being charged with doing action plans and monitoring reports. The Secretariat should consider employing outside experts to undertake evaluations and in addition instigate a 360 degree evaluation so that the overall UCCN system is being assessed given the mutual interdependencies.

Recommendation Four: The main capacities of the UCCN Secretariat are its designation authority, its status and its convening power. It should shift its self-identity and organizational ethos to giving creative guidance and providing influence rather than protocols and rules. Being an enabler, a connector, a broker of opportunities and resources and an orchestrator of serendipity is a better challenge.

Recommendation Five: The UCCN Secretariat should sub-contract as many activities as possible to leave space to do those things it could do best, thinking always 'what is most catalytic'. UNESCO should simplify. It should build strategic relationships with other organizations, such as in research, so becoming more a sign-poster and curator, rather than having to do everything itself.

Recommendation Six: UNESCO should explore, and this is different from the past 2012/13 discussions on organizational change, creating a hybrid, arm's length, entity jointly managed by the Secretariat and the network's steering group with some outsiders involved. This can liberate the Secretariat and share the workload. **Managing a professionalized entity** will also reduce political pressures on the Secretariat and UCCN. The Secretariat then focuses more on being a licensing authority and quality controller. Examples are given in the longer report.

Recommendation Seven: Finance for this professional entity should come from a mix of sources, including members and other sources that will then be easier to garner. A fair method can be devised that safeguards impartiality, fairness and ensures no-one has disproportionate influence because of their financial input.

Recommendation Eight: The Secretariat, freed from many burdens, should institute calls and incentives, such as to encourage spill-overs and spin-offs and cross discipline collaboration or other topics; award schemes for good projects and rewards for better-performing cities.

Recommendation Nine: The seven creative fields should be enlarged to include the performing and visual arts. In addition cities should be designated as comprehensive creative cities with an option to focus on a specific field.

Recommendation Ten: De-designation should be made simpler and procedures should take less time. Being called a creative city is an honour not to be taken lightly.

Recommendation Eleven: The UCCN Secretariat should undertake a thorough communications review including exploring a more sophisticated online presence incorporating interactive platforms.

Recommendation Twelve: Clarify the targets for growth and an overall aim, such as a maximum of 25 new members every two years over the next decade. This will generate confidence that a paced and purposeful approach is present and create a better sense of continuity.

Maximizing the Potential of the Creative Cities Network: The Supplements

Supplement One: Rationale of the Survey & Process

Preface

'Maximizing the Potential of the Creative Cities Network' aims to highlight the strategic dilemmas, choices and ways to move forward as well as the development stresses and lessons learnt from other networks and experts. It should be seen more as a living, dynamic document rather than a fixed timeless report. It seeks to aid strategic discussion, vision and decision making amongst network members and UNESCO.

The purpose of the review was threefold:

- To explore how Network members can help contribute to the broader purposes, agendas and aims of the UN family, and UNESCO in particular.
- To investigate how expectations of membership, between members and in relation to UNESCO as well as UNESCO's expectations of the potential contribution of the Network and how improvements can be made.
- To suggest how challenges can be solved and opportunities be best fulfilled.

The work was initiated, co-ordinated and written by Charles Landry with partners UNESCO, Östersund, Mannheim City of Music, Heidelberg City of Literature and Mid-Sweden University. **It was undertaken by a 10 member team** and interviews were held whenever possible in the native languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

In all **103 of the 116 members were interviewed**. Some were easy to contact, enthusiastic in their responses, thoughtful and full of rich observations and insight. Others to put it mildly were extremely difficult to reach. The ability to communicate and get responses from members is clearly a problem and achieving this level of response was a veritable task

sometimes involving 10 or more attempts. That in itself tells a story. In some cases it is understandable given politics, changes in personnel or levels of development in others unfortunately because the city cannot be bothered, and some well-known cities are included here.

Speaking directly to people rather than relying on written replies provides a different level of understanding and subtlety. Trusting the interviewer was important and several respondents in cities wanted to ensure that the interviews were anonymous so they could be honest and open. "I feel safe in letting you know my concerns". "Which answer do you want to hear", said one, "the sincere one or ideal answer" and another: "Do you want me say what I really think" or "can I be honest or shall I just agree to everything". The report at times acknowledges the quote by a city and at others leaves it anonymous.

This is why written answers can often be bland and even meaningless, such as: "Our Creative City programme shares development and sustainability objectives akin to UNESCO and UN" or "we have a strong commitment towards UNESCO". "We take UNESCO into account with everything we do". Yet even direct conversations can be revealing. One interviewer reported back: "The replies given do not sound sincere but like an empty political discourse". "He was a charming guy, but I did not believe him". "He kept on talking and does not say much and is going in circles". "He does not give back up, everything was vague." "An easy question, but they did not give me a straight answer". Crucially the interview process has made cities think about the state and potential of the network.

Those involved in undertaking the research were established cultural consultancies and experts: Do-In Choi and Meesoh Kim and other associates from Metaa Consultancy in Seoul for Korean members; Masayuki Sasaki, creative city expert for Japanese members; Anne Yao, from Bamboo Curtain International in Taipei for Chinese members; Franco Bianchini director of the Hull Institute for Research on Culture and the Creative Industries for the Italian cities; Spanish speaking members were interviewed Bruno Mattiussi and Elena Perez working under the guidance of Jonathan Hyams, a Comedia partner; Duarte de Lima Mayer who works with cities in the Lusitanian world interviewed Brazilian and Portuguese cities with Marcus Martins; Rainer Kern who runs Enjoy Jazz the biggest German festival of its type interviewed many of the music cities; Margie Caust from Adelaide who set up the Thinkers in Residence programme in South Australia and worked in London in strategic planning communicated

with Asian and Arab cities; Justyna Jochym from Krakow co-ordinated the work with literature cities and Daniel Laven and Willie Skoglund from Mid-Sweden University interviewed a mix of cities and their students Marie Gathen, Beatriz Carvahlo and Qi Huang have produced master theses on UCCN.

Apart from the cities a number of individuals were interviewed, including Koïchiro Matsuura the former Director General under whose aegis the CCN was set up by UNESCO, Bob Palmer a leading figure in the European Capitals of Culture Movement and former head of culture at the Council of Europe as well as the key players in UNESCO.

In addition a series of **other networks were interviewed and explored** and each has lessons for the CCN to consider. They include: Sarah Gardner of IFACCA, the international federation of arts councils and culture agencies, with its 130 members. Over the last few years IFACCA has clarified its role and relationships and offers to members far more precisely. See its clear strategic plan¹. Phil Wood a founder of the Intercultural Cities Network initially launched by the Council of Europe and now present across the world just reached 100 members and has a timely and globally relevant focus. It has clear advice and methods to help cities become intercultural and has recently worked on its financing model.² Anna Lisa Boni the head of Eurocities with its 165 members and associate members from 35 countries has structured peer learning mechanisms, such as its CASCADE project and has been reviewing how to make its meetings more meaningful and effective.

Others interviewed include the co-ordinators for Actors for Urban Change the Robert Bosch funded competition and award using that focuses on culture and development and is essentially linked to the sustainable development goals the UN promotes; Katherine Heid of Culture Action Europe with 97 members, which is reviewing its purposes and effectiveness in a review undertaken by Ivor Davies formerly of the Arts Council. The European Cities of Culture Network was included, a grouping of former ECoC cities, which has set up a policy group and a research programme to review the impacts of being a city of culture. A key publication is Beatrix Garcia's review of the European Cities of Culture

¹ http://media.ifacca.org/files/IFACCA_Stratplan_english_web_July2015FINAL.pdf

² <http://www.coe.int/en/web/interculturalcities/home>

Programme 1985-2019³. Finally conversations were had with Bernd Fesl of the 23 member city network New Innovations in the Creative Economy (N.I.C.E.) network and its hybrid implementer E.C.C.E.

Others explored include: The Informal European Theatre Meeting – IETM⁴ which has now changed its strapline to ‘International network for contemporary performing arts’ as it has globalized. This network of over 500 performing arts organisations and individual members covers precisely those art forms missing from UNESCO’s list such as those working in the contemporary performing arts worldwide: theatre, dance, circus, interdisciplinary live art forms. The Global Cultural Districts Network⁵ curates conversations the role of culture in urban development. Trans Europe Halles (TEH) the 88 member network of cultural centres initiated by citizens and artists was established more than 30 years ago when occupying an abandoned factory was a rebellious act performed only by the most courageous cultural and social activists. Their belief was that buildings could have a second life as cultural venues, spaces for artistic production and community meeting points. It runs a training academy and has a consultancy service and produces research such as Creative Lenses: Business Models for Culture.

Many of these international cultural networks come together as networks of networks to share experiences and knowhow, to increase cooperation, to support the cultural sector and to advocate culture’s value for development. Their manifesto⁶ reminds us of the bigger picture aims of this work: “Networks share values and ethics” and “as networks we build trust and nurture relationships across national borders that support people to overcome local as well as global difficulties”.

Setting the historical scene

Creativity is a renewable resource and heritage a non-renewable resource, although its interpretation and meaning might change through time. Together they shape, make and co-create the evolving culture of places in a process that is continually negotiated. Harmonizing the

³ http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/513985/IPOL-CULT_ET%282013%29513985_EN.pdf

⁴ <https://www.ietm.org/en/about/history>

⁵ <http://www.gcdn.net/index/current-members/>

⁶ <http://teh.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/The-Value-of-International-Cultural-Networks.pdf>

potentially diverging priorities or even tensions of **past achievement and contemporary exploration** is a wider aim of UNESCO. It can be a positive experience and trigger imaginative responses.

In the global imagination UNESCO remains mostly associated with heritage and its tangible and intangible heritage listings are what it is known for. Its scope of work is of course wider, such as in education and science. Yet since the early 1980s it has been concerned with creativity as a form of cultural expression, source of distinctiveness and later a source of wealth creation, employment, image and perception of place. Then it produced several documents concerned with the cultural industries - only from the 2000s onwards did the term creative industries come into popular use.

These concerns moved apace increasingly under the leadership of Milagros del Corral from 1990 onwards starting with her focus on the wider role of crafts and folk art. **This culminated in the 2005 Convention** on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions under which the Creative Cities Network falls.

The Creative Cities idea was proposed to UNESCO by Lesley Hinds, the then provost (city leader) of Edinburgh in 2003. The idea had been suggested to the city leadership by Edinburgh's cultural community and accepted by UNESCO's then Director General Koïchiro Matsuura.

In parallel **from 2005 onwards UNESCO undertook substantial advocacy** work encapsulated in initiatives such as the International Fund for Cultural Diversity launched in 2010, a multi-donor, voluntary fund that relies on donations from governments, individuals, civil society and the private sector. Under the label 'Creativity Matters: A new agenda for sustainable development' it is now in its seventh call for proposals and has so far provided US\$5.8 to 84 projects in 49 countries. Related advocacy documents include the 2013 Creative Economy Report.

The Creative Cities Network launched in 2004 started with a group of six cities. It grew slowly and after some hiccups expanded to 24 cities by 2010 and 41 by 2013 after which a further 28 cities joined subsequent to the 2014 call for applications and 47 after the 2015 call. A total of 116 now form the network. This more recent explosive growth has caused concern in some quarters.

The survey questions & people interviewed

The interviews held covered seven areas, which are listed below. These provided the template for discussion. Clearly interviews went with the flow of the discussion and attempted to cover all the topics. Yet clearly not every interviewee could respond in detail to every question

Question groupings: Expectations

Why did you apply to be part of the Creative Cities Network?

How did you prepare the application and who was involved? Were not-for-profits and businesses from the cultural and creative sector (CCI) involved and if so how?

What were your main expectations of getting the designation and also of joining the Network?

Is membership primarily seen as a promotional platform through culture for your city or for the Network? Does this differ depending on the stakeholder?

Did you feel you had responsibilities to UNESCO and the wider world of cities? Which ones? Were you aware of the desire to fit into the wider UN strategies such as the Millennium Development Goals, the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda or UNESCO's response to those? If so, has your city implemented or intend to implement specific projects and/or programmes to work towards this international agenda at a local level?

Did you understand that joining the Network was an engagement to become an active player in implementing the UCCN Mission Statement both at the local and the international levels? What did your city do in that sense when getting the designation? Did you understand yourself as an "ambassador" for the programme and if so how did you implement this?

Are all the above expectations based on a clear mid/long-term strategy of your city's development? If that is the case, please explain how.

Question grouping: Your creative field

Why and how did you choose the creative field? Was it the obvious one or could there have been others? Is your creative field particularly relevant and essential to you as a UNESCO Creative City? What are the spin-offs from your designation in a particular creative field for your city?

Do you agree with the Network's potential orientation to emphasize more a broader definition and notion of the creative city, as distinct from categorising it by a creative field? Not all the creative fields are included in the network, such as performing arts? Does this matter?

Have you got a specific programme for your creative field in the form of an action plan as required by UNESCO? Would these activities have happened anyway or is it new?

How did you adapt the UCCN Mission Statement to your creative field? Does your city focus on the implementation of one or several objectives of the UCCN Mission Statement in your creative field? Did you find particular opportunities and challenges?

Have you connected your creative field to other creative fields or sectors covered by the Network and if so how?

How does your creative field have global relevance in helping to create better, inclusive and sustainable cities?

Question grouping: Networking & collaboration

What do you think is the potential of the Network? How do you think the Network should best operate to maximize this potential?

What do you think the future work of the Network and its members should focus on both at the local and the international level and why? Some examples include: Contribution to research? Collection and analysis of data on culture, creativity and sustainable urban development? Promoting innovative policies, measures and initiatives intended to implement the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals at the city level through creativity? Fostering the mobility of artists and cultural professionals and strengthening international flows of cultural activities, goods and services? Others?

How could your city contribute to reinforce networking and collaboration initiatives intended to implement the UCCN Mission Statement both locally and internationally?

Have you increased the number of international collaborations, especially with UCCN cities? If so, are these within your creative field and/or across several creative fields covered by the Network? Are there common types of collaboration, such as exchanges programmes, co-organized events, or other? What are your best examples?

