

Chapter 22
Global Cultural Governance Policy
Nancy Duxbury and M. Sharon Jeannotte

Introduction

Tracing the bridges – both theoretical and practical – between the instruments and mechanisms of global cultural governance and cultural planning practices at the local level is both stimulating and frustrating. Stimulating, because there appear to be growing links between what happens on the ground in cities and communities and what happens in forums such as UNESCO, the World Bank, and the UN Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). Frustrating, because these links are often indirect, the paths are usually circuitous, and the degrees of influence are highly dependent upon place-specific contexts and cultural politics at the local level. Three main dynamics can be observed at play:

1. International agencies attempt to reach out to the local level through particular strategies and programs. UNESCO is the most dominant player here, although public and private foundations that operate internationally are also very active (see below).
2. Individual cities find international ‘designations’ or relationships attractive – both for their symbolic value and the distinction conveyed, as well as for the financial rewards that frequently ensue. In this type of dynamic, the moral authority of the international agency is seen as a means of enhancing the municipality’s reputation and prestige.
3. Locally based networks of municipalities organizing collectively (for example, United Cities and Local Governments) strive to influence global cultural policies, while also using the knowledge-sharing and collective capacities of the network to support local actions and strategies. This dynamic also encompasses *glocalization* actions based on city-to-city relations and cooperation and anchored in the work of local governments, NGOs, and international institutions (Savir 2003).

These dynamics, systems, and networks are mediated by national and sub-national levels of government, which sometimes reinforce the moral authority or moral suasion of global actors through other types of governance instruments – regulation, grants and subsidies, organizational or capacity-building, and (more rarely) privatization and taxation. They may also be influenced by national or sub-national networks and initiatives.

In addition, many public and private foundations that operate internationally provide direct funding to enable cultural planning initiatives, and indirectly influence the ‘global cultural policy’ realm through their investments. Many also contribute to configuring and enabling the terrain on which cultural planning initiatives occur. For example, the European Cultural Foundation has recently funded local cultural policy and planning projects in L’viv, Ukraine, and in three Turkish cities – Kars, Antakya, and Çanakkale – which have led to further cultural planning initiatives in those countries (see Knudsen McAusland 2011, Ince 2011). The Aga

Khan Trust for Culture operates a number of programs related to culture, architecture, music, planning and building, and historic cities (<http://www.akdn.org>). These foundations frequently co-invest in projects in cooperation with a network of other similar agencies.

In this chapter, we provide an overview of key international cultural governance/policy initiatives and assess the main linkages that have developed with local cultural planning. Our examination of the policy threads encompasses three thematic areas: heritage; creative industries and creative cities; and culture, sustainability, and diversity. We look at how various global governance instruments are incorporated within these three thematic areas, and consider how the precepts outlined in these instruments have been adapted or localized and linked to the practices of local cultural development and planning. The final section examines Agenda 21 for Culture, an initiative of United Cities and Local Governments, through which cities are collectively acting at the international level to link multicultural diversity and cultural rights with cultural planning, urban planning processes, and sustainable development. In closing, we reflect on how global cultural governance and local planning seem to be connected, and consider prospects for the future.

Strategies, Tools, and Instruments of Governance

While global entities such as the World Bank or the World Trade Organization have played roles in global cultural governance, the primary actor in this policy area over the past 40 or 50 years has been the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO's work is conceptualized on a global level, with international regions and individual nation states as the primary parties in its initiatives. In the face of rapid urbanization globally, however, UNESCO is increasingly cognizant of the role of cities and is gradually working out means to connect with the local level and to encourage inter-city exchanges (in cultural and other areas). It has tended to adopt four main strategies to influence cultural governance at the local or city level: (1) principles and moral authority/suasion, (2) recognition/designations, (3) programs and funds to incentivize actions, and (4) networks of cities.

Principles and Moral Authority/Suasion

UNESCO's global conventions and recommendations are general references for policy development and direction, and tend to filter down to the local level by influencing or being incorporated within national and sometimes sub-national policies and program frameworks. As well, some cities will independently develop charters or policies that directly reference international documents (e.g., the 2004 *Montreal Declaration for Cultural Diversity and Inclusion*). UNESCO also publishes guides promulgating good practices in program development and operational management, e.g., on management of heritage sites (the World Heritage Manuals, e.g., Pederson 2002) and cultural/creative industry development (e.g., Cano et al. 2011). These types of documents are intended to advise, inform, and facilitate local, sub-national, or national actors to develop initiatives in these areas. While they do not directly address local cultural

planning, they may influence it by recommending and popularizing particular types of policies, programs, and support mechanisms. These publications also reflect UNESCO's influential role as information broker and *imprimatur*, retaining experts to observe, select, and synthesize 'good practices' from different localities and promoting these grassroots actions globally.

