



United Cities and Local Governments  
Cités et Gouvernements Locaux Unis  
Ciudades y Gobiernos Locales Unidos



**culture 21**

Agenda 21 for culture  
Agenda 21 de la culture  
Agenda 21 de la cultura

---

**UCLG Committee on Culture  
11th Meeting  
Buenos Aires, October 1-2, 2014**

**REPORT**

7 December 2014

---

**SUMMARY**

The UCLG Committee on Culture met in the City of Buenos Aires on October 1-2, 2014, under the chair of Lille-Métropole and the co-chair of the cities of Buenos Aires, Mexico and Montreal.

Following the agreements reached during the meeting held last year in Lille-Métropole, the Committee on Culture is working to draft a new document that will update the Agenda 21 for Culture - the chartering document approved in 2004. The new document will help summarize the current knowledge on culture and sustainable development and the role of local governments in this context. It shall also promote the practical implementation of the Agenda 21 for Culture, the production of knowledge, the self assessment and the exchange of experiences.

In this respect, the meeting in Buenos Aires was an intense exercise of discussion and reflection on the first draft document entitled "Culture 21: Actions. The global toolkit for culture in the sustainable development of cities", made available in May 2014 and object of consultation in recent months.

The Committee on Culture will meet in Bilbao on 18-20 March 2015 to approve this new document, share experiences and knowledge, and give visibility to the role of cultural factors in sustainable development.

Simultaneously, the "Pilot Cities" programme, launched in 2014, helps analyse actual experiences in the implementation of the Agenda 21 for Culture and discuss the challenges and basic requirements of the new document with local governments and civil society organizations.

This programme may be the basis of a new ongoing system to assess and exchange experiences.

Similarly, the "International Award UCLG - City of Mexico - Culture 21" launched in 2014 is useful to appreciate experiences and people that contribute to the visibility of the close relationship between culture and sustainable development.

The priorities of the Committee for the next months are: the preparation of the Culture Summit of Bilbao, the final draft of "Culture 21: Actions" and the elaboration of a programme to support its implementation by cities, for 2015-2017, based on the exchange of knowledge, good practice and peer-learning.

The campaign #culture2015goal will continue being active in the next few months. Its purpose is to integrate cultural factors into the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to be approved by the international community in 2015.

The local governments and cities that are members of the Committee, as well as the several observers from international organizations, national networks and civil society, congratulate the City of Buenos Aires for its warm welcome and perfect organization of the meeting.

## 1. Background

The Committee on culture is **a unique meeting point**. There is not another structure at a global level that gathers together cities, organizations and networks that foster the relation between local cultural policies and sustainable development.

The Committee on culture is chaired by **Lille Métropole**, co-chaired by **Buenos Aires, Montréal** and **México** and vice-chaired by **Angers, Barcelona** and **Milano**.

The **Agenda 21 for culture** is the first worldwide document establishing an undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development. 480 cities, local governments and organizations from all over the world were linked to Agenda 21 for culture in June 2013.

**United Cities and Local Governments – UCLG** adopted Agenda 21 for culture as its reference document in October 2004 (Executive Bureau of Sao Paulo), constituted its Working Group on Culture in June 2005 (World Council of Beijing) which was succeeded by the Committee on culture in October 2007 (World Congress of Jeju) and ratified in November 2010 (World Congress of Mexico) upgrading the consideration of culture within the World organization.

The **Committee on culture was created to:**

- Analyze and convey the messages of cities and local governments on global cultural issues. Advocacy, lobbying and policy development.
- Allow cities to exchange experiences and improve mutual learning. Networking and project development.

The Committee on culture strengthens UCLG: it is open to the participation of cities from all continents on an equal basis and helps the visibility of UCLG through very clear and specific initiatives.

The **mission of the Committee**, approved in Mexico (2010) and extended in Rabat (2013) is "To promote culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development through the international dissemination and the local implementation of Agenda 21 for culture". The programme has 5 objectives or priorities: (1) Policy development. (2) Development of projects. (3) Alliances and partnerships. (4) Funding and resources. (5) Better governance.

The Committee held its 10th meeting in Lille-Métropole in June 2013, where it decided to update the Agenda 21 for Culture. In May 2014, the first draft was made available under the name of "Culture 21: Actions. The global toolkit for culture in the sustainable development of cities" (or "new Agenda 21 for Culture").

The Committee held its **eleventh meeting** on October 1-2, 2014 in Buenos Aires (Argentina), after the II International Seminar "Cities, Culture and Future: Towards a new Agenda 21 for Culture", held on September 30 in Buenos Aires and organized by the Government of the City of Buenos Aires and the UCLG Committee on Culture, in cooperation with the Interlocal network. The agenda of the meeting is included in annex 1.

## 2. Summary of the Meeting

### 2.1. Welcome

María Victoria Alcaraz, Undersecretary of Cultural Heritage for the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires and co-chair of the UCLG Committee on Culture, opened the meeting and welcomed all attendees.

Then, Catherine Cullen, chair of the UCLG Committee on Culture, representing the city of Lille-Métropole (France), highlighted the significance of the meeting to reaffirm the work that had been carried out under the Agenda 21 for Culture. She then invited the attendees to introduce themselves.

## 2.2. Discussion on the draft new Agenda 21 for Culture: Background

Jordi Pascual, coordinator of the UCLG Committee on Culture, spoke about the framework and the agenda of the meeting. Then, a video dated May 2014 and celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Agenda 21 for Culture was shown.<sup>1</sup>

After the video, Pascual reported on the drafting of the "New Agenda 21 for Culture", which aspired to gather the current knowledge on culture and sustainable development and be approved at the UCLG Culture Summit to be held in Bilbao (Basque Country, Spain) in March 18-20, 2015. After having circulated a first draft in May 2014, the contributions received and the meeting in Buenos Aires would help draft a second version, estimated to be made available in November.

Then, the floor was opened for discussion.

Eduardo Vázquez, Secretary of Culture for the Government of the Federal District of Mexico and co-chair of the UCLG Committee on Culture, suggested moving the background section to an annex, and replacing the same with an executive and political introduction. He also expressed his doubts about the appropriateness of including an operating annex (like the "Toolkit") in a document of principles like the Agenda 21 for Culture, as it has been done in the first draft.

Eduard Miralles, President of Interarts Foundation (Barcelona) proposed to retain more elements of the original Agenda 21 for Culture. He also emphasised the importance of retaining goals that were purely cultural (diversity, relation between tradition and modernity, etc.), contributing to a new understanding of sustainability, without diluting the cultural dimension into other dimensions. In summary, he suggested that instead of a "new Agenda 21 for Culture", the documents of 2004 and 2010 should be better articulated to then provide a set of supplementary instruments.

Gonzalo Halty, Director of the Cultural Promotion Office, Department of Culture of the Montevideo City Council (Uruguay), put emphasis on the flexibility of the draft, which let it be adapted to different environments and ensured its usefulness. He considered the evolution of a text written more than one decade ago was appropriate and necessary.

Walter Gómez Méndez, senior official of Culture for the Autonomous Government of La Paz (Bolivia), spoke about the appropriateness of assessing the effectiveness of the undertakings under the 2004 Agenda, in terms of, for instance, the public funding of culture.

Frédéric Vacheron, Culture Programme Specialist at the UNESCO Regional Office in Montevideo, stressed that the Agenda 21 for Culture was a baseline document for UNESCO and explained the importance of describing the path that had been followed by the various analysis on culture and sustainable development from 2004 to 2015, when a rich theoretical and practical corpus had been developed. After explaining some aspects of UNESCO's work in the cultural environment, he described the process undertaken by the global community to draft the post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG): even when culture would not be part of them, a major international consensus had been reached about the importance of cultural aspects in sustainable development. In that respect, the "new Agenda 21 for Culture" should explore some intersections in depth, like the genre dimension.