How could networking and collaboration within the Network be enhanced involving cities from different regions, with different sizes and income levels?

What do you think you as a member can give back to the other member cities, and particularly cities from the Global South?

How could peer learning within the Network be further reinforced? What would be the role of the sub-network meetings in this regard and what are the main opportunities to grasp and challenges to overcome?

What is your experience of collaboration with UNESCO? What works well and what can be improved?

How could your city better contribute to the overall management of the Network?

What should be the main role of the Secretariat and that of the Steering Group?

Given the UCCN is an extra budgetary programme, would your city be ready to contribute to the fundraising strategies of the UCCN and if so how? (Examples include: Voluntary financial contributions, a donation of a percentage of the profits from particular activities, supporting fundraising campaigns to the private sector? Others?)

Question grouping: Impact of the designation

How was the designation received in the city by different stakeholders and partners?

What do you consider to be the biggest impact of your UNESCO Creative City designation? (It should include assessing how the objectives of the UCCN Mission Statement that member cities are engaged to implement)

What have the overall benefits been for your city, country and/or region from the designation? More specifically: effecting local creative businesses and if so which; generating employment and income; fostering community involvement; increasing tourist numbers; interest by the young; strengthening international cooperation; stimulating and enhancing initiatives to make creativity an essential component of urban development; broadening opportunities for creators and professionals in the cultural sector; improving access to and participation in cultural life;

integrating culture and creativity into local development strategies and plans?

How the UNESCO Creative City logo has been used and with what impact?

How has the visibility of UNESCO been increased in your city/ country in the framework of the activities implemented following the designation?

Did you already submit some news from your city to be published on the UCCN website? Do you have some suggestions to tap the full potential of this communication tool?

What kind of public awareness-raising activities has been organized in your city? Is culture and creativity now taken more seriously in your city subsequent to the designation?

Was the media helpful and has your city been more recognized in the media as a creative place? Do new communication channels, such as social networks and mobile phone applications, contribute to the reinforcement of this impact?

Have you implemented an assessment tool or data collection process to monitor and evaluation the impact of the designation? If yes, which specific indicators or methodologies is your city currently using? If not, does your city have the intention to create such tools in a near future?

Finally has anything happened as a result of the designation that you did not intend or expect from the outset?

Question grouping: Challenges & needs

For you, what are the main challenges the Network currently faces?

What are the opportunities that the Network can grasp?

As a member of the Network, what are the challenges your city currently faces?

How could the recently formalized membership monitoring exercise be reinforced? Should members be de-designated if they are not performing, such as failing to network, failing to attend key events, or merely using the designation for self-interested purposes?

How to promote a more balanced Network from geographical and thematic perspectives?

Question grouping: Managing the designation

Who manages and organizes the Creative City designation in your city? Is it an independent unit/entity or is it integrated in the local government?

Do you have a dedicated budget and human resources and if so how much and what are the resources?

Does the budget comes public funds (municipality/region/national government/international or regional cooperation) and/or from private funds (enterprises, foundations, other) and in which proportions?

How are links established between the activities implemented at the UCCN level or others carried out at city level related to achieving UCCN objectives?

What is the collaboration between your city and national government institutions (UNESCO National Commissions, Ministries of Culture, Economy, Foreign Affairs, etc)? Is it effective?

What is the collaboration between your city and other designated UNESCO creative cities of your country? (When applicable)

Who is (or will be) in charge of drafting the membership monitoring report of your city to be submitted to UNESCO? Do you plan to consult other sectors, organizations or actors from public sector, private sector and civil society?

Do you have a UCCN internal project evaluation report? If so, how often do you monitor the project outcomes/outputs internally? To whom the report is addressed?

Do you think that the Steering Group (the creative field coordinator) should play a more important role in the management of each creative field and how?

Question grouping: Any other questions

Is there any question that we forgot to ask?

Thank you for your collaboration

Interviews undertaken

Charles Landry: General

Francesco Bandarin UNESCO

Jyoti Hosagrahar UNESCO

Denise Bax UNESCO

Melika Caucino UNESCO

Koïchiro Matsuura the former Director General UNESCO

Ugo Bacchella Fitzcarraldo, Torino, leading cultural consultancy

Franco Bianchini director Hull Centre for Cultural Studies

Anna Lisa Boni the head of Eurocities

Ivor Davies consultant – writer of report on networks

Bernd Fesel, ecce and NICE network

Beatriz Garcia director of the Institute for Cultural Capital

Sarah Gardner director IFACCA

Katherine Heid, head of strategy Cultural Action Europe

Bob Palmer former head of Culture Council of Europe

Andy Pratt professor of Culture & Management

Martin Schwegmann Actors for Urban Change

Masayuki Sasaki co-ordinator Japanese Creative Cities Network

Anne Stenros Chief Design Officer Helsinki

Phil Wood advisor Council of Europe Intercultural Cities Network

19 interviews

Charles Landry: Cities

Lani Gonzalez Austin, media arts

Harm-Christian Tolden, Bergen, gastronomy

Tita Larassati Bandung, design

Tanja Muehlhans, Berlin, design

Mauro Felicori, Bologna, music

David Wilson, Bradford, film

Juan Luis Restrepo Viana, Bogota, music

Renata Vasko, Budapest, design

Mamadou Diallo, Dakar, media arts

Ellen Schneider, Detroit, design

Dominique Roland and Marie Lesage, Enghien les Bains, media arts

Sylvie Yilmaz, Gaziantep, gastronomy;

Bart Doucet, Ghent, music

Wolfgang Skerget, Graz, design

Anu Manttari, Helsinki, design

Andrijana Filinaitė, Kaunas, design

Justyna Jochym, Krakow, literature

Patrick Bartos, Linz, media arts

Rainer Kern, Mannheim, music

Marie-Josée Lacroix, Montreal

Pam Burnside, Nassau, crafts and folk art

Sumarni Gandawisana, Pekalongan, crafts and folk art

Ghadiimi Herfeh Fatemeh, Rasht, gastronomy

Josyane Franc, Saint-Étienne, design

Peter Ives Santa Fe, folk arts

Gidi Schmerling, Tel Aviv-Yafo

Jonathan Mabry, Tucson, gastronomy

Stuart Goulden, York, media arts

38 interviews in total

Korea: Do-in Choi, Meesoh Kim and Metaa and Metaa colleagues

Park, Han-nah, Busan, film

Chung, Won-jong, Gwangju, media arts

Oh, Jae-hwan, Icheon, crafts and folk art

Chung, Seung-won, Jeonju, gastronomy

Lee, Hyo-won & Lee Sang-mook, Seoul, design

Chung, Seo-yeong & Kim, Geum-sun, Tongyeong, music

6 interviews

China: Anne Yao

Chang Miao Miao, Beijing, design

Jiao Hui Hangzhou,

Sun Chi, Jingdezhen, crafts and folk art

Jin Pan Shanghai, design

Ting Xu, Shenzhen, design

Xu Yi-lu, Suzhou, crafts and folk art

6 interviews

Masayuki Sasaki Japan

Masahiro Kubo, Kanazawa, crafts and folk art

Kazuto Yokoyama, Kobe, design

Eriko Esaka, Nagoya, design

Mari Oshima, Sapporo, media arts

Chikako Kudo, Sasayama, crafts and folk art

Toshiro Akiba, Tsuruoka, gastronomy

6 interviews

Margie Caust Adelaide

Sarah Bleby, Adelaide, music

Al-Matard Ahmed, Al-Ahsa, crafts and folk art

Ossama Abdel Meguid, Aswan, crafts and folk art

Mohammad Jawad, Bamiyan, crafts and folk art

Jeffrey Ho, Singapore, design

Grainne Brundson, Sydney, film

6 interviews

Elena Perez & Bruno Matiussi

Esteve Caramés, Barcelona, literature

Marije Blanco, Bilbao, design

Ayelén Borgatti and Jhonnatan Gamboa Buenos Aires, design

Luis González Burgos, gastronomy

Floren Terrades, Dénia, gastronomy

Gonzalo Pizarro Rodríguez, Durán, crafts and folk art

Damián Valles Cañedo, Ensenada, gastronomy

Jesús Ortega Granada, literature

Álvaro Garzón López, Popayan, gastronomy

Ana Paula Cánovas and Michel Chain Carillo, Puebla, design

Adriana Aguerrebere, San Cristóbal de las Casas, crafts and folk art

Juan Villafruela Zúñiga, Seville, music

12 interviews

Duarte de Lima Mayer, Marisa Simoes and Marcus Martins

Dr. Eduardo Klautau, Belem, gastronomy

Susana L. A. da Costa, Curitiba, design

Eligni Pedro Beschen, Florianopolis, gastronomy

Paulo Longo, Idanha-a-Nova, music

Cláudio Rodrigues, Obidos, literature

Sorraya Pessino, Salvador, music

Paula Quagliato, Santos, film

7 interviews

Daniel Laven and Wilhelm Skoglund

Ruth Rørvik, Bergen, gastronomy

Stewart Murdoch, Dundee, design

Declan Gibbons, Galway, film

Dag Hartman, Östersund, gastronomy

Laura Oswald and Mary Hammond Paducah, crafts and folk art

5 interviews

Rainer Kern

Paola Vives, Bogota, music

Gervais Hugues Ondaye, Brazzaville, music

David Laing, Glasgow, music

Benedikt Poensgen, Hanover, music

Tamara Kamińska, Katowice, music

Robert Hill, Kingston, music

Kevin McManus, Liverpool, music

Lina Botero Villa, Medellín, music

8 interviews

Franco Bianchini

Luigi Virgolin and Giorgia Boldrini, Bologna, music

Vittorio Salmoni, Fabriano, crafts and folk art

Gabriele Righi, Parma, gastronomy

Luca Lo Bianco and Vittorio Salmoni, Rome, film

Luigi Ratclif, Turin, design

5 interviews

Justyna Jochym: The literature group interviewed wished to remain anonymous

Baghdad,

Dublin,

Dunedin,

Edinburgh,

Heidelberg,

Iowa City,

Lviv,

Ljubljana

Nottingham,

Melbourne,

Norwich,

Prague,

Reykjavik,

Tartu

Ulyanovsk

15 interviews

Failures:

We tried to get interviews with the list below. In each case multiple attempts were made to contact them.

Bitola, film, brief telephone contact made, but never returned calls;

Jaipur, crafts and folk art, contact made promised feedback never came,

Jacmel, crafts and folk art, brief contact interview failed given change in political situation

Isfahan, music, informal conversation, but no formal interview

Kinshasa, music, all contacts tried

Lubumbashi, music, brief contact made, interview failed

Lyons, media arts, multiple attempts made

Montevideo, literature, multiple attempts, no response

Phuket, gastronomy, all contacts tried

Shunde, gastronomy, no reply 5 attempts

Sofia, film several contact made, but never returned calls;

Varanasi, music, all contacts tried

Zahle, gastronomy, contact failed.

13 failed interviews

Total interviews undertaken 133

Supplement Two: The Bigger Global Context

Before considering expectations and impact a reminder that all cities are facing transition and transformation as they respond to global shifts in

economic potential, political power and cultural relevance and how these shake up the sense of identity and belonging. There are winners and losers as these dynamics unfold. **Old certainties crumble. Systems are breaking at escalating speed.** Unfulfilled are the promises of this better world and dissatisfaction grows. Apprehension is in the air. There is unease as foreboding, disquiet and even doom threaten to shape the atmosphere. The world is showing its darker face. This places great responsibility on global organizations like UNESCO

This **shapes what members cities want from UCCN** and what UNESCO increasingly would like from them – ideally. The UN family response is the New Urban Agenda agreed by Habitat III in Quito in October 2016. It connects to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDG) which seek to alleviate poverty, hunger and encourage health and healthy lifestyle, foster equality in all its forms and deal with climate issues and lower energy use as well as change consumption patterns and especially "make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable". Another of its key processes generated by the World Urban Campaign is 'The City We Need' manifesto. Crucially **a big Quito message is** that the relationship between cities and states should shift **to give cities greater authority.**

Periods of history involving mass transformation, like the industrial or technological revolution of the past fifty years, can produce confusion; a sense of liberation combined with a feeling of being swept along by events. It takes a while for new ethical stances to take root or to establish a new and coherent world view. This digital revolution is well underway and its devices are changing society, social life, public space and urban planning concepts with the rise of third places, culture, levels of connectivity, the economy as well as cities with its immense force. Networking possibilities have dramatically grown with this internet driven world and changed what networking means.

The impacts and influence of the digital age are vastly stronger than some tinkering on top of business as usual. They will be as powerful as the climactic changes that swept through our world with the industrial revolution 200 years ago. These forces are both liberating and potentially invasive. When Airbnb is the world's biggest hotel chain without hotels, Uber the biggest taxi company without taxis and Facebook the biggest media content provider without producing content we know the world and its operating and management dynamics have changed. This needs to impact too on how UNESCO works.

We need a picture of what we want from its power as citizens and cities. This needs an ethical anchor to guide politics, policies and investment, which should be about **solving the global and local problems that really matter**. This mirrors the SDG goals and this new focus was surprising to many UCCN members, yet it is understandable from a UNESCO perspective as the institution wants to remain relevant and credible within the UN family. This puts great responsibility onto the Secretariat and UNESCO as a whole as Chinese cities noted: **"Most cities are looking for creative change and want creative guidance** about change with culture as one possibility if UCCN is successful it will help city development in an ideal world." Or Östersund "part of the way forward for our region is that we have to be part of these global value chains and these global visions/networks, otherwise we're smoked". Or Fabriano, for instance, believe in a shift from the post-Fordist city to "another, new type of city driven through creative thinking which poses the challenge to get over the old thinking". Or as Dundee: "We are searching for a way to transition from a manufacturing city into something else, something competitive and innovative." Or Parma: "By looking at the whole food eco-system we are trying to find new competitive advantages and also be concerned with social goals in the world".

