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# Executive Summary

Introduction

Robert Palmer Consultants were appointed to undertake an independent review of the Edinburgh International Culture Summit (EICS). The aims of the research were to assess the achievements and impact of the Summit in the ten years since the inception of EICS and to recommend options for the vision and the organisational/governance/operating model for any future Summit. As part of the research, the consultants were asked to analyse existing data made available by the EICS Foundation and EICS Partners, and interview a broadly representative range of stakeholders, sector partners and participants who have been connected with the EICS.

The methodology of the Review comprised:

1. Review of more than 1,000 documents and data provided by EICS Partners.
2. Interviews with over 70 EICS staff, Partners, Summit participants, trustees, and others.
3. Completion of five case studies that were selected by Partners.
4. Future Options Consultation Workshops with Partner representatives.
5. Interim and Final Reports presented to EICS Steering Group (Interim Report June 2023, Draft Final Report September 2023) and EICS Strategic Board (Final Report October 2023).

## Summary of key findings

**Vision and purpose:** From a review of documentation and interviews EICS Partners have differing expectations now when compared to those at the Summit’s inception. However, there appears to be a common thread throughout the years of the Summit’s broad vision as “a forum for international dialogue about the value of culture.” There is a strong interest in maintaining but refining the Summit’s core vision to make it more relevant with an increased focus on clarifying objectives, specifying outcomes and achieving tangible results.

**Governance and partners:** The EICS governance structure includes a Steering Group and Strategic Board with representatives from the five founding Partners and the EICSF. Attention was drawn to the slow and somewhat inefficient decision-making processes, with the need to simplify or change the structure. The Review considered alternative models for future governance. These included developing a robust and representative single-purpose foundation and integrating any future Summit-type project into an existing organisation (most notably either the Edinburgh International Festival or the British Council). Potential models were evaluated against a set of five key governance competencies.

**Management:**  All EICSF staff roles have been part-time and freelance. The “project based” approach to staffing has proved inefficient as there were frequent changes in personnel over the 10-year period, and certain roles were not recruited far enough in advance of the Summit. The lack of continuity in staffing between Summits, except for the Programme Director, meant that the skills and knowledge of the team were quickly lost from one Summit to the next. Across interviews with delivery staff, Partner representatives, and trustees EICSF staff were commended for their expertise and high levels of motivation. However, the nature and style of direction and management practice should change to encompass a more co-creative and collaborative approach.

**Invitation process:** Most viewed the Summit’s invitation process as inefficient. Often, invitations were delivered late and too close to the Summit event. Prioritisation of invitees has been considered by some to be ill-defined. Streamlining the process and prioritising invitees could increase efficiency and attendance.

**Summit planning and delivery:** Uncertainty around funding had impeded planning, and a heightened focus on strategic planning and delivery was needed to improve the Summit experience. The last-minute nature of some elements of the Summit, (particularly delegate invitations and confirmation of attendance) led to operational delivery problems. In the future, there should be direct involvement from experienced delivery bodies that have substantial experience in organising and staging events that can meet the expectations of high-level government participants.

**Scottish Parliament:** The Scottish Parliament as a prestigious setting added “gravitas” and “theatricality” to the Summit, and the staff at the Parliament were commended for their essential support. The Parliament building is difficult to navigate however, and tight security makes it problematic to move around freely. Despite this, most interviewees agreed that the Parliament is a “valuable and highly symbolic” venue, and that “some elements” of the Summit should remain there. Use of alternative venues for components of the programme could improve delivery and promote more informal dialogue and networking.

**Timing and dates**: Despite well-recognised difficulties of hosting the Summit in August in Edinburgh, Edinburgh’s festivals offer a distinctive and unparalleled context, which has been the Summit’s main USP. There was a consistent view that major components of any future Summit-type activity should continue to take place in Edinburgh in August.

**Finance:** The direct cost of the 2022 EICS Summit was estimated at c.£650k, excluding substantial in-direct and in-kind contributions given by Partners and others. EICSF has been consistently successful in attracting philanthropic and individual donor support. Founding Partners provide a significant contribution in the form of combined direct funding and in-kind support. A ratio of c.50/50 direct public and private contributions appears to have been consistently achieved with private funding exceeding public (excluding in-kind contributions). Finance levels are insufficient however to meet both the rising costs of the existing Summit model, or to address under-resourcing.

**Summit participants:** Although inconsistent record keeping has prevented a full analysis of participants and contributors at past Summits, the report analyses the nature of participation by governments and others. Evidence shows thatthere has been a broad range of countries represented by delegations and contributors over the years, although most countries have only been represented at one Summit. Of the 81 countries that had international delegations attend the Summit since 2012, 60% have attended more than one Summit, while 20% have attended four or more Summits. Increasingly poor attendance from “priority countries” (as defined by the Partners) was noted over successive Summits. There is a reputational risk with the current Summit model being seen as an event with minimal impact for diplomatic and policy purposes. Many expressed the view that the cultural sector is not sufficiently integrated into the planning and participation of the Summit.

**Ministerial involvement:** The figures show that ministerial attendance had been falling from a high in 2014 to a low in 2020, which recovered in 2022 with several Ministers attending as digital delegates due mainly to the post COVID landscape. EICS developed a “hybrid” approach which was welcomed by countries where ministers were unable to travel. In 2022 most countries participated at sessions in the Scottish Parliament with an in person delegation of government representatives, some of whom were members of the UK diplomatic core. Overall, the view of those interviewed was that if a smaller number of Ministers were specifically targeted to attend a Summit ministerial attendance would be significantly higher than the open invitation to a large number of Ministers.

**Programme:** Interviewees generally spoke positively about the quality of speakers at plenary sessions, although frequent criticism was levelled at speeches irrelevant to the Summit themes from Ministers. Most interviewees felt that roundtables were a valuable opportunity for dialogue, but questioned the depth of discussion and exchange that took place. The very high calibre of expert speakers at the Summits was highlighted by almost all interviewees, as was the quality of contributing artists. Many believed the Summits were over-curated however, with limited opportunities for informal networking and discussions. A number of interviewees representing Partner organisations expressed a desire to be more involved in the process of programming and decision-making about speakers for future Summits.

**Bilateral meetings:** Included in all Summits were informal meetings between Ministers of the UK and Scottish Governments and their international counterparts, as well as with the representatives of the wider Edinburgh festival network. The documentation does not include reports of any bi-lateral meetings that took place. While new connections may have been made through bilateral meetings, there has been insufficient follow up to indicate specific impacts or outcomes, beyond initial contact.

**Performances, installations, exhibitions:** Interviewees spoke highly of the artistic performances interspersed throughout the Summit, and the complementary evening programmes. External visits to cultural and heritage institutions in Edinburgh and Glasgow were appreciated by some delegates as were opportunities to see festival performances, although attendance was often patchy and disappointing at several Summits.

**Youth engagement:** A youth programme was integrated into the 2018 and 2022 Summits. A disappointing number of international delegations brought youth delegates in 2022 (a reduction on the number achieved in 2018). The evaluation report of youth engagement in the 2022 contained mixed views from the youth participants. From reports and interviews it was apparent that young people involved in the Summits enjoyed working on and participating in them, but that involvement with the Summit was limited – an enhancement of the youth dimension should be a priority of any future Summit-type project.

**Cultural Leadership Dialogues:** The 2022 Summit hosted the Ukraine Cultural Leadership Dialogue to strengthen Ukraine’s international standing and support Ukrainian cultural colleagues and institutions affected by the war. The 2022 Summit also hosted the Australia Cultural Leadership Dialogue, programmed as part of the UK | AUSTRALIA Season of cultural exchange. The approach to the Dialogues was generally appreciated by participants.

**Objectives, outcomes and impacts:** There are considerable gaps in documentation around strategic planning for the EICS and the setting of aims, objectives, outcomes and key performance indicators. It has not been possible to develop any coherent or consistent list of verifiable or measurable outcomes from the six Summits that have taken place. Looking forward, establishing clear outcomes and KPIs to track impact and success of each Summit will be essential. In addition, a robust evaluation framework and methodology should be developed to consistently gather data demonstrating success and impacts.

**International landscape and case studies:** The survey of the international landscape of cultural events, conferences, and summits has been augmented with five case studies: Culture Summit Abu Dhabi, G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers, Mondiacult World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development (UNESCO), World Cities Culture Forum Summit and World Summit of Arts and Culture (IFACCA). Direct comparison between the case studies and the EICS is challenging due to differences in purpose, size, focus, funding and governance. Several key conclusions emerge however: successful events tend to have a stable governance model and maintain consistent delivery teams, and all studied events were part of broader organisational portfolios, which seems to be advantageous in terms of financial support, convening power, and engagement with relevant international partners.

**Future delivery options:** The findings from the Review suggest a strong need to change the current EICS delivery model, with the majority of those interviewed believing that the current model (however well-intentioned and relevant in the past) can no longer achieve the results required by key stakeholders. Findings suggest that one single purpose, large scale gathering such as a biennial Summit without carefully planned and strategically phased activity in between is no longer effective. Two consultation workshops were held to explore potential options for the future of EICS drawing on the experience and perspectives of the EICS Partners. Three options were considered: the creation of an Edinburgh World Culture Forum, the development of an Edinburgh International Cultural Expo with Edinburgh’s festivals at its core, and the hosting of Edinburgh International Cultural Dialogues. Drawing on evidence gathered in the Review, each option was evaluated against agreed criteria.

## Summary of recommendations

The report outlines recommendations for the future, summarised as follows:

**1. Retain aspects of the core vision and values**: Continue to build on a vision focused on the pivotal importance of dialogue to promote a high-level, international and representative sharing of views and experience to inspire reflective thinking, advance ideas and action and strengthen the role and practice of creativity in societies globally.

**2. Develop a new model of delivery:** A new delivery model should replace a centralised biennial Summit overseen by a programme director. The new model should comprise an annual, strategically planned cycle of well-moderated dialogue platforms focusing on resolving specific and urgent cultural questions. The annual dialogue platforms should be built around an initial four-year pilot period (2024-2027) leading to a milestone event every four years.

**3. Build the brand incrementally, and in partnership, towards a milestone event:**  Sustained, iterative development efforts over four years of dialogues should lead to a new milestone event, an *Edinburgh World Culture Forum in 2027* (a working title for an option favoured by Partners during consultations).

**4. Involve Edinburgh’s festivals:** Ensure that Edinburgh's international festivals are integrated fully into the planning, programming and delivery of the Edinburgh dialogue platforms.

**5. Focus on action-oriented results and outcomes**: Action must be a cornerstone of the new delivery model, built on clearly defined objectives with appropriate KPIs within a robust Theory of Change Model.

**6. Develop a significant research strand with knowledge partners**: To ensure the initiative is at the forefront of “cultural thought leadership” the research and insight contributing to and resulting from events should be instrumental to developing and raising awareness of the model’s brand with international stakeholders and attractiveness for participants.

**7. Connect with the key national and international cultural networks**: For legitimacy and impact, key partnerships and valuable alliances must be built with established and respected global cultural organisations and initiatives with overlapping objectives.

**8. Organise satellite events**: The dialogue platforms held in Edinburgh in August alone will be insufficient to achieve impact and international brand awareness. There must be an ongoing programme of coordinated activity that takes place within the context of other cultural forums and international festivals in other places and at other times of the year.

**9. Consider alternative structures for future governance**: No ideal or agreed governance model emerged from the evidence gathered in this Review (although alternatives have been suggested in this report). Discussions should take place between the Edinburgh International Festival, the British Council and the EICS Foundation to determine their interests in, and approach to the governance of any future initiative.

**10. Enhance commitment by both the Scottish and UK Governments**: The future project will require the continued commitment of both the Scottish and UK governments. It should link to their policies, strategies, plans and priorities for the cultural and creative sectors, and for international cultural cooperation and exchange.

**11. Extend the public-private funding partnership model**: The financing of any future project should continue to be derived from public authorities and the private sector, with support from donors, sponsors, trusts and foundations.

**12. Determine the next step expeditiously and decide upon leadership**: Over one year has elapsed since the last Edinburgh International Culture Summit. To build on the foundations of its achievements and maintain the momentum of expectations raised by this Review, Partners should agree without undue delay on the direction they wish to take.

# 

# 1. Background to this report

Robert Palmer Consultants were appointed to undertake an independent review of the Edinburgh International Culture Summit (EICS) after an open tender process managed by the British Council, with the agreement of EICS Partners. The aims of the research were to assess the achievements and impact of the Summit in the ten years since the inception of EICS and to recommend options for the vision, objectives, and organisational / governance / operating model for any future Summit. As part of the research, the consultants were asked to analyse existing data made available by the EICSF and EICS Partners, and interview a broadly representative range of stakeholders, partners and participants who have been connected with the Summit. A final report with recommendations was requested for presentation in September 2023, with an Interim Report of initial findings in June 2023.

The specification for the project initially identified over 50 questions to address and, with the agreement of partners, these were integrated into six main research areas:

1. Vision and purpose
2. Governance, management, operations, funding
3. Participants, partners, stakeholders
4. Programme
5. Impacts and outcomes
6. International landscape

The research methodology and timeline encompassed five stages:

1. Inception (March)
2. Primary research (April-June)
3. Consultation through interviews (April-July)
4. Testing (August)
5. Final reporting (September/October)

The number of EICS-related documents reviewed during primary research for the preparation of the Interim Report exceeded 1000. As agreed, confidentiality of all material has been observed, although direct reporting from relevant documents is included in the interim and final reports, which remains confidential to Partners.

The process of interviews began in April 2023 and concluded in August. Although the undertaking of 60 interviews was initially agreed, the final number exceeds 70 representing a wide range of viewpoints, organisations and interests in Scotland, the UK and internationally. The Partners selected the interviewees. The list of people interviewed appears as Appendix 9. About 90% of those interviewed had attended one or more Summits (including the online Summit of 2020). Approx 40% of those interviewed had attended two or more of the Summits since 2012. Only four interviewees had attended five or six Summits.

Each interview (averaging 75-90 minutes) was structured around a combination of factual, convergent, divergent, and evaluative open questions, with prompts related to the specific topics of the Review. Depending on the participant’s involvement with EICS, some interviews focused more on fact-finding/checking to fill information gaps in the documentation, others concentrated on personal or organisational viewpoints and suggestions. Different perspectives of EICS were explored and probed in depth during each interview. Interviews took place with each member of the EICS Steering Group and EICS Strategic Board, with the only exception being the DCMS ministerial representative on the Strategic Board. All interviews were recorded with the consent of participants and complete transcripts of the interviews were made, with summaries of main points annotated and integrated into the analysis of findings included in the Interim and Final Reports. All participants gave GDPR consent at the start of each interview. All comments by interviewees have been anonymised.

Included in the methodology was a survey of international cultural events and summits (Appendix 6), and the completion of five international case studies selected by Partners and relevant to the Review. The case studies are summarised in this report and appear in detail in Appendix 7.

A number of issues were highlighted in the Interim Report which equally apply to the findings and recommendations of this Final Report. These are summarised briefly below:

*Missing Data and Documentation*: Despite the hard work undertaken by Foundation staff (both present and past) to locate data and documentation from 2012-2022, retrieval of all relevant documents has not been possible. Efforts have been made to mitigate these gaps through background interviews with former members of staff, trustees, and representatives from Partner organisations.

*Measuring Outcomes and Impacts*: Although considered an important component of the research brief, only a very small number of tangible or measurable outcomes/impacts arising directly from the six Summits has been harvested. Outcomes-based measures have not been part of the Summit’s approach. Defining tangible outcomes for such an event and the precise measurement analytics used might be contested depending on the varying viewpoints of different stakeholders. From the interviews to date, we have some limited anecdotal evidence of outcomes, which cannot be verified. However, the report does reflect any reported significant outcomes.

*Measurements of Success*: Following from the comments about outcomes above, there appear to be no documented significant measures of success that had been agreed by all EICS Partners.

*Value for Money (VFM)*: One of the specification research questions was to comment on the VFM aspect of the Summit. While we referenced HM Treasury’s Green Book (2022) for guidance on how to appraise policies in relation to VFM, and consulted with DCMS on how a VFM approach might be adapted to the cultural sector, there appears to be no viable methodology that can be applied sensibly to an initiative such as EICS. Industry conference methodologies, triple bottom line and Social Return on Investment (SROI) approaches could be researched further.

*2020 Online Summit*: As described in the Interim Report, plans for the anticipated in-person Summit in 2020 were replaced by an online programme of events due to restrictions relating to the Covid pandemic. To a large extent the 2020 Summit was therefore an anomaly, and in most respects cannot be compared to the other Summits. Relevant data was drawn from the 2020 experience and used in the Report. However, we felt this merited additional attention and included a 2020 Summit case study as Appendix 10 of the Interim Report (but not repeated in this Final Report).

# 2. Organisation of the final report

This document is the Review’s Final Report.

The EICS Steering Group met on 26 September to consider the draft Final Report following a presentation by consultants, and any factual errors noted by the Partners were corrected. A meeting of the EICS Strategic Board to discuss the Final Report and its recommendations has been planned for 23 October.

This Final Report follows the same structure and chapter headings as the Interim Report to facilitate cross-referencing, although the numbering of sections has changed.

A description of the background to and history of the EICS that appeared in the Interim Report has been repeated in this Final Report. Also, at the request of Partners, some data that was analysed in the Interim Report appear again as Appendices to the Final Report.

When reference is made to “future Summit” or “future Summit-type activity,” this should be understood as meaning whatever project or initiative is developed in the future that follows on from the EICS.

Statements in “quotation marks” represent views expressed by participants in the research, or that appear in the formal evaluations undertaken by EICSF or Partners.

# 

# 

# 3. Brief Background to EICS

The Edinburgh International Cultural Summit was established in 2012 through the Edinburgh International Festival along with the founding Partners: British Council, the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish and UK Governments. The first Summit took place immediately following the Olympic Games that were held in London in 2012. Founding documents indicate that the values of the Summit echoed the values of the Olympic Games, “uniting people and nations in a celebration of achievement, excellence, and the best of humanity.”

The Summit aimed to bring together Culture Ministers from around the world, prominent artists and thinkers, and others who were responsible for the development and delivery of cultural policy and initiatives. The Summit aimed (from its early mission statements) to be a model for “peer-to-peer learning and exchange, the forging of connections, and an exploration of how the arts can enrich the lives of people around the world.”

A body called the Strategic Board of the EICS was created with representatives at ministerial or senior executive level from the founding Partners, and from 2016 included the EICS Foundation Chair. The Strategic Board has been chaired by the Presiding Officer or senior executive representative of the Scottish Parliament. A second body called the EICS Steering Group was also established comprising senior representation from each of the founding partners and the Foundation.

The first two Summits (2012 and 2014) were delivered as a special project of the Edinburgh International Festival. In 2014, an independent organisational structure was established called The Edinburgh International Cultural Summit Foundation (EICSF), which in 2016 became a charitable company limited by guarantee, with a Board of Trustees responsible for the production and promotion of the EICS. Sir Angus Grossart became the first Chair of the Foundation’s Board of Trustees and remained in this position until his death in 2022. The EICS Foundation was responsible for overseeing the Summit’s programme and delivery, and the raising of private sector funds. From 2016, the executive delivery of the Summit was the responsibility of a dedicated delivery team appointed by the Foundation, with contracts offered to all personnel on a time-limited project basis. In addition, the delivery team was supplemented through secondments drawn from the Partners. To date there have been no full-time staff working on the Summit. The only consistent executive leadership has been Sir Jonathan Mills.

Following the initial Summit in 2012, subsequent Summits took place in 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020 (online) and 2022 - six Summits in total. Currently, there are no specific plans for a Summit to be held in 2024, which is a matter still to be considered by the Partners.

Organising the Summit during the peak of the Edinburgh festivals season in August was considered to be an important draw to Summit delegates. The backdrop of what many believe is the world’s largest arts festival offered an unparalleled context for the experience of delegates. Hosted by the Presiding of the Scottish Parliament, Summit plenary sessions took place in the debating chamber of the Scottish Parliament during the summer recesses. Summit participants also attended closed roundtable sessions in the Scottish Parliament’s committee rooms. In addition, the Summit also encouraged bilateral and informal meetings between delegates. The exception to the in-person gatherings was the 2020 Summit, which was held online due to restrictions caused by the pandemic.

At the five live in-person Summits at the Parliament, networking receptions, as well as optional attendance at performances, visits and other activities were planned to enhance the experience of Summit delegates.

All Summit programmes were curated by the Summit delivery team, with Sir Jonathan Mills as Programme Director, and included both formal and informal speeches and presentations, and artistic interventions and performances. The titles of past Summits have been: *culture as an international dialogue* (2012), *culture as a currency of trust* (2014),  *building resilient communities* (2016), *connecting people and places* (2018), and *culture and education/culture and sustainability/culture and freedom* (2022). Each Summit also identified sub-themes relating to the core topic. Speakers at the six Summits have included government ministers, representatives of partner organisations/senior officials, over 70 specialist expert contributors, and artists/performers.

Over the years, the Summit attempted to expand the diversity of participants and contributors, widening youth representation, and developing connections with knowledge partners and international institutions. The 2022 Summit was programmed as a “hybrid” event combining digital and in-person contributions. In 2022, a new programme “Cultural Leadership Dialogues” was piloted. The inaugural Cultural Leadership Dialogue between UK and Australia comprised events at the Scottish Parliament and in Melbourne involving Ministers and professionals. A second Dialogue focused on Ukraine, bringing together representatives from the UK and Ukraine.

Influenced by the special online edition of the Summit of 2020, the Summit subsequently embarked on a post-Summit digital programme of panel discussions, in collaboration with key partners.

The model for the funding for the EICS can be characterised as a public-private partnership. There has been no rolling core funding in place. Public funders (British Council, Scottish and UK Governments, Edinburgh City Council) finance the Summit on an edition-to-edition basis, occasionally supplemented by one-off financing towards specific initiatives. The EICS Foundation has successfully raised additional finance from commercial sponsors, trusts, foundations, and private donors. In addition to direct financial contributions, there has been significant indirect or in-kind support from each of the founding partners, as well as from other types of partnerships (e.g., knowledge partners) and supporters.

# 4. EICS Review Findings

## 4.1 Vision and Purpose

The Summit’s articulation of its vision 2012-2022 has remained broadly consistent across the 10-year period of the Summit, although there is considerable overlap in the formulation of vision, objectives and outcomes (Appendix 1 summarises Partner objectives in 2012. Appendix 2 lists Summit outcomes 2012-2022). Partners appear open to further refinement of the Summit’s core vision most frequently described as providing “a forum for discussion about the role and value of culture and to encourage dialogue amongst and between policy makers and artists”. The interviews evidenced what was described as “mission creep” however, with new language and concepts being added from Summit to Summit, leading to external confusion about the EICS fundamental purpose.

Although there has been uncertainty expressed by the majority of those interviewed about what the EICS vision is, when prompted there was little opposition from most to the Summit’s broad intentions and aspirations. A considerable majority of those interviewed believed that it is not the vision itself that should be questioned, but the method of delivering the vision.

Most participants believed that the current EICS vision needed to be “refreshed” and “be made more attractive” with language that has “more power and impact” to make it more relevant to cultural stakeholders, with a stronger “call to take action,” “and for those actions to bring results” and “make a difference”.

The interviews identified phrases that might be included in the development of a future vision, including:

* “*A platform for provocative and rich conversations”*
* *“Linking to the aspirations of Edinburgh’s international festivals as thought leaders.”*
* *“An embodiment of 21st Century Enlightenment, a place of new ideas and fresh thinking”*
* *“A practical pathway towards a stronger, bolder future with culture at its centre”*
* *“A place to come together to help shape the future of culture and arts in a changing world”*
* *“To contribute to the creative well-being of societies around the world”*
* *“Intimacy of scale, generosity of time, diversity of voice and creative immersion will combine to spark lateral thinking, imaginative intuitions and collective discernment of new approaches to global cultural challenges”*

Such thoughts should now be assembled into what might be used as the basis of a renewed vision statement for any initiative that follows the EICS.

The purpose of the Summit was discussed in interviews. The intention of bringing diverse and international cultural stakeholders together (especially policymakers and those active in the cultural field) through a live in-person gathering was considered important, and perhaps even more urgent now than was the case at the Summit’s inception in 2012. The diverse views about the relative importance of the participation of Ministers of Culture appears later in this report.

Although the exchange of ideas and sharing of experience may have been of considerable value, and the insights gained through conversation and thought-provoking experts and thinkers were beneficial, the absence of rigorous follow-up to each Summit was a consistent criticism expressed by interviewees. There was a strong feeling that the Summit’s approach and proceedings would benefit from greater focus, with more attention paid to the pressing need for cultural action and change, and more proactive follow up activity (e.g., through dissemination of Summit content, further research, monitoring and a robust evaluation of progress). To achieve this would require a shift from the Summit’s preoccupation with staging a “one-off event” every two years to “a process of change” of which the Summit is “but one staging post on a longer and sustainable journey.”

## 4.2 Governance, Partners and Management

### 4.2.1 Governance and Partners

The detailed review of documentation relating to the involvement of the founding Partners in EICS (and its model of governance combining a Strategic Board, Steering Group and Foundation) highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the current governance system, in particular:

* The uniqueness and value of the partnership between the Scottish and UK Governments, with the British Council.
* The shared commitment between Partners of resources (direct and in-kind) to the Summit.
* The loss of knowledge and experience as a result of frequent changes in Partner representatives on the Strategic Board and Steering Committee across the 10-year period of the Summit.
* The ineffectiveness of the complex structure characterised by slow decision-making and weak oversight.
* The tendency for the Steering Group and Partners to focus on operational details, often noted as “micro-management” rather than policy direction.

The views of Partners and those directly involved in EICS governance were consistent in expressing the need either to streamline the current system or create a more efficient alternative, dependent of course on what type of initiative would replace the Summit in the future, and the governance demands that would be required for it.

Interviewees shared views about the roles of each of the current Partners, and how they may be changed or enhanced in any future Summit-type activity. The most consistently expressed views are summarised below.

#### Scottish Government

Buy-in by the Scottish Government to whatever follows on from the EICS was seen to be essential. The Summit was instigated and championed by a Cabinet Minister who invested considerable effort in demonstrating its potential and value. Although continued political support will be vital, it was felt any future iteration should be integrated strategically into the Scottish Government’s policies and priorities, especially in the field of culture and creative industries. Findings suggest the Summit should, to ensure impact, form a major component of Scotland’s newly created International Cultural Strategy, linked firmly to the objectives of promoting international cultural cooperation and exchange, showcasing what Scotland has to offer, and being part of global cultural networks. Interviewees suggested the Summit should be utilised as a powerful tool to profile Scotland as a thought leader, not only in culture but also in education, the environment, social justice and human rights. Frequent references were made in interviews to Scotland’s association with the Enlightenment to frame the Summit, and the exceptional iconic power of the Edinburgh festivals that offer a unique context. Interviewees also suggested that the Scottish Government should exploit the potential of its International Offices in drawing attention to any future Summit-type activity, and as a focal point for the promotion of Scottish culture and creative industries.