Mariana Andrade, Metropolitan Secretary of Culture in Quito (Ecuador), emphasised the importance of culture for sustainability, and she argued that culture should be interpreted as the second key element for sustainability, and not as a fourth pillar. Territory and culture would then become the two essential categories to design and implement appropriate, effective and consistent development processes, going beyond the traditional combination of economics and demographics. She also mentioned the concept of "cultural sense", as the collective human

---

<sup>1</sup> The video 10th anniversary of the Agenda 21 for Culture (A21C) is available at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f\\_72V6dVLnU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f_72V6dVLnU) [seen on October 30, 2014]

capacity of knowing that you are part of a territory and evidencing such fact through customs and habits that respect and are in harmony with such territory.

Claudia Patricia Restrepo Montoya, Vice mayor of Education, Culture, Participation, Recreation and Sports of the Medellín City Council, considered the text under discussion was a "second generation" text. After the first policy-building Agenda, the new text had taken the principles of the former and made them evolve. Perhaps the articulation between the two documents might be explained more appropriately. The "Toolkit" in the new document was the true agenda -a framework with a political strength of its own- that deserved a more adequate denomination.

Luciano Ojeda, coordinator of Municipal Awards at the Municipality of Santiago, Chile, proposed a document consisting of a first section with background information (concepts and good practices) and a second section of principles and proposals. He warned that there was a risk that the proposed Toolkit might not be seen as sufficiently political.

Antonio Aniesa, head of the "Plaine Commune" Urban Community (France), considered that, even when the background section may be considered too long, it was convenient to describe the path followed to date, and leave some open space for each city to adapt the Agenda 21 for Culture to its own environment. He considered that the challenges faced by the promoting cities, which had driven them to write the Agenda 21 for Culture in 2004, were still present, and he recalled the significance of the bet made at that time: changing the global context by starting locally.

Claudio Lillo Aranda, sociologist of culture and advisor to the Council of Culture and Arts of Araucanía (Chile), pointed out that the draft was the continuation of a long process of discussions that had started in Porto Alegre.

Marta Bustos Gómez, Director of Art, Culture and Heritage of the District Secretary of Culture, Recreation and Sports in Bogotá (Colombia), asserted that it was normal to update elements included in a document written in 2004. In that respect, it was appropriate to maintain the background and principles sections and to highlight the development of the Agenda 21 for Culture during the last decade. She underlined that the Toolkit was the strongest piece in the document and she asked that the purposes should be further developed in that section, using a clearer leading thread for the various elements in the new Agenda.

Iñaki López de Aguilera, director of the Cultural Area at the Bilbao City Council (Basque Country, Spain), highlighted the work that had been done, but said the proposal could not be considered an agenda in itself. An easy-to-remember and easy-to-explain text should be drafted. It should be more declaratory, specific, brief and political. Other aspects, such as the background section, the good practices or the toolkit, might be supplements to the main document.

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) reminded that the capacity of the cities to integrate culture into their strategies had derived from their own dynamics and not from the Agenda 21 for Culture, but that the Agenda had provided them with arguments to be used at other levels of government and to convince consciences. In this sense, the new document should help reaffirm the principles, update some concepts, incorporate new issues (like minorities or indigenous peoples), reinforce other issues (public freedoms) and keep on reflecting on transversality and decentralization.

Manon Gauthier, member of the Executive Committee of the City of Montreal (Quebec, Canada) with responsibility for culture, heritage, design, space for life and status of women and co-president of the UCLG Committee on Culture, put emphasis on the evidence of the progress made during these years: from culture as a responsibility of the state to a shared competence and to a better understanding of the importance of culture. Montreal had approved several documents in this respect. The "new Agenda 21 for Culture" should witness that progress and facilitate the implementation of policies as well. She asked to pay more attention to urban planning and public space management and to the consensus with all agents in the territory.

Luis Alberto Pereira, director of Cultural Programming at the Maldonado City Council (Uruguay), said it would be appropriate to include more references to communication, mass media and social media, taking into account their significance in the current cultural practices. Additionally, he considered that more specific contents should be added to the reflection on cultural rights, to reflect on culture as a universal service, including its dimension as a universal service, to address "heritages" in plural, and to recognize the major role played by citizens.

Michel Vallée, director of Arts and Culture in Vaudreuil-Dorion (Quebec, Canada), emphasized the need to prepare a document that may be understood by ordinary people, instead of governments, so that the language used should be accessible and, perhaps, a glossary should be included. He considered that the work done so far had been excellent and asked to further develop the practical implications of the Agenda, as well as to introduce references to the concept of "cultural citizenship".

María Victoria Alcaraz (Buenos Aires) set a distinction between the core document of the "new Agenda 21 for Culture" and other supplementary instruments that might help in the actual implementation of the Agenda. She also suggested the convenience of drafting a statement or communiqué expressing the results of the meeting of the Committee on Culture in Buenos Aires.

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) spoke about the need to pursue a "socializable narrative", so that the contents of the Agenda might be easily disseminated.

Catherine Cullen, chair of the ULCG Commission on Culture, addressed many of the questions posed during the discussion: was it a new Agenda or an ongoing process? Perhaps, mirroring other international processes, we should speak of an "Agenda 21 for Culture + 10". With respect to the combination of principles and practical guidance, she considered it was an appropriate formula to respond to the demand for operating tools made by several cities. She also considered appropriate to include a background section to show that the process was being shared with other agents, although she said the document might start with a list of principles, followed by a shorter background section. Finally, she stressed the need of speaking of culture as the fourth pillar for sustainable development and, at the same time, as the element that links all other pillars.

Jordi Pascual made reference to the difficulties of making the Agenda 21 for Culture a text understood by English speakers, due in part to its declaratory approach - something the new text should try to remediate. He considered the major reason to draft a new text was the need for specific tools expressed by several cities, instead of reaffirming the principles. In this respect, perhaps it would be convenient to find a new heading, instead of sticking to the idea of a "new Agenda 21 for Culture".

Eduardo Vázquez and Martín Levenson (City of Mexico) agreed that the term "new Agenda" should be avoided, because it led to confusion and conveyed the idea of disruption. To reaffirm the principles, the same should be included at the very beginning of the document. It would also be better to use another term instead of "Toolkit".

Walter Gómez Méndez (La Paz) put emphasis on the significance of reaching out more people. The principles affirmed in 2004 were still valid, although it would be better to speak of "cultures" in plural at all times.

Johanne Bouchard, research assistant at the Interdisciplinary Institute of Ethics and Human Rights at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), agreed on the appropriateness of reaffirming the principles and listing the achievements of the last decade. She suggested regaining the concepts of "undertakings" and "responsibilities" used in the 2004 document. She also recalled that a document with tools to implement the Agenda 21 for Culture had been drafted in 2006 (local cultural strategy; charter of cultural rights and responsibilities; cultural council; impact assessment) and such document was still relevant. Finally, she recommended to avoid speaking of "culture" in singular, and speak of "cultural" resources, factors, etc.

Frédéric Vacheron (UNESCO) suggested it would be appropriate to introduce some references to the role of culture in dispute resolution, humanitarian aid and natural catastrophes (earthquakes, etc.).

### **2.3. Discussion on the Draft new Agenda 21 for Culture: Principles**

Once again, Catherine Cullen opened the floor for discussion and asked that all interventions be focused on the section of principles of the document at issue.

Manon Gauthier (Montreal) put emphasis on the importance of having a tool that might be understandable and precise at the same time. She underlined the need to address territorial planning and reflect on the cultural quality of territory: an integrated approach to territory encompassing landscape, public art, heritage, architecture and design.