Design and gastronomy and perhaps media arts with its linkages to the new economy and start-up world at first sight are the easier categories to link to SDG goals. Increased pressure to change our eating habits, our food production methods and to reduce food miles provide an opportunity for gastronomy cities to become global models. Ensenada notes: "Our contribution to other cities is to be a model placing gastronomy at the centre of a city's sustainability by consuming local products, creating employment and increasing local income.....amongst current projects there we are creating urban gardens and orchards, getting inhabitants involved in picking fruits and making local products and linking inhabitants as suppliers with distributors, storage and warehouse services and chefs among others." Or Dénia: "As a city of gastronomy we have the potential to promote agrifood systems by implementing consumption alternatives away from mass industry and strategies to incorporate local products to the catering and hotel business." Belem: "We are the centre of Amazonic gastronomy and we can learn a lot from our ancestors". Florianopolis has a strong research presence in sea foods and gastronomy (five universities offer courses), for instance inventing new techniques to develop oyster cultures.

South American members **focus on social development and the designation can help**. Duran: "The program would have been implemented in any case in Durán had we not been elected as a creative city, as this program has been running for the last two years". "Our aim is to work with the youngest to respond to our problems especially drugs. Connecting students and young people and the university or creating craft markets". "We expect to be a city of culture will contribute to dilute the city's stigmaconflicts between ethnic groups, the drugs image and that citizens will feel more pride for their land". Or Salvador: "Beyond the relevance of music manifestations in the city, there are many social projects concerning music and de-privileged communities, for instance social transforming orchestras". The 'reggae and social change' signs in Kingston send out a pertinent message. But other places also see the social development theme. "The under-privileged should have a benefit from the title, such as via our Institute of Film and Visual Literacy". (Bradford)

A strong theme in the design cluster is social design and how post-industrial cities can be re-designed. These are design processes that contribute to creating more humane lives. **This connects design to urban planning** and perhaps these physical transformation processes should become a focus for UCCN and UNESCO. Here Shenzhen's young designers award with its focus on solving environmental problems is a good example of UCCN members leading the way. Another focus is design thinking seen as the next competitive edge for the global economy. This why so many of the big ambitious cities like Berlin, Beijing, Seoul or Singapore chose this category even though they had many choices.

Crafts and folk arts link local distinctiveness and identity to local employment with wider implications so creating possible models for global sustainable development. Take Pekalongan where around 1000 small enterprises employ nearly 20000 people in batik. Think silk in Suzhou, ceramics in Jingdezhen, straw in Nassau or carpet making in Isfahan and all these forms can be looked at afresh With the other categories film, music, and literature, beyond the pure pleasure of these forms, the impact on sustainable development is less obvious. Yet with the world in the midst of a dramatic transformation from the historically recent dominance of word and text based communication to the visual then visual literacy becomes crucial for our understanding and experience. Active music making has its known impact, for instance, on the intellectual, social and personal development of children and the young.

Literature is essentially about the ideas that can provide us with our ethical backbone. In sum, collectively the UCCN membership could potentially have a significant impact on global sustainability.

Supplement Three: A Colourful Canvas of Member Views

The Creative Cities Network represents a colourful, complex canvas of light and shade, variety, success and unexpected highlights as well as unfulfilled promise or expectations. **Everyone agrees that the network is a positive initiative** and that most cities have benefitted from the designation. Yet many believe that there are worries on the horizon and that the recent explosive growth of the network has brought things to head. The time has come, they say, to re-assess where UCCN stands and what it can become.

The following text wedged together with quotes from the interviews reminds us of the opportunity for UNESCO's Secretariat to reflect on **'where next with the network and how'**. Clearly the new grouping that entered in 2015 are less able to give considered views and are generally more enthusiastic.

Most places are very proud and grateful to have the acknowledgement. "People love the designation". "We are receiving ordinary people every day asking how can they help" (Denia) "People are approaching us like a bar or restaurant" (Gaziantep). "This offers us the opportunity to work with places we wouldn't have collaborated with otherwise". (Barcelona) "Becoming UCCN member is like having an international name card. It facilitates more international communication and collaboration". (Chengdu) "The designation has been received very positively, although people do not know what it means". (Dundee) "Overall: It is very positive. We have lots of influence over projects and we can really influence the sustainable development trajectory of our region". (Östersund) "The network's most important achievement is that it facilitates culture and creativity to be recognized by governments as major elements to take into account when designing cities". (Buenos Aires)

Worries about the explosive growth of the network are nearly pervasive. There are concerns that its might implode under its own weight. **Consolidation is the watchword.** There is a clear division here between those recently accepted and those designated before 2014. Yet had there been more transparent decision making they feel growth would have happened in a more paced and purposeful way. Cities feel it dilutes the

status and credibility of the brand and it as 'brand', a term that feels commercial, that people discuss the designation. The famous Dunbar number is also a factor. This states that you can only absorb by name up to a number of 150 people. It is a good warning. As it stresses how certain numbers, such as 15 people you can know very well, or 50 reasonably well before the absorption and cognitive overload problem comes in. A network can grow: "but, what is the plan, what is the target, the meaning of the title connects to the exclusivity". (Graz) "There are too many members now to have effective dialogues in the network". (Beijing) "It grows too fast, some members never show up. The network should control its pace of development, there is no clear objective". (Suzhou) "On the one hand it is bad and on the other good as it has more coming in so UCCN could have more influence". The Korean consensus highlighted the worry about devaluing the brand. Even newer members say it could devalue, but tend to say it is still too early to make considered comments about the overall network. When numbers rise so do the transaction costs and effort and the difficulty of maintaining trust, common values and interests.

By contrast: "I have no problem about UNESCO being wide it would be against the spirit of UNESCO if it is only including those with greater quality, as UNESCO is there to help those with less capacity. I believe 250 cities could be a limit". (Fabriano) "Would not be a good network if we were all the same and same level of development". (York)

"Growing..... OK, if there was a structure and a way of doing this collaboration". The central issue here is to be explicit about what the aim is in terms of numbers. 250, 500, 1000, 10000 cities? "Now the call for application becomes biannual it will help to slow down the growth of membership". (Shenzhen) "Set a target of say 25 a year". Perhaps being a provisional member with a trial period should be explored before full acceptance as a means of challenge to perform.

This **growth has a series of consequences**. It both increases global recognition and equally dilutes. People question why some cities are deemed to be creative when others, clearly creative, are not on the list. Second, some cities and well-known members too are disengaging as they feel things are getting out of control. 'We were involved quite early and we are now doing less and using less energy'. They will not make an issue of it, but their involvement will become more symbolic. UNESCO needs to worry about this. Third, cities are increasingly finding it easier to communicate within their art forms like design especially if they are large

like Buenos Aires or Seoul and in any case they have other networks too. Smaller cities prefer to communicate regionally and these groupings are emerging as in South America and here there is an active discussion in Brazil. Regional networks can be effective as in Japan where, as an instance, the small Sasayama is being mentored and helped by the more established Kanazawa. Similar UCCN networks are emerging in Korea or the US.

With the growth of UCCN, as also happened with the European City of Culture or Intercultural cities networks, **a shift occurred** and clearly there are notable exceptions. Here cities as seen as less focused on creating a network but more using the designation as a marketing tool. The older cohorts can become disenchanted. 'It is not the same network anymore in the beginning we were looking for the same values to help each other and to develop friendship and we were curious and generous, the network felt extremely strong'. In reality at its origins UCCN was culturally based more on a Western paradigm (in spite of Buenos Aires' and Popayan's presence) and inevitably this changed as Asian cities came in force as well as cities from the global South. Yet **addressing cultural complexity is one of UNESCO's major aims.**

None of the cities explicitly stated there should be a specific fixed limit about growth, but rather more how it is to happen and whether cities feel listened to. **When members feel disempowered the mood changes.** 'Rapid growth is the antithesis, it makes it difficult to stay close to the spirit' and the 'danger is that it encourages applications solely for branding'. In addition growth made it easier to do nothing as 'within a smaller network we could point to the inactive'. 'My own attitude has changed and now I am more opportunistic I needed the network to be credible for me to get to the next stage ... it has partly done its job, but then the centre changes the terms, that is a different question''.

In these joint discussions it is useful to consider **what type of network UCCN should be** and what image UNESCO and the members have in mind. Is it a hierarchical network driven from above or is responsibility shared. Clearly not - even though UNESCO is the 'brand licensing authority'. Is it part of a 'full mesh topology' where every node or member is connected to every other node in a network or is it seen as a star network with core decisions coming from a central hub and where communication passes through that hub. Is it a network with the implication of working together or merely an association where there are less obligations? Can you create these connections at a global scale and is

UNESCO the right organization strategically to do this. A connector has to be in both camps, the official and the creative, as that force feeds potential, they need to develop space for creativity.

This is why the successful network logic stresses trust to reduce chains of command. In addition it needs to consider the network's possible limits, the extent of its openness and closedness and different levels of membership.

The aims of joining had mixed motivations and there was a spectrum of use. "Everyone makes out of the network what suits them, for some it is symbolic, for others a call for action, and others a practical programme, some cities are using it as a marketing and others as making changes".

Some cities believe they hold the designation as of right, whilst others use it as an aspiration and a trigger for action. Some have made the most of opportunities whilst others have let things drift. Understandably the vast majority of places tried to become part of the network **to increase their international presence** and image, economic prospects or tourism impacts. **Wider ethical considerations** or global concerns **were far from their mind**. The benefits of designation are obvious given the prestige that UNESCO holds. Sticking strictly to the economic Tucson calculated that the value of free media attention would have cost them \$6million in the first 6 months after designation.

In some cities the urban leadership has **a clear view of why they wanted** to be part of the network and know what they want. For instance Beijing, Seoul, Singapore, Montreal or Budapest are clear that design thinking is deeply linked to the next phase of the innovation driven economy and considered membership UCCN as part of a suite of strategic moves. This is also why so many joined the design category. Others like Östersund or Santa Fe were clear early on what they wanted to achieve. The crisis of Fabriano's craft driven printing industry called for a re-assessment of the local economy and their designation as a crafts and arts city has become a vehicle for rethinking how the town develops.

Asian **cities saw UNESCO as a troubled, powerful, undervalued asset** with a solid brand, like the football teams Asian financial magnets have taken stakes in like Manchester City, Inter Milan, Atletico Madrid or Aston Villa. It was also part of their soft power strategy as UNESCO was like a sleeping beauty. Their investment was effective in terms of returns. It gave exposure and helped too to put the Chinese creative economy on

the map. This is why Chinese cities like Shenzhen, Beijing or Chengdu in particular have put so much effort into the title gathering together complex partnerships across the municipality and city to work on the programmes.

By sharp contrast in other cities individual activists or specialist associations had to persuade and cajole their city to get involved. One thinks here of Pamela Burnside's leadership of a civic organization in Nassau where "the government just wasn't not interested, we just went ahead in any case". In Ensenada or Bandung civic organizations also led the bid. At times at the encouragement of UNESCO national governments convinced cities to apply such as in Indonesia and at UNESCO headquarters it is often the ambassador who lobbies very strongly for their city and one thinks here of Kaunas. In Fabriano a small group of visionaries kicked-started the process, especially Francesca Merloni owner of a white goods company, who supported the bid and various festivals. Their annual budget of ca. 150,000 euros coming mostly from the Merloni Foundation is exceptional. In other instances it involves tough work as in Detroit creating an advisory board of 30 people. "We want to take the time to get partners on board and as we have no central government system you have to build a coalition".

Sometimes the creative field is **a perfect fit** for a city and at others you wonder why they applied. Linz with its global reputation linked to Ars Electronica fits the media arts category like a glove as does Tel Aviv given its astonishing IT driven start-up eco-system or Mannheim and Kingston with music, but is Montevideo really a literature city and does it have aspirations to become one. The choice of a field is often politically motivated. Bologna, more known in the global imagination for gastronomy, became a music city admittedly with some merit since the then mayor was a fervent music buff. Bogota according to its own leadership was not necessarily a music city, but Antanas Mockus, the then interesting eccentric mayor, used public concerts as a means of re-establishing civic life in city renowned for its deadly violence. This wonderful example of art and civic engagement clearly deserves recognition. Yet a surprise emerged in that Bogota's hidden, but progressive and socially aware favela hip hop scene has become a good linking point between similar scenes in Mannheim, Katowice and Adelaide. At times cities chose a creative field in order **to shift perceptions**. York surprised many of the city's constituents by choosing the future focused media arts and its modern image given that the city is a renowned

heritage hub. "People were surprised, it is taking time for people to understand why we did this". Equally Austin is globally known for its music scene, see its South by Southwest (SXSW), but chose the media arts category as it wanted to widen perceptions of the city. "We are known for music and trying to take a broader approach. Media arts a better umbrella as we have tech savvy digital community". Barcelona more known for design chose literature to shift attention to its publishing industry which is suffering from a down turn and needed a strategic plan. The aim was to increase reading habits and support public libraries in a digitizing age. "We know we are a creative city, but joining the network is about something else". Hamamatsu wants to link its cultural assets and industry and shake off a dowdy image. Burgos chose gastronomy as a means of inspiring itself even though it agrees its reputation is less strong than Denia also in Spain or Parma.

Cities in the midst of transformation like Torino realize they need ambitious goals, remembering that their main employment in FIAT has declined from 98,000 to 4,000 in the last 20 years. "It is important to be connected to global cultural networks; we want to go beyond Europe into Asia and South America. This is all part of our re-invention plan, we want city to be play a particular role in a sub-theme, perhaps leading it, or hosting an event, even leadership of a particular cluster perhaps. We had prepared a strategic plan for CCN 2 years before UNESCO asked for it". This contrasts with the feedback from one interviewing team about another city: "They could much more, they are highlighting things that are basic stuff".

For Helsinki there is a long trajectory and the title is an element. First they were a European Cultural Capital, then the World Design Capital, then they created the Design Driven City 2013-2015 project as a WDC legacy; "now we are on the last step of the ladder, thinking even more of the strategic use of design and creative thinking..... this is the world's first Chief Design Officer and the next phase is Helsinki Lab on the ground floor of city hall. It is all about design embedding into the city, changing public procurement, bringing lots of our capabilities together.....this is trying to articulate a message that we are open and transparent ... and inviting others to develop the city with us".