Recognition/Designations

UNESCO is perhaps best known for its World Heritage Site designations, and while the selection process is politically charged and influenced by clashes of different intellectual approaches (Schmitt 2009), the designations continue to influence tourism flows and serve as a basis for local actions regarding site conservation and management. A UNESCO World Heritage Site designation is an impetus to local development activities (e.g., 'Palestine...' 2011). While UNESCO 'encourages community-based policies and conservation practices that foster local development while preserving sites' (UNESCO 2010: 4), and provides guidance to local communities to manage these sites for tourism purposes, the connection to local residents in heritage locations may be neglected when city authorities are primarily interested in attracting visitors. In some historical neighbourhoods, local social inclusion-focused conservation/revitalization policies and programs are emerging to address this issue, such as in the al-Darb al-Ahmar neighbourhood of Cairo, Egypt (Morbidoni 2011).

Programs and Funds to Incentivize Actions

UNESCO also makes use of more interventionist governance instruments that go beyond the 'moral currency' of persuasion and designation. For example, in 2002 it launched a network of cultural producers, the Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity, 'to strengthen local cultural industries in developing countries through fostering partnerships between private, public, and civil society in "project partnerships"' (UNESCO 2010: 12). These project partnerships generally emerge from local cultural development strategies. For example, 'Nzassa, House of Music and Dance' in Treichville, Côte d'Ivoire, an innovative support structure for cultural businesses, was launched by the local authorities to harness the potential of the local music and dance sector (UNESCO Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity 2011). By 2010, some 50 projects in 30 countries aimed at fostering North-South cultural producers/market connections had been supported.

UNESCO also provides some financial assistance under the World Heritage Fund (created in 1972) to assist states to identify, preserve, and promote World Heritage sites. States contribute one percent of their annual UNESCO dues to the Fund, but can also make voluntary contributions. As well, countries can donate funds-in-trust for specific purposes, and additional income is derived from partnerships, sales of publications, and private donations (UNESCO 2008b). However, total annual contributions amount to only about U.S. \$4 million, which is clearly insufficient to meet more than a fraction of global needs. Therefore, UNESCO must rely heavily on partners for assistance in meeting its objectives

Networks of Cities

While the previous strategies may engage local governments, their influence on local cultural policies, plans, and programs are largely indirect or focused on the implementation of defined projects. More direct linkages with local governments, mobilized through establishing UNESCO Networks, have emerged since the early-to-mid 2000s. The website of the International Coalition of Cities against Racism articulates the rationale for this focus: ‘UNESCO chose *cities* as the privileged space to link upstream and downstream actions. The role of city authorities as policy-makers at the local level, is considered here as the key to create dynamic synergies’ (UNESCO 2011d). Within these culture-related networks of cities three types of strategies tend to be employed – knowledge-sharing, recognition, and technical assistance – mirroring the instruments that are prominent in other types of global governance:

Knowledge-sharing about ‘best practices’ and strategies An example of a UNESCO knowledge-sharing network strategy is the *International Coalition of Cities against Racism* initiative launched in 2004. The network includes six regional Coalitions against racism, discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance which have been established in Africa, the Arab Region, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Canada with almost 5000 cities involved (UNESCO 2010). It encourages municipalities (and their NGO partners) to share their practices and strategies to overcome racism, discrimination, and intolerance. Each regional Coalition has developed its own ‘Ten-Point Plan of Action’ and signatory cities are encouraged to integrate this Plan of Action within municipal strategies and policies and involve civil society actors in its implementation. The UNESCO affiliation motivates cities to become involved in this network while, from UNESCO’s perspective, the network brings cities into the ambit of its broader initiatives on this topic. UNESCO has organized meetings to facilitate exchange between network members, such as a Networking Event at UN-Habitat’s third World Urban Forum in Vancouver, 2006. However, on an ongoing basis the network’s ‘driving force’ resides in the affiliated municipalities’ actions, with UNESCO playing a minor role in the ongoing dynamics of the regional Coalitions.

Recognition to enhance city branding/promotion Influenced by the effectiveness of its World Heritage Site designations, a growing interest in networks, and the ‘creative city’ movement, UNESCO launched its Creative Cities Network in 2004. To become a member of the Network, a city must apply to be a *UNESCO Creative City* in one of seven fields (literature, film, design, music, crafts, media, or gastronomy), complete an application of 50-80 pages, and be evaluated by UNESCO and NGO experts (UNESCO 2011c). Only 28 cities are members of this network at mid-2011. The notion of *creative tourism* is highlighted, reflecting the tourism-based returns cities expect from the designation (UNESCO Creative Cities Network 2006). Member cities are encouraged to share ideas and best practices with one another, and selected member cities have organized international conferences to facilitate this exchange (e.g., Santa Fe in 2008; Shenzhen in 2010). However, the limited number of cities in the network restricts

such knowledge-sharing and makes this secondary intent seem to be only a ‘sidecar’ to the Network’s promotional value.

Providing technical assistance and advice (on local governance issues) A new UNESCO initiative is the Cities for Sustainable Development and Dialogue program, intended to address ‘the challenge of accommodating modernization and transformation in historic cities without compromising their identity and that of local communities, or their role as drivers of cultural creativity and urban regeneration’ (UNESCO 2010: 12). The program will provide ‘technical assistance and advice on innovative urban governance approaches’ to local and national governments (p. 12). The initiative will bring together some of the ongoing work of different areas within UNESCO, and intends to incorporate and reorient the Creative Cities Network to ‘maximize the contribution of member cities as active partners’ in this new program (UNESCO 2011b: 135). This strategy seems to echo UN-Habitat’s Urban Development and Management stream of initiatives focused on training and capacity building in local authority management and urban governance.