Martín Levenson (City of Mexico) agreed on the need to further develop a reflection on heritage and public art within the framework of landscape management. The section on principles should strengthen social cohesion, coexistence, culture of peace, service to the most vulnerable groups and reconstruction of the social fabric through culture, where the concept of "community cultural development" might be useful. It would also be necessary to reinforce the relation between education and culture and, in general, to talk about transversality, to call the attention of other departments in local governments.

Claudia Patricia Restrepo Montoya (Medellín) agreed on the need to talk about culture of peace and the role of culture in building resilience. She highlighted the need that the reflections on the relation between culture and sustainable development in the principles section should go deeper, affirming that culture was something key and not an add-in. In essence, the document should be a means to resist certain models, and it was necessary to uphold that development was built from the local level up.

Mariana Andrade (Quito) underlined the importance for the communities to decide on their own development model. In that respect, they were betting on the culture-territory axis as the fundamental combination for development, involving dynamics responding to the territory (there is no universal model) and from culture, leaving behind the models based on demographics and economics.

Leônidas José de Oliveira, Secretary of Culture of Belo Horizonte (Brazil) highlighted the need to work on the basis of the tangible and intangible heritage and asked for explicit references to those concepts and their relation with territory and urban planning. In Belo Horizonte, territorial planning had to go through culture: no public space might be intervened without a prior consultation with the department of culture and without assessing the cultural impacts of the proposed action. If heritage were more explicitly mentioned and the management of resources might be influenced, the role of culture would be strengthened within the city model.

Marta Bustos Gómez (Bogotá) reflected on the way the principles had been stated in the document: some of them were closer to actions than principles and it would be appropriate to revisit the same to produce a stronger political declaration. It would also be necessary to revise the order of the principles and be clearer on how they were interrelated; to include more explicit definitions in some cases, as well as references to intergenerational relations, gender perspective and peaceful conflict resolution; to speak of "cultural democracy" instead of "access to culture" (that presupposed the existence of a culture that had already been built); to strengthen the democratic dimension of culture; and to avoid an anthropocentric definition of cultural rights, integrating culture into nature.

Johanne Bouchard (University of Fribourg) suggested that, within the reflections on territorial planning, the document should speak of equity among territories. She proposed to speak of "vulnerable groups" as a generic concept, with no need to mention any group in particular. It would also be appropriate to include a more adequate explanation of the principle that linked culture and sustainable development.

Mariana Andrade (Quito) pointed out the appropriateness of introducing the concept of "cultural sense" and approaching the endurance of ancestral peoples. She stressed the importance of the public space and the introduction of a medium and long-term horizon. The Secretary of Culture of Quito had prepared a document amending the draft of the new Agenda that would be emailed to the coordinator of the Committee on Culture.

Francisco José García, general director of Cultural Heritage and Urban Landscape Quality at the Madrid City Council, spoke about the importance of reflecting the idea of transversality in the document, which might result in new statuses in terms of municipal management, particularly regarding heritage and territorial management. The idea of "townscape" or "urban landscape" should also be included in a transversal fashion, with potential to build more friendly and respectful cities.

Claudio Lillo Aranda (advisor to the Council of Culture and Arts of Araucanía (Chile)) emphasised the importance of having indicators for issues related to the social context. He also pointed out the need to vindicate the stability of the financing systems: in Chile, there was no structural financing for cultural programmes, only for specific projects.

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) suggested retaining the principles listed in the 2004 Agenda by introducing a new statement reaffirming the same. He agreed on the convenience of publishing a statement or communiqué after the meeting in Buenos Aires to explicitly identify the good practices observed in various cities around the world, as well as the commitment to share the same. He claimed the need to affirm that social inclusion would require the acknowledgment of cultural diversity, approach the dialectical tension between the community role of heritage and its use by economic forces, and secure access to the mass media, as part of cultural rights.

Gonzalo Halty (Montevideo) spoke about the need to examine the language of the text, so as to make it less masculine.

George Xolile, executive director of the South African Local Government Association (SALGA, South Africa) validated the principles proposed, but he asked to expand a bit more about the scope of action of national governments and the lower levels of government. National governments should be responsible for strengthening the national identity and securing financing for local governments. In that respect, it was necessary to speak about roles, responsibilities and the need for resources.

Alonso Murillo Valverde, advisor to the minister of Culture and Youth of Costa Rica, asked for a greater effort to communicate and explain the Agenda 21 for Culture. At some points, there might be a feeling that the document had been prepared for wealthy cities: it was necessary to put it "down to earth" to facilitate its adoption by local governments with less resources.

Frédéric Vacheron (UNESCO) requested that, if the principles were making reference to the idea of "cultural landscape", mentioned in some international documents before, that fact should also be reflected in the toolkit. He also put emphasis on the need to encompass alliances with the private sector, acknowledging that governments were not able to do everything on their own.

Eduard Miralles (Interarts Foundation) suggested adding a preamble to the section of principles to explicitly relate the specific to the universal, the local to the global, because those relations were not clear at all. It would also be convenient to explain, in the principles section, the idea of "cultural sustainability", i.e. to insist on culture as the "fuel" and most important raw material for all areas of development. The confusion in this field was really widespread and there was a clear risk that culture might be understood as a sector subsidiary to environmental sustainability and to sustainability in general. He asked to introduce more dimensions to the relation among culture, community and territory, considering there was more than one diversity and that identity had to be interpreted as a process. When talking about ancestral cultures, it was necessary to ensure that they might be related to modernity, for their own benefit. Finally, he proposed to include references to the virtual dimension of the public space, and to be aware of the risks

brought by transversality: even when it was necessary to claim for the same, cultural policies should be reaffirmed as structural policies, having the resources they needed.

George Xolile (SALGA) explained that, in contexts like the South African, certain issues like the legacy of colonialism, the instrumentation of culture in that context and the ill-treatment to which the indigenous communities had been subject to for many years, had to be addressed, among other issues.

Antonio Aniesa ( Plaine Commune") warned that the Agenda 21 for Culture should be a document of local governments, a commitment of local governments to cultural development and not a manifesto of the cultural sector. The purpose was to vindicate the right of the cities by means of culture, a "reappropriation" of cities by persons, something meaningful in the peripheral areas of urban spaces, among others.

Mariana Andrade (Quito) and Manon Gauthier (Montreal) agreed on the convenience of publishing a statement or communiqué with the conclusions of the Buenos Aires meeting, to give visibility to the process, strengthen the cultural dimension of cities and reaffirm the value of communication and democracy.

Martín Levenson (City of Mexico) brought up the possibility that the principles might include a reference to the institutional strengthening necessary in the cultural policy areas of local governments, which, in general, were weak. He also considered appropriate to include references to medium and long-term planning.

As a conclusion of the first day, Jordi Pascual, coordinator of the UCLG Committee on Culture, expressed the willingness to include, as much as possible, the contributions received during the meeting in the next version of the document. He pointed out that there were different interpretations of certain concepts (like "agenda" or "tools"), partly due to the meaning of such terms in each of the drafting languages.

#### **2.4. Discussion on the draft new Agenda 21 for Culture: Toolkit**

The meeting continued in the morning of Thursday October 2. Catherine Cullen opened the meeting and the floor for the contributions related to the "Toolkit" that had been included in the draft version that had already been circulated.

Manon Gauthier (Montreal) began talking of culture and urban planning: she asked to address the management or cultural planning of the territory, stressing the role of the agents and instruments proper to culture in the context of territorial planning: artists, for instance, and design, architecture, landscape, public art, etc. Design examples might be found, for instance, in the UNESCO's Creative Cities Network. Then, regarding culture and ecology, she asked to strengthen the interdependence between biodiversity and cultural diversity and to acknowledge the role of design in the management of the natural environment and the adoption of eco-responsible practices.