There is also continuity in Graz "joining UCCN in 2011 was a continuation of the European City of Culture of 2003, a great year and built the Kunsthaus, lots happened, UCCN was a target. After the 2005 financial crisis things had stopped".

"Our aims have now shifted to media entrepreneurship as basically all the start-ups are in media. My work shifted from design focus to start-ups and the mayor set up new department of innovation which would not have happened without designation." (Linz) "We in Dakar had the oldest arts biennale so media arts is a good choice and it links to digital tools and economic development".

UNESCO shifted the criteria from "why do you deserve this....to what do you hope to achieve". "In the past you had to prove a design centre, strong education, and events, now all this start after designation". Early candidates had to provide detailed descriptions of their creative ecology, yet not now. As a consequence **unexpected candidates have emerged** of which Obidos, a city of literature is one. It is a small place, smaller than UNESCO's criteria allow and has no literary tradition, but it is ambitious. It is copying the famous Hay-on-Wye book town model that has been copied across the world. Objectively Hay, that has not wanted to apply, warrants the creative city designation as it not only invented the book town idea in the 1970's it has also developed the most vibrant British literary festival that has been exported and branded in several continents. Another surprise is Al Ahsa which as an oasis culture is a slightly whimsical choice. Even Bucheon a satellite city of Seoul is thinking of applying even though it has hardly any artistic traditions, but again it is very ambitious.

The network has **far greater impact for smaller cities** and these are mostly very enthusiastic and active, think here of Denia "We are so happy about being recognized" or Pekalongan "Yes, it is true, we are really the city of batik". "Small cities need UCCN more whereas big cities have many more alternatives for cultural development". (Paducah) "The designation is a marketing tool for small cities in particular and why is Barcelona getting the designation, they do not need it". (Granada). With the growth of UCCN 2nd cities tend to take the label more seriously and it is more meaningful for the whole of their city as most people know about it. They also increase their networks often quite dramatically, for instance Fabriano's internationalization strategy was given a focus and a boost.

The **principles of creativity are the same for smaller and larger cities**, but the expression is often different and they can at times be freer as they are not constrained by reputation. The two Portuguese cities Obidos and Idanha a Nova with their rapidly declining populations are examples. Both have an intergenerational vision linking education, technology, crafts and elderly support. In addition Obidos boldly and ambitiously wants to be

World Book Capital in 2018 and says of itself: "Ours is a small multitasked and not bureaucratic team, this is the way we try to get things done".

Idanha-a-Nova, a music city whose theme is "Music is a place out of time: The music that we carry, the music that we are, the music that we want" is in one of the most desertified areas of Portugal. It began networking strongly with music well over a decade ago and focuses both on ancient oral and music traditions as well as having a Boom Festival: "Today, it's a touchstone for psychedelic trance. It's not just a festival. It's a technological concept about going back to nature".

Aspiration is important to reward but cities like Montreal, Krakow, Sydney, Beijing, Ghent or Seoul and many, many others are worried about diluting the value of the designation, which in essence is a brand. In addition they ask what are the connection points or similarities between cities that have little track record or of those with 10million plus inhabitants and those of around 100,000. These are good issues to explore.

Some cities and especially those who have been part of the network for longer question **why some cities are members and others are not**. "Some deserve it, some don't and some do deserve but do nothing, some should be on the list." Many well-known cities across the globe warrant being part of the network but either choose not to apply and one thinks here of Yokohama that believes itself to be comprehensively creative or have not got around to applying such as Havana. This leaves aside the obvious globally creative hubs like Tokyo, New York, Paris, Amsterdam, London, Milan, Rio de Janeiro or Los Angeles, who do not feel it necessary to apply. Others such as New Orleans, Bamako, Penang or Trinidad's carnival culture are obvious choices. Or in Italy Mantua that has the most renowned literature festival.

Separately **Canada and Japan have their own wider creative cities networks**. Canada's was founded in 2002 and most municipalities in the country, key cultural institutions and several hundred individuals belong to it. In Japan the network founded in 2009 has 74 municipalities in membership and Prof. Sasaki wants to set up a Creative City institute in Kyoto. The six Korean cities have established a grouping with Busan, Gwangju, and Tongyeong in particular having strong expectations. Italy are in the process of setting up regional networks involving cities that are not part of UCCN. South East Asian Creative Cities Network has developed slowly on purpose in order to clarify the definition of Penang, Bandung, Chiang Mai and Cebu. "It is now clear what we need to be using 2nd cities,

they are more flexible the size and more frivolous” (Bandung). Argentina’s cultural ministry is setting up its own creative city network of over 20 cities and discussions are on-going in the States to explore a regional cluster.

For bigger cities membership of UCCN is only a small part of their overall strategy and most could have gone for any category but chose that which was **most strategically catalytic**. The UCCN label is not their driver it is simply an add-on and part of an assemblage of branding devices. Any big city has many links. Beijing, as an instance, has 50 sister cities like Tel Aviv, Helsinki, Bilbao in the network and cultural exchange activities already exist. Global cities play in a different league. “We have sister cities and are trying different networks.” (Shanghai) “Bogota is very much involved in global networks, the UCLG and others, from community networks to ones related to SDG aims”.

All cities are looking at the potential to get themselves onto the global radar screen. The **UCCN title is part of most members’ city strategy repertoire** and a tool given its focus on the creative economy which is seen as a significant engine of the knowledge intensive and symbol driven experiential economy. Examples follow. This includes the Caribbean members who call this the Orange Economy promoted strongly by the Inter-American Development Bank. Here Jacmel, Kingston and Nassau as well as Trinidad are beginning to collaborate starting by developing a statistical data base. The design cities from Graz to St. Etienne or Detroit realize that the catalyst to advance their innovation capacity is to embed design thinking into every process, product and service of their urban economies and here social design is beginning to play an important role.

The urban strategy often centres on regeneration and cities like Medellin or Bogota are using music to engage, to create skills and to empower their under-privileged people music or to strengthen the public realm and squares. Kaunas is focusing on its built fabric and architecture using discussions around this topic to discuss urban development in general and to introduce the city to CCN ideas. Part of this includes 3-year architecture festival and also applying for European Cultural Capital status for which the UCCN application has been helpful. Detroit is using the label to trigger a visioning process for the designation itself that is woven into a broader city plan. This has taken a year and was launched at its design festival in September 2016. This collective process has generated a kind of stewardship for the ideas behind the application. In Parma’s step by step approach their involvement in Expo 2015 and having the European

Food Security Agency gave confidence. "We have everything in the agro food business from pigs to potatoes, famous products parmigiano and parma ham ". Some like Belem was celebrating its 400 year anniversary and that committee put the UCCN application together.

UCCN clearly helps **cities suffering from political difficulties** and exclusion whatever their size. Think here of Baghdad "this is so important to us to keep the international connections" or "Iran was for so long isolated, this gives us a way linking with other cities" (Isfahan); "nobody really knows about us, but we also need to learn about the network and what to do". (Lubumbashi)

Globally recognized creative cities like Bandung or Curitiba have **had to squeeze their application into a specific field** and have mostly quite naturally chosen design as this category is the most all-embracing. Yet Tel-Aviv, rated in some indices as one of the world's most creative cities has chosen media arts given the wealth of start-ups in that field. Israel as is known is called: "the start-up nation". Curitiba, renowned for its urban planning from 2013 created a new urban plan with a sectoral design plan called embedded called 'innovation and design' central to its city strategy. They applied for World Design Capital and lost to Mexico City and see Helsinki as a model especially with its initiatives like appointing the Chief Design Officer. Nassau went through a 6 year journey to be part of UCCN is now perhaps more appropriately a city of crafts and folk arts, but originally proposed itself as a city of design. "We chose Kaunas architecture but it could have been music". "Also the links between heritage and innovation will become stronger". "In Sapporo we made strong creative city strategy in 2006 especially a focus on media arts, now we are going wider to music drama".

Many people ask **why there are only seven creative fields**, when quite clearly the performing arts, painting or architecture demand attention as do crossover forms like performance art that mixes theatrics and visual art as do the newer forms of circus. There is nothing to do with expressive movement. In addition art forms are merging seen clearly with media arts and digitization playing a powerful role. Crucially all cultural forms can or are being reinvented without degrading their core attributes. Hardly any city specifically defended restricting membership to the seven categories although there were contrary views. Think here of Noh theatre, banraku or kabuki in Japan as one instance or African and Indian dance forms many of which are renewing themselves within a stimulating fusion.

Salvador said: “we say music but it is dance like toosamba, samba reggae, capoeira that we are known for”.

Crucial too is an **understanding of the spillover effect and its spin-offs** where increasing blending is happening between arts forms, across culture and non-cultural activities and into business and social life. Crucially these cultural sectors contribute not just to adding economic value and jobs or image and identity, but more importantly, **to the evolutionary process of the economy and society as a whole**. Behind music lies sound and vibration; behind the painting arts visualization; behind film moving images; and design is in essence a moulding, patterning and problem solving activity and the new media are largely focused on connections. An underexplored insight is that these attributes have migrated into every sphere of life and every industry and service. This makes their combined impact as powerful as electricity. The current economy could not run without them and they have transformed the way individuals, the city, the economy and society operate. There are part of their DNA. UNESCO and member cities need to connect these attributes to its sustainable development goals.

This is why the debate about **rewarding comprehensive creativity** has moved to the fore. Chinese, Korean and Italian interviewees in particular had strong views here as had many others. The issue was raised by nearly 30 cities as they saw this as a way of thinking about comprehensive economic development. They felt creative field designations are too narrow. “The title is very much part of a creative city strategy and the world of creatives this is part of our Roman identity”. Large cities like Beijing, Buenos Aires or Seoul obviously feel they represent more than just design and all the five Italian members are working on comprehensive creative city strategies. Here Buenos Aires: “We believe we are the Latin American capital for talent, culture and creativity and we are linking different creative fields such as design, music, literature and so on together. We could have chosen another field rather than design – just think of the tango, but where would that fit, it is music and dance”.

“The landscape of culture is now differently discussed. The network is in danger of remaining old-fashioned”. (Bradford) The Italian consensus was: “We believe in the creative city in general and barriers between disciplines is artificial” (Torino) “When you say UNESCO people always think of heritage, we are interested in a creative city ...the bigger approach”. All Italian said they want links to heritage and creativity. “We

very much believe in augmented and virtual reality, basically media arts, so the distinctions are ridiculous” (Rome) “The vision of the identity of Tartu as a creative city is included in the development strategy „Tartu 2030“, the total vision of which interprets the development of Tartu as a city of intertwined unity of knowledge, entrepreneurship, modern environment, care, and creativity”.

“In Budapest one of our main projects and partners is called Holis, that name tells you everything”. “We have several labs, we believe creativity comes from cross-fertilization and at the boundaries, see our Brain Bar and Future Festival..... Our goal is to enable stakeholder networks” (Budapest) “Some do not understand that the network is dynamic, they think it is more like a heritage site and you do not need to do much.”

There was a split opinion of whether to increase creative fields and several mentioned the need to connect fields. UNESCO encourages this: “Each application must refer to only one creative field. This field should be considered as the focus of the application but not as a closed box with no intersections or connections with other creative fields. Innovative approaches in this respect are encouraged”.

Again smaller cities especially those within the crafts and folk art field are keener on art form designations. But even Ensenada, for instance, “understands their creative field as a cross-disciplinary space that combines science, poetry, music, design, landscape preservation, agriculture, wine making and fishing, all of which are of utmost importance to Ensenada”.

Some cities and clusters are very active such as design and music with gastronomy increasingly becoming eager with new members like Parma joining the network. The crafts and folk art category inevitably attracts cities from less developed places and this restricts their ability to organize meetings or joint projects. Korean cities are beginning to move fast. Icheon felt the crafts and folk arts cluster needed a push and was not as active as the design cluster. Thus it organized the ‘Global Creative Cities Workshop’ this year where 8 out of 20 members participated. Needless to say finance limits participation for many cities especially from the South. Jeonju is organizing the ‘UCCN Jeonju International forum in October 2016 and Tongyeong a global forum in 2017

Supplement Four: Expectations

Expectations from the title

There are differing expectations about UCCN, such as UNESCO's expectations of members and those of members of UNESCO and those of the media and member cities as a whole. UNESCO's expectations have changed. The initial focus centred on unleashing the power of the creative industries has shifted. Now there is a greater focus on linking to larger UN process such as Habitat III and its New Urban Agenda. But as UNESCO says: "Cities should see that the designation is not end point but a beginning of a relationship and this involves an obligation".

Expectations from cities of the designation are multiple and the motivations varied from persuading politicians of the value of the creative economy to networking the city and putting it on the map. Some are driven understandably by self-interest and by collective interest is present too.

"It was an accelerator of opportunities" "It helped the politicians take the creative industries more seriously." (Berlin, Montreal) Norwich too expressed clearly **expectations from being a member that could apply to practically all cities** and substitute literature with any of the other cultural forms. 1. Increasing the profile of literature and culture in our city to engage more people in the benefits of this work 2. To gain access to a network of like-minded cities ready and prepared to work with us 3. To raise the profile of our city on the national and international stage in order for us to deliver more and better work 4. To undertake better cooperative projects with cities within and without our accreditation. We wish to do this for four key reasons: 1. To join an international cohort of cities who place literature at the heart of the cultural activities; to learn from them; to exchange good ideas with them; to grow with them. 2. To showcase the cultural and literary strengths of our city on a world stage 3. To increase the benefits of literature and the cultural industries for those who live in, work in or visit our city 4. To increase our capacity (artistically, financially) to deliver more and better work through the UNESCO brand. Even more succinctly Melbourne said: "To promote Melbourne as a city and cultural capital internationally."