In summary, UNESCO has tended to rely primarily on its moral influence to move member states toward desirable goals. In the absence of financial or regulatory power to achieve its objectives, it has made heavy use of partners, especially private philanthropy and civil society organizations, to support cultural activities in developing countries. More recently, it has begun to reach out to sub-national levels of governments, such as cities, by creating global and regional networks to help achieve its aims. Cultural planning-related assistance has, to date, formed a minor portion of these initiatives but as cities gain socio-economic and political power, UNESCO is paying increased attention to an emerging *glocalization* anchored on city-to-city relations and cooperation among various local governments, NGOs, and international institutions.

Thematic Case Studies

In this section, we critically examine three areas where UNESCO has influenced the direction of global cultural governance to varying degrees – heritage protection and conservation, the creative industries/creative cities movement, and the cluster of initiatives surrounding culture, diversity, and sustainability – and assess the degree to which these global frameworks are reflected in sub-global cultural planning initiatives.

Heritage Protection and Conservation

UNESCO’s *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* was adopted in 1972 and is arguably the governance mechanism that has had the most widespread global influence on culture policies at the national, sub-national, and local levels. Under the *Convention*, signatory countries are encouraged to protect their natural and cultural heritage and to nominate sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List (UNESCO, 1972). As of 2010, 186 countries had ratified the *Convention* and over 900 sites had been listed

(<http://whc.unesco.org/>). Sites are chosen for listing by the World Heritage Committee, which consists of representatives from 21 of the state parties to the *Convention*, chosen for terms of up to six years. The Committee meets yearly and is responsible not only for listings, but also for allocation of financial assistance under the World Heritage Fund, examination of reports on the state of conservation of listed sites, and inscription or deletion of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger (UNESCO 2008b: 9).

The main governance instrument used to promote UNESCO's heritage protection and conservation goals is the World Heritage List, which operates primarily through the force of moral suasion exercised by UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee. UNESCO aspires to what Schmitt (2009: 111) calls 'metacultural production' or what UNESCO itself refers to as 'the overarching benefit ... of belonging to an international community of appreciation and concern for universally significant properties that embody a world of outstanding examples of cultural diversity and natural wealth' (UNESCO 2008b: 9). Describing the dynamics of the yearly Committee sessions, Schmitt observes that 'international institutions do not *a priori* reflect the fixed preferences of national states, but on the contrary have a socializing effect and are thus able to change positions, preferences and identities of state actors' (p. 110).

Socialization is often complicated by the differing world views of the Committee's two principal advisors – the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). As Schmitt observes, the IUCN 'regards outstanding universal value as an inherent quality of properties', while ICOMOS takes a more social constructivist view (p. 111). In addition, countries at diverse stages of development sometimes have differing views of what is possible in terms of heritage protection and conservation, with delegates from countries in the global South, as Schmitt puts it, 'generally more appreciative of the difficulties facing local and national authorities', while delegates from the global North see governance as 'basically organized in accordance with the homogenizing principles of "Western" (in a historical sense) modernity' (p. 114). These differing viewpoints are typical of multi-level governance situations, but are exacerbated in UNESCO's case by its reliance on other actors to flesh out its rather limited range of governance instruments.

As mentioned previously, UNESCO does provide some financial assistance under the World Heritage Fund, but must rely heavily on partners for assistance in meeting its objectives. For example, the 26 international safeguarding campaigns that have been launched since 1972 to save sites such as Abu Simbel in Egypt and the Temple of Borobudur in Indonesia have cost in excess of U.S. \$1 billion, much of it derived from private sources, such as the Japan Trust Fund for the Preservation of World Cultural Heritage (UNESCO 2008b). Other prominent partners include the Aga Khan Historic Cities Programme, the Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial; the Nordic World Heritage Foundation; and the Organization of World Heritage Cities.

While UNESCO assists states to develop comprehensive management plans for listed sites through the provision of advice and technical training, by necessity it depends upon partners at the national and sub-national levels to implement such plans. In developed countries, where systems of cooperation and support are in place, this can be an effective governance strategy. For example, the Rideau Canal, a 202 km waterway in the Province of Ontario, Canada, was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2007 as ‘the only canal in North America dating from the great canal-building era of the early 19th century which still remains operational along its original line and with most of its original structures intact’ (Canadian Commission for UNESCO 2007). Parks Canada, a federal government agency, maintains and operates the Canal and takes the lead in its preservation, assisted by a complex web of partners.