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) considered that, under governance, it would be appropriate to ask a question about the share of the local budget allocated to culture. In terms of social inclusion, he suggested to add issues related to the agents or groups that were taken into account when developing a cultural activity, as well as the need for accessibility to communication media and integration of cultural diversity into them. To conclude, he spoke about the need of ensuring the information obtained from the questionnaire was used as basis for a useful diagnosis to revise the policies.

María Victoria Alcaraz (Buenos Aires) agreed with the contributions of the City of Mexico regarding social inclusion. She said that the self-assessment process might also be useful for civil society agents.



Catherine Cullen added that the questionnaire should be interpreted as a recommendation, and she pointed out that some questions might not be applicable to all cities, while some cities would have to address additional issues.

Valentine Roy, head of the "Plaine Commune" Urban Community (France), said that, in addition to artists, citizens should also participate in the definition of priorities and elements for territorial planning and management. With respect to public budgets, she suggested to take into account the resources of the cultural area and the resources corresponding to other sectors of public action that were used for culture. Finally, she spoke of the need to ensure the participation of the civil society's cultural agents in all discussions related to the Agenda 21 for Culture.

Gonzalo Halty (Montevideo) admitted the difficulty of setting a common budget allocation for culture (as a percentage of the total budget), but he proposed to explain in detail the need of integrating culture into the highest municipal priorities. In terms of governance, it was necessary to think about the sustainability of the civil society's cultural projects and to recognize the role of the private sector in the city's cultural system. Sustainability implied a need for training and a reflection on the use of resources and financing strategies. He mentioned the case of the Departmental Council of Culture in Montevideo, which had helped strengthen programs and transfer some responsibilities to the civil society.

Enrique Glockner, partner of IGC Asesores (Puebla, Mexico), spoke about the appropriateness of addressing urban mobility and access of citizens to cultural activities, coping with distance, transportation costs, etc. Public transportation might be a space for dialogue and interaction, a public space.

Nancy Duxbury, researcher at the Centre of Social Studies at the University of Coimbra (Portugal), highlighted the potential of the "Toolkit" to engage cities and raise their awareness and to reveal the aspects highlighted by each city as aspects from which others might learn. The categories included might be very important to learn and communicate.

Claudio Lillo Aranda (advisor to the Council of Culture and Arts of Araucanía) emphasised the need to define quality standards or minimum recommendations, like, for instance, the existence of a municipal department of culture, with structural financing. In Chile, only 25% of the municipalities had a department of culture.

Marta Bustos Gómez (Bogotá) asked for a more logical sequencing of the documents, modifying the order of the axes. She also said the wording should be reviewed, because some axes had been stated as proposals and some others, as descriptions. Cultural freedoms and the explicit acknowledgement of cultural rights should be included under cultural rights. With respect to urban planning, the introduction should go beyond the physical meaning of territory, highlight that the absence of a cultural reflection on planning had an impact not only on the cultural sector, but on the whole of the population, and make reference to rural areas and metropolitan environments. She also rejected the use of the term "cultural desert". Regarding culture and ecology, she asked for more clarity when using terms like "ecology", "environment", "natural resources", etc. and their relation to sustainable development, and to check the wording when making reference to the sustainability of agricultural practices. In the field of culture and education, the initial statement should be reviewed, because culture is not just a means for knowledge, but knowledge itself. With respect to social inclusion, it would be appropriate to provide a better definition of "poverty" and consider that the problem was, perhaps, the distribution of wealth and not poverty in itself. She also asked to reflect on the concept of "smart cities" that, in any case, should be related to the concept of sustainable development. She finally warned on the need to revisit the headings and subheadings of each axis to ensure they were related to the subjects discussed under each of them.

Claudia Patricia Restrepo Montoya (Medellín) explained they had compared the draft "new Agenda 21 for Culture" with the "Medellín Charter" approved in April 2014 by the 7th World Urban Forum,<sup>2</sup> and that the following observations had resulted from such analysis. She asked

---

<sup>2</sup> The *Medellín Charter. On the human future of the world's cities* (2014) is available at <http://es.urbansolutionsplatform.org/conocimientos/carta-medellin/> [seen on 10/31/2014]

that statements on culture and education go beyond the artistic and cultural education, in line with its subheading, which made reference to active citizens. With respect to urban and territorial planning, she spoke about the integration of "aesthetics as an ethical stand", being necessary for aesthetics to be reflected in the urban dimension, as well as in pure artistic practices. All thoughts about ecology should be based on understanding sustainability as a cohesive element that also included culture, and on viewing ecology as something more than natural resources and the environment. In terms of social inclusion and fight against poverty, inclusion and equity should be upheld as main challenges for culture, because culture had the capacity to promote equitable environments and to contribute to inclusion, instead of fighting poverty under economic terms.

Johanne Bouchard (University of Fribourg) observed that some elements might be moved from one axis to another to gain consistency. That would be the case of some references to cultural rights in particular. The wording under Urban planning might be reviewed to include some territories (e.g. rural areas). Under Governance, perhaps it was necessary to address the duty of interaction among territories (for instance, at metropolitan or international level). In the case of education and ecology, some concepts should be better defined and, in general, it would be necessary to have a clearer leading thread among sections to ensure a wide understanding of "culture". In terms of social inclusion, references to the "creation of wealth" and the "creation of common sense" might be included, as well as acknowledging different types of "poverty".

Michel Vallée (Vaudreuil-Dorion) asked for a more precise definition of "participation in cultural life". With respect to social inclusion, it was necessary to include the intergenerational dimension, and to ensure that the Agenda 21 for Culture was a partnership involving the whole of the community and not an exclusive initiative of any local government.

Alonso Murillo Valverde (Ministry of Culture and Youth of Costa Rica) brought in a reflection on the generation of tourism thanks to the investment in culture. It was then necessary to include some issues about the relation between culture and tourism to ensure the protection of cultural expressions and resources. In terms of the citizens' participation in cultural life, several modes of involvement should be described (consultation, production, active participation, etc.).

Manon Gauthier (Montreal) suggested including the cooperation with other local educational institutions under the culture and education axis. She said that the numerous contributions received at the meeting would be used to review the work, and that they were useful to check the progress that had been made over the years. She finally mentioned the importance of indicators for self-assessment and for the future, to guide cities in their 10-year development.

Luciano Ojeda (Santiago, Chile) recommended including civil society organizations in the reflections on citizen participation, as well as the need of having formal organizations: in Chile, the predominance of informal organizations limits their possibility to receive public support. He put emphasis of the need to stress the promotion of equity and the role of culture in that respect, instead of stressing the fight against poverties. It would also be convenient to highlight that cultural tourism might foster the growth of world tourism and, at the same time, certain measures should be taken to ensure cultural sustainability within such frameworks, and that the resulting wealth would be reinvested in the local cultural territory, exploring any new opportunity. He finally asked for the proposed questionnaire to become a table of indicators to facilitate self-assessment and comparison.

Eduard Miralles (Interarts Foundation) considered that, in the case of the Agenda 21 for Culture, citizen participation could not only be a process or issue related to governance, but a core aspect in the creation of citizenship. Consequently, the link between cultural rights and governance should be strengthened. He made a point on the complexity of meaning of concepts like "inclusion", "exclusion" or "cohesion", which complexity increased when working with several languages. He quoted Eduard Delgado and said that the key reference in terms of the contribution of culture to inclusion was acknowledgement: culture helped incorporate the contribution of certain collectives into the collective narrative and it would be appropriate to explicitly state this fact in the document. With respect to cultural tourism, he considered that all forms of tourism were cultural, whether sustainable or not. Culture should aspire to design the cultural offer so as to create a virtuous cycle; otherwise, tourism would entail several risks for

culture: "monoculture", extreme variability of touristic flows, discomfort of the indigenous population, etc.