#### UK Government

Unanimous views were expressed about the value of the partnership between the Scottish and UK Governments in the Summit, and that this should remain in any future Summit-type activity. The UK Government’s importance in mobilising the power of the UK as a whole around cultural exchange, and its capacity to maximise the potential of the UK creative industries, was frequently mentioned. There were strong suggestions that whatever happens next, the UK Government should be “more proactive” in creating an alliance of specialist interests for a future initiative within DCMS, FCDO and DBT. In particular, significant interest was raised in the potential of actively involving the governments of Wales and Northern Ireland, and building on the strong relations that existed between the Arts Council of England, Arts Council Wales and Wales Arts International, the Arts Council of Northern Ireland and Creative Scotland, as well as “actively promoting connections between the cultural departments of all four Home Nations” in future planning.

#### British Council

There was widespread acknowledgement of the important role played by the British Council in the Summit as the UK’s primary agency in promoting cultural relations. Beyond direct funding to the Summit since its inception, the British Council has provided substantial in-kind resources through staff time and the generous use of internal budgets linked to the Council’s programmes. Many interviewees commented on the value of the knowledge, contacts and global reach of the British Council working with people in over 200 countries, with offices on the ground in 100 countries. Several interviewees (both external to the British Council and internal staff) believed that any future Summit-type project should become a “flagship for the British Council” aligned with its work in arts and creative industries, and its promotion of cultural exchange and the UK’s creative talent. Current British Council projects such as Momentum and collaborative international projects in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England were viewed as important assets that could strengthen the importance of any future Summit. Concerns were also expressed however, about the “slowness” and “bureaucratic approach” of British Council decision-making and its need to “follow UK government priorities.” In interviews, the British Council stated it would be able to address such concerns in the management of any future Summit-type project.

#### Edinburgh International Festival

Concern was expressed by some of those interviewed at the perceived separation between the EICS and the EIF, with the Summit being viewed as “operating in parallel to both EIF and other festivals in Edinburgh” rather than being an “integrated part of the entire Edinburgh festivals offer.” Since its inception, EIF has been a champion of promoting the exchange of ideas, the deepening of understanding between cultures and showcasing the finest artistic talents from around the world. The significant expertise of EIF in terms of curation, international contacts, event management and fundraising has not been utilised by the Summit, and interviews confirmed that the interchange between the Summit and the EIF and other festivals has been “very limited”. From interviews, it appears that EIF may wish to become more actively involved with any future Summit-type activity that could be aligned to its vision (i.e., of EIF offering a platform for discussion, debate and conversation), and its firm interest in promoting international cultural collaboration and exchange. EIF might consider embracing and integrating a future re-designed Summit-type activity within its organisation and its programme offer, but meeting their own conditions to ensure quality. Concerns were expressed by some that “too much control” by EIF over a future Summit might inhibit close collaboration with Edinburgh’s other international festivals and that EIF influence might lead to “too narrow a focus on an EIF interpretation of the arts”, rather than the wider aspects of the cultural ecology and creative industries that any future Summit might champion. A few believed that EIF should be offering a platform for discussion between artists, the public and others anyway within its current programme, and were uncertain of what the “added value” would be to a future Summit if it became “yet another project” exclusively managed by EIF. However, there was a consistent view that close involvement of EIF expertise in any future Summit-type activity would be a “considerably important and needed asset.”

#### EICS Foundation

Different views were conveyed about the role and work of the EICSF. The Foundation saw its trustees as having been visible in the membership of the Strategic Board, facilitation of Summit sessions, attending and speaking at diplomatic briefings and networking events and hosting dinners for delegates. Many non-Foundation interviewees recognised the “undoubted success of the Foundation in raising substantial funds from the private sector,” its “superb work in making the Summit happen often under difficult circumstances,” and the “high quality of the Summit programme, speakers and contributors,” while others viewed the Foundation (especially its Board of Trustees) as “somewhat opaque” and “too Scotland-based for an international project.” Several interviewees recommended that the EICSF Board of Trustees should in future encompass “a significantly wider range of international expertise” and focus its attention “on external fundraising beyond the small pool of Scotland.” It is noted that the EICSF had recently appointed a new very experienced Chair and new trustees to extend its international expertise and academic connections. It is assumed that the role and membership of the Foundation and its operational functionality would be reviewed on the basis of the needs of a future Summit or its replacement. A strong view emerged from the interviews that whatever future is decided for the Summit, its governance should be “independent and arm’s length from government control” and have the capability to raise public and private funds that would help guarantee the autonomy and quality of the Summit. There was widespread support for what is perceived as a “rewarding and successful public-private partnership.”

#### Scottish Parliament

The involvement of the Scottish Parliament was greatly valued by all, in particular its generous hosting of the Summit, the help and support of Parliament staff, and the role of the Parliament’s Presiding Officer in chairing Summit proceedings. Comments about the suitability of the Parliament as the main location for the Summit appears later in this report in the section on Operations. From a governance perspective, although the equal role of the Parliament as one of the five founding Partners of the Summit was deemed appropriate and very much welcomed, some of those interviewed commented on the confusion of a project formally led “by two governments and one Parliament.” Although not at all calling into question the value of the Scottish Parliament’s involvement, nor the participation of Parliamentarians in any future Summit, several believed that the Scottish Parliament “was of a different order of partner,” and its role in a future governance model should be reviewed. Although disputed by some, this view was echoed in many interviews including with representatives of the Scottish Parliament itself, given the Parliament’s recent review of its major events policy.

### 4.2.2 Future Governance Options

Three alternative future governance options were tested in consultation workshops held with representatives of the six EICS Partners in August 2023 (see Appendix 3 - EICS Review Options Consultation Workshop - Summary Report) alongside options for future Summit delivery models.

Five main governance competencies are outlined below.:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Does the governance model offer strong strategic leadership, including from an international perspective? | Will the model have the capacity to set direction within a clear framework and ethos of values, take decisions efficiently, encompass international experience and representation, and collaborate effectively with all partners? |
| 2 | Does the governance model have the capacity for accountability? | Will the model demonstrate strong oversight of finance, financial management, compliance to statutory and contractual requirements, self-review and external accountability to funders and partners? |
| 3 | Will the governance model have the capability to build a highly effective delivery team? | Will the model attract a highly experienced team with strong skill sets necessary to achieve results with performance management at the highest level? |
| 4 | Will the governance model have independence of action, flexibility and skills to deliver efficiently? | Will the model inspire confidence of all stakeholders (including public, private and cultural sector interests) and be capable of acting with independence to deliver a world-class event? |
| 5 | Will the governance model have the capacity to raise funds from the private and non-governmental sector? | Will the model be capable of raising considerable funds from the private sector, foundations and other non-governmental sources while maintaining the strong support of public-sector partners? |

A detailed summary of Partner responses to the governance options, including a provisional combined scoring of each option, can be found in Appendix 3.

The governance options considered and discussed were as follows, incorporating the advantages and disadvantages gathered through the workshops:

#### Option 1: Continue current model

Continue current governance and delivery model with the components of a Steering Group and Strategic Board, with a continuation of the EICS Foundation as the independent legal entity tasked with the final responsibility for fundraising from the private sector and the curatorial and operational delivery of the Summit (or alternative future model). This option anticipated re-definition of each of the components of the current governance model and a clarification of roles and responsibilities of each Partner to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

##### Advantages / disadvantages

The main advantage of this option was in ensuring the continued direct involvement and responsibility of the Partners, utilising their combined strengths and resources, with the Foundation having final accountability for delivery and fundraising. The main disadvantage of this option was the complication of such a structure which, even with streamlining, might remain time-consuming in effort and reporting, and still result in specific tasks and lines of responsibility remaining blurred.

#### Option 2: Single-purpose Foundation

Develop a single purpose Foundation as the sole entity responsible for all aspects of policy, strategy, delivery and financing, comprising both members nominated by each of the founding Partners and/or other key stakeholders, as well as other members with appropriate experience. The Board of the Foundation should reflect diversity in its membership and include several trustees with significant international cultural experience and reputation, and others with connections of benefit to fundraising from the private sector and foundations, not only in Scotland. Strong youth representation should be incorporated into the Foundation’s structure. The Foundation should have an independent Chair not linked directly to any of the major funders.

##### Advantages / disadvantages

The main advantage of this option was its clarity in terms of responsibility and accountability, combining the direct involvement of Partners with appropriate external expertise, as well as the independence of the structure. The main disadvantage was the potential withdrawal of direct interest of certain Partners, and the complexity and time required to create a Foundation that is entirely “fit for a new purpose” with adequate international and fundraising expertise.

#### Option 3: Integrate into another organisation

Fold all or part of the responsibility for the EICS (or future alternative) into the organisation of an existing Partner (or other organisation) as the legal entity and overall delivery mechanism, with a specialist committee of advisers for the project. Two possibilities suggested during the Review were the inclusion of the project into the structure of either the Edinburgh International Festival or the British Council (with both organisations having experience of such arrangements).

##### Advantages / disadvantages

The main advantage of this option was placing the Summit within an existing governance framework with a proven track record, and a well-functioning organisation with expertise, strong credentials and a recognised history of impact and achievement. The main disadvantage was the possible loss of autonomy for the Summit, or competition with the host organisation’s other programmes and competing strategic and fundraising priorities.

The main reservation expressed about hosting by the British Council was its apparent requirement to adhere to the UK government's political priorities, and thereby not having sufficient freedom of manoeuvre or the sensitivity to avoiding risks that may arise with controversial topics or polarising debates linked to global cultural challenges. The concern about EIF hosting centred around whether it was interested in collaborating fully with Edinburgh’s other international festivals, and its primary focus on finite components of arts practice.

Each of the options above (EIF, BC) assumes the recruitment of a specialist executive delivery team and the appointment of a strong international programme advisory board (suggested by a large majority of interviewees), as well as sufficient financial resource to manage and deliver any future Summit-type initiative to an international standard, while maintaining the current principle of a public-private partnership.

Although different perspectives were shared by the workshop participants, Option 2 (Single purpose Foundation) and Option 3 (Integrate into another organisation) were favoured strongly.

During the process of this Review, discussions have taken place with the current Chair of the EICS Foundation concerning Option 2, and separately with the British Council and the Edinburgh International Festival (the two organisations that indicated a willingness to consider hosting a future iteration of the EICS) concerning Option 3. Both governance models are viable alternatives. The governance of a future Summit-type activity will require further reflection by EICS Partners.

### 4.2.3 Management

The Review examined roles of the EICSF delivery team, and included the views of EICSF delivery staff, Partner representatives, Foundation trustees and Summit participants in relation to EICS management.

Interviews reinforced the view of the “talented and hard-working” personnel of the Foundation, and the ways in which the professional staff enhanced the reputation of the Summit. Three issues were consistently highlighted, however:

First was the “project-based” approach to recruitment of the management and delivery teams. All EICSF management and delivery roles were part-time and freelance as a result of limited funding. The consequences of this approach are the frequent loss of knowledge and skills due to staff turnover, a lack of continuity and inconsistency in processes and procedures, and an inability to follow-up on activity between Summits. Many criticisms levelled at the Summit (e.g., operational problems leading up to and during Summit proceedings) are due to a combination of capacity and the failure to secure long-term funding to secure a consistent skilled staff team.

Second, weaknesses were raised in internal management practices including unclear or too many centralised decision-making processes in an organisation described in some interviews as a “one man show,” but with respect for the undoubted talents of the “one man.”

These management issues are perceived as major problems which will need to be addressed in the management of any future Summit-type project. Looking forward, consideration of Fair Work practices in relation to the recruitment, contracting, appraisal and payment of staff should also be a consideration for best practice.

## 4.3 Operations

The Review analysed the processes and problems involved in inviting Ministers, government delegations and other stakeholders to Summits, and the detailed operational planning and delivery of the Summit as a whole.

### 4.3.1 Invitations

Concerning the invitation process, major strengths were cited as to the reach of the British Council’s global network, the consensual decision-making by Partners concerning priority countries (as defined by them) and the collective efforts made to attract those invited. Weaknesses were also outlined in some detail, resulting in increasingly poor attendance from governments of priority countries and decreasing participation of Ministers of Culture (see Appendix 4).

Concerns focused on the process of invitations being too last-minute and reactive, and the ways in which governments were invited and approached. While some believed that the final attendance at any ministerial event was always likely to be unpredictable, others insisted that the inefficiency and timing of the invitation process and the appeal of the Summit’s offer were the major causes of disappointing attendance by key government decision-makers. Interviews with representatives of the consular and diplomatic corps suggested that the timing of invitations and the attractiveness of the Summit’s offer were the key issues to be addressed if senior government representatives were to be attracted.

Interviews with representatives of the cultural sector across Scotland and the UK reinforced the view of feeling “marginalised” from the Summit, and that the selection of cultural invitees was “inconsistent,” “tokenistic,” “based more on personal connections than representation” and often “last minute”.

### 4.3.2 Operational Delivery

Although the majority of those interviewed recognised the commitment and dedication of the Summit’s operational teams, there was substantial criticism around aspects of communication, planning and timing. The fundamental cause of these may indeed have been due in part (as referred to in the previous section on Management) to insufficient resourcing, the “project-based” part-time nature of the EICSF team and uncertainty around funding. The evidence gathered also demonstrates certain shortcomings in the operational processes used by EICSF. However, a detailed evaluation of the Summit’s operational procedures and processes and the measures required to overcome problems were not components of the specification for this Review and so has not been addressed.

### 4.3.3 The Scottish Parliament as Summit Venue

An important question in the delivery of the Summit was the suitability of its primary location, the Scottish Parliament. Viewpoints were mixed. Although the majority of Summit participants recognised the “prestige,” “gravitas” and “symbolic importance” of the Parliament’s debating chamber, and its attractiveness to participants (especially to international delegations and contributors) the chamber’s layout created considerable constraints in the convening of informal conversations.

Although suitable for more formal plenary sessions with conventional speeches, presentations, questions and comments from the floor, the space was not felt to be the most suitable for the style of exchange desired by the Summit (e.g., “dialogue amongst and between artists and policy-makers,” “forum for discussion,” “free exchange within a marketplace of ideas”).

Views about the success of the roundtables were varied also. These were held in committee rooms and ancillary spaces of the Parliament. In interviews there were serious criticisms of “overcrowding” in these rooms, difficulties in “navigating the Parliament building” (in spite of signposting and guiding) and limitations for informal conference activities.

Depending on timing, it is sometimes difficult to secure confirmation of the use of the Parliament building more than 18 months before an event which may be problematic for longer-term event planning. In terms of the security requirements of the Scottish Parliament (although meeting the needs of certain Ministers and visiting delegations sensitive to security risks), there were also frequent complaints of “queuing for entry” or other restrictions necessitated by security arrangements.

Responsibility for the use of the Scottish Parliament building for major events like the Summit is overseen by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body. The use of the Scottish Parliament for past Summits was viewed positively by many, but it should be known that there are increasing demands on the building. A recent review of the Parliament’s major events policy suggests prioritising its use for events that increase the reach of the Parliament’s engagement and the diversity of those engaging with the Parliament. Therefore, any future Summit-type event would need to ensure that it supported these aims.

A feasible and appropriate use of the Scottish Parliament in any future Summit-type event might be to host its formal opening session, followed by the use of other venues in the city that are more appropriate and suitable, while recognising that Edinburgh in August “is a very crowded place”. No interviewee suggested the total abandonment of the Scottish Parliament for any future Summit; the widespread view was that the Parliament “had an important symbolic role” and its use as a location should continue, but only “when it suited the nature and style of the proceedings.”

### 4.3.4 Timing and Dates

A significant majority of those interviewed believed the main justification to hold the Summit was the backdrop of the Edinburgh festivals in August. The context was not only a substantial draw to delegates and participants but also seen to offer an unparalleled opportunity (unlike any other conference) to experience and showcase the “energy” and “excitement” of the city in August.

Although not all Summit participants took advantage of attending festival performances and exhibitions, the “creative atmosphere” that surrounded the Summit and the “explosive range of artistic expression on display” was in itself felt to be a “poignant message” that added considerable value to the discussions and conversations during the Summit itself. Almost all of those interviewed felt that “not enough was made of the connection between the Summit experience and what was happening outside” and that this needed to be addressed in any future Summit-type project that should aim to “interrelate” more with the festivals.

A small number of interviewees however, believed that holding the Summit in August presented several major insurmountable challenges that included the cost of accommodation and travel, the difficulty attracting media attention, and coinciding with the holiday period of some delegates and participants such as those representing certain international institutes and organisations. Some believed that the additional activity of a Summit was unnecessary and created a further burden on Edinburgh-based participants and speakers, as well as the Edinburgh consular corps and diplomats, artists and others who were already overstretched with commitments.

Both the advantages and disadvantages of holding any future Summit-type project in August during the festivals were apparent to all. Although there was divided opinion, the considerable majority of interviewees favoured maintaining the August date for any future Summit-type event, but with planning to integrate the Summit with the creative activity that surrounds it.

## 4.4 Finance

### 4.4.1. Overview

Due to insufficient reliable data, the Interim Report was rather inconclusive concerning the finances of the EICS and EICSF. Further discussions with EICSF staff however, and the re-presentation of available financial data has led to a more complete understanding of Summit costs and income.

In any future iteration of the EICS steps should be taken to harmonise and simplify financial reporting systems to reduce complexity, for the purposes of analysis and increased transparency and accountability. The difficulties in the interpretation of EICS financial data are described below:

* The Summits were biennial, and so the planning, preparatory and delivery costs were necessarily spread over three financial years. The formal accounting years and procedures of the Partners varied.
* Public funding was determined in line with the internal budget agreements with each EICS Partner, while private funding was an ongoing process without guarantees. Public EICS Partners appear not to have been involved in any clear overall and detailed fundraising strategy.
* The EICSF took responsibility for raising funds from the private sector. There is no documentary evidence of a clear strategy being in place, although considerable donations were raised. Despite the unpredictability of the final outcome, EICSF had consistent success in meeting (and frequently exceeding) the notional 50/50 public/private income targets.
* Funding from public and private sources was subject to different decision-making procedures and timescales, and these often did not coincide with the EICSF planning and delivery requirements.
* Aspects of Summit budgets were iterative and changing. Programme development was often responsive and opportunistic to income generating opportunities. Precise costs were dependent on the number of delegates confirming attendance (often not until close to the start of each Summit), which resulted in variances in costs related to Summit hospitality, excursions and festival performance attendance.

Appendix 8 itemises EICSF expenditure for the period 2015-2022, analysed by financial years, and covers the accumulated direct costs of the 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022 Summits. As stated, costs of any given Summit have often spread over a three-year period.

Until 2019, financial records were manual and not digitised, and so the detailed analysis of financial data relating to earlier Summits was only possible by time-consuming scrutiny of paper documents. For this reason, the analysis for this Review was confined to the 2022 Summit to address two fundamental questions: 1) What was the cost of the 2022 Summit? 2) What were the sources of income for the 2022 Summit?

### 4.4.2 Cost of 2022 Summit

Focusing on the 2022 Summit alone, based on the most accurate figures available, the direct cost of the Summit itself was c.£650k. Some additional costs for evaluation work and finalising end of year accounts etc., should be added to this figure. This accords with approximate figures given (from memory) in interviews with executive staff of the Foundation (figures varied from £600k-£800k for the cost of each Summit).

A precise additional cost was given for direct additional expenditure relating to the Ukraine Cultural Leadership Dialogues which was c.£27.5k, the source of income for which was the British Council.

The cost to EICSF of the UK/Australia Cultural Leadership Dialogues in Edinburgh and Melbourne was c.£96k. These figures exclude in-kind costs which were covered by the British Council, Scottish Parliament and University of Melbourne. Sources of income for these Dialogues included British Council Australia (£25k), High Commission Australia in London (£50k) and Arts Council Australia (c. £21k).

However, the question of the “total” cost of the Summit is more complex since it combines both the direct costs (as cited above) and additional (and substantial) in-kind/indirect costs. In-kind/indirect costs for past Summits have included the following:

* Cost of the Scottish Parliament (including security, but excluding additional staffing and broadcasting over core hours, and Summit hospitality (teas, coffees, lunches etc). If the Summit took place when the building was closed to the public, although significant additional costs would be incurred, the Summit had exclusive use of the Parliament building which had distinct advantages.
* Travel and accommodation costs for most official delegates (paid by delegations themselves, with some exceptions where costs of air fares and/or accommodation in Edinburgh were covered by the British Council).
* Costs of civic and government receptions.
* Costs of Summit contributors (including fees) that were covered directly by academic institutions or knowledge partners, such as the Aga Khan Foundation.
* Unpaid volunteer time, although volunteers were given training, daily expenses and hospitality.
* Costs of staff time and travel of EICS Partner organisations involved in the preparation and delivery of the Summit (Scottish Government, UK Government, British Council, Scottish Parliament).

If the estimated value of all the above in-kind contributions is combined with the actual direct costs incurred by the EICSF (staffing, programme, travel, communication, hosting, etc.), the total actual cost of the 2022 Summit is estimated to be in excess of £1 million. In-kind contributions were estimated on the basis of discussions with Partners, and assumptions were made of average travel and accommodation costs by delegations as well as other in-kind costs listed above.

### 4.4.3 Income for 2022 Summit

The precise breakdown of income for the 2022 Summit is summarised as follows:

Partner Income £270,000

Private Donors £122,500

Trusts/Foundations £183,576

Corporate Donors £ 80,000

Other Public Funding £ 5,000

Total £661,076

The analysis of all sources of income for the EICSF 2015-2022 demonstrates the ratio of accumulated public/private income over a seven-year period: 42.9% public authorities / 57.1% private sector (combining private donors, corporate donors, trusts and foundations). For the 2022 Summit, the ratio of public/private income was 41.6% public authorities / 58.4% private sector.

It should be noted that funds remaining after the 2022 Summit have been used to cover the basic costs of continuing essential services of the ECSF, including for example: maintenance, renewal of domain names, subscription services, office software and one part-time freelance staff member to support the Foundation and the Review process.

## 4.5 Participants and Stakeholders

### 4.5.1 Overview

The table of International Delegations 2012-2022 appears as Appendix 4 to this report. Inconsistent record keeping over the timeframe prevented a full analysis however as there were variations between published intended participant lists and actual attendance due to last-minute cancellations and additions. However, from the data available key facts included:

* 60% of the 81 countries that had sent international delegations attended more than one of the six Summits; 20% attended more than four Summits. The available data suggests that the only country outside the UK and Scotland that attended all six Summits was Japan.
* Decision-makers from governments of “priority countries” (as defined by UK and Scottish Governments) have not attended Summits with any consistency.
* The percentage of ministerial delegations attending Summits has fluctuated from a high of 72% of total delegations in 2014, falling to 63% in 2016, 49% in 2018, and 47% in 2020 (online) and recovering to 89% in 2022 (hybrid).
* The 2022 Summit was the first to offer a hybrid approach to attendance, with several countries sending an in person delegation of government or consular representatives, with a Minister joining online.
* However, ministerial attendance (in-person or online) has often been restricted to a single contribution at a Summit session, rather than participation in the Summit as a whole. The analysis of data of Summit participation suggests that only a small number of Ministers personally engaged with the entire proceedings of a Summit including roundtables.
* 11 countries had delegations of returning participants. Only rarely did the same Minister represent a country in more than one Summit due to the frequency of ministerial change (with the notable exception of Scotland).

Further analysis undertaken of Summit delegations has considered participation in relation to the Global North/South divide, G20 countries, Commonwealth states and European Union member states:

* Global North/South: Global North includes North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and parts of East Asia. Global South includes Africa, Latin America, China, less developed nations of Asia, parts of the Middle East, Ukraine, Russia. The average ratio of countries from the Global North/South across six Summits was 60% North/ 40% South. In 2022, hybrid attendance (in person and online) was 58% North/ 42% South.
* European Union (27 States): Eight EU States have never been represented at a Summit (Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Portugal. Sweden, Slovakia). The average number of EU states represented across six Summits was six EU member states. Only Ireland and Latvia have attended more than two Summits. The EU Commission was only officially represented at the Summits of 2012 and 2014.
* Commonwealth: 25 of the 56 Commonwealth states have attended at least one Summit.
* G20: The average number of G20 countries represented across six Summits was 10 (50%). In 2022, hybrid attendance (in person and online) was 10 G20 countries.

### 4.5.2 Ministerial Participation

There were different views expressed by each partner organisation on the relative value and importance of ministerial participation in Summits. Depending on the interviewee, views varied from ministerial attendance being considered essential or very important, to unnecessary and unimportant. Political interviewees were generally at the “very important” end of the spectrum, while non-government policymakers and representatives from the cultural sector were around the “unimportant” end. Most agreed that “some ministerial involvement would be an important component of a future Summit, “depending on the level of interest and nature of the contribution made by a Minister”.

From a ministerial perspective, the attractiveness of the Summit depended largely on “which other Ministers would be attending and from which countries”, “the potential for meaningful bilateral discussions”, “the relevance of the themes/topics under discussion”, “the total time-commitment required”, and in terms of the festivals, “if their country was being strongly represented”.

Other constraints that were mentioned included the cost of travel (unless supported, for example by the British Council) and accommodation (“extremely expensive in Edinburgh”), especially for smaller countries. For some Ministers, the timing of the Summit was difficult as it coincided with holiday season, which was “not insurmountable” if the event was considered to be of “national importance and personally engaging.” Several countries mentioned that their attendance had been influenced by “political issues” and “relations with the UK” at the time of invitation between the UK and their country. As indicated earlier, EICS did develop a hybrid approach in 2022 which was welcomed by countries where ministers were unable to travel. In 2022 most countries participated at sessions in the Scottish Parliament with an in- person delegation of government representatives, some of whom were members of the UK diplomatic core.

Overall, the view of those interviewed was that if a smaller number of Ministers was targeted to attend a Summit “on the basis of geography, size of country, theme, or importance of the contribution to be made by each Minister,” ministerial attendance would be significantly higher than an open, ill-defined invitation to a large number of Ministers. Many commented that ministerial participation should be “broader than Ministers responsible for culture” depending on the topic.

It was also suggested that Ministers would prefer “selective round tables that were specifically organised for them and in their interest,” “in a Chatham House setting” and “that focused on discussion of relevant and topical issues of importance to governments'' rather than being “one of a rather arbitrary diverse group”. In addition, having a “focused discussion that led to tangible results and actions'' was preferred. That being said, several Ministers appreciated the input of high-level experts and the sharing of experience within smaller bilateral meetings at the margins of the Summit. A substantially different and more targeted approach to the issuing of invitations to any future Summit-type events was recommended.

### 4.5.3 Contributors and Knowledge Partners

Uncertainty and lack of documentation about relationships with contributors and knowledge partners created challenges for a full analysis. The findings can be summarised as:

* Although in the Summits 2012-2016 male contributors dominated the Summit programmes, the gender balance was more equal in 2018, 2020 and 2022.
* Interviewees commented on a “western” bias in speakers, although it appears the Summit has been taking steps to address this. In particular, much praise was given to partners such as the Aga Khan Trust for Culture.
* There has been consistent support from knowledge and programme partners that has brought benefits to the Summits, with added value due to the strong relations between partners and the EICSF, in particular its Programme Director.
* The list of knowledge partners does not sufficiently reflect many of the global priorities that have underpinned themes of the Summit (climate, diversity, cultural rights etc).