Parks Canada has developed a Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy that ‘works with First Nations, federal and provincial agencies, municipalities, NGOs, property owners and others to build a new vision for the Rideau’, and both the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada and the Ontario Heritage Trust have recognized the Canal as an important heritage site (<http://www.pc.gc.ca>; <http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca>). Tourism is one of the primary motivations for involvement, with the Province of Ontario featuring the Canal in its online travel guide (<http://www.ontariotravelguides.com>) and many of the communities along the Canal providing information on local heritage attractions near the Canal (<http://www.ottawatourism.ca>; <http://www.twprideaulakes.on.ca>). The National Capital Commission (NCC), another federal agency, maintains eight kilometres of the Canal during the winter months as ‘the World’s Largest Skating Rink’ (<http://www.canadacapital.gc.ca>). Private sector partners are also active in tourism promotion as part of a consortium called the Rideau Heritage Route Tourism Association (RHRTA), which publishes an online travel guide in several languages (<http://www.rideauheritageroute.ca>). A group of volunteers, the Friends of the Rideau, manages a Rideau Legacy Fund that is used to publish reports and books about the Canal (<http://www.rideaufacts.com>), and an annual Rideau Canal Festival celebrates its listing as a World Heritage Site (<http://www.rideaucanalfestival.ca>).

In contrast, designations in some countries may encounter political barriers to successful protection and promotion. For example, the Old City of Jerusalem was proposed for listing by Jordan in 1981, and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1982. A subsequent request by Israel to extend this site to include Mount Zion was reviewed by the World Heritage Committee in 2001, which decided ‘to postpone further consideration of this nomination proposal until an agreement on the status of the City of Jerusalem in conformity with International Law is reached, or until the parties concerned submit a joint nomination’ (<http://whc.unesco.org/>). In 2007, the Director General of UNESCO was asked to send a technical mission to Jerusalem to investigate archaeological excavations being carried out by the Israeli Antiquities Authority on the Mughrabi pathway leading to the Haram el-Sharif. These excavations were viewed as illegal by the Islamic Waqf of Jerusalem, which is

responsible for the Haram el-Sharif compound. In paragraph 46 of its report, the technical mission noted that ‘in the present situation no dialogue exists between the Israeli authorities and the Islamic Waqf but still felt that ‘all parties should be invited to contribute in addressing and solving this issue in a cooperative way’ (UNESCO 2007: 5). Schmitt (2009) has observed that inscription of a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger often functions as a means of ‘shaming and blaming’ which induces states to ‘exert pressure on other local and regional actors to take active measures to protect the site’ (p. 118). However, there are instances, such as this one in Jerusalem, where geo-political tensions prevail over the limited moral authority of UNESCO to promote positive change.

Creative industries / creative cities

Since about the mid-1980s, recognition of the economic significance of cultural industries has grown rapidly in Europe, Australasia, and North America, which has led to a generalized political-economic imperative to boost the contribution of the arts and an array of other ‘commodified creative endeavours’ through various interventions (Johnson 2009: 21). Numerous national and subnational initiatives have contributed to shaping a growing trade in cultural products, a market largely dominated by developed countries that are striving to strengthen their individual positions in these economic flows. Within this context, UNESCO has largely focused on creating ‘an enabling environment for the emergence of cultural and creative industries’ and enhancing their economic development impact in developing countries (UNESCO 2011a: 34). UNESCO’s *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (UNESCO 2005b) forms an overarching framework for concerns about creative/cultural industries development and expression globally. Complementing these efforts, supranational policies, emerging from specific regions, such as Africa, or agencies such as CARICOM in the Caribbean community, also aim to develop cultural products as a platform for economic development. At an operational level, a wide array of training programs, ‘best practice’ guidelines, and producer partnerships and projects have been devised and implemented for developing countries, although these are usually designed at a national or supranational regional level.

In the early 2000s, cultural/creative industry development and the ‘creative cities’/‘cultural capitals’ movement dovetailed as cities became increasingly recognized as the dominant engines for the development of the world’s creative economy. The movement has been fuelled by economic crises, the rise of the post-industrial economy, and the perceived imperative to attract a mobile ‘creative class’ (Johnson 2009).

International agencies began linking cultural industries development with city development (Yusuf and Nabeshima 2003 and OECD 2005). Some efforts to place cultural industries on the Millennium Development Goals agenda also focused on cities and communities. A Senior Expert Symposium was held in Jodhpur, Rajasthan entitled *Asia-Pacific Creative Communities: Promoting the Cultural Industries for Local Economic Development – A Strategy for*

the 21st Century (UNESCO 2005a). Subsequently, the Inter-agency Technical Assistance Programme established an Asian Cities Creativity Index, ‘to track and measure the effectiveness of policy initiatives in support of cultural industries’ (UNESCO 2005a: 7).

The confluence of cultural/creative industry development and cities is also evident in programs promoting creative clusters and urban regeneration of particular neighbourhoods or districts. For example, within the European Union, cultural planning related projects have been funded by European Structural Funds and through programs such as URBACT and URBAMECO. Individual cities and networks of municipalities, such as the URBACT Network on Creative Clusters in Low Density Urban Areas, are planning and implementing local cultural/urban development efforts within the framework of both international and transnational initiatives, which directly inform their actions and policies.

Although ‘creative city’ competition dynamics continue to be prominent, in recent years they have been critiqued as an unsustainable basis for long-term city development, and a search for more nuanced approaches can be observed. The rise of sustainability concerns has led to a gradual morphing of the concept of *creative cities* to one of *creative sustainable cities* (e.g., Staines 2010). This shift has been accompanied by a general plea for recognition of more humanized and diversified approaches to city building and development (Duxbury and Jeannotte 2011).