A typical comment stands for many: "Our aim is strengthening business and our city as a creative centre". "**Recognition is the main idea**, it is more external facing, the internal objectives are less". "It's seen as a promotional platform for the city and of course prestige". "Helping the creative class is important to us". Variations of this was said by 30 or so cities. Inevitably there is a strong 'what is in it for me' business driven approach: "We want to connect our businesses and the global community,

this is like a business opportunity". "The bigger SDG agenda – was not on our mind". Yet looking across the network as a whole there are reasons for joining that are specific to the circumstances of a place, **but some reflect a higher purpose**. "The network discussing issues that really matter will make it much more fun". (Santa Fe)

Kaunas added: "Apart from recognition, we also want locals to understand why our modernist architecture (the basis of their bid) is important." What we really want is to create the platform so they can work without us in the city and we want to launch a website so they do not need us ... we want to be an enabler". By contrast: "Our expectations were low. We knew it would be useful for branding and awareness but had little awareness of what it actively meant." More elaborate: "We wanted to have bigger presence, we felt city was too parochial, the city bourgeoisie is complacent, we want links with universities. We felt although had strong food assets" (Parma) They also believe: "Parma needs a new shared purpose – given rise of individualism and selfishness and CCN makes a contribution. We see gastronomy as linking local and international development and tourism. The confidence to put bid was related to Expo and our interest in themes of hunger and infant mortality". Bologna: Our main objective is not promotion but learning via experience of exchange. We are interested in creating opportunities for our creatives. Policies on sustainability are much more important the UCCN mission." This links well to the mayor's initiative 'the civic imagination project (immaginazione civica).

Without wishing to be pedantic it was noteworthy that when interviewees submitted written responses they thought might be seen before telephone interviews they focused more on stating their link to wider UCCN sustainable development aims than in direct conversations.

The **strength of the past or the opportunities for the future** were two themes. These overarching reasons for joining are neatly expressed by Korean cities. Jeonju, Icheon and Tongyeong wanted to be part of the network given their cultural assets, history and traditions whereas Seoul, Busan and Gwangju – design, film and media arts respectively – chose fields where they wanted to become leaders. They noted too that Seoul, Icheon and Jeonju that had joined before 2012 were more focused on industrial policy and seeking to energize their infrastructures, whereas those that joined later were emphasizing more the marketing and promotional aspects of the designation.

Connecting and reconnecting was crucial for many and especially with the creative groupings in other cities. "Our former far right council network cancelled international networks, thus this is part of Rome rejoining the world. Promoting Rome itself is not relevant. We believe we will enrich the network". "We really want to connect with the creative milieu in other places, but sometimes that is difficult, because the partners are city officials" (Montreal) "We like to link with creative people and projects, not only the top leaders." (Graz)

Dakar "It is interesting to go beyond the formal meetings, more interested in how our creative people can contribute within the network. But we do have many connections already happening but not via CCN". "We want people when they come to Parma to have hands-on experience and go to factories and learn how ham and cheese are made. Our three pillars are education, experience and production.

Highlighting and legitimizing cultural status and the importance of arts was a theme. Hamamatsu seen as industrial, but has a big music sector and the base of Yamaha increased its cultural credibility, this was equally true for St. Etienne and Dundee. Or Detroit: "We wanted Detroit to value arts and we have been championing design as a driver for development... We do not have a cultural department." "But our tactic was that the designation would give a reason not to cut funds for culture, and it worked." (Linz)

"Transformational impact locally was what we wanted and beyond that we wanted to be part of a global network. In York we would never have used media arts to project ourselves, it was a surprise and it was difficult." Transformation was mentioned by Curitiba and underlay some of the core reasons why there was a rush to join the design cluster when design thinking emerged a decade ago. It is a central part of the strategy of global cities like Singapore, Beijing and Seoul who know its role in the innovation process. Detroit's believes its renaissance hangs on design: "We hope to raise Detroit as global entre of design". "A big part is to retool assets and build pipelines for people in the new economy and that includes urban design".

Centres already with strong cultural status like Heidelberg could see that the label gave them an extra dimension and as Helsinki and others noted: "The designation is lifelong, it is permanent... and it provides continuity after our World Design Capital year in 2012." But there is also UNESCO's high cultural status, so Baghdad: "Yes. The city authorities redirected all their normal programs to achieve the objectives of the designations as

they felt the honour and heaviness being an ambassador of the world's most prestigious cultural organization UNESCO."

There was an undercurrent that expectations were not being met: "We did have expectations at the beginning and quite quickly I thought... I think it is a group of cities that mostly want to exchange exhibitions". But to counter-balance "UNESCO has **given cities a gift, and it gives you more than it takes** and so do not want to be negative" and importantly most people realize that UNESCO is not going to fund cities.

Expectations of UNESCO

UNESCO believes that giving the title of 'creative city' involves responsibilities and rights. The main obligation is to help pursue the goals of UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) using creativity as a resource.

A global organization like UNESCO also has responsibilities to its world-wide membership and audiences across the continents, rich and poor, developed and less developed. Any network it associates with has to reflect those requirements. So a North/South and East /West balance has to be maintained. It cannot be: "A network with a predominance of English speaking cultures and Northern European cities". Yet to make this diversity feel vibrant the wider understanding of creativity and the creative city is more useful given the vast sources of creativity visible in 'the bottom billion' from which the richer places can learn. This requires being less obsessed with technological creativity stimulating as it is and more humble. Think instead of social creativity, financing innovations or mutual aid structures. "I found it so inspiring working together with people in such a difficult setting; it energized me, it was a learning experience". (Berlin)

Expectations from UNESCO

The central theme in terms of expectations of UNESCO are: "**UNESCO should be more a connector than an administrator**". So Kingston and Paducah: "The Secretariat ought to be more oriented towards enabling interaction between the member cities". "Dakar needs to be able to access the expertise in the network ... UNESCO should be a broker for getting the expertise".

Bigger cities expect more. They want "a more responsive central entity and if we have better UNESCO collaboration to can get a bigger budget." We need to know better what the exact expectations are and

systematized reporting." "It should propose programmatic initiatives it has not done so far".

Less privileged cities from the South wanted more practical things from UNESCO. Some of this it perhaps cannot do nor is the best entity to do it, such as being proactive and giving mentoring help to new cities to integrate them into UCCN. "There should be a UCCN Handbook" noted one city. To provide guidance for raising funds if not financial aid (probably UNESCO less equipped here); UCCN should send representatives and qualified experts to help promote UCCN locally as well get UNESCO to instruct its national offices to work more closely with members. Finally they feel the balance between North/South is uneven. "UCCN should have quotas both for countries and continents, some countries have too many members".

But there can be misinterpretations of what UNESCO is doing given its track record of fair treatment: "We do not have direct support from UNESCO. I hope this lack of priority is not to do with us not having "allegedly" a higher level of development than other places".

A strong theme was marketing, for instance Shanghai: "UCCN needs to raise its international influence and to propose concrete collaboration programs in order to have tangible impact to cultural exchange and economic development". Korean cities feel the need for international promotion outside of member cities, also targeting the general public, for instance by publishing an Activities Report of the best projects to the wider. "**UNESCO has bad self-marketing**, it's all quite superficial". The Secretariat can also learn from its own members like Parma who are far more sophisticated and see city branding as an instrument around which they want to focus on shared values and deal with problems. They are working with the company who developed Eataly to create a total gastronomic experience.

A significant and strong Chinese message was that the Secretariat is not registered so making payments to it is difficult.

Expectations from the city and media

This main comments here point to a communications challenge both for UNESCO and for the city designated. Cities mentioned as the two most common questions they face after membership: "What are you actually doing after joining the Network?" and "What results did you achieve from it?" The second main issue emerging from members is how many people or organizations think UNESCO has financial resources: "A primary false

expectation included the expectation by the media that UNESCO would bring some money” or “we do less open forums as the worst rather than the best come – often they want the opportunity for protest and to complain about lack of funding”. Some said they were sceptical about this label, ‘what are we getting out of this when it is our creative work that got you the designation”. Yet another sceptic said: “The title sounds so nice the media like it.”

Supplement Five: Catalytic Impact

Everyone is busy, but the title can be a factor for development and a great tool, it can in the right circumstances be a powerful lever. Impacts range from the subtle to the direct and from the visible, countable to the invisible and vague. Levels of impact vary sharply. The **designation is an organizing device for certain cities at a point in their development and size.** Increasingly now the label has far more impact on 2nd and 3rd tier and especially the very small cities where excitement is marked or cities excluded from global networks. Think Denia, think Idanha-a-Nova, think Baghdad, think Rasht, think Aswan. Yet 1st tier cities like Rome and soon Paris are finding benefits too.

Yet “It was the right step at the right time” (Berlin) “Incredibly important to overcome jealousy and to put people together”. (Rome) “UCCN has opened a world of possibilities but needs to do more to make it happen, but also from us”. This sentiment was a common refrain across Asian, American and European cities. “What is brilliant about the UCCN programme is that it operates at high political levels and that at UCCN and city level we can do things” (Santa Fe)

“Without the UNESCO link the archive would not have joined the partnership”. (Rome) “Qingdao is trying to become a film capital and the investor wants to build a bigger Hollywood It is asking Bradford to advise and help and is talking of co-production. This is incredible” “At the level of our collective psychology things improved in the city”. (Fabriano). “It connects us, and the world knows more who we are”. (Bamiyan)) “UCCN creates a platform to be connected and we get invitations to events and we have budgets to go”. (Gwangju) “It provided the opportunity to bring the start-up world and media arts community together at the moment the city is organizing things, but we want to set up a self-organizing platform that does not involve us the municipality at all “(Tel Aviv)

Comments such as “The title gave a good press and made it easier to go to politicians to invest in the creative industries” were common. “Joining the UCCN can help empower the industry and economic transformation”. (Shanghai) “Loads has happened but still we are at the beginning. It is a regeneration initiative through and through. We are in it for the long game – it counteracts the negative image and UNESCO brand valued in funding applications”. (Bradford) The UNESCO brand provides status. “After the membership it has become much easier to get funding via projects (EU and such) since the UCCN designation is attractive” (Galway) “It gives us more clout when applying for grants such as for the Mediale” (York) “Feasibility of obtaining government grant gaining intra-organizational support within the bureaucracy has allowed us to advance” (Busan). “UCCN can be exterior pressure to the city government in a positive way.” (Suzhou)

“Daniela Mercury, a popular artist made a special hymn of Salvador “A cidade da música” when we got the title. It was sung at carnival. CCN, had an impact in the way the natural creativity of the city was viewed, making it more structured and professional. A special group in the Municipality was created benefiting with many departments participating” (Salvador) “We noticed quite a bit in the schools of Paducah, where culture has been elevated in the curriculum and within tourism Paducah has strengthened its position as “the city of quilting”.” “There are more tourists in Denia”

For several it triggered physical development. “The impact of this bet has been felt in the increasing of restaurants being opened and good dynamics like redesigning the old market and a new restaurant alley like Madrid did in Mercado San Miguel, or Lisbon in the Mercado da Ribeira”. (Florianopolis) “Now 20 Parma restaurants working together ... and they agree with the general policies”. “Our Drinks By Design usually had 300 people attend, after designation it was 900. It has settled at 600. It has elevated the design profile”. (Detroit) “It helps Curitiba be seen in a new light”. “The development of cultural industries is one of our key priorities. We try to improve access to and participation in cultural life by carrying out “literary interventions” - unusual literary events held in open urban spaces. As now we are the only Russian city in the network, we feel ourselves as the “ambassadors” to acquaint other Russian cities with the programme”. (Ulyanosk)

Many cities across the continents emphasized the constant pressure to demonstrate the value of this network. “Our officials could wipe us out

instantly... we are under constant pressure to demonstrate value". "Government is pleased we have the award, but they do not get what it means....this is why we want UNESCO to intervene.... The IDB understand and help us, they are switched on, IDB gets culture and are interested in the 'orange economy'" "Our straw industry was dying and in the old straw market there are 5% authentic goods – 95% imported largely from China... we hope to change this" (Nassau)

A lack of understanding of what the designation can do was again a common theme especially with national organizations. "They do not think strategically in the city and the city and national government do not work well together". (Kingston) "It is long and confusing to explain that we are a UNESCO City of Literature in the UNESCO Creative Cities Network, made up of 7 disciplines and respective sub-groups. So depending on the situation, but we typically communicate and promote the city as a city of literature. We always add UNESCO due to the prestige of the name". By contrast: "Kanazawa understands how important culture in regeneration is and being recognized is one helpful step in a long term plan". "This helps us

At the other extreme: "Nothing is happening, there is no money, no staff just me and I am leaving, no office.... but just having the title and being on the list helps our external aim to promote our city on a wider front". Remember too the rhetoric and reality problem: "It sounds so nice the title, the press love it, so it does not matter what is actually happening".

Unsurprisingly most cities **use the cache as a badge of honour** for marketing purposes and cities are even beginning to use external experts or consultants to write their UCCN application. Think here of Jeonju, Busan, Tongyeong, Paducah, Rome and Fabriano. This is a similar development to that which happened with the European Capital of Culture process. This can present a dilemma. If the city is not able to write its own bid does that devalue their designation? Or are the externals helping the city to increase their capacities? This needs to be carefully assessed, and advice is always welcome, but one wants the voice of the city to come through strongly.

Given this variety of cities, issues and interests there are few questions where every city agrees except that they are delighted to be part of a prestigious club. Yet most cities if the truth be known are using the designation more for their own purposes than larger UN agendas.

Here a solid theme is coming through for UNESCO to **tell a compelling story or to describe a vision** for the network that is simple, focused and relevant to a global audience. This **needs a touch of realism and magic**. Sharing good practices and creating a learning environment is fine as far as it goes as is encouraging artist exchanges. Of course every artist wants to perform or exhibit. But **are these aims aspirational enough?** UNESCO can always be a network the question is whether it wants something effective and which direction that should take.

The above provides a picture of complexity and these issues are addressed below under a number of headings starting with vision. This raises again the question whether the listing is now only attracting lower tier cities, bar notable exceptions like Rome, who have most to gain in reputation terms from being designated. Berlin joined early at the time when it was still re-establishing its positioning. "We were involved early on as part of a bigger creative industries push, now the importance of the network is different".