## 4.6 Programme

### 4.6.1 Overview

Key findings from the review of Summit programmes are as follows:

* The vision, knowledge, skill, experience and connections brought to the Summit by the ECSF’s Programme Director was clearly acknowledged and commended.
* The expert contributors and artist performers at Summits have generally been of exceptionally high quality and world-class in terms of their interventions and presentations and have been recognized as highlights of past Summits.
* In general, there was disappointment in the contribution of Ministers who often used Summits as “platforms to state their own cultural achievements rather than contributing to discussions.”
* The Summit programmes were viewed by many to be “over-curated” with too limited opportunity for informal networking and conversation.
* The Summits did not achieve the open dialogue that had been intended, especially in the plenary sessions.
* In general, the themes of past Summits were believed to be relevant but often “too broad and general” with some elements repeated from previous Summits.
* The breakout or roundtable policy discussions were generally viewed as “interesting and productive,” but improvements were necessary to allow for more in-depth debate and exchange amongst participants.
* Documentation suggests there was no follow up to the reports of Summit sessions.
* There were mixed reactions to the organisation of bilateral meetings that took place at the Summits. While new connections were often made and felt to be “useful,” there was frequently limited or no follow-up. Often, connections that were made with government senior cultural policy officials, independent expert contributors and artists attending were more valuable than ministerial contacts. The exception was the bilateral meetings with Scotland’s Cabinet Ministers who greatly valued the Summit opportunity to meet and exchange views with peers from other countries, and the ongoing dialogue that continued with some.
* No systems were in place at any of the Summits regarding feedback from bilateral or informal meetings that took place.
* Due to the frequent changes of Ministers of Culture (with the notable exception of Scotland) and role of government officials, it is unknown whether bilateral discussions of any Summit ever led to concrete results.
* Generally, Summit participants greatly valued the informal settings for breaks, lunches and teas, although these were often felt to be “too crowded” and were “victim to Summit sessions running overtime.”
* Cultural performances across the Summits were well received and added value to each Summit.
* Attendees generally spoke positively about the complementary programme of festival performances and excursions, although the final attendance of delegates at these were disappointing, with many “dropouts’ at the last minute. The relatively low interest in the extra events resulted in the cancellation of some.

### 4.6.2 Cultural Leadership Dialogues

The Ukraine Cultural Leadership Dialogue (in partnership with the Ukrainian Institute and British Council) and the Australian Cultural Leadership Dialogue (programmes as part of the UK/Australia season of cultural exchange in partnership with Australia Council for the Arts, Australian High Commission London, British Council, Scottish Parliament and the University of Melbourne) were hosted by the 2022 Summit. Reports of the two dialogues were published on the EICSF website.

Most interviewees involved in the Dialogues spoke positively about the experience that offered “more depth and focus on themes” and suggested that the Dialogues could be a future model for Summits. Several commented that although valuable, the Dialogues suffered from the same problem as the Summit in terms of few tangible long-term outcomes, although too little time has elapsed to make any firm judgement about the results or what actions may be followed up by participants.

### 4.6.3 Youth Engagement

A youth programme was integrated into the 2018 and 2022 Summits.

The National Youth Arts Advisory Committee (NYAAG) was a knowledge partner of the 2018 Summit, and with the Scottish Youth Parliament (SYP) and the Scottish Youth Theatre (SYT) were Youth Partners in the 2022 Summit. An EICSF document (2020) states that “the Summit is committed to delivering a fully integrated youth programme, focusing on the age group 18-35.”

Analysis of the youth engagement component of Summits through the study of reports and interviews demonstrates that a range of activities were created in the lead up to and during the 2022 EICS, including youth participation in the Summit’s digital programme and the introduction of a monthly youth working group of representatives from NYAAG, SYT and SYP working in partnership with Creative Scotland. A pamphlet about NYAAG was also added to each delegate bag/online delegate pack.

At the 2022 Summit, data confirmed that:

* 13 of the 42 Summit contributors were aged 35 or under, an increase of 5% on Summit 2018.
* A disappointing number of delegations brought youth delegates with them in 2022 (a reduction on the number achieved in 2018). Other than Scotland, the only recorded delegations who brought youth delegates to the 2022 Summit were Kosovo, South Africa and Wales.
* Youth Partners formed a standalone delegation to represent EICS youth work.

The evaluation report of youth engagement in the 2022 contained mixed views from the youth participants. Many expressed that they felt “empowered to be invited,” that “their voices were heard and respected, and that they developed new skills through their participation. However, others believed that “their contributions were not put to good use,” that “Ministers were not really listening to them,” that “they had not built a sound knowledge of the Summit, the team or its functions,” and expressed some uncertainty that “their level of responsibility was appropriate”. Feelings of being “side-lined” were less pronounced in the evaluation of the 2022 Summit when compared to previous Summits.

From reports and interviews it was apparent that the youth involved in the Summits enjoyed working on and participating in them. However, a strong view emerged that the youth involvement and the EICS was “underdeveloped” and that “the opportunity to focus on the event’s outcomes were limited.” One view was that a future successful route might be to allow a younger generation to establish its own identity and audience, and then report collective views that emerged from this at the Summit. However, an evaluation report of youth engagement (2018) suggests that young people generally did not favour a separate event and preferred attendance at main Summit sessions.

For a future Summit-type event, key actions suggested in evaluations and interviews regarding youth involvement are summarised as:

* A longer-lead time and a robust plan to help delegations understand the importance of youth contributions, help identify appropriate youth delegates and increase their visibility.
* The inclusion of youth representatives in active roles in the Summit, with messages of commendation and continuing follow-up post-Summit.
* Integrating the youth voice into Summit research and programming, in consultations, and co-design, and increased engagement with the Summit team in the preparation of the Summit.
* Engagement with additional youth organisations in Scotland, the UK and at an international level, and taking into account marginalised young people on the basis of, for example, gender identity, global minorities and disability.
* The youth voice should be integrated into all aspects of Summit governance and management.
* Establish projects which have the potential to continue beyond each Summit cycle.
* Outcomes of youth engagement should be more clearly defined.

### 4.6.4 Topics and Themes for Future Summits

Each Summit 2012-2020 was programmed around a core title and several sub-themes which would shape the discussions. In 2022 this was reduced to two themes to allow more time for in-depth discussion. Themes are summarised in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Summit Year and Title | Themes | |  |
| 2012: Culture as an  International Dialogue | The role of the arts and culture in deepening and broadening our understanding of complex relationships between cultures and nations | Sustaining private and public support for culture | Skills for the future, for the creative industries and the role of technology |
| 2014: Culture – a  Currency of Trust | Values and measurements | Cultural Sustainability | Cultures and Nation Building |
| 2016: Culture – Building  Resilient Communities | Culture and Heritage | Culture and Economics | Culture and Participation |
| 2018: Culture –  Connecting People and  Places | Culture in a Networked World | Culture and Investment | Culture and Wellbeing |
| 2020 - The Transformative  Power of Culture | Culture and Education | Culture and Social Cohesion | Culture in Vibrant Communities |
| Culture Summit 2022 | Culture and Education | Culture and Sustainability |  |

Opinions on the themes by interviewees were mixed. In general there was agreement that past themes were appropriate and relevant, with the Culture and Wellbeing theme from 2018 highlighted as particularly successful and stimulating by several interviewees. Others suggested that themes were “too broad and general” with some elements repeated and “each edition felt too much like the others”.

During the interview process numerous suggestions were offered about topics and themes that might be considered for future Summit-type events. For the interest of EICS Partners, key suggestions are mentioned briefly below, although some have already been used in past Summits. The topics are not listed in any priority, and some are overlapping. However, they do illustrate primary interests from the sample of those interviewed for this Review:

**Art and activism**: Many artists, creatives and cultural practitioners are actively engaged in social and political activism, using their work as a platform to address pressing issues such as climate change, social justice, and human rights. The role of culture in peacebuilding, conflict resolution and reconciliation requires further reflection.

**Arts and mental health**: Examining the therapeutic benefits of engaging with art and cultural activities as a means of promoting mental health and well-being. Cultural practices that contribute to health, reducing feelings of isolation, stress reduction, helping to connect with cultural identities, and contributing to quality of life.

**Censorship and freedom of expression**: Artists and cultural organisations in various parts of the world are facing challenges related to censorship, freedom of expression, and government regulations. Promoting the freedom to imagine and create, and issues connected with the protection of cultural rights of all citizens, especially minorities and marginalised groups in society requires attention.

**Content creation and monetisation**: Creators are exploring new ways to monetise their content, such as through crowdfunding, subscription models, and the sale of digital assets like NFTs (Non-Fungible Tokens). Exploring issues such as platform dependency, income stability, monetisation ethics, content guidelines, and privacy concerns were all suggested.

**Creative and cultural industries**: Exploring and defining what constitutes the creative economy, recognising the interlinkages across a wide ecology and the difficulties of measuring impact across such a varied territory. How to deal with the informal economy of much creative work (independent artists, freelancers) and the difficulty of tracking and supporting intangible assets such as rights and IP. Reconciling sectoral issues and differences for culture (artistic freedom, right of access etc) and creative industries (business and technology). Gathering comparative reliable data due to global variability and determining the broader and comparative social impact of ‘creative industries’ internationally.

**Cultural appropriatio**n: Debates around cultural appropriation, where elements of one culture are borrowed or imitated by another, have sparked discussions about respect and ethical considerations in the arts. Harmful stereotypes leading to misrepresentation, power dynamics, disrespect, and profit and exploitation were topics that were suggested.

**Decolonisation**: There is a growing movement to decolonise the approach to cultural relations by revising cultural narratives to incorporate Indigenous perspectives. Efforts to revive and preserve Indigenous cultures, languages, and artistic traditions, involving close collaborations between Indigenous communities and cultural organisations were suggested by some interviewees as discussion topics.

**Digital transformation**: The digital age has significantly impacted how art and culture are created, distributed and consumed. Opening up new possibilities for artistic expression, challenging traditional boundaries and raising questions about the role of technology in creation are important issues. AI-generated art is sparking debates about authorship, creativity, and the role of humans in the creative process. The integration of virtual reality, augmented reality and mixed reality in education and creative development, allowing people to explore and create art in immersive digital environments. Cultural policy in the age of digital platforms is a topic favoured by several who were interviewed.  
  
**Diversity and inclusion**: There has been a growing emphasis on diversity and inclusion in cultural creation and consumption, with movements advocating for representation of marginalised communities and addressing issues of cultural appropriation. Exploring how gender, race, ethnicity, and other factors intersect cultural production, and addressing issues of representation and equity within these intersections. Engaging civil society in cultural governance is a pressing issue.

**Globalisation and hybridity**: The interconnectedness of cultures in a globalised world has led to the emergence of hybrid art forms and cultural identities, prompting discussions about authenticity and cultural fusion. Content creators are balancing global appeal with localised content to cater to diverse audiences worldwide. Rethinking identity politics requires attention.

**Intellectual Property:** Rights and fair compensation. Advocacy for fair compensation and royalties for creatives, especially in the digital era, has led to discussions on how to ensure creatives receive equitable earnings from their work. The regulatory landscape is evolving to address issues like copyright, online content moderation, and the rights of content creators in the digital age.  
**Sustainability**: The arts and culture sector has been increasingly concerned with sustainability, including eco-friendly practices in production and addressing climate change through creative expression, minimising environmental impact in creative processes and in cultural events and festivals. Creatives are addressing the challenges of climate change through their work, whether by raising awareness, inspiring activism, or proposing sustainable solutions, eco-friendly production practices, reducing carbon footprints, and addressing ethical supply chains. Whatever follows the EICS must become in itself an example of sustainable practice.

## 4.7 Marketing and Communications

### 4.7.1 Overview

Due to inadequate data, the Interim Report was unable to analyse or comment on the marketing and communications aspects of the EICS. Additional data has been gathered, and detailed analysis of marketing and communications appears in the report as Appendix 5.

Summit marketing and communications were led in 2012 and 2014 by EIF’s head of communications, who then founded their own PR agency in 2015 - Cornershop PR - which has led on the Summit’s communications since 2016. The Managing Director of Cornershop PR has been the one of the few people consistently involved in the Summit since 2012 and provided documentation from past Summits for the Review.

Lack of availability of full evaluations for marketing and communications for each Summit prevents full analysis, and many figures presented are estimated, but do incorporate comparative figures regarding media reach, website users etc., especially in relation to the 2016, 2018 and 2022 Summits. Media reach data has not been verified.

Very few interviewees commented on the marketing and communications aspects of past Summits, or its effectiveness other than to acknowledge that it was generally handled “efficiently.”

### 4.7.2 Marketing and communications findings

Based on analysis of the data acquired, a summary of key marketing and communications findings for the EICS that did not appear in the Interim Report is included below:

* Records indicate that marketing and communications has been one of the most clearly planned and evaluated areas of the Summit, despite some gaps in documentation.
* The continued involvement of key personnel in marketing strategy since the first Summit in 2012 has ensured some level of consistency in strategy and evaluation, though some records have been lost over time as EICSF.
* The structure of marketing and communications strategies has been fairly consistent since 2014, and key objectives have broadly remained the same since 2016 with clear measures for evaluation. Despite this, marketing and communications strategies have adapted based on changes to the Summit programme and delivery, with novel approaches taken in reaction to them.
* Evaluations recommended increasing online activity between Summits to maintain engagement. While this did happen from 2020/21, this appeared to have been in response to necessity rather than a reaction to recommendations. It has been unclear when recommendations have been acted upon.
* Social media following has consistently grown, though remains largely static between Summits. E-newsletter open and click through rate has remained above sector average, though subscribers may have been lost when a new mailing list was created in 2020.
* Partner organisations have been involved in planning communications and marketing through Cornershop PR. Further engagement of Partners could improve the consistency of approach to marketing and communications.
* Lack of clear objectives for the Summit may have detracted from the ability to successfully communicate its purpose to audiences.
* There was no documentation about the dissemination of end of Summit reports and no clarity about knowledge exchange following a Summit. The nature and scale of the communication of Summit conclusions and recommendations remain opaque.

## 

## 4.8 Impact and Outcomes

### 4.8.1 Overview

There were considerable gaps in documentation around strategic planning and the setting of aims, objectives, outcomes and key performance indicators. Interviews with delivery team staff, past members of the EICS steering group, and representatives of partner organisations indicated that the process of setting aims, objectives and outcomes did occur, but that documentation was missing. Aims and objectives were consistently referred to as ‘outcomes’ and no specific metrics were suggested. The list of proposed Summit outcomes 2012-2022 has been compiled during the Review and appears as Appendix 2.

End of Summit reports were analysed for the Review, as were the evaluations that took place in 2012, 2014 and 2018. Outcomes in the 2018 evaluation were identified in categories such as “building connections,” “shaping thinking,” “stimulating debate and discussion,” “influencing work at home,” “giving strength to youth voice,” and “more awareness of Scotland’s creativity,” each of which were rated as ‘high’ by relatively small sample of delegates and programme contributors (52 in total), but with no specific measurement. The 2018 evaluation does mention a few tangible outcomes, such as specific contacts that were made, a partnership agreement that was developed, one speaker contributing a chapter to another speaker’s book, one knowledge partner inviting people to their events, one delegate being invited to take part in an international residency. There appeared to be no follow-up to determine the longer-term impacts from any of the outcomes identified however, and there seems not to have been any measurable outcomes in the financial agreements between funding Partners and the EICS Foundation that we reviewed.

Of the 70+ interviews conducted during this Review, there were several anecdotal references to tangible outcomes of Summits, such as maintaining contact with a high-level government official from another country, or a discussion of a new project, or a sharing of helpful experience, or an exchange of useful contacts. The majority of those interviewed however were unable to mention a tangible or specific outcome of attending a Summit. And of those interviewed, some were divided about the need for or importance of identifying tangible or measurable outcomes or impacts from an event such as the Summit (the question of measurement was viewed by some as inappropriate).

For this Review, we have attempted to utilise the technique of “outcome harvesting,” often useful in situations when very specific measurable goals have not been clearly defined in advance of an activity, or where there has been no Theory of Change or Logic Model in place. Although a discussion of outcomes was a significant component of every interview, very little detailed data on outcomes or impacts was harvested. Similarly, limited useful data on outcomes or impacts were identified in EICSF and Partner documentation, including previous Summit evaluations.

As a result, and as intimated as early as the first Inception Meeting for this Review with EICS Partners in April 2023, and highlighted in the June Interim Report, EICS impacts and outcomes have unfortunately remained vague and unverifiable.

The Summit was categorised in interviews by some as an instrument of UK “soft power” or “cultural relations” (two different approaches). Work done by the British Council and others on the measurement of outcomes of such instruments suggest robust measures and sophisticated analytical tools (taken over time) are needed for informative quantitative behavioural analysis, network and discourse analysis, and influence mapping. These were not introduced into the Summit’s processes of evaluation.

In future, requirements relating to the achievement of outcomes and processes of evaluation need to be more explicit and integrated into planning at the outset.

### 4.8.2 Future Outcomes

Turning to the future, public funders expressed strong views that public investment in a future Summit-type project could not be justified without tangible outcomes that were in some manner measurable. Defining outcomes for such an event might be inherently contested (as would measurement analytics, depending on the varying viewpoints of different Partners and stakeholders involved). Suggestions for outcomes were offered in interviews and are summarised below.

Suggested tangible outcomes:

1. Attendance and participation.
2. Agreements and resolutions.
3. Policy change proposals made.
4. Partnerships, collaborations, and joint projects.
5. Research and publications.
6. Educational outcomes of workshops and training programmes.
7. Media coverage.
8. Cultural and artistic outputs (e.g., exhibitions, performances, cultural exchanges).

Suggested intangible outcomes:

1. Networking and relationship building.
2. Knowledge exchange.
3. Inter-cultural and cross-cultural understanding.
4. Inspiration and motivation.
5. Cultural relations and diplomacy: assess the soft power and diplomatic influence generated.
6. Perceptions of the host country and organisation.
7. Capacity building of individuals, institutions, and communities.
8. Advocacy and awareness related to a theme.

Interviews with governments and other public bodies were consistent in the view that the definition of outcomes and impacts, whether tangible or intangible, would contribute to the success and significance of future Summits and that, as stated above, it would be difficult to justify investment in a future Summit-type activity without them.

Major challenges were also highlighted for any form of robust evaluation of EICS outcomes and impacts however, and these are summarised below:

**Diverse complex objective**s: The EICS serves different purposes for different Partners, from knowledge sharing, making connections, fostering collaborations and networking to influencing policy and profiling Scotland and the UK. These diverse objectives make it difficult to define a single set of measurable outcomes. As evidenced by this Review, different stakeholders, such as governments, sponsors, delegates, artists and speakers, have different perspectives on what constitutes a successful outcome.

**Long-term effects and attribution**: Some of the impacts of a Summit will not become apparent until months or even years after it has taken place. Many participants may not immediately act on the information or contacts acquired at a Summit, making it harder to track their subsequent actions. In any case, it would be challenging to attribute certain actions directly to the Summit, rather than other factors.

**Subjectivity**: Assessing the value of the EICS involves subjective judgments about the quality of presentations, networking opportunities, and the relevance of the content. A robust qualitative evaluation framework would need to be in place to undertake this.

**Lack of data**: Gathering data on EICS impacts would be expensive and time-consuming, and the EICCF and its partners would need to allocate adequate resources and means to collect comprehensive data.

**Lack of benchmarking**: For the EICS, there was no baseline or benchmark against which to compare outcomes, making it hard to gauge improvement or success. Suitable benchmarks may be difficult to find.  
  
To address these challenges in future, a robust Summit evaluation framework and methodology should be developed.

### 4.8.3 Evaluation

Some evaluation of the certain elements of the EICS programme and operations did take place, such as the youth programme, volunteering, delegate liaison and marketing and communications. Reference has been made in this report to relevant findings from EICS evaluations. However, it remains unclear from the documentation how evaluation reports were used, and there is no evidence in the findings of recommendations from the evaluations being implemented or being influential in the planning of future Summits. Many interviewees representing Partner organisations were unaware that these reports had been produced.

Existing evaluation frameworks seem not to have been appropriate for the Summit in terms of its scale and investment, or to the status of the Partners involved. Developing a Theory of Change model for the future that sets out clear objectives, inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts will be essential. The involvement of independent knowledge partners (such as universities, research institutes or consultancies) to support the research needs of the evaluation should be considered.

# 

# 

# 5. International Landscape and Case Studies

## 5.1 Overview

A survey of the international landscape comprising over 30 cultural events, conferences and summits was compiled to better understand the place of EICS in the broader landscape of cultural events. The complete survey appears as Appendix 6, which describes the timing, location, instigating organisations, participants, core subjects, purpose, key outputs and funding of these events.

## 5.2 Case Studies

EICS partners selected five case studies for further research. These were:

1. Culture Summit Abu Dhabi
2. G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers
3. IFACCA World Summit of Arts and Culture
4. Mondiacult World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development (UNESCO)
5. World Cities Culture Forum Summit

A summary outlining the objectives and goals, data sources, focus of the analysis and key findings appears below. The five detailed case studies appear in full in Appendix 7 and should be read in conjunction with the summary that follows.

### 5.2.1 Case study objectives and goals

The research aimed to assess prominent international summits as a means to identify adaptable models for the development of EICS. This exercise aimed to investigate similar events, analyse their unique selling points, strengths, weaknesses, as well as shared elements contributing to their success and areas requiring further exploration.

### 5.2.2 Case study data sources

The research relied on existing publicly available data sources, including declarations, reports, press releases, video content from the summits and media coverage. Interviews were not conducted during this phase, but they could be considered for future research to delve deeper into specific areas of interest.

### 5.2.3 Summary analysis of case studies

The study was organised around six primary research areas that align with the research specifications for the EICS Review:

1. **Vision and purpose**: Examining the overarching mission and objectives of each summit.
2. **Governance and management**: Investigating the structures and processes involved in summit organisation.
3. **Funding and finance**: Analysing income sources and the organisations supporting the summits.
4. **Participants, partners, stakeholders**: Identifying the audiences and key actors involved in the events.
5. **Programme**: Evaluating the content and activities featured in the summits.
6. **Impact and outcomes**: Assessing the long-term effects and tangible results generated by the events.

Highlighted below are findings relevant to discussions about the future of EICS that may warrant attention or concern.

#### Vision and purpose

All five case studies share a common goal of acknowledging the transformative influence of culture and seek to facilitate global collaboration, the formulation of policies and advocacy efforts to harness culture's potential for societal and economic advantages. They stress the significance of culture in shaping communities, nurturing creativity, and improving the quality of life at local, national, and global levels. Nonetheless, they distinguish themselves by their unique selling points (USPs) derived from notable differences in their approaches.

Mondiacult primarily centres on cultural policy and development based on past experiences, while Abu Dhabi places a strong emphasis on fostering open dialogues and taking action. The G20 Meetings of Culture Ministers link culture to global peace and development within the broader G20 framework. IFACCA's World Summit promotes the transformative power of arts and culture on a global scale, whereas World Cities Culture Forum Summit (WCCFS) focuses on urban culture as a catalyst for city development.

The vision, mission, and purpose of these events are rooted in the goals of their organising bodies. Notably, all these summit events are either explicitly integrated into existing organisations (e.g., UNESCO, IFACCA and G20) or, as in the case of the Culture Summit Abu Dhabi, serve as components of a larger governmental public relations and political agenda. They can also serve as platforms for announcements and report launches, bolstering their influence and reach. In some instances, the stated mission and purpose of the events may differ from the underlying motives. For instance, the IFACCA Summit functions as a platform for recruiting and promoting the Federation, and the Abu Dhabi Summit serves as a means to address negative perceptions and elevate the UAE's profile. Being part of a broader mission allows these events to tap into existing networks, increasing their prospects for long-term success.

#### Governance and management

The governance and management approaches of the five events vary significantly due to differences in their parent organisations, leadership models and funding sources. The Abu Dhabi event is spearheaded and financially supported by the UAE government. Mondiacult operates within the international framework of UNESCO. The G20 Meetings of Culture Ministers adhere to G20 protocols. IFACCA's World Summit is organised by an international professional federation. In contrast, WCCFS functions as a collaborative network of cities, coordinated by the Greater London Authority (GLA) through an intermediary consultancy.

While there are notable disparities in the transparency of governance structures and implementation methods, successful events with enduring impact often maintain consistent delivery teams. These teams may involve external consultancy support (such as BOP Consulting overseeing WCCFS and the Abu Dhabi Department of Culture and Tourism working on the Abu Dhabi Culture Summit) or rely on internal systems and established teams with larger bodies, like UNESCO. Further in-depth research would contribute to a better understanding of this domain.

#### Finance and Funding

While there are only a limited number of income sources available for such events, the financial models employed show considerable diversity. For instance, Culture Summit Abu Dhabi relies solely on government funding, whereas others, like the WCCFS and IFACCA's World Summit, draw contributions from member entities. In contrast, Mondiacult and the G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers operate according to their own financial principles and rely on funding from the host countries. Some events actively seek external funding, sponsorships, and in-kind support to supplement the budgets provided by host states. These disparities in funding approaches arise from differences in organising bodies, the nature of participation, local funding environment and their core missions.

It is plausible that the Abu Dhabi Culture Summit not only benefits from being state funded but also enjoys unusually substantial budgets, allowing the event to attract high profile speakers, participants, and partners like UNESCO and Google. However, obtaining detailed information about budgets and income sources would require further research and interviews.

#### Participants, partners and stakeholders

While there are fundamental similarities to EICS, such as the presence of cultural leaders and artists, and the international nature of all five events, the extent of these similarities varies significantly. The distinctions primarily arise from the goals and purposes of each summit, characteristics of their organising bodies, financial resources, and thematic areas of each event. While certain summits concentrate on Ministers and policymakers (e.g., G20 Culture Ministers Meeting), others aim to involve a wide range of cultural stakeholders, including business leaders, academics, and industry experts (e.g., Abu Dhabi Culture Summit and IFACCA's World Summit).

Stakeholders, in this context, are defined as entities or groups with a direct interest in the results and impact of the summit, often with a long-standing commitment to the summit's mission and objectives. They can be traced back to the initiating organisations, funding entities, and governance structures (e.g., Abu Dhabi Department of Culture and Tourism, GLA and WCCF). On the other hand, partners are organisations or entities that collaborate with the summit, often providing resources, expertise, or financial support to facilitate the success of the event. The specific roles of stakeholders and partners can vary depending on the summit's focus, goals, and organisational structure. It is worth noting that the Meeting of Culture Ministers is part of the G20 ecosystem of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), annual Presidencies, and G20 reports. Similarly, Mondiacult serves a similar function within UNESCO and contributes to the broader United Nations agendas. Abu Dhabi's rapid development and substantial budget have allowed it to form a partnership with UNESCO and become part of the UN network.

Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that while all events attract an international audience, the extent of their global reach may differ based on the membership of the parent organisation (e.g. limited participation from the Middle East and North Africa region in the IFACCA Summit maybe a reflection of IFACCA’s lack of membership in the region; conversely, IFACCA’s growing Pacific region membership may be attributed to their HQ being situated in Australia) and the location of the event (e.g. more representation from the United States at the San Francisco WCCFS). To encourage greater inclusivity and promote the Federation, IFACCA offers bursaries to professionals requiring financial support.

Regarding ministerial involvement, the G20 Culture Ministers Meeting and Mondiacult have the greatest influence in terms of their convening power, driven by the geopolitical significance of their parent bodies (G20 and UNESCO, respectively). Both IFACCA and WCCF are membership-based organisations that show limited interest in ministerial presence. Consequently, their flagship events focus on senior representatives within their specific sectors, such as deputy mayors, directors of culture departments in member city authorities, policymakers, and national arts agencies. Peer-to-peer interaction is crucial, but ministerial participation is only feasible in cases where Ministers can engage in bilateral meetings with countries of a similar stature.

#### Programme

All the summits identified in the case studies typically feature plenary sessions, keynote speeches, roundtable discussions, and presentations that revolve around cultural policies, practices, or the role of culture in society. They also emphasise networking and collaboration opportunities in their programmes, enabling participants to connect and share their insights. All five summits are committed to fostering discussions and collaborations related to culture, cultural policies, and their impact on various aspects of society, the economy, and sustainable development. The specific content of the programmes is tailored to each summit's unique objectives and areas of focus.

Themes play a significant role in all summit programmes, and further research could delve into how different events develop their themes. IFACCA introduces its themes through an online discussion paper presented not only to the participants but also to a broader cultural community. It is important to note that despite the differences in organising bodies, objectives, target audiences, and available funding/resources, there is a significant amount of overlap in terms of themes and formats across the five events. This overlap is likely due to major global issues (e.g. climate change, sustainability, the role of technology), high professional calibre of delegates (ministers, cultural leaders, academics), and a degree of interconnectedness between organisations (e.g.G20, Mondiacult, IFACCA and Abu Dhabi working collaboratively and sharing common values).

Additionally, the pandemic has contributed to an increased use of digital platforms and technologies, with some organisations using knowledge-building and digital accessibility as part of their engagement and participation strategy (e.g., Mondiacult's 2022 "Share your Voice" pre-event in partnership with IFACCA). However, it is worth noting that videos of panel sessions or speeches tend to attract limited viewing numbers.

Culture Summit Abu Dhabi stands out as the most glittering and dialogue-focused event that has additionally integrated the Cultural Diplomat of the Year Awards into its programme.

Performances, exhibitions, and site visits are essential components of all these summits, often used as a means to showcase the culture of the host country. Mondiacult operates on a much larger scale, with the 2022 event involving five regional consultations prior to the main event and organising over 100 side events, some of which occurred concurrently with the main three-day conference.

#### Outputs and Outcomes

All five case study summits share certain core outputs and outcomes, such as free resources in the form of reports, discussion papers or policy briefings, facilitating international exchange, and recommendations that sometimes include actionable measures. These components fulfil a variety of objectives, including increasing visibility and potential membership growth of the parent organisation (IFACCA World Summit, WCCFS), advancing professional development (e.g., IFACCA), and serving more subtle purposes related to soft power and public relations agendas (e.g., Culture Summit Abu Dhabi).

Long-term outcomes and impacts are an opaque area that sometimes can only be fully investigated over an extended period. Objectives are often aimed at policy changes at city, regional or national level, or in the case of G20 and Mondiacult at highlighting key areas of global concern and mapping pathways to solving some of the key problems facing the world today.

While they provide resources and encourage international engagement, Mondiacult’s emphasis on cultural diplomacy and policy discussions has broader geopolitical implications. In contrast, IFACCA's Summit is intentionally structured to cater to the organisation's requirements and strategic objectives, thus forming an integral connection with significant milestones in its institutional growth, such as the ratification of IFACCA's constitution, the introduction of Connect CP, and the establishment of the African chapter. Arguably, the most tangible results manifest in the creation of new communities and the initiation of exchange and development initiatives, exemplified by programmes like the World Cities Culture Forum Leadership Exchange Programme, Europe-wide cultural policy network ACCESS, and the Abu Dhabi Artist Incubator Programme.

### 5.2.4 Learning from the Case Studies

While direct comparisons between the case study summits are challenging due to differences in purpose, size, focus, funding and governance, several key conclusions emerge:

1. **Consistency in governance and delivery teams:** Successful events that have been in existence for a considerable time tend to have a stable governance model and maintain consistent delivery teams, either embedded within their parent organisations or via consultancy support. For any future EICS, it is advisable to establish a dedicated and experienced team to ensure the event's smooth execution and continuity.
2. **Vision and mission clarification**: Whatever major project is agreed to follow EICS, it should ensure that its vision and mission statements are clear, concise, and aligned with its overarching goals. Clarity in vision and mission will help guide activities and communicate its purpose effectively to stakeholders and participants.
3. **Participant-centric approach**: Effective events focus on attracting the right participants and tailor their programmes to cater to the needs and interests of delegates. Any future Edinburgh Summit-type project should prioritise participant engagement and ensure that its programme aligns with the expectations and goals of delegates. The selection of participants should align with the project’s specific goals and objectives, considering the event's convening power and potential for meaningful interactions. Ministerial presence should be evaluated in the context of the future mission, and invitations should be extended strategically to achieve the desired outcomes. Balancing the environmental impact of the event, especially in terms of travel and resource consumption, with its global reach and effectiveness is likely to be a growing concern.
4. **Integration into wider organisational infrastructure**: All studied events are part of broader organisational portfolios, which can be advantageous in terms of financial support, convening power, and engagement with relevant participants. Any future Edinburgh Summit-type initiative should explore opportunities for integration into existing cultural and governmental frameworks and/or existing organisations to leverage expertise, support and resources.
5. **Partnerships**: The development of strong partnerships (with international cultural bodies, cultural networks and platforms, cultural industry bodies and relevant private sector interests) is of the utmost importance and should be prioritised.

### 5.2.5 Further Case Study Research Areas

**Funding models and budgets**: Further research is recommended into funding models and budgets to determine the most suitable financial approach for sustained success.

**Internal systems and feedback mechanisms**: Research is recommended into internal systems and feedback mechanisms, especially for measuring outputs and outcomes, to assess the event's impact and identify areas for improvement.

**Governance structures**: Further investigation is recommended into governance structures that align with objectives, potentially drawing inspiration for future Summit-type projects from successful models among the studied events.

# 

# 

# 6. EICS Future Options

## 6.1 Overview

The emerging findings from the Review suggest a strong need to change the current EICS model, with the vast majority of those interviewed believing that the current model (however well-intentioned and relevant in the past) can no longer achieve the results required by key stakeholders. However, the findings suggest significant support for the continuation of some form of face-to-face/in-person gathering taking place in Edinburgh in August, with the need also to maximise the integration of the evolving digital landscape. The findings suggest that “one single purpose large-scale universal gathering for all” may no longer be an appropriate model, and if any form of Summit (or alternative) is to continue, it will need to be re-conceived in terms of its focus and integration with the current policy priorities and strategies of key stakeholders. Consistent views were also expressed during the Review that in the current financial climate any new initiative will need to include clearly articulated tangible outcomes and impacts.

Two consultation workshops were held to explore potential options for the future of EICS drawing on the experience and perspectives of the EICS Partners. Each workshop enabled testing of the degree to which each selected option met strategic objectives and priorities for the current Partners, and the criteria and essential delivery competencies emerging through the Review.

The workshops did not look at the financial viability or delivery feasibility of the options at this stage, or topics not included in the Specification for the Review.

A summary report of the options consultation workshops appears as Appendix 3.

## 6.2 Gateway Appraisal Criteria

Gateway criteria were used to determine the selection of delivery options. Any option that did not meet these criteria was not included for discussion as part of this workshop. The gateway criteria were drawn entirely from evidence gathered during the Review and reflect key objectives from a strong majority of those interviewed. These are:

1. The broad mission for any future alternative to the EICS should include the need to encourage and promote international cultural dialogue and exchange and advance the case for supporting culture (although this might be refined and expressed differently).
2. Some form of continued partnership between the founding Partners would be desirable: Scottish and UK Governments, British Council, Scottish Parliament and EIF (although the nature of the partnerships and role of each Partner would be subject to review, and other partners might be added).
3. At least some major in person activity needs to take place in August and within the context of the Edinburgh festivals.
4. Scotland should remain the host for and be strongly associated with all major events.

## 6.3 Criteria for Evaluating Delivery Model Options

Drawing on the evidence gathered in the Review, criteria were developed against which the delivery options could be assessed and were used in the workshop to help Partners consider how successful each option could be in achieving the broad mission “to encourage and promote international cultural dialogue and exchange and advance the case for supporting culture”. Partner clarifications on these criteria are included in Appendix 3.

For the delivery model options, the suggested criteria were:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Is it attractive to senior decision-makers? | Does this option have a strong potential to attract appropriate Scottish/UK and international “senior” government decision-makers (including Ministers when appropriate) and key representatives from the cultural and creative sectors (including artists)? This should not be interpreted as “excluding” others (e.g., academics, high level thinkers, marginalised voices). |
| 2 | Can it be communicated as an international event? | Can this option easily be communicated as a genuine and important “international event” in terms of identity and branding? This should not be interpreted as excluding Scottish or UK interests. |
| 3 | Does it add value to the Edinburgh festivals? | Will this option add value to and take reciprocal advantage of the Edinburgh festivals that collectively celebrate the breadth and power of creativity and accomplishment in the cultural field? |
| 4 | Does it advance cultural policy? | Will the option advance international dialogue around cultural policy development in the “broadest sense” (cultural policy itself or policy development of other themes with a “cultural lens”)? Does it link to UK/Scotland’s cultural strategy goals? Does the option give the opportunity to present best practice examples of work/cultural policy internationally, enhancing the Summit’s legitimacy and attracting interest as a leading forum |
| 5 | Does it enhance international connections? | Does the option have the strong potential to pro-actively enhance international connections and collaborations in the cultural field for organisations and artists in Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland? |
| 6 | Does it have a relevant global thematic impact? | Does the option have the potential to achieve compelling and relevant thematic and topical interest and impact beyond the UK, and attract international media and public attention? |
| 7 | Does it strengthen the international profile of Scotland and the UK? | Will the option add to the international cultural profile of Scotland and the UK as a whole in terms of “thought leadership” in the cultural field and openness in promoting a platform for intercultural dialogue? |
| 8 | Does it contribute to UK soft power or cultural relations objectives? | Will the option contribute to appropriate components of the UK’s “soft power” or “cultural relations” strategies globally, especially in relation to “priority” countries? |
| 9 | Does it relate to relevant conventions and international organisations? | Does the option relate to the ambitions of appropriate international cultural conventions, treaties and declarations and the interests of international bodies? Does it have the potential of developing stronger connections with relevant governmental and non-governmental international professional associations in the cultural and creative fields? |
| 10 | Will it help to achieve tangible outcomes and impacts? | Will the option likely achieve tangible results, outcomes and impacts (to be clearly defined for each option) that can be evaluated in some manner? |

## 6.4 Delivery Options Considered

Two potential options for consideration were rejected: 1) full continuation of the current EICS model with only a few refinements to delivery; 2) total discontinuation of EICS without replacement. Each of those options was supported only by a small minority of those interviewed during the Review process.

The three options considered were not intended to be mutually exclusive but could be combined in some way. The ‘working titles’ given to the options were descriptors only and not recommended names. During the consultation workshops, more detail was given concerning the possible activities and potential partners that might be embraced for each option.

The three options are summarised below:

#### Option 1: Edinburgh World Culture Forum

Unique focus on future cultural policy, cultural trends and creativity (from the widest perspective, including technology and media) with the primary objective of sharing knowledge and achieving outputs that add value to the international cultural and creative industries sectors in terms of influencing policy and developing alliances internationally. Bringing together international and UK professional bodies representing different sectors with policy decision-makers, and especially artists. The Forum might parallel models in the education field such as “Going Global” or “the World Education Forum.”

#### Option 2: Edinburgh International Cultural Expo: The Power of Creativity

Galvanising the creative energy generated by the festivals in Edinburgh each August, and working closely with other international partners, the Cultural Expo would be unique collaboration and co-creative effort initially between the Edinburgh International Festival, the Edinburgh Fringe Festival, the Edinburgh International Book Festival (and possibly in certain ways inclusion of the Royal Edinburgh Tattoo, the Edinburgh International Film Festival, the Edinburgh Art Festival). The Expo would cultivate strong partnerships between Edinburgh’s international festivals with work presented in the festivals as part of core programmes. This partnership might be extended in time to include additional cultural events in Scotland with an international reach (e.g., Celtic Connections, Glasgow International). Themes would be driven by the artistic preoccupations of creative artists in relation to world challenges, with artists at the centre of the Expo.

#### Option 3: Edinburgh International Cultural Dialogues

Bespoke dialogues based on specific and highly topical/controversial global cultural issues (impact of artificial intelligence, freedom of expression, culture and conflict) that require action from a coalition of high-level thinkers and policymakers representing the key global players both the public and private cultural spheres, or dialogues aiming at building stronger relationships between the UK, Scotland with one or more countries or regions of the world. Focused debates would be stimulated by the best research and insights. A parallel model to the Salzburg Global Seminar or a “mini-Davos,” attracting opinion-formers and policymakers at the highest level, including relatively intentional groupings of Government Ministers, officials, and private sector entrepreneurs.

As stated above, a summary report of views expressed by representatives of Partners who participated in the options consultation appears as Appendix 3.

Combining the views of Partners in the workshops with the wider findings from the Review, and including the results of interviews, there was agreement that the future of the EICS should adhere to the four Gateway Criteria outlined in section 6.2 above, and the delivery criteria in section 6.3.

The favoured option discussed by Partner representatives at the consultation workshops was the option of developing an Edinburgh World Culture Forum (working title), which scored relatively high against most of the criteria.

In addition to the key criteria agreed by Partners, different perspectives emerged from the Review’s interviews about any future Summit-type project. For simplicity, a future option here is referred to as “the project”. The most frequently expressed views about the future were the following:

* The international festivals in Edinburgh should be at the core of whatever events follow EICS, and there should be connections between those events and the work presented or promoted by those festivals. The EIF is critical to this connection, but the Edinburgh Fringe Festival and the Edinburgh International Book Festival in particular should be integrated into future planning.
* The British Council because of its international reach and connections should be a central partner. Both the Scottish and UK governments should also remain important partners.
* The voice of creators and artists should be central to whatever project takes place.
* The role of the EICS Foundation should depend on decisions regarding a future governance structure, and the make-up of the Foundation.
* The project should not be called a Summit. The terms forum, platform and gathering were considered a more accurate reflection of what needs to place.
* Events should happen annually, although a larger event every three or four years should take place.
* The project’s primary focus should not be attracting Ministers of Culture, although appropriate government Ministers and government officials should remain part of the “mix” of participants and be attracted more strategically. However, the project should maintain an ambition for high level political participation.
* Edinburgh’s historical legacy as the “beating heart” of the Enlightenment in Scotland should resonate. “It was the intellectual courage of its thinkers with the vision of civic leaders that created a post-Union metropolis that put the city on a world stage.” Edinburgh became known for its forums for debate and as a leading centre for the exchange of ideas. A post-Summit project should build on that heritage.
* Although Edinburgh in August should remain the place and time for the project, there should be “satellite projects” in the UK and internationally that are branded as being connected to Edinburgh. Such projects may be connected to other international festivals, or other world gatherings.
* The project should encompass a few specially commissioned works and have artists/creators in residence as animators and facilitators.
* The project might promote a special awards scheme to recognise and support emerging talent.
* The project should be constructed to cross the frontiers of and embrace distinct cultural and creative sectors (arts, heritage, film and video, television, design, crafts, gaming, etc. as well as relevant creative tourism and events interests).
* The project in part, and perhaps through involvement with the festivals, should promote UK creativity and culture, with attention paid to the showcasing of creative talent in Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland.
* The project should integrate a significant youth (new generation) strand in all its dimensions.
* The project should create a local communities’ strand to extend the diversity of voices, including marginalised voices.
* There was concern that a project that was global in intention would still be dominated by western and UK colonial attitudes that would marginalise the important voice of the Global South.
* A significant research strand should accompany and inform the project, including the publication of reports and evaluations, with the ethos of open access.
* Ongoing follow-up of the project will be essential, with an experienced team in place to undertake this role.
* The project might wish to engage other relevant non-UK government partners and international foundations.
* The project should be planned to include strategic international partners such as UNESCO, IFACCA, ISPAA, European Festivals Association, international cultural platforms and others, as well as connect to the Mondiacult.

Such views have been taken into account when framing the Review’s conclusions and recommendations.

From the many conversations that took place as part of this Review, three proposals emerged for “working titles” for the project to succeed the EICS. These were: the *Edinburgh World Culture Agora, Edinburgh International Culture Assembly* and the *Edinburgh Global Culture Dialogue*. There was a view that the terms such as “World Summit” and “World Forum” were overused.

# 7. Conclusions drawn from the Review process

**Vision:** There appears to be strong interest in maintaining the current Summit’s broad vision but reconsidering its method of delivery. The lack of clear purpose has led to unclear expectations, and measures are needed to make it more relevant and attractive to stakeholders and participants internationally and to achieve more clearly defined objectives and outcomes with an emphasis on tangible results.

**Governance:** The current EICS governance structure with its various component parts has been inefficient. A streamlined structure is required to improve coordination, decision-making, leadership and oversight. The partnerships in place between governments and other stakeholders are important and should be maintained and strengthened, but not using the current governance model. While the evidence gathered did not suggest an ideal future governance model (although several distinct options were identified) there was consensus that it should be designed to reflect the needs of the chosen delivery model.

**Management**: The EICSF’s management has been dedicated but operating in difficult circumstances due to the complex governance structure of EICS, uncertainty of funding and limited resources. This has meant it could only operate on a project basis with frequent changes of personnel. Any future Summit-type project will require a full-time team. Strong personalities have characterised the EICS management structure, and although this was undoubtedly a key to the realisation and continuation of the Summit, the future management style should aim to be more co-creative and collaborative, with employment practices incorporating Fair Work.

**Invitations**: The invitation process to attract senior government decision-makers to past Summits was challenged with the method and timing of finalising invite lists, the distribution of invitations and the unpredictability of actual participation raised as issues. In future, there will need to be a smaller number of carefully targeted invitees and a compelling offer to attract them.

**Operational delivery:** Partly due to limitations on resources, the last-minute aspect of many elements of the Summit, the short term nature of recruiting personnel, and the absence of staff continuity (and despite high levels of motivation and significant hard work by both staff and volunteers), elements of Summit delivery were considered uncoordinated and inefficient. This could be addressed in future by the direct involvement of experienced delivery bodies with undisputed expertise in organising and staging high-level events. Two such organisations are current EICS Partners: the Edinburgh International Festival and the British Council.

**Scottish Parliament:** The professionalism and commitment of Parliament staff and their efforts to accommodate the Summit with its many logistical challenges were clearly recognised and appreciated. In future, alternative locations in addition to the Scottish Parliament should be utilised.

**Timing and dates:** Despite the well-recognised logistical difficulty associated with hosting a Summit in Edinburgh in August, the Edinburgh festivals offer a distinctive and unparalleled context, which has been the Summit’s main USP and power of attraction. Major components of any future Summit-type activity should include that it continues to take place in Edinburgh in August. The Summit has been rather disconnected from the exceptional festivals’ offer that surrounds it however, and this should be addressed in future.

**Finance**: EICSF has been consistently successful in attracting significant support from the private sector, exceeding the projected 50% public / 50%private ratio of financing. Founding partners have also provided a significant contribution in terms of in-kind and indirect support which has been essential to the functioning of the Summit. On current levels of funding however, there will be insufficient overall finance to meet the rising costs of the existing Summit model and address the long-standing limitation of under-resourcing. A new funding arrangement based on an achievable financial strategy should be developed once the delivery model for any future Summit-type project is agreed.

**Participants:** Although a broad range of countries have been represented since the Summit’s inception, lack of attendance from UK “priority countries” (as defined by Partners) and fluctuating levels of ministerial attendance was noted over successive Summits. There is a reputational risk with the current Summit model of being seen as an event with minimal impact for diplomatic and policy purposes. The ways in which participants representing the cultural and creative sectors are selected to take part in the Summit was criticised, as was the underrepresentation of marginalised groups and strong voices from the Global South. A more targeted approach to determining participation in future Summit-type projects (including for example smaller bespoke gatherings) may lead in time to a larger global forum.

**Ministerial involvement:** The figures show Ministerial attendance had been falling from a high in 2014 to a low in 2020, which recovered in 2022 (hybrid approach) with several Ministers attending via on-line participation. Views on the importance of ministerial participation were mixed. Overall, those interviewed felt that if a smaller number of Ministers were targeted to attend a Summit “on the basis of geography, size of country, theme, or importance of the contribution to be made by each Minister” then ministerial attendance would be significantly higher. In addition, it was felt the focus of any ministerial involvement should broaden from Ministers of Culture.

**Programme:** Summit programmes overall have been of a high standard with a strong mix of high-level expert contributors and artistic performance. Themes have been relevant and well-appreciated. Programmes were considered too crowded and over-curated however, offering insufficient opportunities for bilateral meetings, informal conversation and networking. Views on presentations in plenary sessions were mixed. Some felt there had been an overabundance of messages from Ministers that were promotional or unrelated to the themes of the Summit. Others felt there had been enlightened and provocative addresses. Breakout sessions and roundtables were considered valuable in terms of delving into specific themes but would have benefitted from more time for debate and active participation.

**Cultural Leadership Dialogues**: The Ukraine and UK/Australia Cultural Leadership Dialogues were additions to the 2022 Summit, with interviewees commenting that they had enabled more in-depth and focused discussion, with potential for developing closer relations and new collaborations. The single-purpose focus and engagement of a specially targeted group of relevant participants could be a feature of any future Summit-type project.

**Youth engagement:** The Summit’s youth engagement initiatives, and its partnership with NYAGG, SYP and SYT, were successful in enabling Scotland’s youth voices to be heard in the context of an international discussion and provided useful development experiences for the young participants. Youth partners were involved somewhat late in the Summit planning cycle however, and the level of youth representation in international Summit delegations was disappointing. The development of a more integrated youth strand was supported by the Partners and most interviewees and should be a priority of any future Summit-type project.

**Marketing and communications:** EICS marketing and communications have been clearly planned and executed with coherent and consistent strategies since 2014. Social media presence in particular has grown steadily, but the impact of communications on professional and public awareness of the achievements of the Summit is unknown. The approach to communications will need to be carefully developed alongside any future Summit-type activity to reflect and measure its objectives and ambition.

**Outcomes, impacts and evaluation**: Few tangible outcomes of the EICS have been identified in the documentation or from interviews, although there is anecdotal evidence of the Summit stimulating informal contacts, partnerships and knowledge-exchange. In addition, the Summit did create a platform for Scottish Ministers in particular to meet informally with Ministers from other countries, and created opportunities to raise the cultural profile of Scotland and the UK. The absence of accurate and robust data has made the appraisal of Summit outcomes and impacts problematic and inconclusive, however. Although some evaluation took place it was inconsistent, received too few responses to provide representative or reliable data, and the evaluation framework was not appropriate for the Summit’s scale, the level of investment or the status of its Partners. The planning of any future Summit-type project must be based around clear and prioritised goals with a process of robust monitoring and evaluation in place to measure outcomes and impacts.

**International landscape and case studies:** The survey and comparison of international case studies highlighted the absence of a connection to, or a proactive involvement with many international initiatives that could have enhanced the value and impact of EICS. The five case studies undertaken demonstrate the workings of other models in detail, from which any future Summit might learn. Steps are required to establish strong connections with international bodies, networks and initiatives that have similar or overlapping goals.

**Options for the future:** An appraisal of several options for both the delivery and the governance models of any future Summit-type project was undertaken, and consultations with Partners further helped to inform conclusions and recommended courses of action. Drawing on the findings, the majority believed in-person gatherings were as essential and urgent as ever, but that the Summit delivery model required change. Rather than one large mega-gathering, the emerging preference was for numerous smaller events taking place in Edinburgh in August that were coordinated and inter-linked. Many advocated a phased, incremental approach to build a new model that was focused on action, and possibly working towards some form of large-scale milestone cultural event. Most also proposed the involvement of a wider range of participants representing a broader alliance of interests across the fields of arts and culture, creative industries and heritage, as well as the inclusion of diverse voices who might otherwise be marginalised from such debates.

# 8. Recommendations for the future

The recommendations that follow represent an interpretation of where a consensus might lie to begin the next stage of discussion, after further reflection by Partners on the Review’s key findings.

**1. Retain aspects of the core vision and values**: Continue to build on a vision focused on the pivotal importance of dialogue to promote a high-level, international and representative sharing of views and experience to inspire reflective thinking, advance ideas and action and strengthen the role and practice of creativity in societies globally. In addition, the vision should:

* Encompass the role of providing a forum for demonstrating “cultural thought leadership” which builds on the UK’s strong position as a contemporary leader in the arts and creative economy, on Scotland’s historic Enlightenment legacy, and on Edinburgh’s place as a world festival city.
* Retain the values of dynamism, diversity and collaboration, augmented with inclusion, innovation, sustainability and action.
* Enable the Partners to define clear ambition, aims and objectives for knowledge and cultural exchange, international cooperation and cultural policy development, advocacy and next generation engagement to confront, and respond to, major global cultural challenges.

**2. Develop a new model of delivery:** A new delivery model should replace a centralised biennial Summit overseen by a programme director. The new model should comprise an annual, strategically planned cycle of well-moderated dialogue platforms focusing on resolving specific and urgent cultural questions. The annual dialogue platforms should be built around an initial four-year pilot period (2024-2027) leading to a milestone event every four years (see recommendation 3). In addition, the new model should incorporate:

* Inclusive, intercultural, intergenerational and interdisciplinary dialogue platforms, co-created in Edinburgh each August by carefully selected experts in a given field, and planned within the context of (and linking to) Edinburgh’s international festivals.
* Annual, thematic dialogue cycles with topics carefully chosen following consultation with cultural, creative industry and knowledge partners, with links to Edinburgh’s festivals.
* Development to inform the UK’s contribution to UNESCO’s 2026 Mondiacult event, with the potential of hosting pre- and post-Mondiacult deliberations in Edinburgh (in collaboration with UNESCO).
* The USP of Edinburgh in August. The major concentration of creative talent in one place should be harnessed, and a key strength of the new model should be to give expression to the collective voice of artists and creators through exchange with policymakers, academics, industry experts, governments and others via expert moderation and mediation.
* Curatorial input from different festivals and other relevant organisations working in close collaboration.
* Open sessions for the public. The dialogues should ensure that community interests that promote inclusivity, equity and social cohesion are well represented, including marginalised voices often ignored in policy discussions. Youth and new generation thinking needs to be fully integrated into the approach.
* Convening a limited-invite roundtable of specially targeted government ministers to exchange views on how governments in distinct parts of the world are tackling cultural challenges.
* Using different appropriate venues across Edinburgh in addition to the Scottish Parliament
* A complementary programme of performances, films and talks which already form part of the festivals in August and relate to dialogue themes (with agreement from their relevant organisers).
* The integration, compilation and wide dissemination of insights, research and reporting from dialogues along with active follow-up on any proposed actions.
* A revised title (such as *Edinburgh Global Culture Agora, Edinburgh Global Dialogues* or *Edinburgh World Culture Assembly* - suggestions that arose during the Review, or an alternative*)* could be adopted to reflect the changed model of delivery*.*

**3. Build the brand incrementally, and in partnership, towards a milestone event:**  Sustained, iterative development efforts over four years of dialogues should lead to a new milestone event, an *Edinburgh World Culture Forum in 2027* (a working title for an option favoured by Partners during consultations). In addition, the Forum should:

* Be innovative and unconventional, with its format considering sustainability and global representation by using distributed, networked and decentralised approaches combining both in-person and digital engagements.
* Take place in Edinburgh with linked satellite events in other places, and would incorporate for example: hybrid gatherings, VR and AR immersive experiences for participants, 360-degree live streaming, crowdsourced content, themed networking events, personalised content tracks, experiential learning sessions, ”unconference” discussions, hackathons/ideathons, live-captioning, real-time multilingual translation, and other innovative and experimental approaches to engage global audiences.
* Be a result of development and testing with a range of international knowledge and technology partners over the four-year pilot period.