To some degree, this transition is reflected in UNESCO’s new Cities and Sustainable Development program, which will reorient the existing Creative Cities Network to this emergent framework (UNESCO 2011b). While details of the program are not available at time of writing, the ‘urban management system’ that is envisioned may serve to further integrate cultural considerations into broader local planning schemes and to catalyze North-South city collaboration partnerships among Creative Cities Network members.

Culture, Diversity and Sustainability

UNESCO has been at the forefront of global efforts to address issues of cultural diversity and sustainability over the past two decades, but global governance in these areas is still very much a ‘work in progress’. Seminal works in this area include the 1996 report *Our Creative Diversity*, as well as the 2005 *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. More recently, UNESCO has articulated the relationship between biological and cultural diversity (UNESCO 2008a); proposed measures to operationalize Article 13 of the *Convention*, which deals with the integration of culture in sustainable development (UNESCO 2009); advocated for the inclusion of culture in sustainable development policy and programs (UNESCO 2011a, 2011b); and created a new Cities and Sustainable Development Programme.

UNESCO’s leadership and, to a certain extent, its moral authority have inspired other supranational, national and subnational initiatives on both diversity and sustainability, although this guidance is seldom explicitly acknowledged. Linkages between global, national, and local cultural policy and planning can be observed in a variety of recent attempts to situate culture

within a local ‘sustainable development’ context. These initiatives were developed through loosely organized cross-national informal learning and policy-development networks in which initiatives in one location inspired and informed other efforts.

The evolution of these initiatives can be traced internationally through three distinct periods (Duxbury and Jeannotte 2010). During Phase 1, *Differentiating ‘culture’ from ‘social’* (approximately 2000-02), concerns about the relative neglect of cultural considerations in sustainability discourses and conventions gave impetus to grassroots thinking that fuelled the development of a four-pillar model of sustainability (e.g., Hawkes 2001). In Phase 2, *Focusing on local development* (2004-06), national governments began to establish frameworks for local sustainability planning including a cultural dimension (e.g., NZMCH 2006a, 2006b: Government of Canada 2005). In Phase 3, *Rearticulating culture within sustainability at national and transnational levels* (2008-09), subnational level initiatives began to emerge (e.g., SALAR 2008, Thames Gateway North Kent 2006, Quebec Ministry of Culture, Communications and the Status of Women 2009).

More recently, the UCLG *Agenda 21 for Culture* initiative has placed local cultural policy and sustainable development at the centre of its mandate and has adopted the ‘network’ governance tool as the central instrument in its efforts to integrate culture into local planning frameworks.

Local Cultural Planning at a Global Scale

From a ‘bottom-up’ perspective, the potential of networks to influence supranational cultural policy is important to acknowledge. As cultural networks proliferate and develop over time, they are becoming a more visible dimension of cultural development, although their role in cultural policy is still uncertain (Cvjeticanin 2011). City networks are proliferating on a wide array of topics. Two main types of city networks with cultural interests can be observed: (a) political networks with primarily advocacy roles, which include culture as an explicit interest, such as the Eurocities Culture Committee, and (b) staff-oriented national or subnational networks with primarily professional development and knowledge networking roles, such as the Creative City Network of Canada and the Cultural Development Network (Victoria, Australia). Through such networks, individual cities share experiences and ideas, adapting policies and practices from one another. The networks also serve as contact points for national and international agencies, other networks, and municipalities and may be catalysts and agents for knowledge-sharing initiatives and collective actions. They may directly influence supranational policies through, for example, publishing responses to policy discussion documents and taking other advocacy-related actions. They may also have a more indirect influence through projects and publications, participating in international think tanks and meetings, and facilitating the circulation and promotion of local ‘good practices’ which may then inform and influence the policy and program development of international policy agencies.

United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), launched in 2004, is an international NGO that represents and advances the interests of cities, local governments, and municipal associations throughout the world. The UCLG Committee on Culture brings together cities, organizations, and networks that foster relations between local cultural policies and sustainable development. The committee serves as a platform for mutual learning and exchange of experiences, for advocating about the role that cities play in cultural policy and practice, and for enabling cities to contribute to global cultural governance (Duxbury, Cullen and Pascual, forthcoming). The document *Agenda 21 for Culture* is an initiative of the UCLG Committee on Culture, and through it, UCLG is an active player on global cultural issues. Building on this, in November 2010 the UCLG Executive Bureau officially approved a Policy Statement on ‘Culture as the Fourth Pillar of Sustainable Development’ which advocated for explicitly recognizing culture in sustainable development and including a strong cultural dimension in governance at all levels – local, national, and international (UCLG 2010b).