The final crucial issues need to be mentioned. **Disparity in resources** will ultimately become a factor for the network to become sustainable. One thinks here of Shenzhen, Hangzhou or Beijing in contrast to Zahle, Popayan or Rasht. Cities mostly have a part timer as the contact point with an annual budget that barely covers travel and few exchanges. How well the city does depends on that individual and this is too unstable in the longer term. Places like Pekalongan have a dedicated focal point who is doing as much as possible in their power, but they cannot affect their changing local political landscape.

National or **global conflicts affect the activities**, the potentials and mobility of several members and here the UNESCO designation can play an significant role in keeping the spotlight on cities and here Aswan in Egypt, Baghdad, Bamiyan in Afghanistan or Gaziantep in Turkey come to mind. Apart from the dangers of moving about simply getting a visa can be troublesome. These issues are understood by members but there is no structure to help in a coherent way.

Supplement Six: Organizational Mechanics

Cultural differences lie at the heart of UCCN and **dealing with cultural complexity is the currency UNESCO copes with**. This makes it invigorating and at times hard work and this includes language barriers, something that emerged several times. Since the working language is English inevitably English speakers and their way of thinking tend to

dominate. It tends too to infantilize other language groups as members can never fully express themselves and so we lose some of the creative richness we know is present not only in meetings but the cities themselves.

Add to this **cities and UNESCO are in a complex symbiosis**. It is blending these differing cultures that present a major challenge. The one devises protocols and the other needs to fix the streets, collect the garbage, deliver the water and make the city work; and social activists want to ensure the needs of the voiceless are heard and business seeks opportunities to make a profit, sometimes with a social conscience. Handling this well requires emotional intelligence.

This means there is a strong political overlay to everything UCCN does. as **politics enters the arena at differing levels** in terms of the cities, UNESCO, the network as a whole. This is not surprising, yet it effects the good functioning of the network. This is exacerbated since getting the prize of becoming a designated creative city is relatively easy as compared to the value it offers. Thus political lobbying can be strong and the UNESCO ambassadors play their part seeing it as their duty. Yet these processes can imbalance the network. Some are worried: "Why do some cities become a member" was heard more than once.

From the perspective of the **creative actors they want UCCN to be a stronger professional organization**: "We must de-politicize, if the network is only a political symbol ... that is a great pity, it will weaken it". "We know lots of politics is happening at headquarters, there is pressure to do things in certain ways".

Cities want a new relationship and clearly the recent members did not have enough background to express this view forcefully. **Everyone understands UNESCO's limitations** and financial problems although in the cities themselves some think UNESCO can provide financial support. As a consequence an increasing trend fostered by UNESCO is to create mixed partnerships with a broad stakeholder base and here North American cities are especially adept given their traditions of stakeholder partnerships. One thinks here of Detroit's work in getting its 'creative city vision' worked through. This will help create a more stable resource base over the longer term.

Here some Asian, South American and Spanish city quotes give a flavour of more local politics: "The new mayor does not think the creative city network is important"; "there has been a change in leadership and the

new mayor does not understand UCCN"; "there have been problems in implementing the project as a result of the diversification of political forces, delaying, for example, the approval of the budgets of the city"; "I have to wait I cannot do anything at the moment, I have to see what the politicians want"; "we had the budget but it has not been approved". "We don't have any budget: due to political instability the public funds for 2016 weren't approved (50,000 €) and the city didn't launch a fundraising campaign aimed for private institutions." "The proposal to be part of UCCN was developed by our civil society organization with public representatives, but then the politics changed and the city wanted to take control. They said we were acting in our self-interest, but we disagree". "To tell the truth, there is something strange going on." One interviewer noted: "I had a good interview with the contact point and then someone else contacted me and said I should not speak to them... they did not know what was going on."

UNESCO's more recent application criterion highlighting the need for partnerships is good as building these can create and spread local ownership.

Governance is a big issue especially for cities of longer standing. Some cities want collaborative decision making between the cities and the Secretariat and the Asian interviewees expressed this nearly in unison and the Europeans in more hushed tones. The newer members, so delighted to be designated expressed no view yet. This issue becomes even more important when cities are financially contributing to the running of the network. It brings too difficult questions to the fore such as: 'what are the capabilities and competences of UNESCO itself'. The new steering group set-up is a step in the right direction, yet some people feel it is only facilitating the execution of decisions rather than being also about joint strategic planning.

In addition the thematic clusters are beginning to find good purposes and energy with new regional clusters emerging in Latin and North America, as well China, Korea and Japan. This helps simplify the complexities of a global network into more manageable forms. Here people can mostly communicate in their language and form alliances that easier to organize and less expensive.

The creative city title is in essence a gift from UNESCO. The notion that the **designation confers both rights and responsibilities** on cities is not

generally embedded. This dual feature though applies both to the cities and UNESCO.

UNESCO and its member cities are inextricably linked. UNESCO provides the title and the cities provide the creativity, although there are cultural differences in how creativity is expressed. The partners must get on well together and the moment to build a new relationship is here. It needs to address the faultlines described previously especially how the creative industries landscape is in flux and changes dynamically. The way it connects is bound less by rigid rules but more by codes of behaviour, it allows for self-organizing. UCCN needs to be **strategic principled and tactically flexible to operate in this world**. Otherwise the network could lose its energy.

“If UNESCO really begins to understand how to share ideas, perspectives and projects, they could unleash a huge force of creativity to drive sustainable development globally”. “UNESCO should help facilitate the network to reach its potential, rather than constrain things”. “

“The Secretariat is inserted into a heavy structure, it has leadership in some sense, but they are not free to manage as they should given political pressures”. “The growth, lack of resources effects or creates a lack of leadership. This is the real problem, the problem with UNESCO then becomes UNESCO”.

This means UNESCO cannot harness its potential and resources. And most **cities want UNESCO to operate at its best** and to use its strongest assets. These are its ability to designate, to give credibility, to be in effect a ‘licensing authority’, to manage quality standards, to award prizes and to reward achievement, to have an overview, to use its convening power when appropriate. By moving more out of the way they believe **UNESCO can free itself from those things it is less good at**. Thus liberated from much of the day to day mechanics they think it can then provide creative guidance rather than administrative directives. It can be more light-footed, more a broker, a moderator, a connector, an enabler, it can provide ideas, it can focus on trying to be being a leader. “Being harsh what does UNESCO offer apart from the title, what are its other capabilities”.

The implication is, and this is different from the past 2012/13 discussions on organizational change, subcontracting as much as possible and jointly with the network’s steering group managing a professionalized hybrid entity that takes on the tasks UNESCO is less equipped to do. Helpfully it

takes a burden off UNESCO and would let "UCCN be like a professionalized NGO". Here some felt the Secretariat should go one step further and explore the idea of an arm's length structure came up in this context as it could bring out the best of what UNESCO, participating cities, creative actors and expert outsiders together can bring to the table together.

Subcontracting and having an arm's length entity would allow the network to create a high powered interactive web platform or garner and sign-post the vast sources of research information on creative cultural development or on the creative industries rather than duplicating what many others are doing. It could help measure outcomes cities' creative strategies and these targets need to be far more clear, it could help evaluate with expert teams. Some fear you potentially lose some internal links in UNESCO, say to heritage or education, whilst others think precisely the opposite.

Freed then UNESCO can focus on developing the network's potential and in a co-creative way seek financial stability for the network as a partnership of equals. The Secretariat can then operate more like creative bureaucrats and some cities have these: The initiator of the bid was a government official who drove it, he invented a music museum and was connected to music business". (Kingston) "He helped", so the interviewer, "kiss awake a sleeping beauty".

Many suggest, as things stand, that **the network is too institutionally driven** largely run and organized by politicians and city officials with perhaps too little direct experience and involvement in the creative ecology of their city so leaving inadequate space for the creative community to make its mark. "We start from scratch all the time when civil servants change or a politician. There is no memory no history and often they are not an expert". This can be constraining and curtail potential and one thinks here of debates in Belem or San Cristóbal de las Casas. "If you look at internal structures mostly people in charge are civil servants who have no idea about the whole, as it is not really their task". "it would be good to have real experts responsible for the project". "Why does UNESCO always mainly communicate with our mayor or politicians, rather than those who know about the sector." "These officials rarely have experience of actually instigating or managing creative projects, so they always think about easy things like sending an artist abroad, all you have to do here is buy a ticket". "Interesting networking is about creating and doing things together and otherwise everything stays at the simple exchange level"

At the network level the **general meetings are seen as too formal** and cumbersome not reflecting the creativity that this creative city network is about. Why are these meetings not creative experiences many ask? The best networks they argue have an enabling structure that embeds looseness and flexibility within it and that takes advantage of social media and digital possibilities more actively and strongly. "The mayors meetings can become purely political and end up being more like a trade show. I was sitting next to a guy who produces windows and the biggest dumpling manufacturer. I ask myself are they going to sell dumplings to Kinshasa". "some of these meetings are like a propaganda fest and as an attendee you get no advance briefing about what is expected".

Östersund 2016 was determined to make a different kind of meeting as they made soundings with other cities and thus highlighted more good practices that could inspire people.

At the same time some cities, one thinks here of Sydney, Nassau or Nagoya, struggle to get their politicians to understand what the UNESCO designation can do for them. "They do not know what to do with the network and so attach it to an existing organization". Smaller less well known cities are simply grateful to be part of a prestigious roster like Bamiyan, Obidos, Baghdad or Dakar.

Most cities are **willing to contribute fees for membership**, with the appropriate scales for different cities, but with a proviso that the balance and relationship between the centre and the members is rethought. "**The level of professionalism has to be aligned with a fee**". Many do not want to contribute financially if the centre is seen to be inefficient. At its simplest they ask: "what is the best organizational form given the strengths and weaknesses of all parties to achieve network aims". People acknowledge and are grateful how Beijing and Shenzhen made such significant financial contributions to safeguard the network. They are concerned, of course, that money buys influence otherwise the network is less sustainable. There are some major exceptions on the fees question with Bologna concerned that cities could become members because of their willingness to pay: "we don't want cities to pay their way in, the credibility of the network goes down".

The majority are in fact willing to **pay some equitable membership fee** provided there is more equal and clearer decision making process between the Secretariat and member cities. Here is a reminder of the 'no taxation with representation' principle. Again joint strategic planning was

mentioned by many cities especially in Asia and Europe as well as what the competences are of each side of the network partnership.

The capacity to resource activities is crucial. Shenzhen, the astonishing city that exploded over 35 years from a large village to a 13million people metropolis was the first Chinese city to join. The UCCN was a perfect fit to create a strategic breakthrough for the city in 2008 at a time when they could shape the network and be part of a smaller group. This is reflected in Shenzhen's resourcing with its seven full time staff and like Engchien Les Bains this is an exception. Thus most have far too few resources to execute their strategies and more ambitious plans as well as to network and co-create joint projects.

Major exceptions aside like Chinese cities or places like Parma or Katowice with their good budgets, financing the work for the network in cities is difficult as "you have to understand you cannot do this UNESCO activity in your spare time". Here some innovative examples emerged, such as in Parma where partners contribute in kind or money plus a percentage of tourist tax goes to their CCN operating foundation. There was a large cluster of cities where the budget grouped around 30,000 to 80,000 euros, but often there was hardly anything so initiatives or travel costs were squeezed out of existing departmental budgets.

Revoking membership and de-designation is a hot topic and most cities feel that if cities do not contribute you should lose the title "since it is a valuable gift". The current procedure "feels purely theoretical and too long winded". Some believed in sanctions whereas the Italian cities in particular favoured incentives, "more attempt at recovery and prevention" and "help to do more". "The threat of taking away the title is my biggest power, this is how I get politicians to take us seriously", (Montreal) "Because they don't know any better, the threat often works as there is very little awareness and work being done". Another said: "You need the threat of expulsion, things are so political, the selection and evaluation process needs to be de-politicized". "This threat has to feel real". Chinese cities had quite forceful views here. A common comment by members is that: "those who aren't active should have their designation revoked after a reasonable time (four or so years) this revocation should pose a real and effective threat on members to become active again." (Granada) Some such as Krakow were very honest: "We are far away from pushing this issue, because of how much work we need to do to get "our house in order". Yet remember many associations withdraw the privilege of membership when the benefits are only one way.

The evaluation and action planning agenda came up frequently. Three points are worthy of note. First, most cities said they **would not be completely open in their self-evaluations** as this could present an internal threat and reflect badly on those writing the evaluation. Second since the evaluations are publicly available they were wary. **Self-promotion is easier than self-criticism** in this context. Lastly some interviewees felt that the action plans were not really specific to the creative city designation and that it was difficult to distinguish what was really new and what was a repeat of what was already happening. In short what was the value added activity of the network.

Nevertheless the UNESCO and UCCN mission and its priorities has inspired re-workings of several city strategies, with some excellent examples from new members. As noted from Krakow: "Slowly progress is being made, with changes in mindset and focus".

Supplement Seven: A Vision for Creativity & Creative Cities

UNESCO's UCCN Secretariat **needs to clarify its vision and restate its mission**. It is changing and so unclear. It says it wants to: "strengthen cooperation with and among cities that have recognized creativity as a strategic factor of sustainable development as regards economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects"..... "to make creativity an essential component of urban development"... "UCCN covers seven creative fields". It says it wants to "develop partnerships that promote creativity and the cultural industries". Yet now the Secretariat is focusing on UN's Sustainable Development Goal 11 "to make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable". Does it mean by using the seven creative fields to accomplish this task? It is not specified. This is very important as many cities interviewed are confused. "For the 2030 sustainable development agenda, there's nothing specific in culture field, so it's hard to adapt it in the action plan".

Nowhere is creativity defined nor how you can become more creative. Equally **not what a creative city is** or its qualities and characteristics **or how a city can become creative** or how you measure it. Unless creativity here is being defined as the seven fields (crafts & folk art, design, film, gastronomy, literature, music and media arts) and that this makes a creative city with the cultural industries at the forefront rather than other values deriving from arts and culture. This is self-evidently too narrow and goes against common sense. If a city is a complex eco-system of people, place, resources and potential then what about the contribution of social activists, scientists, business people, engineers, doctors, creative

bureaucrats and many more. **A way to square the circle in a coherent fashion is** for UNESCO to explicitly say 'what are the special qualities and roles of these artistic forms in shaping cities creatively that make a unique contribution to solve global problems in a sustainable way'.