**4. Involve Edinburgh’s festivals:** Ensure that Edinburgh's international festivals are integrated fully into the planning, programming and delivery of the Edinburgh dialogue platforms. In addition:

* The four-year pilot stage should include intensive collaboration between three primary strategic festival partners - Edinburgh International Festival, Edinburgh Fringe Festival and Edinburgh International Book Festival, with the support of an expanded and re-oriented version of the British Council’s *Momentum,* Edinburgh Festivals’ delegate programme.
* The rationale for suggesting the three strategic festival partners relates to the considerable but differing experience of each in international cultural exchange, cultural and industry contacts, art form interests and approach to dialogue. It is such a collaboration that will combine the distinctive nature and reach of each festival that will add significant value. Over the pilot, the collaboration may be extended to other Edinburgh festivals or events that will add appropriate new dimensions to the dialogues.

**5. Focus on action-oriented results and outcomes**: Action must be a cornerstone of the new delivery model, built on clearly defined objectives with appropriate KPIs within a robust Theory of Change Model. In addition, measurement should include:

* SMART objectives defined for any immediate next stage.
* A strong “call to action” for participants in dialogue pilots to reflect, share knowledge and embrace change.
* Embedding of outcomes and impacts tracking in the implementation of ongoing evaluation processes as part of a change process.
* KPIs related to defined objectives, including a combination of attendance metrics, feedback from participants, content ratings, knowledge transfer and dissemination indicators, follow-up engagement, policy change tracking and innovation monitoring.

**6. Develop a significant research strand with knowledge partners**: To ensure the initiative is at the forefront of “cultural thought leadership” the research and insight contributing to and resulting from events should be instrumental to developing and raising awareness of the model’s brand with international stakeholders and attractiveness for participants. In addition, relationships should be built with:

* UK universities, researchers and research institutes at the forefront of creative and cultural policy research to secure high-calibre knowledge partners, and with respected culture policy centres in other world regions.
* The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) to secure project support.
* Appropriate distribution channels to ensure research and findings emanating from the initiative are published, widely disseminated and referenced.

**7. Connect with the key national and international cultural networks**: For legitimacy and impact, key partnerships and valuable alliances must be built with established and respected global cultural organisations and initiatives with overlapping objectives. This should include:

* Close collaboration with Mondiacult (UNESCO), the World Summit of Arts and Culture (IFACCA), the G20 Meeting of Cultural Ministers, the European Festivals Association, and other cultural initiatives. The identification of, and approaches to international partners should be actions taken in the next stage of development.
* Special efforts to connect the international cultural strategies of the arts councils and creative industries bodies of the UK's Home Nations.
* Development of strong partnerships across the wider national and international cultural ecology, in stages over the four-year pilot.

**8. Organise satellite events**: The dialogue platforms held in Edinburgh in August alone will be insufficient to achieve impact and international brand awareness. There must be an ongoing programme of coordinated activity that takes place within the context of other cultural forums and international festivals in other places and at other times of the year. This should involve:

* The British Council working to instigate partnerships with other governments resulting in appropriate linked events in different regions of the world to achieve global reach for the Edinburgh dialogues.
* International cultural networks and other festivals being invited to host associated dialogue platforms.
* Ensuring that the branding of all associated satellite events connect to Edinburgh.

**9. Consider alternative structures for future governance**: No ideal or agreed governance model emerged from the evidence gathered in this Review (although alternatives have been suggested in this report). Discussions should take place between the Edinburgh International Festival, the British Council and the EICS Foundation to determine their interests in, and approach to the governance of any future initiative. In addition, it is noted that:

* The combined strengths of these three bodies should be harnessed in a governance partnership to achieve collaborative advantage. Such a model should be explored as an urgent follow up action taken in the next stage.
* Future governance should include significant wide international representation.

**10. Enhance commitment by both the Scottish and UK Governments**: The future project will require the continued commitment of both the Scottish and UK governments. It should link to their policies, strategies, plans and priorities for the cultural and creative sectors, and for international cultural cooperation and exchange. In particular the new delivery model should:

* Connect strongly with Scotland’s new International Cultural Strategy.
* Reflect the UK's ambitious plans to grow the creative industries.
* Enhance Scotland and the UK's international cultural profile.

.

**11. Extend the public-private funding partnership model**: The financing of any future project should continue to be derived from public authorities and the private sector, with support from donors, sponsors, trusts and foundations. To achieve this:

* The successful public-private funding model should be continued and expanded. A fundraising strategy requires development in the next stage.
* Opportunities to attract funding from other governments, inter-governmental bodies and appropriate private sector interests should be explored fully.

**12. Determine the next step expeditiously and decide upon leadership**: Over one year has elapsed since the last Edinburgh International Culture Summit. To build on the foundations of its achievements and maintain the momentum of expectations raised by this Review, Partners should agree without undue delay on the direction they wish to take. In particular it is recommended that:

* In initiatives of this type, strong leadership that gains the confidence of all key Partners involved is essential. A small expert team, seconded from or financed by the Partners, should be appointed to take the agreed actions forward.
* This team (possibly comprising a Director/Coordinator and an administrative assistant) should have strong collaborative and partnership building skills, relevant experience and contacts nationally and internationally in the cultural and creative fields and should be tasked with moving forward with a feasible programme of action. This would likely include undertaking further research, helping to negotiate an appropriate governance framework, identifying and raising resources and creating a realistic roadmap and timeline for implementation.
* The new model should be launched during the period of the Edinburgh festivals in August 2024.

# Appendices

## APPENDIX 1: Partner Objectives/Outcomes 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012 Individual Partner Outcomes and Objectives | | | |
| **Partner** | Objective | Outcome | Category |
| **British Council** | To collaborate in developing arts policy and practice internationally | That all stakeholders and participants rate the event organisation and format as excellent, and that the content is considered relevant and furthers international understanding of the power of culture in promoting international dialogue | Networking/ Influencing cultural policy |
| To create international opportunities for the people of the UK and other countries and build trust between them worldwide | The event is acknowledged by key stakeholders as making a valuable contribution to the overall success of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games by demonstrating in particular that the UK has delivered its promise to concentrate on culture as well as sport; have cultural and educational reach across the whole of the UK; and to have been truly international | Olympics |
| To increase International Culture Ministers’ knowledge of UK and international arts administration and policy | That the event is acknowledged to have contributed to the legacy of 2012 by hosting a successful meeting and establishing the idea of a regular Culture Ministers summit, in particular agreement from all stakeholders to hold another event in 2014 around the time of the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow and a further summit in 2016 in Rio | Olympics |
| **DCMS** | Support cultural, media and sports diplomacy | The event will deliver an injection into our cultural diplomacy agenda and an on-going benefit with our high priority countries | Networking/ Influencing cultural policy |
| Build effective international relationships for the benefit of the sport, creative, cultural and tourism industries | The event enables the development of cultural contacts and the building of effective international relationship for the future benefit of the creative and cultural industries | Networking/ Influencing cultural policy |
| Deliver a safe and successful Olympic and Paralympic Games in London in 2012 and help to deliver a genuine and lasting legacy | The event will spread the benefits of the Olympics across the UK | Olympics |
| **EIF** | To offer an opportunity for international partners and policy makers to observe at first hand the world class platform that an invitation to appear at Edinburgh’s Festivals offers to their artists and companies. | Relationships developed by Summit leads to increased understanding of the value of the platform offered to artists by EIF, increasing potential for support from International Partners, increased awareness of Edinburgh and its festivals | Positioning |
| Develop and consolidate relationships with international partners and policy makers in order to assist with future approaches for financial support for artists from those countries | To enhance EIF’s reputation for delivering meaningful international cultural diplomacy projects with UK and International stakeholders | Networking/ Influencing cultural policy |
| To contribute to international cultural discourse, and in particular to bring the viewpoint of artists to that discourse | To hold a successful event which will establish regular Culture Ministers’ Summits in future, in particular in 2014 to coincide with the Commonwealth Games | Olympics |
| **Scottish Government** | Showcase the best of Scotland, Scottish culture and Edinburgh’s Festivals | The Scottish creative and heritage sector to have showcased Scottish culture and creativity and secured specific cultural exchanges and connections | Positioning |
| Position Scotland and Scottish Government as a leader in international cultural debate / cultural diplomacy | Enhanced Scottish international profile and reputation | Positioning |
| In the Year of Creative Scotland, celebrate and enhance Scotland’s reputation as a highly creative nation | Recognition of Scotland’s position on culture, the importance placed on culture, and learning from those other nations represented | Positioning |

## 

## APPENDIX 2: List of Summit Outcomes 2012 - 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012 | 2014 | | 2016 | 2018 | | 2020 | 2022 | |
| *First 4 underpinned by the collective and individual outcomes and objectives of the four partners, added value statement. 'External headline outcomes'* | *Taken from the 2015 evaluation - Overall Summit outcomes. Unclear if external facing* | *Programme Outcomes. Taken from a document dated 23/01/14* | *From British Council Document - Mission, Values and Outcomes* | *Taken from Consular Briefing document - outcomes for delegates.* | *Taken from 2018 evaluation, follows the same structure as the Consular Briefing outcomes for delegates, with additional wider outcomes.* | *Designed with measures of success. Proposal differentiates between external facing and internal use objectives, but it is unclear what was made public and what was not.* | *Carried over from 2021 as part of the intended 3-year cycle.* | *Found in FAQ document for Diplomatic Briefings, similarity with 2018 document.* |
| **Useful/relevant meeting, allowing networking and influencing cultural policy** - The Summit has demonstrated the role of culture in facilitating international dialogue, consolidated ongoing relationships with high priority nations and organisations, enhanced individual and collective reputations and developed new connections and cultural collaborations for the future benefit of the creative and cultural industries. | The Summit has demonstrated the role of culture in facilitating and influencing genuinely international and multicultural dialogue and is established as a significant ongoing forum for debate and discussion about international culture policy | Provide a unique environment for discussing international cultural policy, topics and trends by bringing artists and creative thinkers together with ministers and policy makers. | The Summit has succeeded in attracting Culture Ministers from a range of nations and cultures. *Measured by both number of countries attending, and representation of priority countries as defined by partners* | The Summit has demonstrated the role of culture in facilitating and influencing genuinely international and multicultural dialogue and is established as a significant ongoing forum for debate and discussion about international culture policy | Engage in genuine dialogue | to affirm the global leadership role in culture of Summit partners, their ability to contribute to innovative cultural policy development, broker peer-to-peer conversations, and to offer a meeting and marketplace for policymakers | to affirm the global leadership role in culture of Summit partners, their ability to contribute to innovative cultural policy development, broker peer-to-peer conversations, and to offer a meeting and marketplace for policymakers | The Summit has demonstrated the role of culture in facilitating and influencing genuinely international and multicultural dialogue and is established as a significant ongoing forum for debate and discussion about international culture policy |
| **Positioning** - The Summit has enhanced awareness of Scotland’s creativity and cultural reputation, and of Edinburgh and its Festivals, developing both local and international profile and the potential for future international partnerships | The Summit has provided a trusted environment for dialogue between artists and policy makers, facilitating new and nurturing established connections and making the most of opportunities presented by holding the summit during Edinburgh’s festivals | Encourage development of international cultural collaborations and research by creating a dynamic, flexible structure conducive to genuine, creative interchange. | Culture Ministers and their officials attending the Summit agree that it has shaped their thinking around the development of regional and global arts policy. | The Summit provides a trusted environment for dialogue between artists and policy makers, facilitating new and nurturing established connections, and making the most of opportunities presented by holding the Summit during Edinburgh’s Festivals | build connections | to remind audiences of Edinburgh’s power to inspire even in the most challenging times | to remind audiences of Edinburgh’s power to inspire even in the most challenging times | The Summit facilitates peer-to-peer conversations and opportunities for collaboration which are brokered within a marketplace of ideas |
| **Olympics** - The Summit has made a valuable contribution to the overall success of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games, delivered its promise to focus on culture as well as sport; and benefited people culturally and educationally across the UK and internationally. | The programme for delegates of the Summit has enhanced awareness of the creativity and cultural reputation of Scotland and the UK, and of Edinburgh and its Festivals, embedding Scotland and the UK’s reputation as forward thinking global cultural leaders | Facilitate knowledge exchange and the sharing of case studies and best practice by hosting carefully crafted policy discussions and encouraging bilateral meetings. | The Summit is established as a significant forum for debate and discussion about international cultural policy. | The programme for delegates of the Summit has enhanced awareness of the creativity and cultural reputation of Scotland and the UK, and of Edinburgh and its Festivals, embedding Scotland and the UK’s reputation as forward thinking global cultural leaders | Shape their thinking | to contribute to making the case for the power of culture to connect, transform, contribute to wealth, employment and well-being | to contribute to making the case for the power of culture to connect, transform, contribute to wealth, employment and well-being | By holding the Summit during the Edinburgh Festivals, we make a distinctive and lasting case for the power of culture to connect, transform, contribute to wealth, employment, and well-being |
| **Legacy** - The Summit has contributed to the legacy of 2012 through its success and the agreement to hold regular future Culture Minister Summits, in particular 2014 to coincide with Glasgow’s Commonwealth Games, and 2016 for Rio’s Olympic Games. | The Summit is established as an excellent international event that has made a valuable contribution to the success of 2014 as a momentous year for Scotland and the UK | Initiate research into developing models for valuing culture and measuring its impact, presenting this project as the Culture Summit’s defining research interest. | The summit has initiated international research and benchmarking into different models for measuring and valuing cultural impact. |  | Develop ideas and actionable agendas for change in their home country. | to maintain momentum in the period between full Summits and to launch the discussion process which will lead to fuller engagement in 2021 and 2022 | to maintain momentum in the period between full Summits and to launch the discussion process which will lead to fuller engagement in 2021 and 2022 | The programme for delegates of the Summit has enhanced awareness of the creativity and cultural reputation of Scotland and the UK, and of Edinburgh and its Festivals, embedding Scotland and the UK’s reputation as forward-thinking global cultural leaders |
| **Value statement** - The Summit has provided delegates with the opportunity to experience the best of Scottish and UK hospitality and Culture whilst discussing the cultural agenda on an international stage |  | Showcase Scotland and Edinburgh’s culture and creativity via a curated programme of events and exhibitions centred on the Festivals. | The Summit has demonstrated the role of culture in promoting international dialogue and understanding between nations and organisations, thus helping to build new connections, cultural collaborations and long-term sustainable relationships for the future benefit of the creative and cultural sectors. *(British Council)* |  | **Wider outcomes around how the Summit would:** | to sustain and offer the opportunity of engagement to our core audiences of Ministers, leading officials and culture leaders, even if numbers are limited | to sustain and offer the opportunity of engagement to our core audiences of Ministers, leading officials and culture leaders, even if numbers are limited | Through our theme of Culture and a Sustainable Future, Summit 2022 seeks to increase climate literacy and to promote and adopt sustainable practices wherever possible |
|  |  |  | The Summit has enhanced awareness of Scotland's creativity and cultural reputation, and of Edinburgh and its festivals, developing both local and international profile and the potential for future international partnerships. *(Scottish Government)* |  | Represent youth voice in culture | to raise awareness of the Summit’s role and power with the next generation of cultural leaders, numerically likely to be our largest audience in 2020 | to raise awareness of the Summit’s role and power with the next generation of cultural leaders, numerically likely to be our largest audience in 2020 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Raise awareness of Scotland’s creativity and cultural reputation | to pilot and evaluate virtual delivery models which will feed through into successful innovation in future editions | to pilot and evaluate virtual delivery models which will feed through into successful innovation in future editions |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Develop the status of Summit in terms of forum for debate and discussion. |  |  |  |

## 

## APPENDIX 3: EICS Review Options Consultation Workshop – Summary Report

Purpose and aims of the workshop

The EICS Options Consultation Workshops were conducted to augment and assess findings emerging from the desk research and the 70+ interviews conducted between April-July 2023.The purpose of the workshops was to explore potential options for the future of EICS drawing on the experience and perspectives of the EICS Partners. The workshops enabled testing of essential criteria and competencies and suggested options emerging through the research against strategic objectives and priorities of the current key Partners.

It was not the aim of the workshops for participants to identify preferred options, or to consider their viability or feasibility.

Methodology

Two, two-hour workshops were hosted in August 2023 at the British Council offices In Edinburgh. Attending were representatives of the Partners including:

* British Council (Stephen Stenning)
* DCMS/UK Government (Joe Cook)
* Edinburgh International Culture Summit Foundation (Joanna Baker)
* Edinburgh International Festival (Christy McCurdy)
* The Scottish Government (Iain Waller)
* The Scottish Parliament (Roy Devon)

A background information document was shared with all participants in advance of the workshops which proposed the criteria, options and competencies for discussion (a copy of which is included in the appendices).

The workshops were structured around five discussion topics:

1. Gateway appraisal criteria
2. Delivery model criteria
3. Delivery model options
4. Governance model competencies
5. Governance model options

Participants were asked to take part in light touch weighting of the options at the end of the workshop. Those ‘scores’ are attributed in the report. Participant contributions as recorded in the workshops are unattributed and anonymised in this report.

Key Workshop Findings

#### Gateway criteria

All participants agreed with the gateway criteria which had been applied to select a shortlist of future options for EICS for the workshops:

1. The broad mission for any future alternative to the EICS should include the need to encourage and promote international cultural dialogue and exchange and advance the case for supporting culture (although this might be refined and expressed differently).
2. Some form of continued partnership between the founding Partners would be desirable: Scottish and UK Governments, British Council, Scottish Parliament and EIF (although the nature of the partnerships and role of each partner would be subject to review, and other partners might be added).
3. At least some major in-person activity needs to take place in August and within the context of the Edinburgh Festivals.
4. Scotland should remain the host for or be strongly associated with all major events.

#### Delivery model criteria

Overall, the criteria proposed for measuring each of the delivery model options (Refer to Final Report Options section) were supported by participants, with the following clarifications:

*Criteria 1: Is it attractive to senior decision-makers?*

A need was expressed for a clear definition of what is meant by 'decision-maker' for the Summit in future. It was felt that working around ministerial and government participants had at times resulted in mission creep, and that catering to a type of decision-maker may narrow the voices heard in programmes.

*Criteria 4: Does it advance cultural policy?*

There was interest in how creative industries could be better integrated into future models for EICS, reflecting cultural policy in its broadest sense and opening the Summit to a wider range of potential partners and participants. The challenge of defining what is meant by arts, culture and creative industries globally was raised however, since each term has different meanings to policy and agency structures worldwide.

*Criteria 8: Does it contribute to UK soft power?*

There was a strong preference for future summits (or whatever replaces them) to be contributing to cultural relations, policy and knowledge sharing. The term 'soft power' was considered problematic and unhelpful.

*Criteria 5, 6, 7 and 9: International connections, profile, themes and conventions*

Participants queried the legitimacy of EICS being articulated as a truly international event, noting a dominance of Scottish voices in key speeches and English being the only language in previous Summits. In future, participants felt there was a need to manage any current Global West bias to create truly international events. It was felt there was no need for the Summit to align to specific declarations, conventions or treaties, and the suggestion that a Summit outcome could be a declaration or convention was felt to be controversial and unnecessary. Clearly articulating a future EICS model's position in relation to other international initiatives was seen to be important, however.

*Criteria 10: Will it help to achieve tangible outcomes and impacts?*

It was noted that while Partners may weigh outcomes and impacts differently, there was agreement that agreed outcomes and measures for future Summits should be in place.

#### Delivery model options

Brief descriptions of the options discussed appear in the Final Report (Future Options). Across all options there was broad support and interest in incorporating youth viewpoints, local communities’ involvement, and research and publication strands in future models. These were seen to be important for strongly embracing new generation thinking, gaining an outward focus and sustaining and promoting 'the brand' between live events. In addition, harnessing the power of Edinburgh for the wider benefit of Scotland and the UK was seen as important. The weighting scores represent the combined scoring of the 6 workshop participants when asked to score each option against 10 criteria as outlined in the Final Report (Options).

*Option 1 - World Cultural Forum (weighting 134)*

This was felt to be the option most related to the current EICS model, and the one participants were most supportive of overall.

There was enthusiasm for the 'forward looking' approach of the Forum, with the view that if promoted well enough in advance this model could be both provocative, and an enhancement to the Edinburgh festivals offer (although some noted it could conversely also be seen as a competitor to the festivals if not managed well or had limited connections to the festivals).

There was a strong desire to ensure that a World Culture Forum presents a world view. Participants queried whether a UK-based partnership could achieve a global perspective authentically. Suggestions to resolve this included other international partners being involved at the outset; Global South representation in programming; multi-lingual programming (supported by digital/AI tools); and a reflection of different government models worldwide.

For ministerial attendance in this model it was felt that careful, targeted invitation lists curated in relation to specific policy themes would be much stronger and more successful that the current EICS approach to ministerial invitations.

*Option 2 - Festivals Expo (weighting 106)*

This was the next most interesting option to participants. While there was some enthusiasm for elements of the integration of Edinburgh’s well-recognised international festivals (most notably EIF, Fringe and Book Festivals), there were concerns around the competition between the festivals themselves, and whether the festivals would have sufficient capacity to deliver successfully more than they were already achieving.

However, there was interest and enthusiasm for thought leadership offered by the Edinburgh festivals, but a feeling that making that the core focus would not add value to what is already happening.

Participants could see connections with existing programmes which focus on export and creating business links (e.g., Momentum and Made in Scotland initiatives), and potential for intergovernmental and policy interest around the sustainability of festivals. It was noted that there might be the potential interest to the Department of Business and Trade in both this option and especially the World Cultural Forum.

There was interest in the artist-led focus of the Expo and in participants being able to experience and feel included in the Edinburgh festivals during August.

The legitimacy of the Edinburgh festivals as a host for a world expo was raised, with a suggestion that involvement from other UK Festivals (e.g., Manchester International Festival) could be interesting.

Overall, participants felt that Edinburgh is already an 'Expo' In August, and that this model would add little to what exists, would become an ‘event within an event’ and offered little for the founding Partners. However, the link between the festivals and whichever option is finally agreed was viewed as essential.

*Option 3 – Edinburgh Dialogues (weighting 93)*

This option had the least appeal as a standalone model for the participants.

It was felt that for this model to be a success, it would take foresight, a clear vision and strong planning to target ministers and to build and maintain ministerial commitment over the long term. While the Edinburgh festival is an annual calendar fixture, it is not a political one therefore significant effort and private investment would be needed to secure this as a fixture in the global ministerial calendar.

While participants could see a benefit for a 'closed' forum for discussion between ministers, there was little need to host them in Edinburgh in August (and could even be counterproductive to try to do so).

It was also noted that similar long-standing models already exist (e.g., Salzburg, Wilton Park, Chatham House) which the Dialogues would need to position itself around, or compete with.

There was a general feeling the Dialogues could work well as a programmed element of one of the other delivery options, providing an annual strand that built and maintained brand recognition, and kept the Summit front of mind with stakeholders.

#### Governance model competencies

There was agreement on the proposed competencies across both workshops. The weighting scores represent the combined scoring of the 6 workshop participants when asked to score each option against 5 criteria as outlined in the Final Report (Governance)

**Governance model options**

Overall, there was agreement that across any option:

* The choice of governance option should be based on what will work best to deliver the vision and preferred delivery model.
* All strategic partners in any future model should have the right level of engagement (i.e., not involved with operational decision-making) with clear partnership roles and responsibilities, and a designated responsible person in each partner organisation for continuity.
* Historically the primary weakness of EICS has been its delivery model, lack of capacity and resources. However, the summit constitutes in future, it will need increased investment and a consistent staff resource.
* Any future model must involve international partners to ensure a global outlook.
* Any future governance model should retain government involvement, at arm’s length. While government ministers are not heavily involved currently, if investment were to increase, scrutiny and interest may increase also.

#### Single purpose foundation (weighting 73)

It was felt that a more independent foundation might free up EICS from the “whim of ministers,” but raised questions about whether the governments would still be interested in funding it.

While the preferred option by rather small margin (in scoring), some participants queried whether the reconstitution and the development of the existing Foundation could happen quickly, and gather sufficient reputation, partners and investment to successfully deliver the next iteration of EICS.

#### Fold into another organisation (weighting 68)

This model generated much discussion with strong interest in hosting noted on behalf of the British Council. Interviews with EIF also reflected potential interest in their hosting of what follows the EICS.

Participants noted that folding governance into another organisation could bring efficiencies and cost savings (although it was noted this could as easily be the opposite, and that it had previously been separated out from the EIF).

Benefits were noted for hosting by the British Council or the Edinburgh International Festival (e.g., existing international links and partnerships, a successful track record raising funds). Both organisations have experience of a similar role e.g., Edinburgh International Festival with the Edinburgh International Film Festival, British Council with the International Cultural Protection Fund.

In either case it was noted that a dedicated independent committee of advisors would need to be appointed, with an expert specialist delivery team in place, but drawing on the significant experience and resources that the host organisation could offer.

#### Current model (weighting 63)

Maintaining the current model was of least interest to participants. It was felt the model would require notable change, and it would be a challenge to communicate and demonstrate a new approach with the current structure.

It was also noted that the current model has masked the key role that the Foundation has played in raising funds for EICS, which has exposed the Foundation to too much risk which would need to be addressed, if this model continued.

Summary conclusions

A clear definition of who the target for future iteration of summits is required, with clarity around decision-maker involvement and more targeted and purposeful ministerial engagement.

It is important that future summits are not seen primarily as a mechanism for UK soft power. Messaging should focus on cultural relations, policy and knowledge sharing, encapsulating the full creative industries but with a strong arts and culture focus.