When a local government formally adopts *Agenda 21 for Culture*, it expresses its will to ensure culture plays a key role in its policies, and shows its solidarity with other cities and local governments. In late 2010, over 400 cities, local governments, and organizations were linked to *Agenda 21 for Culture*, with geographic coverage growing more extensive over time. It has informed or influenced local cultural strategies in several cities and launched a Fund for Local Cultural Governance in 2010 to assist cities and local governments in Africa, Latin America, and the Mediterranean to implement *Agenda 21 for Culture*. However, implementation is often not straightforward or easy. Within *Agenda 21 for Culture*, there are internal conceptual tensions: As Teixeira Coelho (2009) has observed, its broad scope is difficult to synthesize, some concepts are not explained in detail, and it fails as a real ‘agenda’ because it does not provide specific goals and qualitative and quantitative targets. The implementation of *Agenda 21 for Culture* is challenging for local authorities, with a need to link culture to key local planning and sustainability programs, which usually do not have a cultural dimension. Thus, the local impacts of adherence may be limited in the short- and medium-term. In addition to these difficulties, UCLG is a very young organization, with scarce resources, limited lobbying capacity, and communication limitations. With no defined action plan that follows adherence to *Agenda 21 for Culture* the UCLG Committee on Culture is not able to monitor what cities actually do after adopting it.

In terms of global governance, the UCLG can attend the meetings of the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity (Intergovernmental Committee and Conference of Parties), but only as an observer with the status of an NGO. It can take the floor, but cannot suggest amendments to documents. Thus, while cities (through UCLG) are present in global cultural policy fora, they are not full participants at these tables and their influence is contingent on decision-makers’ attention to and endorsement of the UCLG’s messages and proposals.

In light of these multiple challenges and issues, the *Agenda 21 for Culture* initiative continues to evolve. To address the implementation and post-adherence limitations, the UCLG emphasizes intermunicipal sharing of knowledge and experience about local implementation practices. To improve the document itself, in 2012, the UCLG Committee on Culture will initiate action to write a new Agenda that will involve practitioners (cities and local governments), civil society (academics, activists), and national and international institutions (UCLG 2010a).

Like UNESCO, UCLG relies heavily on moral suasion as a governance instrument, but lacks the resources to move up the hierarchy to more interventionist and, perhaps, effective measures. Its strength lies in its networking capacities, which have enabled it to establish a presence fairly quickly in the sphere of global cultural governance. The next steps that it takes will be critical in determining its ultimate impact.

Concluding Thoughts

Today

The United Nations is increasingly recognizing the essential role of cities in achieving global development goals and is gradually looking to establish partnerships with local governments and their associations on the ground. Gradually, the planning and governance of cities is gaining attention as a topic for project-based actions and assistance initiatives, with the integration of cultural considerations into planning emerging as one of the most recent topics to be added to this framework. At the same time, local governments are strengthening their global lobbying on international issues and forming more strategic partnerships with UN and multilateral institutions.

In the face of growing complexity in the international arena, how the various international agencies and foundations interconnect or overlap with other players in various cultural topic areas is in constant dynamic shift. The field is changing, and the 'globe' is shrinking through technology. Structurally, local governments are not formally recognized at global cultural governance tables, but are involved in the system in various ways: as clients, policy and program informants, and increasingly as agents catalyzing international exchanges. As *sustainable development* and *urbanization* grow as dominant frames for cultural development, the focus on cities is increasing within global cultural governance and will continue to do so.

Cities have financial and other resource constraints, but have the capacity to be nimble networkers, sharing ideas and experiences from other cities through networks and online project profiles. Cities also bring unique strengths and perspectives to the global cultural policy arena, based on the diversity of local practices, multi-sectoral collaborations and partnerships, and modes of implementation for policies and projects. Because of these factors, they can be innovative partners in global governance.

The symbolic top-down city networks created by international agencies appear to have been launched with 'a vague hope' that the members themselves would provide the energies

and dynamics to drive the network's knowledge sharing and training functions, but in a climate of 'limited and reduced monetary resources and stretched staff resources, it is difficult for municipalities to take on such "extra" roles' and the networks tend to focus primarily on city branding or marketing (UCLG 2007: 1). As a result, these networks have generally had limited impact, and it is becoming clearer that creating a network is not sufficient to make it functional and effective over time. Careful investments and strategies are required to integrate the enabling vision expressed by international or national bodies with the needs of cities in the areas of training, exchange of good practices, peer review, and similar actions. With careful attention to functionality, the particular strengths of local government and planning can be catalyzed by networks and network-projects, but only if there are effective working partnerships with other knowledge and policy partners and stakeholders.

As the thematic cases discussed in this chapter have shown, intergovernmental partnerships with UNESCO appear to work most smoothly and efficiently in traditional areas, such as heritage protection and conservation, where the instrument of moral suasion has been finely honed. Yet, even in this area, moral suasion can only go so far in an environment where national and local authorities are either unwilling or unable to carry forward initiatives. If all the players are functioning optimally, their 'natural' governance roles can be mutually reinforcing: the supranational entity provides the inspiration and moral authority, the national entity finances and regulates, and the regional and local entities provide the local intelligence and 'on the ground' expertise to deliver results. However, as the Jerusalem example illustrates, if this synergy is weak, the moral force of the supranational authority tends to be ineffective as well.

In newer policy areas, the effectiveness of partnerships is still at the testing stage. UNESCO has served as a catalyst for networks focused on cultural diversity and creative cities. Because of national governments' interest in the trade-related aspects of cultural diversity, international networks in this policy area have enjoyed relative success as policy instruments. For example, the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity has provided a forum where civil society and governments can engage in dialogue on action plans and deliverables. With regard to creative cities and anti-racism issues, however, the picture is more nuanced.