Francisco Marchiaro, secretary of Culture of Córdoba (Argentina), considered the contributions to the draft and the discussion were extremely useful for reflection, also for those that were not present at the room. In that respect, he suggested to think of people with fewer opportunities, to ensure that the process leading to the "new Agenda 21 for Culture" and its drafting was something plural and communicated to the exterior. With the appropriate training activities and a platform for discussion, many activists might benefit from the material prepared over there. He pointed out the differences between big and small cities in terms of their possibilities for intervening in the issues raised by the Agenda. Finally, he proposed to benefit from the different interpretations of the key concepts and their translations, to generate a virtual multilingual community that might work and discuss in a wiki format, thus creating a true "glocal" model.

Francisco José García (Madrid) emphasized the appropriateness of including references to the "townscape" and "heritage dimension" of the cities. He agreed on the need of making reference to tourism, and he proposed to include references to the awareness of citizens regarding culture, heritage or memory, under the education heading.

María Victoria Alcaraz (Buenos Aires) reinforced the need to take into account the cities where there was no department of culture or funds were scarce; the final document should be appropriate for working at various scales. She agreed on the importance of aesthetics aspects not only to enhance the public space, but also to ensure that all persons might have access to the aesthetics dimension. She suggested making more visible the affirmation of culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development, when structuring the draft "Toolkit".

Catherine Cullen had taken down several questions and contributions posed during the morning session. She upheld that the Agenda 21 for Culture was, first of all, a partnering and participation process shared by local governments and citizens, and she suggested to include references to sustainable tourism and describe different ways of cultural participation, as well as to avoid the idea of "cultural desert", because every human being is a cultural being.

Along those lines, Jordi Pascual, coordinator of the UCLG Committee on Culture, pointed out several aspects to be reviewed in the document: the consistency of headings, subheadings and the development of each axis; the definition of certain key concepts, the simplification of questions, avoiding those that represented a statement; and the list of questions. In terms of the future steps, he asked to be emailed the documents that had been amended by some participating cities. He mentioned that, within the framework of the "Pilot Cities" programme, several citizen debates would be held around the Agenda 21 for Culture, and that the second draft "new Agenda 21 for Culture" would be sent to the other UCLG Committees to secure the representation of all sectoral perspectives, and that the same would be presented at the UCLG World Council at Haikou (China) in November 2014, to guarantee the legitimacy of the final documents. Some elements from the 2004 Agenda would be recaptured, particularly regarding principles and undertakings. He concluded by proposing to use the following session to discuss the self-assessment proposal and the adequate mechanisms to offer visibility to the cities willing to complete a sound self-assessment process.

## **2.5. Discussion on the Mechanisms to Support Cities in the Implementation of the new Agenda 21 for Culture (2015-2017)**

After a break, Jordi Pascual took the floor and explained that some cities that had adopted the Agenda 21 for Culture had been requesting support (specific advice on implementation, expertise, funding) to locally implement the Agenda. He mentioned the need to give visibility to the cities with a higher implementation quality, although any city interested in adopting the Agenda might do so. In this respect, a mechanism similar to the "Pilot Cities" programme might be implemented, so that experts or other cities might comment on the cultural policies of the participating cities and produce documents or "deliverables". That exercise might be supplemented with a self-assessment whose results would be shared to gain visibility. Then, the floor was opened to discuss those issues.

Mauricio Castro, director of the Cultural Artistic Centre of Concepción (Chile), explained that his city had adopted the Agenda 21 for Culture in March, within a framework of strategic planning for culture. They were interested in measuring the progress at the various stages of the plan and they would like to share their experiences with other cities.

Alonso Murillo Valverde (Ministry of Culture and Youth of Costa Rica) highlighted the importance of training for cultural managers, as confirmed by the absence of specialized training in regions like Central America. The only training activities in Costa Rica consisted of specific workshops and e-learning from foreign digital platforms. The Ministry of Culture and Youth was working to promote a training offer in that field.

Nancy Duxbury (University of Coimbra) spoke about the strategies followed by Creative City Network of Canada to raise awareness on the importance of culture for cities. They had tried to participate in conferences and publications of other public action sectors, among other things. She put emphasis on the importance of case studies and their visibility and on gathering good practices in theme-based reports. To that effect, the proposal made by Jordi Pascual was adequate.

Silvana Ayala Forno, head of the Culture Network programme of the National Council of Culture and Arts of Chile, highlighted the similarity in the challenges that had been identified by several cities. The political will and the willingness of individual persons were key. It was also necessary to write a speech that might go beyond the cultural sector and its institutions, and the Agenda 21 for Culture had the capacity to achieve that. She pointed out the need of mentioning the safeguard and protection of heritage in the document and of having a comprehensive vision of the participation in cultural life.

Michel Vallée (Vaudreuil-Dorion) commented that external visibility was key for those with public responsibility and for the population. The challenge was to become the owners of the Agenda 21 for Culture, even without such external recognition. One of the possibilities would be to offer the cities a template or table to identify good practices.

Ricardo Basualdo (researcher and activist, France and Argentina) confirmed that a commonality of thoughts might be built from exchanges, so as to inspire twinning mechanisms among local experiences and interpersonal meetings.

Eunjoo Chae, coordinator of the Department of Cultural Affairs of Jeju (Korea), expressed her satisfaction for the participation of Jeju in the "Pilot Cities" programme that had to contribute to the local cultural development. She said that such exchanges should involve not only the local government, but also the artistic community and other agents, and she said it was convenient for the program to become more visible.

George Xolile (SALGA) expressed his conviction that, in addition to reaffirming the principles and proposing assessment mechanisms, the "new Agenda 21 for Culture" should be a useful tool to raise awareness and lobby for the significance of culture beyond those agents that had already been convinced. Some external recognition models should be procured, either adapted to small cities or favouring networking and mutual support and acknowledgement at national or regional levels. Some comparative indexes might also be used as assessment mechanisms. He concluded by asking for the transversal integration of a gender perspective in all strategies.

Leônidas José de Oliveira (Belo Horizonte) spoke about the illusion and respect felt at municipal level, after having been chosen as a "Pilot City" of the Agenda 21 for Culture. The exchange of experiences and knowledge among cities was mandatory in that case due to the high number of cities in a state like Minas Gerais. He confirmed that, despite the progress made by Brazil in several fields, progress was lagging behind in other areas, considering the diversity of topics included in the Agenda. He spoke about the importance of the agreements between local governments and the central government as a formula to facilitate the outreach of the Agenda 21 for Culture, transforming the same into a policy of state. In Belo Horizonte, the principles of the Agenda had been recently considered in the preparation of the 10-year municipal cultural

plan. He finally proposed a closer cooperation among the three Brazilian cities at the meeting (Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo and Belo Horizonte).

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) emphasised the need to widely socialize the ideas of the Agenda 21 for Culture, because it was not just a promise, but also the confirmation of experiences that might become a viral event. He suggested disseminating the same in videos, testimonies, exchanges among cities, etc. The social added value of cultural policies was greater than that of any other policy. That fact had to be communicated using other languages different from narrative: marketing, movies, radio, poetry, novels, etc., transforming it into an awareness-raising campaign.

Mariana Andrade (Quito) explained that the Quito municipality was preparing a cultural ordinance that would include elements of the Agenda 21 for Culture.