Harnessing the power of Edinburgh for the benefit of Scotland and the UK is important, but any future governance and delivery model must be truly representative of a global view, with international expertise and participation at all levels.

Youth, communities, research and publication strands should be a part of future models, with potential for ‘Dialogues’ strands to maintain presence and brand between in-person events.

The preferred delivery model option is for a World Culture Forum, clearly positioned amongst related international events, as a provocative, forward-looking event that has artists and culture at its heart and enhances Edinburgh’s festival offer to the world in August.

In any future governance structure, the strategic partners must have clear partnership roles and responsibilities (without operational involvement), and a designated person in each partner organisation for continuity. Government involvement, at arm’s length, should be maintained.

There was no clear preference for a governance model in the workshops, with the caveat that any future governance model should be designed to reflect the needs of the chosen delivery model. However, EICS constitutes in future, it will need increased investment and a consistent staff resource.

## APPENDIX 4: Table of International Delegations at Summits 2012 - 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| International Delegation Attendance 2012 - 2022 (2020 online/2022 hybrid) | | | | | | | |
| **M** = Ministerial Delegation **Y** = Youth Delegate attending | | | | | | | |
|  | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 | 2022 | **Total M** |
| Albania |  |  |  |  |  | **M** | 1 |
| Algeria |  |  |  |  | **M** |  | 1 |
| Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Australia |  |  |  | **Y** | **M** | **M online** | 3 |
| Bangladesh |  | **M** | **M** |  |  | **M** | 5 |
| Belgium |  |  |  | **MY** |  |  | 1 |
| Bhutan |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Brazil |  | **M** |  | **MY** |  | **M** | 4 |
| Bulgaria |  |  |  | **M** |  |  | 1 |
| Cameroon |  |  | **M** | **MY** |  |  | 2 |
| Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Chile |  |  |  | **M** | **M** |  | 2 |
| China |  |  | **M** |  |  | **M online** | 3 |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Croatia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Cyprus |  |  | **M** |  |  |  | 2 |
| Estonia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| European Commission |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Finland |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| France |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Gambia |  |  |  | **MY** |  |  | 1 |
| Germany |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Ghana |  |  |  | **MY** |  |  | 1 |
| Guernsey |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Iceland |  | **M** |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| India |  |  |  |  |  | **MY** | 3 |
| Indonesia |  |  |  | **MY** |  |  | 1 |
| Iraq |  | **M** | **M** |  |  |  | 3 |
| Ireland |  | **M** | **M** | **Y** |  | **Y** | 5 |
| Isle of Man |  | **M** | **M** | **M** |  |  | 3 |
| Italy |  |  | **M** |  |  |  | 2 |
| Jamaica |  |  |  | **MY** |  |  | 1 |
| Japan |  | **M** |  |  | **M** | **M online** | 6 |
| Jersey |  | **M** |  | **M** |  |  | 3 |
| Jordan |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Kazakhstan |  |  |  |  | **M** |  | 1 |
| Korea |  |  | **M** | **M** | **M** | **M online** | 5 |
| Kosovo |  |  |  |  |  | **MY** | 1 |
| Latvia |  | **M** |  |  |  | **M** | 3 |
| Lesotho |  |  | **M** |  |  |  | 1 |
| Libya |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Lithuania |  | **M** |  | **M** |  |  | 2 |
| Luxembourg |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Malawi |  |  |  |  |  | **M** | 2 |
| Malta |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Mauritius |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Mexico |  | **M** |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Montenegro |  |  |  |  |  | **M** | 1 |
| Netherlands |  |  |  | **Y** |  |  | 2 |
| New Zealand |  |  | **M** | **Y** |  | **M** | 5 |
| Nigeria |  |  | **M** | **Y** |  | **MY** | 4 |
| Northern Ireland |  | **M** |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Oman |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pakistan |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Poland |  |  |  |  |  | **M online** | 3 |
| Qatar |  | **M** |  |  |  | **MY** | 2 |
| Quebec |  |  | **M** |  |  |  | 1 |
| Romania |  |  |  | **M** |  |  | 2 |
| Russian Fed |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Rwanda |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Saudi Arabia |  |  |  | **Y** |  | **Y** | 3 |
| Scotland |  | **M** | **M** | **MY** |  | **MY** | 6 |
| Sierra Leone |  |  |  | **M** |  |  | 1 |
| Singapore |  |  |  | **Y** |  |  | 5 |
| Slovenia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| South Africa |  |  | **M** | **M** |  | **MY** | 5 |
| South Sudan |  |  |  |  |  | **MY** | 1 |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Sri Lanka |  |  |  | **M** |  |  | 3 |
| Tanzania |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Tunisia |  |  | **M** |  |  |  | 1 |
| UAE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Uganda |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| UK |  | **M** | **M** | **M** |  | **M** | 6 |
| Ukraine |  | **M** | **M** | **MY** | **M** | **M online** | 5 |
| USA |  |  |  | **M** | **M** | **M** | 5 |
| Uzbekistan |  |  |  |  |  | **MY** | 1 |
| Wales |  | **M** | **M** | **Y** |  |  | 4 |
| Zambia |  | **M** |  | **M** |  |  | 2 |
| **Total** | 33 | 25 | 30 | 45 | 17 | 26 |  |

## APPENDIX 5: EICS Marketing and Communications

**Notes on the evidence**

Terminology:

* Cornershop PR - the external PR agency used by EICSF since 2016.
* OTP - Opportunity to See.

Gaps: Documentation from 2012 has not been found. Documentation from past Summits was provided by Cornershop PR, as there were few documents found in EICSF records, and while there is a large amount of documentation from 2014 onwards, there are still a number of gaps where strategies or evaluation may be missing. Lack of availability of full evaluations of marketing and communications for each Summit prevents full analysis, and many figures presented are estimated.

Review of Documentation

**Overview**

Summit marketing and communications were led in 2012 and 2014 by EIF’s head of communications, who then founded their own PR agency in 2015 - Cornershop PR - which has led on the Summit’s communications since 2016. The Managing Director of Cornershop PR has been the one of the few people consistently involved in the Summit since 2012.

Documents found for each Summit.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 | 2021/22 |
| Marketing and Comms Strategy | None found | Yes | Yes (though not found) | Yes | None found | Yes |
| Evaluation | None found | Planned but not found | Yes | Planned but not found | Key numbers | Yes |
| Key objectives | None found | Yes | Yes | Yes | None found | Yes |
| Partner objectives | None found | Yes | None found | None found | None found | None found |
| Key messages | None found | Yes | Yes | Yes | None found | Yes |
| Comms Group | Unknown | No | Yes | Yes | Unknown | Yes |

Available marketing/media statistics for each Summit.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | 2020 | 2021/22 |
| Media items (number) | None found | 38 (radio and TV) | 104 print and online UK, 10 broadcast and 37 international articles | 900 in 49 countries (general media) | 302 | 417 articles published in 30 countries  (412 online, 5 print) |
| Media Reach | None found | 7,255,000 (TV/Radio combined) | 15,889,428 (radio)  2,890,000 (TV)  2,919,000  (print) | 250 million | 35 million | Online 309,616,133 OTS  Print  99,249 OTS |
| Website (users) | None found | None found | 4,663 | None found | 8001 | 10,295 |
| Twitter | None found | None found | 1292 followers | None found | 2141 followers | 2680 followers |
| Facebook | None found | None found | None found | None found | 1142 followers | 1414 followers |
| YouTube | None found | None found | None found | None found | 106 subscribers | 273 subscribers |
| Instagram | None found | None found | None found | None found | 292 followers | 484 followers |
| LinkedIn | None found | None found | None found | None found | 47 followers | 539 followers |
| E-newsletter | None found | None found | Almost 1000 subscribers, 35% open rate | None found | 574 (new mailing list created) | 819 subscribers |

Missing data and different methods used in evaluation and reporting make it difficult to compare growth and impact across Summits, but some developments may be observed. From available documentation, the Summit appears to have achieved consistent growth in social media following and online coverage, while print, TV, and radio coverage has decreased. 2018 appears to have been a successful year for media coverage. The increase in social media metrics aligns with broader trends. There seems to be some disparity between the apparently large media outreach figures and the social media statistics. However, the lack of full evaluation data means the context and detail of the figures found are missing.

Cornershop PR records indicate that a new mailing list for the e-newsletter was created in 2020, achieving 574 sign ups in a two-month period. It is unknown why a new mailing list was created. The e-newsletter has consistently achieved above sector standard open and click through rates, indicating that subscribers are generally engaged with Summit activity. From available evaluation, growth in social media occurs with an increase in activity around each Summit, but remains static in the intervening time due to lack of activity. It appears that the campaigns were distinct and related only to each Summit rather than embracing intermediary efforts between Summits.

**2012**

No records found, but documents for 2014 indicate that in 2012 a website and social media accounts were created for the Summit.

**2014**

A marketing strategy was prepared for 2014 and approved by the Steering Group and Strategic Board. The strategy represents an in-depth consideration of the environment the Summit existed in, including SWOT and risk analysis of communications.

Key communication aims from each partner organisation are included in the strategy, with five overarching core communication objectives:

* Build on the Culture Summit success in 2012 and ensure it is established in the media as a significant forum for debate and discussion about international cultural policy. (Awareness).
* Ensure the core elements of the Culture Summit are reported in a systematic way across a range of audiences and media in a rolling programme of communications pre-Summit. (Awareness).
* Ensure importance of “cultural dialogue” is given due prominence in the promotion of the event to stakeholders and publics and outcomes clearly articulated in an implementation plan. (Comprehension).
* Ensure high awareness of the Summit amongst tourism, business and creative industry sectors in order to maximise opportunities for coverage (Reputation)
* Track outcomes for a final evaluation report in order to underpin the case for future Summit events (Action).

Key messages for both within the UK and internationally were planned and the strategy also includes an evaluation plan using both qualitative and quantitative methods. However, no records of evaluation of marketing and communications have been found for this year.

Additionally, in 2014 a broadcast campaign was led by markettiers4dc. Its stated aims and objectives were:

* To raise awareness of the importance of cultural relations between international Culture Ministers and policymakers and the importance of international dialogue between policymakers, artists and art leaders
* To promote arts and culture throughout the UK and internationally and discuss how they are best sustained, promoted and protected.

The campaign focussed on securing TV and radio interviews for the Programme Director. One TV interview and seven radio interviews were achieved, and to further extend reach an audio feature was recorded which featured on 30 stations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of items | 38 |
| Potential audience reach | >7,255,000 |
| Approximate duration of content | 3 hrs 19 mins |
| Advertising value equivalent\* | £81,560 |

\*Based on the cost of purchasing a 30 second TV spot, and at £240 per min

**2016**

Records indicate that a Communications Group, representing each partner organisation, contributed and signed up to a communications strategy and implementation plan in advance of the 2016 Summit, identifying the central key communication objectives and where partners could support through their announcements and networks. This strategy has not been found but aims were found in communication evaluations for this year, which evaluate against these set aims. The key communications objectives were -

* Build on the Culture Summit success in 2012 & 2014 by increasing the global audience reached through the media.
* Position the EICS as a significant and unique global forum for debate and discussion about international cultural policy.
* Seek to extend the audience reached, beyond earned media.

The only objective carried over from 2014 was the intention to build on previous success. Evaluation was set against these objectives, and an in-depth analysis of Twitter, from both the EICS Twitter account and broader mentions of the Summit across Twitter was carried out.

**Key Figures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Website | 4,663 users with a peak on 24 August at 275  Average time spent on the site: 2.25 minutes  30% visited more than once  Most visited from (in descending order) UK, USA, Canada, Australia, Brazil, UAE, France, India, China and Germany. |
| Twitter | 1292 followers (292 new followers during this period, 29% increase on last burst of activity in 2014).  113,762 organic impressions.  6230 profile visits.  1471 engagements (mentions, likes, retweets).  233 link clicks. |
| Print | Estimated reach of 2,919,000 |
| Radio | Estimated reach of 15,889,428 |
| TV (UK only) | Estimated reach of 2,890,000 |
| E-newsletter | Issued to almost 1,000 primarily Edinburgh and Scottish cultural stakeholders two weeks ahead of the Summit. 35% of recipients opened the email. A geographical analysis shows 89% from the UK and the rest from US, Canada, Australia and Spain. |

The evaluation for 2016 also made a number of key recommendations for the future including -

* Streamlining the management of communications, fully costing out PR.
* A series of one-on-one briefings with international media in the runup to the event.
* More video content in advance of and during the Summit.
* Media partnerships should be considered.
* Hosting media (London based) is valuable to provide in-depth insight into the programme of the Summit.
* Sustain a low level of social media throughout the 18-month gap period.
* Begin building a relationship with the BC/delegation and UK embassy team ahead of a nation’s participation being fully confirmed.

No evidence has been found if these recommendations were directly acted upon in later years.

**2018**

The Marketing and Communications Strategy for 2018 includes the following objectives -

* Build on the success of previous Culture Summits by increasing the global audiences reached through the media.
* Position the EICS as a significant and unique global forum for debate and discussion about international cultural policy.
* Seek to extend the audience reached, beyond earned media.

The objectives are broadly the same as the 2016 objectives. Again, a strategy and measures are included for each objective, and key messages are identified. This strategy was also developed by the Communications Group, though individual partner objectives are no longer included in the strategy. This strategy also includes a planned budget for marketing and communications, estimating costs of around £49,750. The communications approach is stated as focussing on broadcast opportunities, feature led articles, and digital activity both in the UK and in-country, with all communications activity linking back to the core objectives. Two stages of activity were planned, in the run up to the event and during the Summit itself.

In depth evaluation was not found for this year, but the strategy states that Cornershop PR would be responsible for this and would evaluate against set aims using quantitative and qualitative measures. The general 2018 Summit Report notes that the Summit reached an audience of over 250 million through over 900 media pieces in 49 countries.

**2020**

No strategy or planning documents found. However, reporting documents were found for November 2020, and January 2021, indicating a continuous approach to monitor marketing and communications in line with increased Summit activity between the 2020 online Summit and the return to in person in 2022.

**Key figures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Media Coverage | 302 articles about the Culture Summit Special Edition across print and online in the UK, USA, Ukraine, Middle East, Australia, South Korea, Algeria and Mexico. |
| Twitter | 289 new, 2141 total  595,500 impressions  8004 engagements |
| Facebook | 464 new, 1142 total  674,172 reach  18,209 engagement |
| YouTube | 90 new, 106 total |
| E-newsletter | 574 subscribers (new mailing list built in 2 months)  50% open rate  15% click through rate |
| Instagram | 202 new, 292 total  1708 impressions  287 engagement |
| LinkedIn | 47 followers |
| Website | 8004 users  11,477 sessions  85% new users 14.7% returning users.  Average time spent on site 2m35s |

**2021/2022**

After the 2020 online Summit, digital programming continued through 2021 to maintain momentum until the next in person Summit in 2022 (see Programme section for further details). A Marketing and Communications strategy dated November 2021 for the first time explicitly includes a digital strategy which centres on planned digital events led by each of the partner organisations. The key objectives in this strategy remain the same as in the 2018 strategy though with different strategies and measures while the key messages are unchanged.

The digital strategy states the aim to support the in-person Summit in 2022 with the intention to offer:

* An international set of references and networks including countries less often highlighted for their artistic and cultural work.
* Global examples of best practice, either in policy itself or in arts projects/approaches which uphold good policy.
* Examples of international models being shared, or wider networks working together.
* Examples of collaborative working.
* Articles or conversations or links or features with thought leaders which progress the conversation around the Summit’s key themes.

The aims of creating this content are stated as -

* Demonstrating for the wide global network the Summit’s ‘convening power’ and central role in disseminating useful information and making connections.
* Progressing conversations which are relevant to the network and themes.
* Demonstrating the value of culture and the arts to wider societal issues, thus advocating for culture (better investment, better conditions, better development).
* Promoting the idea of the Summit as somewhere leaders in the arts want to see themselves represented and that Ministers of Culture recognise as a major player in shaping global cultural conversations.

The strategy focuses more on digital engagement than any previous strategies, with targets set for EICS social media and a new focus on LinkedIn as a platform, which had never been included in previous strategies. LinkedIn is stated as being the most important platform for reaching Culture Summit’s target audience due to its reputation as a trusted and professional platform, where people in the sector already network and share issues affecting them.

Records suggest evaluation and reporting on marketing and communications became more frequent from 2021, indicative of the sustained digital activity occurring from this point. An end of year report for 2021 summarises activity and looks forward to 2022, while there are ongoing reports of website and social media engagement.

Evaluation for 2022 is relatively in depth, with a report summarising activity at the summit and media coverage, with a separate report concerning social media.

Digital Strategy targets and results.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2021 figure | Target | Result |
| LinkedIn | 151 followers | 1000 | 539 |
| Facebook | 1165 followers | 1500 | 1414 |
| Twitter | 2180 followers | 2500 | 2680 |
| E-newsletter | 586 | 800 - 1000 | 819 |

Results indicate some success towards achieving results, and growth across all platforms. The target number for LinkedIn was not achieved despite particular focus on this platform, however the target number does represent an attempted increase of over 650%. Despite this, key figures for 2022 show high levels of engagement with Summit social media and other channels of communication.

**Key Figures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Media Coverage | Total of 417 articles were published on 352 different outlets between June and September 2022 generating 309,715,382 OTS.  412 of the articles were published online generating 309,616,133 OTS. 5 of the articles were published in print generating 99,249 OTS.  The articles were split evenly between 218 national and 199 international ones from 30 countries.  Around 70% of the articles report on the Prime Minister’s opening speech, the exhibiting of the cockerel jug from Ukraine, and more generally about the conflict in Ukraine.  Other articles focus on the participants at the Summit. |
| Twitter | 200 new, 2680 total  327.2K impressions  40.9K profile visits  316 mentions |
| Facebook | 240 new, 1414 total  645,656 page reach  961 profile visits  4,200 post reactions, comments and shares |
| YouTube | 38 new, 273 total |
| E-newsletter | 77 new, 819 total |
| Instagram | 130 new, 484 total  54,344 page reach  1,147 profile visits  476 post reactions,  comments and shares |
| LinkedIn | 181 new, 539 total |
| Advertising | Across 4 ad sets: 717,150 combined reach  946,566 impressions  939 link clicks |
| Website | 8763 new visitors  1532 returning visitors  26,209 pageviews  21,154 unique pageviews |
| Live from the Culture Summit | 820 website page views  (627 unique)  649 combined video views |
| Partner Engagement | DCMS - 6 dedicated tweets, 2 Facebook posts, 1 Instagram post (Culture Summit account not tagged)  EIF - 3 dedicated tweets  Scottish Government Culture - 3 dedicated tweets  British Council - 1 dedicated tweet  Scottish Parliament - 1 Facebook share, and 1 Facebook post to a closed group.  UK Government - no posts |

Cornershop PR’s end of summit report also includes a reflection on 10 years of involvement with the Summit, but a notable point is -

“We are often asked for outcomes from the Summit but beyond reporting what happened, and speeches given we have not successfully been able to demonstrate ongoing outcomes.”

Review of Interview Responses

Very few interviewees spoke about the marketing and communications of past Summits, or the overall approach to this other than to acknowledge that it was generally handled externally. Some acknowledged that there were communications meetings between Cornershop and communications staff from partner organisations, but that there were varying levels of engagement with this.

Summary conclusions on marketing and communications

* Records indicate that marketing and communications has been one of the most clearly planned and evaluated areas of the Summit, despite some gaps in documentation. This may be a result of using an external agency.
* The continued involvement of key figures in marketing strategy since the first Summit in 2012 has ensured some level of consistency in strategy and evaluation, though some records have been lost over time as EICSF.
* The structure of marketing and communications strategies has been fairly consistent since 2014, and key objectives have broadly remained the same since 2016 with clear measures for evaluation. Despite this, marketing and communications strategies have adapted based on changes to the Summit programme and delivery, with new approaches taken in reaction to them.
* Evaluations recommended increasing online activity between Summits to maintain engagement. While this did happen from 2020/21, it is likely this was in response to necessity rather than a reaction to recommendations. It has been unclear when recommendations have been acted on.
* Social media following has consistently grown, though remains static between Summits until activity on accounts increases. E-newsletter open and click through rate has remained above sector average, though subscribers may have been lost when a new mailing list was created in 2020.
* Partner organisations have been involved in planning communications and marketing through the Communications Group, though individual partner objectives have not been found for any year except 2014. Further engagement of partners could improve the consistency of approach to marketing and communications.
* Lack of clear objectives for the Summit may have detracted from the ability to successfully communicate its purpose to audiences.