One of the main challenges for local government movements, such as the UCLG, is therefore to ensure that its partnerships with the UN are mutually beneficial and have a real and sustained impact on global policy development. A cohesive and consistent local government approach is required if thematic partnerships are to demonstrate success in advancing global local government objectives (UCLG 2007).

Tomorrow

In an era of urbanization, on-the-ground cultural development efforts will increasingly be planned and implemented in urban areas. Everywhere funds are limited, and partnerships and

collaborations will be necessary to implement programs and projects. International agencies are relatively accustomed to working in partnership with each other, with individual nations and with major private foundations, but have only recently begun to consider the potential advantages of enlisting cities and urban networks in these working arrangements.

Despite restricted resources, local authorities are already playing multiple roles in this milieu. While to date, they have largely been seen as the recipients of support/implementers of projects, they are beginning to act as providers of expertise and experience-based knowledge. This latter role is growing through national initiatives to encourage inter-municipal assistance projects, served by the willingness of local authorities to innovate and to share their experience with others.

In the future, one can envision a larger role for municipality-directed international initiatives, supporting local needs for development assistance but also co-developing larger-scale policies, strategies, and programs in collaboration with global cultural governance agencies. Municipal ideas and strategies articulated within these initiatives may be noticed by global cultural governance agencies, or will be implemented in partnership with them, and these 'bottom up' strategies could eventually evolve into policies and programs at the supra-national or global levels.

Municipal networks, particularly those with an explicitly defined interest in culture such as UCLG, can play a key role in marshalling locally based resources and diverse knowledge, assessing and synthesizing on-the-ground contributions, facilitating mutual learning and exchanges, and acting as brokers and interpreters among multiple governance systems, local to global. They are conduits to local actors and can catalyze and enable local authorities to play active roles in informing and addressing issues of global cultural governance. However, international and national bodies will need to recognize that the resources of municipal networks are very limited and can restrict their potential to serve as effective partners.

Global agencies enjoy the strategic advantages of geographic coverage, moral authority, and the capacity to mobilize funds to operationalize policy ideas within programs and project implementation. Information technologies are enabling new coalitions and new channels for mutual learning and action. With these new tools, agencies can augment these advantages by tapping into a flow of expertise that is multidirectional. Networks of cities, with global agencies as catalysts and enablers, can better realize their strategic advantages as facilitators of exchanges between experts 'on the ground'.

This possible scenario will require openness to dialogue, and the development of trusted channels of interpretation between 'levels'. It will call for an expansion of relations beyond traditional means of advocacy, such as publishing written responses to draft policies and green and white papers, to the creation of ongoing institutional frameworks for exchange and dialogue with formal, appropriate spaces for this to occur. Moral suasion can still play a role in such an interconnected policy and planning environment, but strategic investments and

clear links between information exchange and policy development will be needed to keep all the players engaged and to maximize the effectiveness of these new and complex dynamics.

References

- Canadian Commission for UNESCO. 2007. The Rideau Canal is inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List. *Communiqué*. Ottawa.
- Cano, G.A., Bonet, L., Garzón, A. and Schargorodsky, H. 2011. *Políticas para la creatividad: guía para el desarrollo de las industrias culturales y creativas*. Paris: UNESCO.
- City of Montreal. 2004. *Montreal Declaration for Cultural Diversity and Inclusion*. Montreal: Montreal City Council.
- Cvjeticanin, B. (ed.). 2011. *Networks: The Evolving Aspects of Culture in the 21st Century*. Zagreb: Culturelink Network/IMO.
- Duxbury, N., Cullen, C. and Pascual, J. Forthcoming. Cities, culture and sustainable development, in *Cultural Policy and Governance in a New Metropolitan Age*, edited by H.K. Anheier, Y.R. Isar and M. Hoelscher. Cultures and Globalization Series, Vol. 5. London: Sage.
- Duxbury, N. and Jeannotte, M.S. 2010, September. Culture, sustainability and communities: exploring the myths. *Oficina do CES*, no. 353.
- Duxbury, N. and Jeannotte, M.S. 2011. Introduction: culture and sustainable communities. *Culture and Local Governance / Culture et Gouvernance Locale*, 3(1-2), special issue on 'Culture and Sustainable Communities', 1-10.
- Government of Canada. 2005. *Integrated Community Sustainability Planning – A Background Paper*. Discussion paper for 'Planning for Sustainable Canadian Communities Roundtable', of the Prime Minister's External Advisory Committee on Cities and Communities, September 21-23.
- Hawkes, J. 2001. *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning*. Melbourne: Common Ground.
- Ince, A. 2011. *Çanakkale, Turkey: One City's Efforts to Build Capacities for Local Cultural Policy Transformation*. [Online: CES/UCLG Committee on Social Inclusion and Participative Democracy, Inclusive Cities Observatory]. Available at: http://www.cities-localgovernments.org/committees/cisdp/Upload/database/canakkale_2011_en_fr.pdf
- Johnson, L.C. 2009. *Cultural Capitals: Revaluing the Arts, Remaking Urban Spaces*. London: Ashgate.
- Knudsen McAusland, L. 2011. *L'viv, Ukraine: Development of a Participative Cultural Planning Framework for the City of L'viv*. [Online: CES/UCLG Committee on Social Inclusion and Participative Democracy, Inclusive Cities Observatory]. Available at: http://www.cities-localgovernments.org/committees/cisdp/Upload/database/lviv_2011_en_ca.pdf