Johanne Bouchard (University of Fribourg) agreed on the appropriateness of having an expert monitoring mechanism to capitalize all available knowledge. The self-assessment methods were interesting, because cities were recognized liberty, but it was important to ensure that both the public authorities and the civil society were involved in such assessments.

Antonio Aniesa ( Plaine Commune") put emphasis on the importance of sharing the draft "new Agenda 21 for Culture" with other UCLG committees, because many of them might have something to contribute. He also spoke about the importance of engaging other networks and making the Agenda known to other agents.

Gonzalo Halty (Montevideo) committed to communicate the discussions in Buenos Aires to those that were not present. He would do so in the Uruguayan city network and with the culture councillors of the various districts of Montevideo. He agreed on the self-assessment and monitoring proposals, saying they might contribute to raise awareness and systematize information, as well as to ensure communication to the exterior. Even when city networks might show certain asymmetries, they also provided regional or transversal views that might help develop further approaches.

## **2.6. UCLG – City of Mexico – Culture 21 International Award**

Eduardo Vázquez (City of Mexico) took the floor and spoke about the contents of the award. By promoting this initiative, the City of Mexico was further strengthening its commitment to the Agenda 21 for Culture and reinforcing, to the interior of the country, the global reflection on culture and sustainable development. In that sense, the awards ceremony (to be held in November) would include an awareness-raising seminar. He presented the agenda and invited all cities to be present and make technical visits to the City of Mexico cultural infrastructure. He concluded by announcing the preparation of an International Meeting of Non-Formal Education and Sustainable Culture in 2015, where significant international experiences would be asked to be presented. They hoped the Committee on Culture might cooperate to publicise that Meeting.

## **2.7. UCLG Culture Summit (Bilbao, March 18, 2015)**

Iñaki López de Aguilera (Bilbao) described the arrangements for the meeting that, apart from approving the "new Agenda 21 for Culture", should serve as a space for working, meeting and learning, and to give visibility to the topics to be discussed. In such a sense, the agenda included the presentation of experiences related to the "Pilot Cities" programme, among others. The provisional agenda for the Summit consisted of three plenary sessions (cultural rights; culture and sustainable development; and promotion of the post 2015 development agenda), 12 parallel sessions and technical visits to infrastructure. The web page for the Summit would soon be available and the name of the confirmed speakers would be periodically updated.

## 2.8. Other Activities of the Committee on Culture

Jordi Pascual, coordinator of the UCLG Committee on Culture, reported on some past and current activities:

- Good practices: in line with the decision made at the meeting in Lille-Métropole (2013), 19 good practices data sheets had been prepared, published and translated into three languages in the last months. The Jury of the "International Award UCLG - City of Mexico - Culture 21" had recommended that more than half of the projects bidding for the award might be considered good practices. On that basis, the Secretariat of the Committee is adapting these 30 projects to be uploaded into the web site. Additionally, some other cities might propose other projects: the database is open for entries, the inclusion criteria are similar to those used for the International Award, and the proposals should be related to a series of previously defined keywords.
- Pilot Cities : the programme was being developed and visits of experts were scheduled for the following weeks. Each city would have, at the end of the programme, three deliverables, and everything would be presented at the Bilbao Summit.
- Campaign #culture2015goal: Jordi Pascual reported on the drafting of the new agenda of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) by the international community, to replace the Millennium Development Goals after 2015. The Committee on Culture was working with the intention of including a cultural target in the goal related to cities and, on the other hand, it was cooperating with other networks to ensure that cultural aspects would be included in as many goals as possible, after having realized that there was no possibility of making culture a specific goal of the new agenda. He emphasised the uniqueness of the cooperation with other international networks within this framework and the support received from more than 800 organizations. He also highlighted the role of Catherine Cullen, who had participated as a spokesperson in several fora and was fighting for the acknowledgment of culture within and outside UCLG.

Marta Bustos Gómez (Bogotá) reported that Bogotá would host the 5th World Summit of UCLG in 2016. In late 2014 and early 2015, the cultural dimension of such summit would be defined, and she invited all cities to contribute to such event.

## 2.9. Closing

Catherine Cullen pointed out that thanks to the continuous and tough work carried out during many years, speaking about the role of culture in sustainable development had become more natural. She also thanked Jordi Pascual for his work and the participation of all cities present.

María Victoria Alcaraz, Undersecretary of Cultural Heritage of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires and co-chair of the UCLG Committee on Culture, thanked for the quality of all attendees. She also said that a communiqué summarizing the meeting would be drafted and circulated to the mass media.

## 2.10 Conclusions:

- The Committee on Culture is working to draft a new document that will update the Agenda 21 for Culture the chartering document approved in 2004. The new document will help summarize the current knowledge on culture and sustainable development and the role of local governments in this context. It shall also promote the practical implementation of the Agenda 21 for Culture, the accumulation of knowledge and the exchange of experiences.
- In this respect, the meeting in Buenos Aires was an intense exercise of discussion and reflection on the first draft document entitled "Culture 21: Actions. The global toolkit for culture in the sustainable development of cities", made available in May 2014 and object of consultation in recent months.

- The Committee on Culture will meet in Bilbao in March 2015 to approve this new document, share experiences and knowledge, and give visibility to the role of cultural factors in sustainable development.
- Simultaneously, the "Pilot Cities" programme, launched in 2014, helps analyse actual experiences in the implementation of the Agenda 21 for Culture and discuss the challenges and basic requirements of the new document with local governments and civil society organizations. This programme may be the basis of a new ongoing system to assess and exchange experiences.
- Similarly, the "UCLG - City of Mexico - Culture 21" International Award launched in 2014 is useful to appreciate experiences and people that contribute to the visibility of the close relationship between culture and sustainable development.
- The priorities of the Committee for the next months are: the preparation of the Culture Summit of Bilbao, the final draft of "Culture 21: Actions" and the elaboration of a programme to support its implementation by cities, for 2015-2017, based on the exchange of knowledge, good practice and peer-learning.
- The campaign #culture2015goal will continue being active in the next few months. Its purpose is to integrate cultural factors into the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to be approved by the international community in 2015.
- The local governments and cities that are members of the Committee, as well as the several observers from international organizations, national networks and civil society, congratulate the City of Buenos Aires for its warm welcome and perfect organization of the meeting.

### 3. Annexes

- The agenda of the meeting is in Annex 1.
- The list of participants of the meeting is in annex 2.
- The work programme of the Committee is reproduced in annex 3

### Contact

**Committee on Culture**  
 UCLG  
 Carrer Avinyó, 15  
 08002 Barcelona

Email [coordination@agenda21culture.net](mailto:coordination@agenda21culture.net)

Web [www.agenda21culture.net](http://www.agenda21culture.net)

Twitter [@agenda21culture](https://twitter.com/agenda21culture)

## **Annex 1**

### **Agenda of the meeting of Buenos Aires**

**Languages.** The meeting will be in French, English and Spanish. Simultaneous translation  
**Place.** Several venues in Buenos Aires.

#### **MONDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2014**

- Arrival and welcome.

#### **TUESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2014**

- Open seminar. The seminar will be a meeting point of cities that work with Agenda 21 for culture and key actors and organizations of Buenos Aires.

#### **WEDNESDAY 1 OCTOBER 2014**

- Discussion on the contents of the new Agenda 21 for culture. Use the first draft as a reference: [www.new.agenda21culture.net](http://www.new.agenda21culture.net) and come with your own proposals.