Creativity at its simplest is multi-faceted resourcefulness relying on qualities such as openness and being alert. Creativity is both generic, a way of thinking and a mindset, and it has specific applications and is task oriented in relation to particular fields, such as being a creative artist, bureaucrat or engineer.

A lengthier description is that creativity is a general, all-purpose problem-solving and opportunity-seeking ability. It helps a process of discovery through the supple capacity to imagine possibilities, to conceive and originate concepts and ideas and downstream to help bring them into being. In this way it enables potential to unfold. It is applied imagination using qualities like intelligence, inventiveness and reflexive learning along the way. Its essence involves the ability to assess and find one's way to solutions for intractable, unexpected, unusual problems or circumstances. It is valuable in the social, political, organizational and cultural field as well as in technology and the economy. It can be applied to all spheres: from rethinking schools and teaching, inventing new systems of healthcare and delivery, recasting organizational structures. Crucially, it is now recognized that creative inputs add value to businesses which are not normally considered creative, such as engineering, facilities management or the hospitality industry as distinct from design, film or music. Crucially creativity without implementation is just having ideas and speculating.

Creativity requires certain qualities of mind, dispositions and attitudes. These characteristics include: curiosity, openness and a questioning attitude, the ability to stand back, listen and re-assess, the courage not to take a given credo, practice or theory for granted and to dare to think outside of the box, the gift of seeing relevance and connections between apparently different things. It involves fluency and flexibility and the ability to draw on ideas from across disciplines and fields of inquiry, to think laterally and to blend concepts from seemingly unrelated domains. It is based on divergent thinking, which opens out possibilities, reveals patterns and helps find solutions before prematurely closing in on a specific answer. Importantly it needs convergent thinking to close in on potential and to turn ideas into reality. This attributes would have to apply to a city as a whole too.

To be effective in **being creative means having judgement** and knowing when to be flexible and open and when to be more focused and closed or tenacious and persistent. A misconception is that being creative is about being unconstrained. Being creative requires just as much attention as being a scientist or an engineer. The central point is that it is a different kind of attentiveness and approach.

Everyone is in principle creative, but not everyone is equally creative, yet **everyone can be more creative** than they currently are. The same applies to organizations, neighbourhoods and city regions.

Grasping what a creative individual might be like is easy, for instance being able to make interesting connections, to think out of constraints or established theories and to have sparks of insight. They have energy and courage and some sense of where they are going, although it is often unclear how. The same is true for a creative organization. But already the priorities are different and it adds a layer of complexity and a different dynamic takes place. Moving on to the next layer – the creative city – issues become very difficult as complexity rises exponentially as you involve a mass of individuals and a mass of organizations with different cultures, aims and attitudes. These can push in opposing directions.

At its simplest a **creative city provides opportunities** for people, organizations and the city as an amalgam of entities **to think, plan and act with imagination** in solving problems and creating opportunities.

A creative city is a place where people feel they can fulfil themselves, there are opportunities and things get done. It is a place where people can express their **talents which are harnessed, exploited and promoted for the common good**. These act as a catalyst and role model to attract others in a self-reinforcing cycle. Here there are myriad, high quality learning opportunities, formal and informal, where self-development is easy. There are ladders of opportunity and choices and a sense that ambition and aspirations can be met. There is a 'can do' mentality. The city is an engine of possibilities. There are places to meet, mix and exchange. There is multicultural colour and diversity. This implies distinctiveness and varied insights.

The confidence to be outward looking comes from a sense of familiarity with family, friendship and professional networks, their neighbourhood, their workplace and crucially physical landmarks be that a street, a cafe or set of facilities. This anchors their sense of safety and security with a community feeling, but an evolving one that adapts to changes and so is

resilient. This confidence encourages exploring and being curious. This creative place exudes a sense of a 'higher purpose' - soulful places perhaps a gallery, a site of interest or religious place.

The overall physical environment functions well for its inhabitants, it is easy to move around and connect with each other. **Its high level urban design inspires, stimulates and generates pride** and affection. The architecture, old and new, is well-assembled, and the street pattern is diverse and interesting. Webbed within the ordinary is the occasional extra-ordinary and remarkable or memorable. It is an environment in which creators of all kinds are content, but not complacent, and motivated to create and where there are outlets and channels to communicate their ideas or research or sell their work. It is a natural market place, where people exchange ideas, develop joint projects, trade their products, or work in its advanced industries. It offers a rich register of vibrant experiences through for example gastronomy, the arts, heritage and its natural surroundings, including thriving mainstream and alternative scenes and a healthy network of third spaces. Opportunities abound: the place is welcoming and encouraging. Its dynamism makes it a magnet and so generates critical mass and attracts people from outside and this guarantees longevity.

A means of **measuring and monitoring a city's creativity** can focus on four core areas and specific domains within them, namely how does the city.

Nurture and identify its creative potential and reinforce its cultural distinctiveness in order to generate more innovations and so make the city more resilient. Here it assesses:

Openness, trust, accessibility and participation

The talent development and learning landscape at all levels

Enable and support this creative capacity so that opportunities and prospects are maximized. The evaluation here looks at:

The political and public framework and its regulations and incentives regime

Strategic leadership, agility and vision

Professionalism and effectiveness

Exploit and harness its expertise, talents and aspirations. The evaluation here concerns:

Entrepreneurship, exploration and innovation capacity

Communication, connectivity and networking

The lived experience of the city physically and in terms of activity in encouraging creative potential so it assesses:

Distinctiveness, diversity, vitality and expression

The place and place-making

Liveability and well-being

An extremely brief trajectory of the Creative City idea follows. It was launched by the author in 1988 in response to the increasing levels of globalization, restructuring of the world economy and growing blandness and homogenization of cities. This was leading to a loss of a sense of belonging, identity and declining distinctiveness of places. At the beginning the idea focused on the contribution of the arts and cultural/creative industries in averting these trends. 'Creativity' was seen as a primary asset since human cleverness, desires, motivations and imagination are replacing location, natural resources and market access as the key urban resources. Major expressions of creativity are the arts and cultural forms but not limited to them given scientific and other forms of inventiveness. From the mid 1990's the definition of a creative city broadened dramatically to include for instance bureaucratic creativity as you **cannot have a creative eco-system if parts of the city are riven with obstacles**. Yet for some the concept was still concerned with artistic creativity.

Nevertheless there is a **coherent way to justify the focus on art and cultural creative fields** as being at the heart of social and economic development. Culture is who we are, the sum of our beliefs, attitudes and habits. Our culture shapes how we create and make our societies. So the scope, possibilities, style and tenor of social and economic development is culturally determined. Closed minded and strongly hierarchical places, for instance, tend to be inflexible and adjust to major transformation with difficulty. It might deter creating mixed partnerships to solve problems and create opportunities. So the overall culture of a place is crucial in helping address SDG 11 "making cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable".

This focus on art forms needs an explicit argument and justification otherwise it sounds like empty words. Here is a possible argument. Thus what is special about the part of culture associated with the arts: singing, acting, writing, dancing, performing music, sculpting, painting, designing, exploring new technologies and mixing them all up with food to follow. Participating in the arts uses the imaginary realm to a degree that other disciplines do not such as sports or most of science. Those are more rule bound and precise. The distinction between the arts and writing a computer programme, engineering or sports is that the latter are ends in themselves, they do not change the way you perceive society, they tend to teach you something specific. The arts can have wider benefits by focusing on reflection and original thought, they pose challenges and want to communicate (mostly). If the goal of a city is to have self-motivated, creative people and places they need engaged individuals who think. Turning imagination into reality or something concrete is a creative act, so the arts more than most activities are concerned with creativity, invention and innovation. Reinventing a society or nursing it through transition is a creative act so an engagement with or through the arts helps.

Engagement with arts combines stretching oneself and focusing, feeling the senses, expressing emotion, self-reflecting and original thought. Essential to it is mastering the craft through technical skill on top of which is layered interpretation that sums up something meaningful to the listener or viewer. The result can be: to broaden horizons, to convey meaning, with immediacy and or depth, to communicate iconically so you grasp things in one without needing to understand step by step, to help nurture memory, to symbolise complex ideas and emotions, to see the previously unseen, to learn, to uplift, to encapsulate previously scattered thoughts, to anchor identity and to bond people to their community or by contrast to stun, to shock for social, moral, or thought-provoking reasons, to criticise or to create joy, to entertain, to be beautiful and the arts can even soothe the soul and promote popular morale. More broadly expression through the arts is a way of passing ideas and concepts on to later generations in a (somewhat) universal language. Not all art creates all these responses. Some is of low quality and boring. The best art though works at a number of these levels simultaneously.

In thinking through monitoring and evaluation **the Secretariat might take a leaf out of the Intercultural Cities initiative,** to which precisely 100 cities have signed up. It was jointly put together by the Council of Europe and my organization Comedia and provides a crafted peer learning

platform for participating cities. Interestingly it describes as a programme not a network and 'supports cities in reviewing their policies through an intercultural lens and developing comprehensive intercultural strategies to help them manage diversity positively and realise the diversity advantage'. Its core policy document outlines the steps required to implement a comprehensive inter-cultural city strategy that is meant to recognize and act upon its ethnic diversity. Its methodology suggests precisely defined activities accompanied by concrete examples, resources needed, questions or dilemmas arising and indicators of success. Its step by step guide defines an intercultural city, explains how you build one and the elements of an urban strategy including the public realm or civic administration. It starts by suggesting a city 'Make a public statement or a symbolic gesture demonstrating that the city explicitly understands and is adopting an intercultural approach' and provides examples of 'iconic action'. It lays out precise measures to monitor progress and has an external expert team to evaluate the performance of cities.

These are **reasons why cities would love guidance and inspiration**. They want UNESCO to create calls and incentives, for instance "to encourage cross discipline collaboration"; there should award schemes for good projects and better-performing cities should get rewards (Seoul and Tongyeong); UNESCO should propose topics and "why did it not propose projects for UN Habitat" (St. Etienne); "they should be leading intellectually rather than only administratively"; "we are launching calls and getting a good response, especially inter-disciplinary work" (Bologna); there should be requests for bids. In sum: cities would like UNESCO to be a catalyst. Many themes suggest themselves like those in Östersund including urban/rural connections, culture driven approaches to adapt to urban change. Here surveying awards schemes like the Bosch Foundation's Actors for Urban Change, the Knight Foundation's Civic Innovation Awards or the N.I.C.E network's award "Solving problems that really matter with a digital twist" can be helpful. Clearly UNESCO should be networked with them.

Supplement Eight: Networks & their Lifecycles

UNESCO can stay as it is and **UCCN will survive whatever, but will it be meaningful** and vibrant. UNESCO's name value remains too strong and some cities will always find value in being associated with it. Others may let their involvement and commitment drift. The network itself as distinct from the spin-off of the name and title must bring value, "you don't keep things going that don't bring value." Yet Linz made a perceptive

comment: "basically UCCN is a good idea as you reward dynamism and creativity, but I find the whole organization ill-suited to do anything I do not see this as a problem as long as cities see rewards, which are internal rewards". "I do want to criticize too much .. it is what it is there is far more on the plus side and it doesn't matter if the internal procedures work or not ... I am pragmatic."

The world of networks is changing and very fast. There is the old and the new networking. Everywhere people are re-considering the effectiveness of their networks, our interviews with cultural networks confirmed, and general lessons are emerging. The competences to run a modern network in a digitally driven world are vastly different from what was required 10, 20 or 50 years ago. The modern day urban network was dominated by the sister city movement and its institutional base that rose to prominence in the post-World War II period. Yet the history of city networks is goes further back and most famously we remember the powerfully effective Hanseatic League of 41 cities across Europe from the 1200 onwards.

Digitally capacities and potential means that today networking is increasingly mirroring social networking with its focus on personalization and the informal. This **throws the idea of an institutional network up into the air**. "UNESCO is not keeping pace with how creative eco-systems now co-operate". Yet since most of the UCCN focal points are institutionally shaped city officials this shift will be less apparent to them whereas for the creative actors in a city it is the new networking methods that matter and here "there needs to be agreements about behaviour and codes". For them the main engine, energy or vitality does not come from a centre, but more from their individual initiative: "If I want a partner I try to get the best partner, I do not care if they are in the network, it is so much easier to find partners and get information nowadays and you do not depend on formally constituted networks. This might be different for others run by city institutions." (Linz) "It is easier to get ad hoc partnerships rather than long time partners I do not see the point of doing something with a network partner when there is someone better outside although the formal looks better to the outside worldit seems solid". "There a lots of ways of discovering good practices, if I am committed, I don't need a network. If I want to know about Ghent I just go on Google and by the time I have a face to face I already know a lot". (ECCE) "Kari Korkman is developing World Design Week Network, this is the real engine for design for us. The sub-network meeting was more

about what we have done rather than what we could do" (Helsinki) "We use networks strategically and in a focused manner."

The network is the institution of our time. It is a new culture. Think of the social networks like Facebook, blogs and microblogging like Twitter, discussion forums, sharing platforms or simply clever use of search engines. Think of the behaviour and organizational patterns that these encourage. Think of how information and good practices are garnered or peer to peer learning enabled. These networks are open systems with dissipative structures, in constant flux, they form and reform constantly, seemingly casual and made coherent through personal choices, always poised for reordering.