## APPENDIX 6: Survey of International Cultural Landscape

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Timing/location** | **Instigating organisation(s)** | **Participation** | **Core subjects** | **Purpose** | **Key outputs** | **Funding** |
| **Americas Cultural Summit** | 3-4 day events started in 2018. To date, there’s only been 3 summits: the first one took place in Ottawa, the second in Buenos Aires and final one in 2021 was a digital summit. | Canada Council for the Arts in partnership with the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), Argentina’s Ministry of Culture and Canada’s National Endowment for the Arts. | Senior government officials, public funding bodies, investors, arts and culture institutions and practitioners from across the region, artists, general public at open public sessions.  Inaugural event included 169 delegates from 33 countries. | Each summit had a special theme (e.g. Cultural change in a diverse territory, cultural citizenship) | Fostering dialogue and collaboration among cultural leaders from across the Americas  Building new cultural management models  Raising public awareness | Workshops/panels/talks/speeches  Public sessions open to all  Post event reports  Joint Call to Action to support new initiatives and collaboration  IFACCA meetings  Ministerial meetings | Multiple revenue streams incl. government funding, and in-kind and financial support from partner organisations |
| **Arctic Circle Assembly** | Annual four-day October event held in Reykjavik, Iceland since 2013. | Arctic Circle is a non-profit and non-governmental international platform with a secretariat based in Iceland. | Heads of states, ministers, members of parliaments, indigenous leadership and representatives, officials, experts, scientists, entrepreneurs, business leaders, environmentalists, students, activists  The 2022 edition was attended by more than 2000 participants from over 60 countries. | Subjects change in line with priority areas. Recent events covered topics, such as the future of Arctic security, peace and prosperity, indigenous perspectives, Arctic urban communities, climate change and sustainable development. | To facilitate “international dialogue and cooperation on the future of the Arctic and our Planet” through networking and knowledge sharing | Receptions/talks and panels/exhibitions/performances/networking events/awards/film screenings  Significant YouTube video content | Registration fees  Exhibitors and vendors  Multitude of global and North Atlantic strategic partners, incl. corporates (e.g. Icelandair, KeaHotels), foundation (e.g. Mamont, Prince Albert II of Monaco) and governments (e.g. Iceland, Quebec) |
| **Art Basel** | Annual art fair in Basel, Switzerland founded in 1970. Later offshoots in Miami Beach and Hong Kong. The Basel event usually spans over 5 days. | MCH Group, the parent company, is a major international live marketing organisation. | Galleries, collectors, artists, art and museum professionals, critics, general public. | Broad range of topics related to contemporary art, e.g. art and curatorial practices, market trends, tech innovations, art and the environment. | Showcasing modern and contemporary art  Networking/creating business opportunities  Fostering critical reflection  Public engagement | The Art Market report (open access resource)  Exhibitions  Free and open to public Conversations programme  Special projects | Diverse income from ticket sales, sponsorships, VIP programme, gallery participation fees, etc. Partners include multinational financial services company UBS and world’s leading private jet company NetJets. |
| **Art Dubai** | Annual contemporary and modern art fair launched in 2007. Happens every March in Dubai, UAE. | The Art Dubai Group – Art Dubai is one of the events in their portfolio.  Works closely with key arts institutions in the region, incl. Jameel Arts Centre, Ishara Art Foundation, Sharjah Art Foundation, Maraya Art Centre, Louvre Abu Dhabi, Salama Bint Hamdan Al Nahyan Foundation, Tashkeel, NYUAD Art Gallery and Alserkal Avenue | Cultural organisations, art professionals, collectors, artists and galleries | Split into several sections (Contemporary, Modern, region or theme specific Bawwaba, Digital) and aimed at highlighting different aspects of the art world. Sections are accompanied by talks, performances, tours, workshops, seminars, panels on art theory, cultural studies, etc. | Promoting Dubai as a regional centre for MENASA (Middle East, North Africa & South Asia)  Art  Developing Dubai’s position as a talent incubator | Art Sales  Artist exposure  Community engagement  Regional Art development  Art Discourse | Multiple income streams incl. ticket sales, sponsorships (e.g. BMW, Guerlain), gallery participation fees and government support. |
| **Arts Festivals Summit** | Annual 3-4 day event (spring or autumn) delivered by different festival members at different locations. | Established in 1952, European Festivals Association (EFA) connects 100 festivals and festival associations in 40 countries. | EFA members, alumni of the Festival Academy, cities and regions reps, business sector. 2023 event attracted 200 delegates | Main focus is the role of the arts and arts festivals in society. Covers a broad range of subjects incl. environmental sustainability, arts in public spaces and inclusivity. | Widening organisational opportunities through networking among festivals and other stakeholders | Policy development  Professional development  Supporting innovation in the sector  Collaborations | Changes with locations but often includes national and regional tourism boards and Creative Europe. |
| **Aspen Dialogues series** | Frequency and locations depend on the theme, regional focus and logistical considerations. Often take place in the Aspen Institute HQ in Aspen, Colorado. | Aspen Institute is a US educational and policy studies organisation. | Academics and experts, business and industry representatives, youth leaders, artists and cultural figures | Very broad spectrum of discussions incl. topics related to economics, politics, international relations and culture, e.g. Environmental sustainability, Cultural diplomacy, AI and society | Stimulating critical thinking  Promoting collaborations  Inspiring action and positive change | Content made accessible to wider audiences  Knowledge exchange  Policy recommendations |  |
| **Beyond The Obvious** | Some gaps but the general pattern is annual events in different European locations | Co-organised by Culture Action Europe | International practitioners, organisations and institutions, policymakers, thinkers, researchers, activists from the cultural, social and other sectors (e.g. health). | Topics relevant to cultural policies, cultural management, cultural diversity, social inclusion, audience development, sustainability, digital transformation, the role of culture in shaping societies. Previous themes included Cultural practices in non-urban territories, Culture and wellbeing, Belonging and becoming. | Knowledge exchange through exploring alternative perspectives, different discussion formats and innovative solutions  Networking and partnership building across Europe  Local community empowerment | Policy recommendations  Workshops/capacity building  New partnerships through networking opportunities | Co-financed by theEuropean Union |
| **Brussels Urban Summit** | 4-day event taking place in June 2023 in Brussels, Belgium. | Co-organised by Eurocities with the Brussels-Capital Region, the Metropolis urban network and the OECD Champion Mayors for Inclusive Growth Initiative. | Political leaders, policymakers and civil society actors from 300 cities around the world. | Key challenges facing today’s urban centres: homelessness, climate change, energy poverty, inequality, migratory shifts, etc | Showcasing urban leadership  Sharing ideas and insights | N/A |  |
| **COP-26 (Culture and Heritage strand)** | SEC Centre in Glasgow, 31st Oct – 12th Nov 2021  COP is a series of UN climate change conferences started in 1995. Each COP summit has a different global location.  Climate Heritage Network (CHN) was launched in 2019. | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is an agreement of 197 countries of the UN.  CHN is supported by a range of organisations, such as International Council for Monuments and Sites, UN Environment Programme, International Union for Conservation of Nature | Representatives of national governments, “observer” organisations (e.g. charities, industry associations, NGOs, etc), UN agencies, academics/experts, activists, media  COP-26 CHN included representation from UK orgs, such the National Trust and Julie’s Bicycle. | The role of cultural heritage in climate action, resilience and sustainability | Networking, knowledge sharing and promotion of research  Highlighting the centrality of culture in successful climate policy development  Education/public engagement in topics related to culture and climate solutions | CultureatCOP.com website  Preliminary events in different regions  Manifesto on Culture and Climate  Reports and research  Searchable database  Action group |  |
| **Culture Summit Abu Dhabi** | Annual event in Abu Dhabi, UAE started in 2017 | Co-organized by the Department of Culture and Tourism - Abu Dhabi in collaboration with international partners, incl. UNESCO, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation, Economist Impact, Google, the Design Museum | Cultural leaders, researchers, practitioners and policymakers | Role of culture in addressing global challenges. Previous discussion topics included cultural diplomacy, heritage preservation, creative industries, cultural diversity, cultural tourism, arts education, and the intersection of culture and technology. | Exchange of ideas  Exploring alternative approaches to cultural policy and practice  Fostering cross sector collaborations | Platform for the announcement of initiatives, partnerships, and policy frameworks  Talks  Performances  Film screenings  Networking dinners | Wide range of sponsors and funders, incl. Google, UNESCO and AFAC Arab Fund for Arts and Culture |
| **Davos World Economic Forum** | Annual event in Davos, Switzerland  started in 1971. | World Economic Forum (WEF) is a Swiss NGO with HQ in Geneva and offices in Tokyo, NYC and Beijing. It is a lobbying, non-governmental organisation. | Global business, government, civil society, media, academia, global influencers, incl. celebrities.  2000 – 3000 on the official invitation list but up to 10000 attend fringe events. | Themes change annually in line with the prevailing global context. WEF2023 theme was “Cooperation in a Fragmented World”. The programme included 500 events dedicated to diverse aspects of the global economy, from the prospects of a global recession to advances in green tech. | Influencing global agendas & decision making, lobbying for public-private cooperation | High level discussions  Collaborative initiatives (e.g. Global Shapers Community, Young Global Leaders, and the Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship)  Policy recommendations  Reports and research papers  Media coverage | WEF is funded by its members and often criticised for its lack of financial transparency |
| **Dhaka Art Summit (DAS)** | Founded in 2012, DAS is a non-commercial “research and exhibition platform for art and architecture related to South Asia” hosted biennially at Bangladesh Shilpakala Academy. Average duration is 8-9 days. | Samdani Art Foundation in collaboration with the Ministry of Cultural Affairs,Bangladesh | DAS is free to public and ticketless. Brings together artists, curators, educators, researchers, critics, cultural organisations and students. Mostly draws participants from the Global South. | Focus on South Asian contemporary and historic art communities | Showcasing contemporary art and Bangladeshi culture  Encouraging dialogue and collaboration  Promoting critical discourse  Exposure and professional development for emerging artists  Promoting cultural participation  Supporting the world’s most climatically impacted areas and communities | Exhibitions  Talks/panel discussions/workshops/master classes  International and local performance art programme  Curated programme dedicated to a region, theme or artform  Educations/outreach programme  Film screenings | Broad range of supporters, incl. government ministries, foundations and private companies. |
| **Eurocities Economic Development Forum** | 3-day event hosted annually in different member cities. | Eurocities is a membership organisation /network of 200 cities in 38 countries | City representatives (e.g. mayors, Chambers of Commerce) and stakeholders (e.g. EU policymakers, European Investment Bank, European Business Network)  Free online streaming to wider public | Each year has a different theme, e.g. 2023 programmes explores the ways European cities are fostering innovation and skills development to enable a socially inclusive green future. | Knowledge exchange / discussion forum for economic development strategies and challenges  Sharing best practice / capacity building | Networking and collaborations  Knowledge transfer/ potential policy recommendations  Streaming content | Multiple revenue streams incl. members’ annual fees, sponsorships, grants, etc. |
| **European Cluster Conference** | Biennial European event started in 2008. Three of the eight conferences took place in Brussels, Belgium | European Cluster Collaboration Platform (ECCP) is project initiated by the European Commission. ECCP runs a number of other side meetings and matchmaking events. | EU and regional policymakers, cluster managers, academic researchers, investors, entrepreneurs, cluster associations and networks. 2022 edition attracted over 600 participants from 40 countries. | Themes related to current priorities (e.g. green and digital transitions, interregional cooperation) but all are aimed at supporting innovation and regional economic development | Networking and partnership building  Dissemination of information  Capacity building  Dialogue and policy discussion  Showcasing EU cluster initiatives | Increased visibility and promotion of cluster work  Resources (reports, publications, case studies)  Policy recommendations  Collaborative projects and partnerships  Cluster exhibition  European Cluster Awards | European Commission, national and regional governments, participant organisations |
| **Eurosonic** | Annual 3-day music showcase and conference in Groningen, NL. Founded in 1986, it always takes place in January and is dedicated to the promotion and discovery of new European music. | Eurosonic Noorderslag (ESNS) is a non profit behind both Eurosonic and Noorderslag,  Dutch music event that immediately follows Eurosonic. | Musicians, music industry professionals, media, academic researchers, local government officials, professional associations and campaigning organisations, public funders.  General public can buy tickets to attend music showcases.  On average, ESNS brings together over 4000 music industry executives, 400 media professionals, and 40 000 fans. | Key music industry trends, with an emphasis on the live sector (e.g. the effects of Brexit on touring), gender representation, sustainability | Showcasing new European talent  Networking and business opportunities  Local/regional community engagement (e.g. pioneering sustainability initiatives)  Knowledge/best practice sharing | Showcase performances  Talent Development programme (ESNS exchange)  Awards (e.g. Music Moves Europe, European Festival Award)  Instigating and supporting partnerships initiatives, incl. Keychange, European Broadcasting Union, Green Deal Circular Festivals  International media coverage  Music industry insight via conference talks, panels, etc. | Ticket and merchandise sales as well as multiple public and private partners, incl. the EU, Heineken, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science |
| **Frankfurt Bookfair** | Est in 1949, this annual event in Frankfurt, Germany is the world’s leading meeting space for print and digital content. | German Publishers and Booksellers Association curate most of the programme | Publishers, agents, authors, speakers include leading cultural and political figures. 2022 edition had 93 000 trade visitors from 121 countries. Runs a special programme for general public. | Emerging industry trends and bigger cultural issues, e.g. Digital copyright, promotion of translated literature, eco-friendly printing, censorship. | Trade and business platform/rights and licensing hub  International networking  Public relations /educational programme  Cultural and knowledge exchange  Showcasing tech innovations | Business deals  Launchpad for new titles  International cultural exchange  Public engagement through signings, readings, awards  Professional development / trend insights | Diverse income streams incl. sponsorships, partnerships, ticket sales and fees paid by exhibition/trade stand participants |
| **G20 Leaders’ Summit** | The G20 Leaders' Summit takes place annually in different locations around the world. Each year, one member country assumes the presidency and hosts the summit. The specific dates and locations of the summit are determined by the host country in consultation with other member countries. | G20 is an intergovernmental forum for international economic cooperation (19 countries/biggest economies + the EU) | Heads of state/government from G20, guest countries, international organisations (e.g. UN, IMF, WTO, FSB), stakeholder or engagement groups (e.g. Women20, Youth20) | Topics vary in relation to priorities and challenges faced by global financial systems each year. Core subjects incl. Economic growth, international trade, Social issues, Sustainable development, Digital economies. | Addressing pressing economic challenges and improving global economic governance  Fostering sustainable development, economic growth, economic policy cooperation  Facilitating global trade, investment and regulatory frameworks | Leaders Declaration (summary of collective commitments)  Action plans on specific issues  Joint statements highlighting collective commitment/action on urgent issues  Policy guidelines  Engagement group recommendations  New initiatives | Funds come primarily from the host country’s government budget |
| **G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers** | First G20 meeting devoted specifically to culture took place 29 – 30 July 2021, Rome, Italy | G20 is an intergovernmental forum for international economic cooperation (19 countries/biggest economies + the EU) | Culture ministers or representatives from the G20 member countries, and delegations from UNESCO,OECD, the Council of Europe, the Union for the Mediterranean, ICCROM, ICOM and ICOMOS, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Interpol and the World Customs Organization (WCO). | -promotion of culture and creative sectors as engines for sustainable growth  -protection of cultural heritage against risks, incl. natural disasters, climate change, deliberate destruction, illicit trafficking  -promotion of digital and technological transformation in the cultural and creative sectors  -building capacity through training  -tackling climate change through culture | Examining strategies for rebuilding the cultural sector post pandemic and ways in which culture could contribute to recovery as a driver of long-term socio-economic development, resilience and well being | Rome Declaration of the G20 Ministers:  Call for G20 governments to prioritise the cultural sector  Proposal for a G20 network of Cultural Business Management Training institutions  Commitment to the creation of special forces to protect cultural heritage in crisis areas | No information available |
| **Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (ICD) sessions** | Periodic meetings take place at UNESCO HQ in Paris. 16 sessions since 2007. | UNESCO | Representatives of UNESCO member states delegations (policymakers, government officials, experts), NGOs, cultural organisations, industry associations, academics | Key topics are linked to the implementation of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions that “supports governments and civil society in finding policy solutions for emerging challenges.” | Monitoring progress and reporting  Policy development  International cooperation through sharing best practice, dialogue and knowledge exchange (e.g. consultation with civil society organisations and cultural enterprises) | Resolutions and recommendations  Guidelines and tools  Increased visibility and awareness of cultural diversity as policy objective  International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)  Funding decisions | UNESCO and voluntary contributions from member states and other stakeholders |
| **ISPA (International Society for the Performing Arts) Congress** | 3-4 day biannual event with one NYC edition and one in another global city | ISPA is a global professional network with representation across185 cities and all regions of the world. | “Performing arts leaders” incl. presenters, festivals, producing companies, artist managers, consultants, and government cultural leaders.  Jan 2023 NYC congress was attended by 546 delegates from 51 regions. | Each congress has a theme, e.g. Arts and Border, The Urgency of Now. | Exchanging/developing ideas  Networking/relationship building (incl. mentoring element/support for emerging professional)  Commissioning and presenting new work | Presentations/workshops/seminars – professional development  Pitch sessions  Networking opportunities  Publications/resources | Each congress is funded differently. Funding appears to be largely linked to the location and includes corporate sponsors, regional/local authorities, Tourism boards. |
| **Mondiacult - World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development** | Two editions to date:  28 – 30 Sept 2022, Mexico City  26 July-6 August 1982, Mexico City | UNESCO | Mondiacult 2022 was the largest global conference on culture in the last 40 years.  It was attended by 2600 participants including 135 Ministers of Culture, 83 NGOs, 32 intergovernmental organisations and 9 UN agencies. | Mondiacult 2022 covered a broad range of subjects incl. culture in times of crisis,  culture for climate action,  creative economy and digital sector,  illicit trafficking of cultural goods,  cultural rights,  cultural diversity,  culture in public policies and education. These strands formed the basis of the Declaration for Culture. | Mondiacult 2022 - “To tackle global challenges and outline immediate and future priorities in order to shape a more robust and resilient cultural sector, fully anchored in sustainable development prospects.” | Declaration for Culture – culture declared “a global public good” to be “a goal in its own right in the development agenda beyond 2030”  Establishment of World Forum on Cultural Policies to be organised by UNESCO every four years from 2025  Shift in thinking about culture: not just a contributor to sustainable development but is one of development’s components. | Hosted by the government of Mexico |
| **Museums Association Conference** | Dating back to 1890, Europe’s largest annual conference for museum professionals has been held in major UK cities, including Edinburgh, Manchester and London. | Museums Association is a UK professional membership organisation that also offers international membership. | Museum and heritage professionals (curators, directors, conservators, outreach educators, etc), policymakers, funding bodies, academics and industry suppliers  Digital access to widen participation  Funded places for MA members who face barriers | Themes and subjects change every year. Past topics included audience engagement, interpretations of collections, conservation practices, role of culture at times of conflict, impact of COVID and BLM. | Professional Development and inspiration  Knowledge exchange  Networking  Fostering sense of community in the sector  Advocacy and policy development | Museums Change Lives Awards  Digital content available via the MA website  Workshops, panels, interactive sessions aimed to inspire learning and best practice | MA, registration fees, commercial sponsorship, exhibition fees, philanthropic income |
| **Q Ideas Culture Summit** | Annual Christian event held at various locations across the USA | THINQ Media (formerly Q ideas) is platform “to help leaders and influencers to engage culture from a biblical worldview.” | International Christian leaders in any field (e.g. church, business, education, government, non-profit, etc.) | Christian reflections on any critical topics of our time (e.g. The idol of productivity, The state of policing, Understanding generations). | Restoring Christian credibility and influence in Western society  Inspiring and building confidence of Christian leaders  Networking | Digital library of learning resources (e.g. recordings of talks)  Media coverage  Relationship/community building  Short talks/Q&As | Multiple income streams including ticket sales and sponsorship |
| **Reeperbahn Festival** | Started in 2006, Reeperbahn is a multi-day annual music/arts showcase and conference that takes place every September in Hamburg, Germany. | Commercial company Reeperbahn Festival GbR in collaboration with local and international partners, sponsors, and institutions | Music industry executives and wider creative industries professionals, media, artists, cultural organisations and music fans | Music industry trends and innovations, EDI and social responsibility, media landscape, artist development, global markets | Promoting new talent/music discovery  Business networking/international and cross disciplinary collaborations  Knowledge sharing / industry insights and trends  Promotion of Hamburg as a cultural hub | Showcase performances  Film, digital arts and literature programmes  Reeperbahn Festival international initiative (Sessions, company visits, showcase, matchmaking in NYC)  Awards (e.g. ANCHOR, International Music Journalism Awards, VUT Indie Awards)  Media coverage | Ticket sales, corporate and brand sponsorship deals, public funding grants, venue partnerships, merchandise sales, trade fair revenues |
| **SXSW** | Annual, normally week-long mega event that takes place in March in Austen, Texas. | SXSW LLC in partnership with numerous other industry and government entities | Pre-pandemic attendance figures ranged from 200 000 to 400 000. Different strands of the event (e.g. Film, Music) attract different audiences that generally include industry professionals media, artists, investors, entrepreneurs. | Trends in music, film, digital media and tech, design, startup opportunities and social engagement/activism | Networking, exhibition and showcase platform  Laboratory for emerging trends in music, film and tech | Showcasing emerging talent  Innovation/tech insights  Start up launchpad  Knowledge exchange  Local community engagement | Multiple revenue streams, incl. ticket sales, exhibition fees, corporate sponsorship (e.g. Netflix, Google, Apple, Facebook), government grants. |
| **Tallinn Music Week** | Est. in 2009, TMW is an annual international music and creative industries event in the Baltic region. Pandemic editions aside, TMW is a spring event. | Shiftworks is the founding organisation that co-produces the event with major regional promoters and venues in the city of Tallinn. | Senior Estonian government officials, EU cultural policymakers, music industry professionals, tech companies, visual artists, musicians, academic researchers, media. 2023 edition attracted over 18000 visitors and artists from 41 countries. | Much wider cultural agenda than a standard music industry event. TMW conference explores how creativity and cultural industries can influence society, promote social causes and contribute to positive change. TMW incorporates music, visual arts, food, children’s and city festivals. | Networking  Fostering creative entrepreneurship  Showcasing new Baltic and international talent  Community engagement  Soft diplomacy, esp. promotion of Estonia as a Nordic nation/EU country  Supporting female and gender minority creatives | Music festival – new music showcase  City Festival – public engagement through talks, Record Fair, free concerts and exhibitions  Creative Impact conference  Conference delegate database  Streamed content | Multiple public and private income streams (e.g. Visit Estonia, Music Estonia, ticket sales, showcase fees). |
| **Transforming Education Summit** | NYC, September 2022 during high level week of UN General Assembly | UN – key initiative of Our Common Agenda | Heads of state/government, Senior UN officials, civil society representative, including “youth-led and youth-organised” Mobilisation Day participants | Five thematic Action Tracks guided by the UN 2030 agenda:  -Inclusive, equitable, safe and healthy schools  -leaning and skills for life, work and sustainable development  -teachers, teaching and the teaching profession  -digital learning and transformation  -financing of education | Promoting education to the top of political agenda  Seeking solutions to a global crisis in education created by the pandemic | Steaming of the programme (open access)  Transforming Education Knowledge Hub (online resources)  Launch of Gateways to Public Digital Learning (UNESCO and UNICEF) and International Finance Faculty for Education initiatives  Global Youth Declaration  UN Secretary-General’s  Vision Statement on Transforming Education |  |
| **Venice Biennale** | Set of biennial festivals in Venice, Italy dating back to 1885. Each festival/art form within the Venice Biennale has its own designated timeframe for exhibitions, events, and activities. The Art Exhibition is the central and oldest component. | La Biennale di Venezia  oversees constituent festivals dedicated to specific art forms (Art, Architecture, Music, Theatre, Cinema and Dance). | Artists, industry professionals, media, commissioners, international delegates/National Pavilions, collectors and cultural organisations. Also open to general public. | Emerging trends in contemporary art and culture as well as global socio-political themes, art theory, urban development. Each festival has its own more defined fields related to its artform. | Creating safe and inclusive space for presentation and discussion of its defined artforms  Promoting cultural diplomacy  Supporting art market/cultural industries  Promoting heritage/tourism | Exhibitions  Awards (e.g. Golden Lion)  Lectures/panels, etc  Exhibition catalogues  Outreach activities/educational programmes  Emerging artist exposure | Very extensive range of income streams, incl. Italian government, cultural institutions, income from National Pavilions, philanthropic contributions, ticket sales, etc. |
| **World Cities Culture Forum Summit** | Annual flagship event hosted on a rotating basis by partner cities. | World Cities Culture Forum – open global platform for cities interested in culture and urban development (Edinburgh is a member) | City leaders, international cultural experts, academic researchers, tourism professionals. | Core underlying theme is the role of culture in urban development. Discussion questions are related to the identity of the host city (e.g. San Francisco > Culture and New Technologies Transforming World Cities). | Networking  Knowledge/best practice sharing  Promoting the value and impact of culture in cities | Documentation/summit reports  Performances  Workshops and seminars  New initiatives |  |
| **World Education Summit** | Digital conference launched in 2020. | Brainchild of Stephen Cox and Anne-Marie Duguid. Stephen Cox is the CEO of Osiris Education, UK independent teacher training provider, who produce the event. | Teachers, schools, policymakers, academic researchers, entrepreneurs and business leaders, campaigners, educational charities  2023 event drew together over 50 000 delegates from 100+ countries. | Seven key themes: Leadership, Insight to Impact, Assessment and Curriculum, EDI, Human Potential, Future of Learning, Teaching and Learning. | Global networking opportunities  Sharing best practice  Promoting innovation  Shaping policy development | Professional development  Product and project launchpad  Enhancing schools’ learning resources | Sponsorships deals (e.g. TES, Zoom), ticket sales |
| **World Summit of Arts and Culture (est. 2000)** | Triennial 3-day event delivered in partnership with different National Member institutions at different location around the world. | Co-hosted by IFACCA (International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies) in partnership with governments of host countries | Depends on the theme of each summit. Previous editions included policy makers, researchers, managers and practitioners from the arts and culture, national arts councils, international networks. Delegate numbers range 400 – 500. | Each summit has a core theme, e.g. Artistic freedom and cultural expression, Creative Intersections, Mobile Minds. | Fostering exchange between government, cultural and non-cultural sectors and civil society    Profiling key issues  Promoting public support for the arts/culture | Discussion papers on key issues/ declarations and manifestos  Showcases and performances  Knowledge exchange and collaborations  Policy development/advocacy  Professional development | Part-funded by governments of host countries |
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## APPENDIX 7: International Case Studies

**A. Culture Summit Abu Dhabi**

**Introduction**

Culture Summit Abu Dhabi is an annual forum of knowledge exchange, debate and policy development set up by the Department of Culture and Tourism (DCT) Abu Dhabi, UAE. Started in 2017, this three- to five-day event convenes artists, creative thinkers and leaders from the field of arts, heritage, media, museums, public policy and technology, to identify ways in which culture can transform societies and communities worldwide by offering practical solutions to the most challenging issues of our time. Notably, Culture Summit Abu Dhabi is one of several events hosted by the UAE that focus on or have strong links to the cultural domain and are aimed at fostering global conversations. Other examples include the Sharjah Entrepreneurship Festival, Sharjah Theatre Research Forum, World Urban Forum, Dubai Design Week, and The Future of Culture Retreat. Each edition of Culture Summit Abu Dhabi is curated under a theme that informs the programme of panel discussions, keynotes, case study presentations, live performances, workshops, dinners and talks, which since 2019 have been brought together in collaboration with local and global partner organisations, such as Google, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation, UNESCO, CNBC, Louvre Abu Dhabi, and Euronews.

Intended as a “Davos of culture,” the Summit also serves as an opportunity to highlight Abu Dhabi’s multicultural social fabric, boosting its reputation as a hub for cultural dialogue and artistic expression. As well as its action-oriented agenda, it is known for its diverse participation and a wide range of performances from local and international artists, singers, dancers, poets, and DJs. Since 2018 some of the summit content has been live streamed and made publicly available online, and the 2021 virtual edition was free and open to the public. Set for October 2023, the 6th edition of the Summit will focus on the theme *A Matter of Time* and will explore our changing relation to time, how this change is impacting the way culture is produced.

**Case Description**

**Vision, mission and purpose**

To bring together politicians, leaders in culture, heritage, public policy, technology, artists, thinkers and performers from around the world and enable open, tolerant and action-driven conversations about the way culture can transform and enhance societies and economies globally.

**Precise objectives and deliverables**

* To position Abu Dhabi as a leading international destination and a global cultural capital (not openly stated but clearly the primary underlying objective).
* To enable collaborations and partnerships between artists and government officials, business and thought leaders.
* To advance change in the culture sector by influencing policy making and issuing recommendations for governments.

**Timing and location**

The first three editions took place in April in Manarat Al Saadiyat, the cultural district of Abu Dhabi. The 2020 event was cancelled and moved online in reduced capacity. It was followed by an extended digital edition in March 2021. The first post-pandemic in-person summit was due to take place in May 2022 but was postponed to October following the death of Sheikh Khalifa, President of the UAE. The upcoming 2023 summit is due to take place in October. With some notable exceptions, such as pre-summit tours and dinner settings, most of the discussions and performances take place at one location.

**Partners**

Initially the Summit worked with a global strategic advisory firm Brunswick Group. The first two editions were organised by TCA Abu Dhabi in conjunction with The Rothkopf Group, publishers of Foreign Policy magazine and an interactive media and advisory firm specialising in global issues, and TCP Ventures, LLC, a cultural advisory firm and a global producer of artistic events at the intersection of culture and social impact. Subsequent events were created by DCT Abu Dhabi in collaboration with a wide network of global partner organisations bringing expertise in diverse fields, from culture and arts to media and technology. Grammy Awards organiser, The Recording Academy of America, is the latest addition to the Summit’s roster of partners. Current list of partners also includes UNESCO, Economist Impact, Google, the Design Museum, Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation, Image Nation Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi Film Commission, Sandstorm Comics, Cultural Foundation, Louvre Abu Dhabi, Berklee Abu Dhabi, Culture Resource, Arab Fund for Arts & Culture, and the Institut Français. UNESCO, who regard the partnership as an instrument to promote ministerial dialogue, has been a key partner for the past four years, with a more formal involvement since 2022. In addition to the core partners who shape the programme of each edition by sharing their expertise and resources, Culture Summit Abu Dhabi is partnered with a number of news and business media platforms such as The National, Arab News, Abu Dhabi Media, Dubai Media Inc., The Economic Times, CNBC, Africa News and Euronews.

**Participants**

From the outset, as the label “summit” suggests, this event was conceived as a major global gathering, a melting pot of ideas with representatives from a wide range of disciplines, geographic and cultural settings, and diverse socio-political contexts. The first edition attracted over 300 of the world’s top creative minds from over 80 countries. Last year’s summit attracted participants from more than 90 countries. Among them were former Heads of state (Lithuania, Croatia, Malawi), Cultural Advisor to the UAE president, Assistant Director General for Culture for UNESCO, Chief Executive and Director of the Design Museum London, Senior Editor and Culture Editor of The Economist, comedian and *The Daily Show* host Trevor Noah, acclaimed architects Frank Gehry and Sir David Adjaye, art collectors Guy and Myriam Ullens, professor and Forensic Architecture founder Eyal Weizman, SXSW VP for Global Partnerships and first humanoid artist Ai-Da. Although the calibre of participants is consistently high, the list is at least in part dependent on the theme of each edition. Previous themes include The Creative Mind of the Connected World: Culture as a Change Agent in the Digital Age (2017), Unexpected Collaborations: Forging New Connections Between Heritage and Innovation, Near and Far, Creativity and Purpose (2018), Cultural Responsibility and New Technology (2019), Alone Together: Culture and Resilience (2020 – original event cancelled, reduced online edition), The Cultural Economy and the Economy of Culture (2021) and A Living Culture (2022).

**Governance Structure**

The 2018 Summit made references to a Steering Committee chaired by HE Noura Al Kaabi, Minister of Culture and Knowledge Development for the UAE. HE Mohamed Khalifa Al Mubarak, Chairperson of the Abu Dhabi Department of Culture and Tourism, was at that point another member of the Steering Committee.

**Management/ Delivery structure**

No information is available about the summit’s current delivery team, but partners play a critical role in the shaping of each programme and driving the dialogue between key representatives. For instance, in 2019 the Economist Events programmed the media stream and provided expertise in discussing issues related to information and its policies; UNESCO addressed the tangible and intangible heritage role in societal change; the Royal Academy of Arts curated and lead on the arts stream; the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation explored the way museums shape the future of culture, and Google provided insights on the technology stream and lead the discussion related to tech, arts and changes in culture.

**Funding and budget**

Core partnerships appear to have a curatorial/knowledge basis rather than offer any direct financial support. Number and calibre of media partners suggest the summit has substantial financial resources as well as a strong interest in influencing global and regional media coverage of the event.

**Key Outputs**

* Cultural Diplomat of the Year awards in 2017 and 2018.
* Declaration of commitment to developing new metrics to measure cultural impact and a collaborative web-based platform designed to foster ongoing cross-cultural conversation (2017).
* Group workshop recommendations for policymakers, governments, public and private sectors organisations (2018).
* Announcement of the joint DTC Abu Dhabi, Ministry of Culture UAE and UNESCO world conference on culture and arts education (2022).