#### **THURSDAY 2 OCTOBER 2014**

- Discussion on the support to cities in the implementation of the new Agenda 21 for culture (2015-2017): peer-review, self-evaluation, good practice, monitoring, training...
- Culture Summit of UCLG
- International Award "UCLG - Mexico City – Culture 21"
- Activities of the UCLG Committee on culture in 2014 and 2015-2017



## Annex 2

### Participants of the meeting of Buenos Aires

<i>City, local government or organization</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Surname(s)</i>	<i>Position</i>
<b>Official members</b>			
Barcelona (Cat, Sp)	Rosa	Mach	Director of cultural activities
Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais, Br)	Leônidas José	De Oliveira	Councillor for Culture
Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais, Br)	Telemachos	Telemachou	Advisor for the Municipal Foundation for Culture
Bilbao (Basque Country, Sp)	Jesús María	Manzano García	Director of the International department
Bilbao (Basque Country, Sp)	Iñaki	López de Aguileta	Director of the Culture department
Bogota (Co)	Marta	Bustos Gómez	Director of the Arts, Culture and Heritage Department – Department on Culture, Leisure and Sports
Buenos Aires (Ar)	Hernán	Lombardi	Minister for Culture and Tourism, City of Buenos Aires  Co-president of the Committee on culture of CGLU
Buenos Aires (Ar)	María Victoria	Alcaraz	Vice minister on Cultural Heritage, Ministry for Culture and Tourism, City of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires (Ar)	María Eugenia	Santar	Department on Cultural Heritage, Ministry for Culture and Tourism
Concepción (Chile)	Álvaro	Ortiz Vera	Mayor
Concepción (Chile)	Mauricio	Castro	Director of the Arts Center
Concepción (Chile)	Sebastián	Torres	Technical manager of Steel Artists Cultural Corporation
Córdoba (Ar)	Francisco	Marchiaro	Councillor for Culture
Interlocal (int)	Diana	López	President of the Interlocal Network
Jeju (Korea)	Mi Suk	Jeung	Director of the Department on Cultural Policies
Jeju (Korea)	Eunjoo	Chae	Coordinator of the Cultural Department
La Paz (Bo)	Walter	Gómez Méndez	Councillor for Cultures, Municipal Government of La Paz
Lille Metropole (Fr)	Catherine	Cullen	President of the Committee on culture of UCLG
Medellín (Co)	Claudia Patricia	Restrepo Montoya	Councilor on Education, Culture, Participation, Recreation and Sports
Federal District of Mexico (Mx)	Eduardo	Vázquez	Councillor on Culture for the Government of the Federal District of Mexico  Co-president of the Committee on culture of UCLG

Federal District of Mexico (Mx)	Martín	Levenson	Advisor for the Councillor on Culture of The Federal District Government
Montevideo (Uruguay)	Gonzalo	Halty	Director of the Department for Cultural Promotion
Montreal (Quebec, Ca)	Manon	Gauthier	Member of the Executive Committee, City of Montreal, in charge of Culture, Heritage, Design, Space for Life & the Status of Women  Co-president of the Committee on culture of UCLG
Montreal (Quebec, Ca)	Caroline	Poirier	Cultural Development Agent
Plaine Commune, Comunidad Urbana (Fr)	Antonio	Aniesa	Head of International Relations
Plaine Commune, Comunidad Urbana (Fr)	Valentine	Roy	Project manager
Quito (Ecuador)	Mariana	Andrade	Councillor for culture
Rio de Janeiro (RJ, Br)	Claudia Maria	Mendes de Almeida Pedrozo	Chief of cabinet of the Councillor for culture
Rosario (Ar)	Horacio	Ríos	Councillor for Culture and Education
Santiago de Chile (Chile)	Luciano	Ojeda	Coordinator of the Municipal Awards
Sao Paulo (SP, Br)	Paulo	Menechelli	Advisor on International affairs for the Municipal Department for culture
South African Local Government Association (SALGA) (South Africa)	George	Xolile	Chief executive officer
Vaudreuil-Dorion (Quebec, Ca)	Michel	Vallée	Director of Arts and culture
<b>Observers</b>			
Canelones (Uruguay)	Alfredo	Fernández Sande	Director for Culture
National Council on Culture and Arts (Chile)	Silvana	Ayala Forno	Head of cultural network programme
Council on Culture and Arts of Araucanía (Chile)	Claudio	Lillo Aranda	Advisor and cultural sociologist
Cultural Development Centre, Bakú (Azerbaiján)	Geray	Alibayov	President
Interarts Foundation, Barcelona	Eduard	Miralles	President
IGC Asesores, Puebla (Mx)	Enrique	Glockner	Partner
IGC Asesores, Puebla (Mx)	Fritz	Glockner	Partner
Madrid (Madrid, Sp)	Francisco José	García	General Director on Cultural Heritage and Quality of the Urban Landscape, Department of Arts, Sports and Tourism
Maldonado (Uruguay)	Luis Alberto	Pereira	Director of cultural programming
Ministry on Culture and Youth (Costa Rica)	Alonso	Murillo Valverde	Advisor to the Minister
Paso de los Libres (Ar)	Ramón Alfredo	Blanco	Councillor for Culture
RBCONSEILS (Fr)	Ricardo	Basualdo	Gerente
UNESCO (int)	Frédéric	Vacheron	Director of the Regional programme on Culture, Office of UNESCO in Montevideo

Temuco Catholic University (Chile)	Marietta	Gedda Muñoz	Coordinator of the VivaComuna Programme
Coimbra University (Pt)	Nancy	Duxbury Carreiro	Senior Researcher in the Social Studies Center
City University - London (UK)	Cecilia	Dinardi	PHD Researcher
Friburg University (Switzerland)	Johanne	Bouchard	Research assistant for the interdisciplinary institute of Ethics and Human rights
<b>UCLG</b>			
Committee on culture	Jordi	Pascual	Coordinator
Committee on culture	Jordi	Baltà	Advisor
<b>Absents</b>			
Angers (Fr)	Alain	Fouquet	Councillor for culture and heritage  Vice-presidency of the committee on culture of UCLG
Bahía (Br)	Antônio Albino Canelas	Rubim	Councillor for Culture, Government of Bahía
Barcelona (Cat, Sp)	Jaume	Ciurana	Deputy Mayor on Culture, Creativity, Knowledge and Innovation  Vice-president of the Committee on Culture of UCLG
Belen (Costa Rica)	Liliana	Ramirez Vargas	President of Curitiba Cultural Foundation
Cités Unies France (Fr)	Virginie	Rouquette	Policy Officer, Mediterranean – Culture Department
Cultural Development Network Victoria (Au)	John	Smithies	Director
Culture Action Europe	Luca	Bergamo	General Secretary
Curitiba (Paraná, Br)	Marcos Antonio	Cordioli	Councillor for culture
Dakar (Sn)	Khalifa	Sall	Mayor
Dakar (Sn)	Abdoulaye Elimane	Kane	Advisor of the Mayor on culture of Dakar
Dortmund (NRW, De)	Kurt	Eichler	Director for culture
FAMSI (Andalucía, Sp)	Antonio	Zurita	Director
Konya Metropolitan Municipality (Turkey)	Mücahit Sami	Küçüktiğli	Head of Culture and Social Affairs Department
Konya Metropolitan Municipality (Turkey)	Selim Yücel	Güleç	Head of Foreign Relations Department
Arts and City (Quebec, Ca)	Linda	Roy	General secretary
Lima (Peru)	Pedro Pablo	Alayza	Vice-director, Culture department
Lisbon (Pt)	Catarina	Vaz Pinto	Councilor for culture
Milan (It)	Filippo	Del Corno	Councilor for culture  Vicepresidency of the