This dynamic challenges institutions. Different levels of networking have different types of behaviour and expectations - institutional or one based on a creative eco-system; hierarchical versus flatter structures, formal and more informal ones. **'We meet in a creative cities network but there is no creativity'** one perceptive interviewee noted and this reminds us of what a good network might be. If UNESCO wants to encourage transformative exchanges and deep learning it needs to **encourage an arms' length entity or bridge** between the formal world and necessities of government and the quicker world of creatives and social activists. This hybrid intermediary can speak the language of both parties and is given the authority to broker between government and non-government as neither party can achieve the full impact without the other. An example is the N.I.C.E. (New Innovations in the Creative Economy) network of 21 member cities set up by the Nord-Rhein Westfalen government. This has ECCE (The European Centre for Creative Economy) set up in 2011 attached to it whose remit is to join the dots between the hundreds of members in the network and to be a virtual match maker, a problem solver and creator of opportunities. It encourages open frameworks, virtual and physical often using play, which official institutions would not want to and could not do as there would be less trust. "The problem in networks is that you need a person who knows their way around the tricks. The formal rules of a city often won't help solve a problem, they are governed by written protocols, for the creative governance of a network you need another way" (Government official) "If the network wants to be innovative people in the network have to speed produce results and go into open environments". "Good networks need people who are networked" (Mannheim)

The competences are different from how a public institution works. **In the old networking "cities just want to showcase** their city and what they have done and not to find new ideas or projects, they are scared to get into open processesI don't know if my mayor will allow me". "At the meeting they all presented and catalogued their qualities, each outbidding each other, it had little impact on enhancement of network". "Creating content is key Remember the Forum for Universal Cultures or the attempts of the Arab and American Capital of Culture schemes, they substitute politics for content and that was their common point of failure". (Franco Bianchini) "Cities need laboratories of imaginative thinking from outside a tight, hierarchical and institutional framework. Networks are an important potential vehicle for this, at least they should be listened to". (Ivor Davies)

These differing conceptions of the dynamics of the network have implications. "It is never the city we are collaborating with ... it is always the person and we could collaborate with anyone" but "I am not connected in this network as it is never the right person who is the city link. They are not informed by the creative scene or is close to it". "It is ridiculous that they address the mayor and not those institutions or people who know". "You cannot run a dynamic network especially in creativity with a heavy organization. UNESCO is in a totally different business... the regulation business". "UNESCO isn't used to working with operative networks full of crazy people... they are used to working with conventions". "It is much easier to manage heritage sites, there are scientific guidelines".

The effective networks are increasingly fluid structures and processes through which ideas and values flow and come alive with network nodes providing the energy rather than a centre. **Their coherence comes from the multiple relationships, interactions, joint projects** and crosshatches of activity that are bound together by these common values and aims. They are an alert, responsive form of social organization, where difference and diversity is encouraged, yet consensus is a common goal. They are more driven by principles than tight guidelines. This raises questions as **UNESCO would need to trade power for creative influence**. This is difficult when it is UNESCO's designation that provides the value and status to cities. Is in fact **UCCN more an association of cities than a network?**

A network is a web of connections and interactions both physical and electronic. Yet even a city network like UCCN **ultimately revolves around**

people and trust though that network might be institutionally anchored and driven such as by UNESCO with policy guidelines or written agreements. They are a human endeavour and their engine is shared values, agreed aims, co-created ideas and programmes, joint planning and ventures and these need to be explicitly acknowledged, lived and experienced – day to day. This makes the network personal and thus meaningful as well as equal and balanced and so generates the energy to do real things. How a network unfolds requires trust. **Trust takes time and patience to evolve** from which a relationship can emerge. This needs to be worked at hard step by step mostly by face to face contact and formal and informal socializing in spite of our virtualizing world. Relations based on trust shorten and speed up transactions and allow more complex things to happen electronically. “If I want to do something tricky, it is not generated in formal meetings, but in a drink”. These pre-conditions get people to exchange information, knowledge and their potentially powerful tacit and unexpressed insights as well as to create new projects.

Establishing a relationship and exchanging information create value, such as foster ideas that you could not develop alone. In addition a good network allows you to be honest or transparent and even to show your vulnerability. That **value creates the motivation, will and desire from which action grows**, rather than simply playing at networking. The desire to create the time, in spite of other obligations do things together and to make an extra effort. This provides the confidence to be open to learn and to allow surprises and unexpected connections and outcomes to happen. In time this can create a network mindset.

This makes the **atmosphere of joint meetings** and especially larger general assemblies or steering groups **vitaly important** as it here that bonds are created and reinforced. If these are experienced as rigid the depth of the network and seamless connectivity cannot grow. Meetings exist not only to reach agreements but also to create a collective experience. Perhaps larger network **meetings can develop a fringe or a kind of creative city festival**.

In thinking through meetings UCCN should consider how to develop effective and transformational **peer to peer learning** and what methods work and how deeper exchanges can be established since so much is less face to face and more through virtual platforms. This reinforces the need to make physical meetings special and to generate an extra quality and value added. It might be through external speakers of renown, creating

masterclasses or mentoring schemes. These are areas UCCN can consider.

In the 'what next' phase of the UCCN **UNESCO must build, perhaps even rebuild, trust** and it cannot be mechanical or formulaic in how it relates to its members cities. Being more transparent will be key to this process as well involving member partners as real equals.

There is a lifecycle to all networks and our review of others such as the Intercultural Cities or IFACCA networks reinforces this. Mostly in the beginning it is a group of the like-minded that connect. There is the enthusiasm of being part of something new and less of others to contend with. It is easier to talk or to speculate about possibilities. In the case of UCCN there was a strong sense of being part of a privileged elite grouping. Cities felt they were the best and this gave motivation. There is less complexity at the outset, but as a network grows the complexity increases exponentially. What was formerly agreed on the run or by an e-mail with everyone involved now needs a more stable structure of sub-groups, executive committees, mandatory procedures. It becomes bureaucratic. Crucially building trust seeks to reduce these processes. "Many networks that don't renew have got sucked into how do we survive and get ossified".

These shifting dynamics of networks affects how UCCN communicates to achieve network aims. **The rise of big data and more sophisticated web platforms challenges UNESCO** to perform better. It needs a concerted effort to make its website interactive and a far more adept at social media. "The UCCN website should be renewed: the communication has to be improved for the network to perform better and there should be much more sharing online". (Ensenada). "We want the website to be more synthetic, analytical, launching ideas and helpful thematic – we want it to be a platform for development" (Rome) "Website should be used more actively, it does not work as a work instrument..... also it should be also for the general public" (Parma) "We need a revitalization of the online platform and the lack of communication to us or promotion of us on the network's is drawing criticism". (Korean members) "The headquarter is not social media savvy" (York). "I cannot easily add my new information myself". (Mannheim) "Website is too institutional and top down ... if it did not have links with cities' website would be worse" (Bologna). There is expertise in the network as with Hannover, who prototyped a website for the music cluster.

“Networks that work well have engaged their cities, see Agenda 21 for Cities and UCLG, through good information, it has an excellent website” (Bob Palmer). The **Secretariat should undertake a major review of its communications**. It should ask what its role is in terms of information provision and sharing and how much it should generate itself or whether it should signpost what others are doing and become more of a clearing house for research and good practices. Clearly a partnership with one of the big global foundations could make this happen. Since it does not have these skills in-house nor the time this is something that can be outsourced.

Supplement Nine: Connections & Synergies

The economic, cultural and social success of cities depends increasingly on the effectiveness of their internal and external networks and their power to connect. This generates the creative ecologies that force-feed and accelerate transactions, exchange, partnerships and opportunity and ultimately wealth creation. The obstacle to unleashing potential is silo mentality still prevalent across the board which several Asian members highlighted, although it happens everywhere: “The bureaucracy in our city is still quite silo functioning.” Examples were even given of communication gaps when several UNESCO projects were underway in the same city.

Connections might be across disciplines like art and science as Sapporo has instigated with its vastly popular hatsune miku - the non-existent virtual star or Enghien les Bains is considering; another is rethinking tourism as a mutual learning experience between host and visitor as Santa Fe has been promoting for the last decade and here Nassau is learning from them; urban/rural links with Östersund leading the charge and Sasayama an interested player; industry/arts links as with Yamaha’s inspirational exchanges between its piano and motorcycle designers created in Hamamatsu and showcased in St. Etienne or similar projects in Torino; or Parma that is linking art, design and food as a means of raising awareness about food production issues and food miles as well as its work with a Sicilian start up to explore how to create a new type of material with orange skin; North-South knowledge exchanges as with Dakar and the UCCN media arts network or exchanges with mentors such as Duran in Ecuador and their partnerships with Barcelona’s Interarts Foundation, which is dedicated to cultural entrepreneurship in Africa and Latin America. More of these kinds of links can be fostered thinking of the brokering activities of organizations such as Pro Helvetia in Africa or

Central Asia or the British Council as well as others like the King Baudouin Foundation and Evens Foundation.

UCCN should **pay special attention to linking heritage and innovation** so experts and visitors can explore, re-experience and re-interpret heritage both to enhance heritage encounters and to safeguard sites from visitor overload. Rome and many others across the globe have created augmented reality experiences. At the Secretariat this implies developing better synergies between its heritage and tech savvy creatives.

Many cities want to link with heritage sites as a means of making them more lively and stronger connections to the media arts cluster could be valuable. Additionally in several cities the focal point is in the heritage section like Kaunas and Tucson. Yet there is more than thinking of the new as merely technology thinking here of Tucson where blending old and new knowledge about food is a significant part of their activities. This is the culmination of a heritage food revitalization movement over two decades and UCCN designation is helping this rediscovery process.

Good old/new blending with food is perhaps the easiest to achieve and the most democratic cultural form. Most people can cook and thresholds to participation are low and each meal cooked is a creation. Tucson's cuisine is culturally layered based on 4000 years of wild desert foods as well as 300 years of livestock ranching and today it blends mission era food with native American and Mediterranean ranch cuisine. The region is in the Slow Food Ark of Taste designed to preserve at-risk foods that are sustainably produced, unique in taste, and part of a distinct ecoregion. Clearly the gastronomy cluster needs strong links with the Slow Food Movement.

Italian cities were especially vocal in highlighting "the old and the new links" with Parma enthusiastically signalling this intent by refurbishing an ancient cloister where the Fondazione its UCCN headquarters will be based. This will create an inspiring setting to host a food lab, residences, education with element of display and exhibition. By contrast Pekalongan produces 60% of the country's batik and "since the early 1980's batik is our city identity" and in 2009 batik was recognized as intangible cultural heritage. But to stay relevant and popular the discipline needs new design combined often with old skills especially since nearly 10000 people are employed in the industry. So the value chain of batik stretches across its batik museum seen as best practice for safeguarding intangible heritage

to new production methods. Nassau initially wanted a UNESCO heritage listing for its straw work and failed to get the designation. Instead it shifted tack to get onto the UCCN list as a means of revitalising the craft. But it wants more support and believes “UNESCO could at least push our government”.

Of course connecting takes effort as Dundee’s quote stands for many: “We would love to explore additional synergies, but we simply don’t have the capacity to do it. I love the idea, but then how do we create an effective governance model?” “It’s clearly hard to interact with the global South, since they are often less frequently at UCCN meetings, but we are willing to contribute to their inclusion”. (Paducah) Media literacy is a significant field for North-South collaboration and cities such as Abidjan Casablanca or Tunis not in the network are all potential partners of Enghien les Bains. Even small and very big cities have found potential linkages in niche areas as with Jingdezhen and Beijing that are working to foster their respective ceramic industries or with Kanazawa helping out and mentoring Sasayama. Yet obvious difficulties remain: “how can we have gastronomy cooperation with these massive Chinese cities?, so Östersund. The exchange of knowledge about the impacts of the Mediterranean and Nordic diet as is being discussed, as part of a health agenda, is far easier to organize.

Across the globe there are innumerable examples well beyond the UCCN that the Secretariat in an ideal world can signpost or enable and to sub-contract to someone else to undertake this task. For instance: Copenhagen’s food miles strategy or that Helsinki although it is a city of design.

There are a mass of other connections that can be made and **this requires a networking mindset**, which is essentially entrepreneurial and opportunity seeking – something extremely difficult for a state sponsored organization like UNESCO. Yet this ability needs to be promoted within member cities, between them and crucially also with entities and successful inspiring projects on the ground outside each city to help achieve wider UCCN aims.

The same is true for the UCCN Secretariat, but it is more used to connecting with institutional networks rather than informal or time dated ones which are often the lifeblood of a city’s vibrancy. An internal goal here might, for instance, be to create more solid links with UNESCO’s education and science departments. If the Secretariat could **see its role as an active connector and broker** then it would start to link members to

institutional opportunities. UNESCO Education clearly has many joint interests with UCCN and their remit such as developing creative education as an empowering tool. Yet some cities had comments such as: "the Secretariat is itself not networked enough with the interesting, non-institutional projects bubbling up, therefore it cannot be on the button". And several members called UNESCO Education "a closed and unresponsive door that always knows better". Bradford, for example, described some powerful examples and methodologies for teaching visual literacy. They feel these could be mainstreamed in developing countries, but they achieved no traction with the Education section – "it fell on deaf ears". In addition they have trained 34 volunteers to help dementia people through film - again something that could be replicated. "No one is capturing these simple things and saying wow that works, how can we replicate this across UCCN". Bradford had seen the UNESCO ambassador for the UK, who said: "You have to do it yourself, do not expect anything from UNESCO".

The Secretariat, however as we know can do important things and using its convening power it could help create key links as well as to global players outside the network like research institutes or bigger foundations, such as Gates or Bloomberg, that a city might not be able to do on its own.

UCCN has rightly given importance to creating partnerships for the application process and **the designation has often triggered a useful connecting process** in cities. One thinks here as an instance of the partnerships created by the five Italian or Colombian members. Bogota, for instance, has built an alliance connected to the UCCN designation led by the culture department and including the chamber of commerce, economic development, tourism, marketing and external affairs department. This is very good but may lack connections to the local NGO sector and business community. Of course many cities, for instance Bandung or Berlin, have already built these links previously without the designation.

UCCN's mission has a strong focus on artists' mobility, but caution is warranted. Is "sending you an exhibition enough" as most exchange projects several interviewers noted were on the level of "I'll send you a band" and perhaps in exaggerated form: "No musician thinks about the SDG". "Of course every musician wants a gig, and thinks I'll get more being in the network, but there is a misunderstanding that UCCN can achieve this for them, it is not a booking agency".

Charles Landry