- Morbidoni, M. 2011. *Cairo, Egypt: The al-Darb al-Ahmar Housing Rehabilitation Programme*. Online: CES/UCLG Committee on Social Inclusion and Participative Democracy, Inclusive Cities Observatory]. Available at: http://www.cities-localgovernments.org/committees/cisdp/Upload/database/cairo_2010_en_en.pdf
- NZMCH (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage). 2006a. *Cultural Well-Being and Local Government. Report 1: Definition and Context of Cultural Well-Being*. Wellington: NZMCH.
- NZMCH. 2006b. *Cultural Well-being and Local Government: Report 2: Resources for Developing Cultural Strategies and Measuring Cultural Well-Being*. Wellington: NZMCH.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2005. *Culture and Local Development*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Palestine: a land of World Heritage Sites. 2011. *This Week in Palestine*, no. 155. Available at: <http://www.thisweekinpalestine.com/i155/pdfs/March%20155-2011.pdf>
- Pederson, A. 2002. *Managing Tourism at World Heritage Sites: A Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Quebec Ministry of Culture, Communications and the Status of Women. 2009. *Notre culture, au coeur du développement durable: plan d'action de développement durable 2009-2013*. Quebec: QMCCSW.
- Savir, U. 2003. Glocalization: a new balance of power. *Development Outreach* (World Bank).
- Schmitt, T.M. 2009. Global cultural governance: decision-making concerning world heritage between politics and science. *Erdkunde*, 63(2), 103-121.
- Staines, J. 2010. *Sustainable creative cities: role of arts in globalised urban context*. [Online: Culture360.org]. Available at: <http://culture360.org/magazine/sustainable-creative-cities-role-of-arts-in-globalised-urban-context/>
- Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR). 2008. *Culture in the Sustainable Society*. Stockholm: SALAR.
- Teixeira Coelho, J. 2009. For an effective and contemporary Agenda 21 for Culture, in *Cities, Cultures and Developments*, edited by J. Pascual. Report no. 5. Barcelona: Committee on Culture, UCLG.
- Thames Gateway North Kent. 2006. *Sustainable Culture, Sustainable Communities: The Cultural Framework and Toolkit for Thames Gateway North Kent*.
- UCLG (United Cities and Local Governments). 2007, 16 March. *Background Paper for the Working Group on Partnerships with United Nations Agencies*. Approved at meeting of the Working Group, Paris.
- UCLG. 2008. *Agenda 21 for Culture*. Barcelona: UCLG.
- UCLG. 2010a. *Committee on Culture – Programme for 2011-2013*. Barcelona: UCLG.
- UCLG. 2010b. *Culture: Fourth Pillar of Sustainable Development*. Policy Statement approved by Executive Bureau of UCLG.

- UNESCO. 1972. *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2005a. *Asia-Pacific Creative Communities: Promoting the Cultural Industries for Local Economic Development – A Strategy for the 21st Century*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2005b. *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2007. *Report of the Technical Mission to the Old City of Jerusalem*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. 2008a. *Links between Biological and Cultural Diversity Concepts, Methods and Experiences*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2008b. *World Heritage Information Kit*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO. 2009. *Article 13 of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Operational Guidelines – Integration of Culture in Sustainable Development*.
- UNESCO. 2010. *65 Ways UNESCO Benefits Countries All Over the World*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2011a. *36 C/5 Draft Resolutions 2012-2013. Vol.1*. UNESCO General Conference. [Online]. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001919/191978e.pdf>
- UNESCO. 2011b. *36 C/5 Draft Programme and Budget 2012-2013. Vol. 2*. UNESCO General Conference. [Online]. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001919/191978e.pdf>
- UNESCO. 2011c. *Creative Cities Network: How to Apply*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/creativity/creative-industries/creative-cities-network/how-to-apply/>
- UNESCO. 2011d. *International Coalition of Cities against Racism*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/human-rights/fight-against-discrimination/coalition-of-cities/>
- UNESCO Creative Cities Network. 2006. *Towards Sustainable Strategies for Creative Tourism: Discussion Report of the Planning Meeting for 2008 International Conference on Creative Tourism*. Santa Fe, New Mexico, U.S.A., October 25-27, 2006.
- UNESCO Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity. 2011. *Nzassa, House of Music and Dance (Treichville, Côte d'Ivoire)*. [Online]. Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/40911/127358389011Nzassa_factsheet__eng.pdf/Nzassa%2Bfactsheet_%2Beng.pdf [accessed: 6 December 2011].
- World Bank. 1999. *Understanding Culture in Sustainable Development: Investing in Cultural and Natural Endowments*. Washington: World Bank.
- World Commission on Culture and Development. 1996. *Our Creative Diversity*. Paris: UNESCO.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our Common Future*. New York: Oxford UP.

Yusuf, S. and Nabeshima, K. 2003, November. Urban development needs creativity: how creative industries affect urban areas. *Development Outreach*. World Bank.