			Committee on Culture of UCLG
Milan (It)	Irma	Dioli	Coordinator for Networks and Cultural Cooperation, Department for culture, fashion and design , General Direction for Culture
Nhimbe - Bulawayo (Zimbabwe)	Joshua	Nyapimbi	Director
Novi Sad (Voivodina, Serbia)	Biljana	Mickov	Researcher, curator, activist
Porto Alegre (RS, Br)	Roque	Jacoby	Councillor for culture
Porto Alegre (RS, Br)	Vitor	Ortiz	Advisor
Reseaculture21.fr (Fr)	Christelle	Blouët	Coordinator
Roberto Cimetta Fund (int)	Ferdinand	Richard	President
University of Laval (Quebec, Ca)	Antoine	Guibert	Consultant on culture and sustainable development
Utrecht (NI)	Hans	Sakkers	Head of strategic and international department
Wuhan Municipal People's Congress (PR of China)	Mr Yu	Jianhai	Deputy Director
Wuhan Municipal People's Congress (PR of China)	Ms. Zhang	Tianzhi	Chief of Friendship Association Department, The Foreign Affairs Office of Wuhan Municipal People's Government
	Gonzalo	Carámbula	Member of the Jury of the International Award "UCLG – City of Mexico – Culture 21"

## **Annex 3**

### **Programme of the Committee for 2014**

#### **1. GOVERNANCE and FUNDING**

##### **ACTIVITY 1: Consolidate governance with 3 new BOARD members**

The new 3 members should belong to non-covered areas: Asia-Pacific, Africa, Euro-Asia or Middle-East  
Active relation with UCLG sections

##### **ACTIVITY 2: A meeting of the BOARD every 3 months**

Virtual meeting or physical meeting

##### **ACTIVITY 3: Agree on new budget for 2015 onwards**

Explore carefully and agree on this scheme ASAP The BOARD cities agreed on a funding scheme for 2013 and 2014. Agree on a new funding scheme for 2015 onwards. This should be linked to new A21C

##### **ACTIVITY 4: Organise a very high-level meeting of the Committee**

The meeting must be the moment of discussion of the main contents of new Agenda 21 for culture If possible, a city that belongs to the BOARD should organise this meeting. Buenos Aires

#### **2. INTELLIGENCE**

##### **a. Solid new A21C process with many open discussion threads**

##### **ACTIVITY 5: New draft**

A first draft to be discussed internally by the Committee in April (also within UCLG and with partners in June) and a second almost-final draft in September 2014. The CONTENT of the new document: some 15 paragraphs recalling main principles of Agenda 21 for culture and 8 pilot programmes ("commitments") that invite cities to implement.

##### **ACTIVITY 6: Meetings**

To organise at least three meetings to discuss new draft in 2014. They could take place in Buenos Aires, Milan and another place in another continent: perhaps Taipei on occasion of ASPAC congress? Perhaps South Africa? Perhaps Montreal / les Arts et la Ville? One of these meetings should also be a meeting of the Committee on culture.

##### **ACTIVITY 7: "Articles" written by experts**

To commission at least 10 articles (4-5 pages) that provide the basis of the new document. They should all be finished and published in January 2014. Besides, some key people (see below) could be asked to write a one-page article. Articles written by Patrice Meyer-Bisch, Eduard Miralles and Robert Palmer are almost ready.

##### **ACTIVITY 8: "Key messages" by cities.**

Around 30 cities could be asked to write a brief article on the current and future A21C. They would give visibility. January-April 2014. Strong connection with future "core cities". Advice is needed. Gender and geographical balance.

##### **ACTIVITY 9: "Interviews".**

Around 30 people could be interviewed on the current and future A21C. These interviews would be done in person, on telephone or online. They would be published after approval of respondent. January-April 2014. Advice is needed. Gender and geographical balance.

##### **ACTIVITY 10: "Questionnaire".**

To upload in January - February 2014, an open questionnaire, aiming at detecting "satisfaction" on current A21C and ask for ideas for the new document

##### **ACTIVITY 11: Agree on name of new document**

Culture21-Commitments or Culture21-Solutions or Culture21-Actions. Evaluate.

##### **ACTIVITY 12: Agree on date and city of approval of new A21C**

Process to be launched by UCLG World Secretariat early 2014, with Open Call to all members of UCLG. Interested cities to respond.

##### **ACTIVITY 13: Agree on Core Cities 2015-2017**

To work in-depth with a number of Core Cities (25 or 30), those that are willing to work with some of the 8 Commitments/Solutions/Actions. Only with a restricted number of cities the Committee would be able to provide adequate mechanisms of follow-up + allow true visibility of the best cities.

**ACTIVITY 14: Define implementation of new Agenda 21 for culture**

A brief guidance document for each commitment would be available to all cities, as well as a self-assessment tool on each commitment. The Committee on culture of UCLG would provide experts and peer-review, as well as specific training on these 8 topics (only for core cities)

**ACTIVITY 15: FINAL EVENT: approval on new document**

Carefully plan the final event (January , February, March or April 2015)

**b. Expertise and exchanges between cities**

**ACTIVITY 16: Online examples**

Examples on how A21C is implemented by cities. At least 30 examples online in January 2014 and 20 more all along the year 2014

**ACTIVITY 17: Visits to cities**

Visits to Pilot cities by A21C ambassadors / experts. These cities wish to implement Agenda 21 for culture, and would be extremely useful as for "testing" contents. Some of these cities would become "CORE CITIES" in 2015-2017

**ACTIVITY 18: More expertise**

To analyze in detail how the new A21C would be implemented, and if a pool of several experts to assist the implementation is requested.

**c. Implementation of Mexico AWARD**

**ACTIVITY 19: Partnerships of Mexico Award**

The Award allows us to involve new partners (find new cities, new allies...), and to capitalise (intelligence) our database of good practices. The whole "AWARD" process is a treasure that is a success in itself in all dimensions.

**ACTIVITY 20: Award Event**

Carefully plan the final event

**3. COMMUNICATION**

**ACTIVITY 21: Website**

Much better and interactive website. It is well-known, and quite user-friendly. The website covers the most well-known events and processes. But it is too theoretical, too "boring". To explore going a step further, and guarantee that the website becomes a true portal: more pages dedicated to projects and to cities. TO ADD information of new Board in website. TO ADD pictures of cultural events / heritage of Board members

**ACTIVITY 22: Presence in social networks**

Boost our presence in social networks. The Committee has a website and is on twitter, but not Facebook. It would be useful to know if (with the current resources) the Committee is using the social networks properly.

**ACTIVITY 23: Training** Online training kit on Agenda 21 for culture. There is many information (Agenda 2004, declaration of Mexico 2010, 5 reports...) but the Committee has not "pedagogical" documents, something that a city can download to very easily understand Agenda 21 for culture.

**ACTIVITY 24: 10th anniversary**

On 8 May 2014 the Agenda 21 for culture will be 10 years old. What is the best way to mark the jubilee? A joint "communiqué?" Linked to new document? Linked to #culture2015Goal? Local activity (press-conferences / seminars on these two endeavours? What do you think?

**4. NETWORKING**

**ACTIVITY 25: Contribution to all UCLG processes: Habitat III, GOLD, Global TaskForce**

UCLG leadership. Provide full support + be very active in all meetings and endeavors.

**ACTIVITY 26: Support #culture2015goal campaign**

Committee leadership. Coordination with IFACCA, IFCCD, Culture Action Europe and other partners.

**ACTIVITY 27: New partners**

Invite some global cultural networks to a seminar on #Culture2015Goal - Identify new champions, and cooperate with them – become the “network of networks”. Identify “old champions” and engage them in our main activities.

**ACTIVITY 28: Partnerships UNESCO**

Campaign on #Culture2015Goal + Closer connection to Convention 2005 + Follow-up of Network of creative cities

**ACTIVITY 29: Specific partnerships with networks**

CultureActionEurope, Eurocities, CCRE-CEMR, Edinburgh Festival, World Capitals of Culture