**Long-terms outcomes and impacts**

* Development of closer and more formal ties with UNESCO / *Culture in Times of COVID-19: Resilience, Recovery, Revival* joint UNESCO report presented at the 2022 summit.
* *Artist Incubator* programme (2018).
* Research initiative aimed at developing and building Virtual Reality technology that would enable new ways of learning and experiencing museums.

**Points discovered in evaluation**

The original 2017 summit attracted some criticism for alleged exclusion of some leaders of the UAE’s artistic community. It is hard to ascertain whether this was politically motivated or a mere curatorial oversight.

When it comes to sector-specific funding in the music industry, recent influx of investment from the MENA countries provoked a lot of tension and debates around subjects related to LGBTQ+ rights, race and gender attitudes in the region.

The Rothkopf Group has also done work for the UAE Embassy in the USA. Its founder and chairperson David Rothkopf is a prominent political affairs analyst and commentator, who has taught International Affairs at Oxford, Cambridge and US Ivy League universities.

Diversity of participants and perspectives is part of the Culture Summit’s DNA and one of its core strengths that enables cross-sector collaborations and insights. The Summit builds its legitimacy and pulling power by attracting celebrities, global brands and key political figures. Coupled with a significant number of media partnerships that cover the MENA region, Europe and North America, this translates into positive media messaging on a global scale and contributes towards a new vision of Abu Dhabi as a free-thinking global culture hub. Working towards closer alignments with global organisations like UNESCO and Google underlines the scale of the Summit’s vision and, most probably, the size of the budgets behind the event. Another important component of the summit’s identity is the integration of performances, screening and other artistic expressions into the core programme. This not only gives platform to the artists but utilises the soft power of culture in breaking boundaries and moving forward critical debates.

However, this event’s lack of transparency in funding and likely reliance on government support via the Department of Culture and Tourism could be regarded as a weakness and not a model that can easily be replicated. The remarkable achievement in drawing distinguished participants to the first summit, along with its extremely prominent global reputation, suggests substantial financial resources. However, the absence of reporting and documentation prevents meaningful comparisons with EICS concerning participation or financial support. Notably, the majority of details about the Summit are conveyed through official government press releases and presented via media outlets partnered with the event. The summit seems to serve as a means to counter negative perceptions of the UAE and to redefine Abu Dhabi as a worldwide hub for culture, fostering dialogue and positive change.

**Learning for EICS**

Culture Summit Abu Dhabi’s success is a combination of its clarity of purpose, strategic long-term planning and generous budgets. EICS has to be clear about its mission, vision and purpose, build a strategy that incorporates partnership development and fundraising targets that allow for a number of permanent/long-term management and delivery team positions as well as healthy marketing/PR budgets.

Areas for further research may include theme development and partner collaborations in programming.
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**B. G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers**

**Introduction**

Established in 1999 G20 is an intergovernmental forum representing 19 of the world’s biggest economies and the EU. It was set up to foster international cooperation, promote economic stability and sustainable growth. Over the years, the G20 agenda has expanded beyond purely economic matters to include other pressing global issues. Following the online meeting of Culture Ministers organised by the Saudi Presidency in 2020, the 2021 Italian Presidency integrated Culture into the G20 agenda as a Culture Working Group (CWG) and hosted the inaugural in-person G20 Meeting of Culture Ministers under the banner of *Culture Unites the World*. This was followed by the G20 Culture Ministers’ Meeting in Indonesia in 2022 and India in 2023.

CWG identifies priority areas for ministerial discussions that traverse economic, social, and environmental dimensions of development, and underscore the importance of culture for both current and future generations (e.g. cultural heritage protection, culture-led climate action, building capacity through training and education, digital transition and new technologies for culture, culture and creative sectors as the drivers for development, culture for sustainable living, equitable access to cultural economic opportunities).

In the G20 context, culture is viewed as a pivotal catalyst for robust, sustainable, well-rounded, and inclusive growth, including advancements in technology and digital transformation. This perspective highlights the interconnected contributions of culture, cultural heritage, and the creative sectors to the G20's actions and their impact on the economy, society, and the environment. It emphasises how culture aligns with the G20's mission and objectives, particularly in the context of post-pandemic recovery and revitalisation.

**Case Description**

**Vision, mission and purpose**

G20 Meetings of Culture Ministers aim to harness the power of culture to contribute to global peace and sustainable development. They provide a platform for high-level multilateral dialogue and exchanges on cultural matters among the G20 nations and guest countries and emphasise the vital role of culture in shaping societies, fostering creativity and innovative policymaking, driving economies, and enhancing international relations. This mission also includes addressing challenges and opportunities related to cultural diversity, heritage preservation, and the creative industries within the context of the G20's broader goals.

**Precise objectives and deliverables**

The Meeting in Rome included presentations, speeches, concerts, dinners, working sessions, bilateral meetings, keynote addresses, site visits and a press conference. It sought:

* to encourageG20 Leaders to increase investments in the culture sector.
* to champion integration of culture into national economic and social recovery and longer-term development strategies.
* to recognise and bring into effective action culture’s potential across the public policy spectrum in forging more sustainable societies and economies.
* to reach consensus around specific shared deliverables.

**Timing and location**

To date there have only been two face-to-face G20 Culture Ministers’ meetings. The first one took place in 29th – 30th July 2021 in Rome and was part of a series of ministerial meetings, working groups and engagement groups held throughout the year under the umbrella of the G20 Italian Presidency. The second was a two-day event in Java, Indonesia in September 2022 in the context of the G20 Indonesian Presidency. The latest Meeting was in Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh in India in August 2023. Alongside meetings and talks, all three events included project visits and tours of cultural locations.

**Partners**

Italian Government/Ministry of Culture, Quirinale and Palazzo Chigi (2021)

Indonesian Government

Indian Government / Ministry of Culture

There is no evidence of any corporate or philanthropic partnerships in place.

**Participants**

The Meetings are attended by ministers of Culture of G20 countries: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Japan, India, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union. Spain is invited as a permanent guest. In addition, every year the Presidency invites guest countries. Several international and regional organisations (e.g., UNESCO, the Council of Europe) also participate, granting the forum an even broader representation. Exact numbers of the 2021 Culture Ministerial are unclear but other attendees included representatives from international cultural organisations (e.g. ICCROM, ICOM and ICOMOS), key actors of the fight to crimes against cultural heritage such (e.g. Interpol, World Customs Organization and UNODC) and Youth 20, the official G20 engagement group dedicated to the new generations.

**Governance Structure**

The G20 does not have a fixed secretariat; instead, its schedule and functions are determined by the alternating Presidencies, in collaboration with member states. A "Troika," composed of the current Presidency holder, its preceding term holder, and its successor, work to maintain continuity within the G20's proceedings.

G20 Meetings of Culture Ministers is an output of the G20 Culture Working Group (CWG) which itself has a higher mandate and a long-term agenda.

The annual plan of the Culture Working Group (CWG) is created by the current G20 Presidency in line with the CWG's responsibilities, the Leaders' Communique, and the Culture Ministers' Declaration. In the future, it may or may not include focal points, such as G20 Meetings of Culture Ministers. Any such plans will depend on G20 members’ discussions at the beginning of each Presidency.

**Management/ Delivery structure**

The G20 Culture Working Group enabled the formation of a network of global experts. It provided essential support for the ministerial meeting in Rome and has been facilitating the implementation of the G20 Culture Ministers’ decisions on a worldwide scale.

Although no evidence exists, it is likely that the host countries utilise the resources and teams of their Ministries of Culture to project manage the event and liaise with the G20 CWG.

**Key Outputs**

* Promoting international collaborations and building diplomatic relationships through multilateral ministerial conversations
* Note on the economic and social impact of cultural and creative sectors (prepared by the Italian Ministry of Culture to facilitate G20 Culture Working Group)
* G20 Culture Group terms of reference (2021)
* Actionable points, incl. fostering digital ecosystems, promotion of inclusive participation and initiatives in education, training and preservation of cultural sites (2022)
* *G20 Culture Ministerial Declaration* (2020)
* *G20 Bali Leaders’ Declaration* (2022) – highlighted culture as an enabler/driver of sustainable development, cultural diversity as a resource for sustainable living, preservation of cultural heritage, fighting illicit trafficking of cultural property, strengthening of cultural economies.
* *Rome Declaration of the G20 Culture Ministers* (2021) – aligning G20 priorities with UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development via by promoting inclusive and equitable growth patterns and broadening the involvement of stakeholders, including inter-governmental organisations and civil society, in governance mechanisms
* Launch of the *“G20 Culture: Shaping the Global Narrative for Inclusive Growth”* report (2023) - insights and recommendations from the expert-driven Global Thematic Webinars
* Kashi Culture Pathway document (2023) – summary of commitments and agreements of the G20 CWG under the Indian presidency.
* Special edition stamp to mark Indian presidency’s Culture Unites All campaign (2023)

**Long-terms outcomes and impacts**

* Proposal for a G20 network of Cultural Business Management Training institutions – network is intended to help participant countries to enhance” the professional capacities for the management of cultural heritage, through exchange and sharing, in order to foster economic and social development.”
* Exploring the creation of the *Global Arts Culture Recovery Fund –* part of a wider effort to promote cultural economic empowerment.
* Commitment to the creation of special forces to protect cultural heritage in crisis areas.

**Points discovered in evaluation**

It's crucial to view the G20 Culture Ministers’ Meetings within a larger context that encompasses the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), MONDIACULT 2022, COP Summits and other CWG initiatives, such as the 2023 Global Thematic Webinars organised in partnership with the Indian Ministry of Culture during the Indian Presidency of the G20. Notably, the discussions and points covered during the second Culture Ministers’ Meeting in Indonesia fed into the G20 Bali Leaders’ Declaration. In a similar way, the results and conclusions drawn from the CWG activities in India are set to contribute to the discussions at the 18th G20 Leaders' Summit, scheduled for September 9th -10th, 2023 in New Delhi under the Indian Presidency.

**Conclusions**

The event’s undeniable convening power is largely a function of G20’s global significance. G20 has access to resources of international organisations and specialist agencies, both in terms of recourse to expert knowledge and financial support. The Meeting is a small part of a very large global, intergovernmental ecosystem and is overall not a good comparator for EICS. It doesn’t have a strong identity of its own and is entirely dependent on the objectives and political shifts within its umbrella organisation. Its purpose is largely political with little immediate impact on policy development in member countries or financial support for the arts/culture.

**Learning for EICS**

The Culture Ministers' Meeting is intricately woven into a complex political machinery of G20, which grants it substantial influence but, arguably, dilutes its distinct identity. While the EICS may not wield the robust backing of the world's largest intergovernmental organisations, it possesses the potential to leverage its strategic location and timing by fostering deeper integration within the vibrant and diverse network of Edinburgh festivals. This strategic alignment could not only provide opportunities for immersive experiences, tours, and enhanced engagement in the creative environment, but also pave the way for additional forms of support, whether in-kind or financial. Furthermore, such integration could amplify the dissemination of EICS messages through different channels and platforms.

The G20 system inherently excels in maintaining consistency and documentation. The EICS could draw from this strength by introducing follow-up meetings or documentation outlining the progress achieved between events. Similarly, the formulation of a declaration, commitment, or a series of actionable points could confer a clear trajectory to its endeavours and enhance its overall credibility through the introduction of measurable outcomes and targets.
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**C. IFACCA World Summit on Arts and Culture**

**Introduction**

The inaugural World Summit on Arts and Culture took place in December 2000 and led to the creation of the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), which later became the co-organiser of subsequent summits. The Federation is an international membership network of public institutions dedicated to the advancement of arts and culture. Currently numbering 70 countries, each generally has one national member (usually a ministry of culture or an arts council) with some countries represented via affiliate membership open to government agencies that operate at subnational levels including state, regional, provincial, and local government. In the UK, the Arts Council of England, Creative Scotland, the Arts Council of Northern Ireland and the Arts Council of Wales are all national members. IFACCA also has affiliate members that include government agencies at regional levels and local government. IFACCA serves as a platform for a diverse range of voices and viewpoints, united by the shared conviction that arts and culture hold intrinsic value as a public good. From its inception, the World Summit had the primary aim of bringing together policymakers, artists, and organisations involved in the cultural and non-cultural fields to discuss key issues, share insights, and collaborate on the advancement of arts and culture worldwide. The World Summit extends its invitation to both IFACCA members and the broader international community, operating in conjunction with National Member institutions. Commencing with its second edition in 2003, each ensuing World Summit revolved around a broad theme (e.g. *Connections: Trends in Government Support for Artistic Creativity* in 2003, *Meeting of Cultures: Creating Meaning through the Arts* in 2009, *Creative Times: new models for cultural development* in 2014, *Safeguarding Artistic freedom* in 2023) that mirrored prevailing trends and concerns of the time.

**Case Description**

**Vision, mission and purpose**

The vision of IFACCA’s World Summit is to foster a global community that recognises the transformative power of arts and culture, promoting their importance in shaping societies, economies, and individual lives. Its mission is to provide a platform for discussing innovative practices, policies, and approaches in arts and culture, exchange of ideas and sharing of best practice, and consolidating existing partnerships. It facilitates networking and collaboration among diverse stakeholders, including artists, cultural leaders, government representatives, arts funders and civil society organisations. The Summit also seeks to influence cultural policy development, encourage advocacy for the arts, and raise awareness of the vital role that arts and culture play in social, economic, and human development.

**Precise objectives and deliverables**

Every summit encompasses a diverse array of activities, including panels, plenary sessions, speeches, interactive workshops, and supplementary side events. Additionally, extensive cultural programmes featuring exhibitions, performances, and in some cases award ceremonies are integrated into the schedules. Preceding each edition, a well-researched online discussion paper is presented to introduce participants and the wider cultural community to the summit's theme and fundamental concepts. Correspondingly, a comprehensive report summarising the deliberations and actionable takeaways follows each event, which in some cases is supplemented by select conference video content.

The Summit aims:

* To offer opportunities for host countries to showcase their arts/culture and to spotlight their region.
* To foster international collaboration and exchange between different stakeholders and actors
* To profile key issues and provide safe space for debate and reflection.
* To enable policy development
* To promote public support for arts and culture

**Timing and location**

Three-to-five-day events in different locations and at different points in the year. To date, the World Summit has been held in Canada, Singapore, UK (England), South Africa, Australia, Chile, Malta, Malaysia and Sweden. Host countries are selected by the IFACCA Board from the member organisation submissions approximately three years before the event.

**Partners**

All summits cite a mix of partners, supporters or sponsors that range from organisations engaged in international cultural relations and tourism (e.g. Singapore Tourism board, Tourism Victoria, British Council), local and regional governments (e.g. Gateshead Council, Australian Federal Government) and higher education institutions (e.g. Newcastle University, University of Melbourne) to trusts/foundations (e.g. Rockefeller Foundation, Commonwealth Foundation, Asia-Europe Foundation, European Cultural Foundation), corporate entities (e.g. Air Canada) and media organisations (e.g. Australian Broadcasting Corporation). Diversity and number of partnerships are likely to depend on the host country’s event design and funding ecosystems. For instance, the 2006 World Summit in Newcastle appears to have been heavily reliant on national and regional ACE support as well as local authorities, businesses and educational institutions in the North East of England. In addition to significant local support, the 8th Summit in Kuala Lumpur worked with four media partners as well as a number of international and IFACCA member supporters, such as BC, US National Endowment for the Arts and Swedish Arts Council.

**Participants**

The inaugural event was an initiative launched by the Canada Council for the Arts in 2000. It was attended by 300 delegates from 50 national arts councils and arts funders, and 40 international organisations and diplomatic missions. The latest 2023 Summit in Stockholm welcomed 424 delegates from 90 countries. In terms of regional representation, delegate composition of each summit is largely dependent on the location of the summit. For example, 67% of the Stockholm Summit delegates were from Europe, 9% from Asia, 11% from Americas. The 8th Summit in Malaysia attracted delegates from 81 countries, with 17.7% coming from Europe, 55.1% from Asia, 10.5% from Americas. 64% of participants and 62% of speakers at the 9th Summit in Stockholm were women. Likewise, women represented the majority of both delegates (55%) and speakers (59%) at 8th Summit in Malaysia. Summit speakers tend to include academics, artistic directors, consultants, representatives from soft power cultural relations organisations, journalists, funders and artists. Ministerial attendance does occur but is clearly not a priority. The Summit offers bursaries to those who otherwise would not be able to attend.

**Governance Structure**

Each summit has a Steering Committee, but composition of committees varies from one edition to another. For instance, the Steering Committee of the 4th World Summit in South Africa comprised of senior representatives of the national member organisation, government officials (local, regional and national) and tourism bodies. Its successor, the 5th World Summit worked with a much smaller Steering Committee that involved representatives from the co-hosts IFACCA and Australia Council for the Arts as well as Arts Victoria, Project Director and Programme Advisor.

**Management/ Delivery structure**

The arrangement for delivery and management appear to rely on the organisational requirements and preferences of the hosting country, as seen in the case of the 2nd World Summit held in Australia, which was coordinated by Meeting Planners International Pty Ltd.

General outline appears to involve:

* A country specific Steering Committee.
* IFACCA team, incl. regional coordinators, project officer, director, general manager and administrator.
* A project management team that covers logistics, PR and comms, programme/report manager.
* An arts team responsible for the cultural programme, such as performances, opening and closing ceremonies.

The three most recent summit programmes have been designed in collaboration with IFACCA’s International Programme Advisory Committee (IPAC) that has a rotating membership of international arts practitioners and senior culture leaders representing a diverse range of arts disciplines. The establishment of the Committee reflects a shift in IFACCA's approach, placing emphasis on collaborative efforts and enhancing chances for mutual learning among its global network of members and experts.

**Funding and budget**

From 2003 onwards World Summits have been co-hosted by IFACCA and National Members, such as Arts Council England or National Arts Council of South Africa, with support from host country governments, corporate sponsors and trusts. The latest 2023 Summit was funded by the Government Offices of Sweden (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Culture) and Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.

**Key Outputs**

* Free and publicly available online resources. Every summit is followed up by a Summary report giving statistical information about the summit and outlining main discussion points. The last Summit was supplemented by video recordings of sessions and interviews (e.g., Artistic Freedom in the Age of Complexity)
* International exchange among IFACCA member representatives and other organisations. Given that IFACCA is committed to international dialogue and exchange, networking is the lifeblood of its activities.
* Professional development of arts practitioners/member organisations through exposure to new ideas and practices.
* Discussion papers issued before each summit give a brief outline of the theme. In some cases, they are updated after the summit to include fresh ideas and approaches.
* Global Cultural Leadership Programme for young leaders (first edition at the 2016 summit)
* Recommendations on future actions. Examples of takeaways include proposals to develop an international artist visa (8th World Summit) and training schemes in cultural policy and management (2003), calls to establish a working group to deepen discussions on participatory governance of Culture (8th Summit) and boost entrepreneurship as a factor in sustainable development (6th World Summit), or new ways of understanding and interpreting key concepts. The latter approach is best exemplified in the Summary report of the 9th Summit (e.g., Artistic Freedom as Ecosystem of Rights, Artistic Freedom as Our Collective Duty).

**Long-terms outcomes and impacts**

One of the primary roles of the Summit is to serve IFACCA’s organisational needs and priorities. As such, it has been a great promotional platform linked to key steps in its institutional development:

* Creation of IFACCA (2000).
* Ratification of IFACCA’s constitution (2003).
* Launch of Connect CP, the international Who’s Who of cultural policy (2006).
* Creation of African chapter of IFACCA (2009).
* Report in Intercultural Dialogue through Arts and Culture (2009).
* Expansion of IFACCA’s membership and promotion of its work.

Evidence of policy changes tend to happen at national level and evidence linking those developments to the summit are scarce. A few instances recorded in some of the Summary Reports include:

* Effective addition of the culture perspective in the Human Resource Development Operational program of Bulgaria (2006).
* National Institute of Culture and History, Belize declaration of commitment to the expansion of alternative funding sources (2006).

**Points discovered in evaluation**

In the latest Summits, participant numbers were monitored with regards to the ratio of female to male delegates and the representation of delegates from various geographic regions. This indicates a commitment to promoting gender equality in the arts and spotlighting regions that are underrepresented. Very little evidence of any media reporting on the summits and, with a notable exception of the Malaysian Summit, few media partnerships involving past summits. Notably, Summit participation is not limited to IFACCA members but there is a correlation to membership. For instance, IFACCA currently counts only two members from the MENA region (United Arab Emirates and Tunisia), and participation from MENA nations tends to be limited. Similarly, the presence of the Australian headquarters might be connected to the Federation's expanding membership in the Pacific region. The Summit may itself serve as recruitment grounds for IFACCA.

**Conclusions**

The World Summit on Arts and Culture exemplifies a successful model of an international membership organisation that has been replicated across various global contexts. To date, 40 out of IFACCA's 70 members have participated in EICS (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Finland, France, Gambia, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Ghana, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Romania, Scotland, Spain, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Slovenia, Tanzania, South Africa, Tunisia, UAE, Ukraine, USA, Wales, Zambia).

While 19 of the G20 nations have been present at EICS, and although IFACCA's membership comprises only half of the G20, the summit has established particularly robust connections with Europe (26 nations and countries) and South / Central America (10 countries). Since its first gathering in 2000, this event has occurred on every inhabited continent across the globe.

Its ability to convene a diverse worldwide audience is a testament to the professional scope and continuous growth of IFACCA. By closely monitoring attendance and prioritising gender balance and representation from more unfamiliar regions, the summit actively champions diversity and inclusivity in the arts. Similarly, the inclusion of voices from a multitude of sectors fosters a more encompassing discourse, resulting in a more nuanced and thorough exchange of ideas and viewpoints. The most recent 2023 Summit welcomed representatives from local, regional and national governments, national agencies and cultural organisations (52%), artists and private foundations (37%), international organisations (8%) and academia (3%). In contrast to EICS, the Summit boasts a noteworthy presence of representatives from the cultural sector, and it is evident that Cultural programmes are considered vital components of every event. Another noticeable distinction is its intentional reduction in emphasis on political or ministerial participation.

However, even though the summit yields valuable conversations and action-oriented points, it remains uncertain whether the practical implementation of proposed solutions post-event consistently unfolds effectively. There may exist a necessity for a more thorough evaluation of the long-term influence of the summit's outcomes on the global arts and culture sector.

**Learning for EICS**

The World Summit model highlights the possibilities presented by the global membership network, including the option of staging the event at different locations to foster collaborations and enable expansion. Further research might look into the way the Summit fits into the wider IFACCA structure and events calendar, its strategies for determining themes and impacts on policy development in member countries.

As IFACCA’s flagship event, the Summit is a promotional vehicle for the Federation, an essential networking platform and a way of gathering intelligence on and stimulating discussions around cultural policy. All Summits are reasonably well documented and clearly integrated into IFACCA’s communications strategy. Each one is preceded by a Discussion paper outlining key aspects of the chosen theme and followed up by a report available in English and Spanish via IFACCA website supported by the Federation’s monthly arts and cultural policy newsletter ACORNS. As well as offering key participation statistics, reports focus on the theme of the Summit looking at the key discussion points and takeaways.
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**D. Mondiacult**

**Introduction**

The UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development, known as Mondiacult 2022, was a ministerial level, category II Intergovernmental Conference convened as a platform for global engagement and discussion. It focused on the vital intersection of cultural policies and sustainable development. This major event was conceived as a collective reflection on the way cultural policies tackle global challenges and designed as a catalyst for the full integration of culture as a global public good in the post-2030 Agenda for inclusive and sustainable development. Mondiacult 2022 was a successor of the inaugural 1982 Mondiacult World Conference on Cultural Policies and the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies for Development held in 1998. The 2022 conference was organised in the context of four thematic sessions and preceded by over 100 official side events organised by a diverse group of international stakeholder organisations. It addressed a wide array of topics including culture in times of crisis, culture for climate action, creative economy and digital sector, illicit trafficking of cultural goods, cultural rights, cultural diversity, culture in public policies and education. Both Mondiacult conferences were hosted by the Government of Mexico in Mexico City.

**Case Description**

**Vision, mission and purpose**

* To review knowledge and experience gained on cultural policies and practices since the Venice conference in 1970 (Mondiacult 1982).
* To promote research about the fundamental problems of culture in the contemporary world (Mondiacult 1982).
* To formulate new guidelines to promote cultural development in general development projects (Mondiacult 1982)
* To facilitate international cultural cooperation.

The second Mondiacult was aimed at shaping “a more robust and resilient cultural sector, fully anchored in the perspectives of sustainable development as well as promotion of solidarity, peace and security, in line with the vision enshrined in the UN Secretary-General’s report Our Common Agenda (UN, 2021), which refers to culture resources as our global commons.”

**Precise objectives and deliverables**

The key objectives of Mondiacult 2022 were consolidation of progress and setting up of new paradigms for the future of cultural policies. To identify regional priorities five regional consultations (Europe and North America, Asia and the Pacific, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Arab States) took place between December 2021 and February 2022. The conference ran along four thematic sessions:

* Renewed and strengthened cultural policies.
* Heritage and cultural diversity in crisis.
* Culture for sustainable development.
* The future of the creative economy.

In addition to the core sessions at the Mondiacult 2022 event, UNESCO invited a broad range of stakeholders in the culture and creative sectors - from intergovernmental and civic society organisations (e.g. Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), *International Alliance for Protection of Heritage in Conflict Areas (ALIPH)*to academics and member state representatives – to organise over 100 side events, some of which took place alongside the main three-day conference and others were held online or presented in hybrid mode ahead of the Mondiacult 2022. Likewise, a pre-event *Share Your Voice – Virtual Global Open Mic* initiative developed by the Ministry of Culture of the Government of Mexico in partnership with key stakeholders, such as IFACCA and the North American Cultural Diplomacy Initiative (NACDI), extended engagement opportunities to a wider cultural sector and public at large.

**Timing and location**

Both events were held in Mexico City, Mexico. Mondiacult 1982 took place 26th July – 6th August 1982 and Mondiacult 2022 happened 28th – 30th September 2022. UNESCO is currently looking for a new host country for the next edition.

**Partners**

Although instigated by UNESCO, both Mondiacult conferences were hosted by the government of Mexico in partnership with 44 Mexican and international public and private sector partners and sponsors, including Netflix, Huawei, the British Council, ICOMOS, Mexican Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AMEXCID), regional Mexican secretariats of culture, Mexico's second largest mass media conglomerate TV Azteca, FEMSA Foundation, Canadian Heritage, Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OEI) and Cielito Querido Café.

**Participants**

Mondiacult 1982 - 960 participants from 126 states (out of the 158 UNESCO member states in 1982).

Mondiacult 2022 - nearly 2,600 participants from 150 states, including 135 ministers of culture, 83 NGOs, 32 intergovernmental organisations and 9 UN agencies. Side events involved a much wider network of collaborations and participants. Plenaries and thematic sessions were simultaneously translated into six official UNESCO languages. Delegations were limited to three people. The government of Mexico offered some free local transportation, but the delegates were responsible for their own flights and hotel expenses.

**Funding and budget**

Since the Government of Mexico hosted both events, it’s likely they made a significant contribution to financing both conferences. One of the documents makes a reference to sponsors as well as partners.

**Key Outputs**

* The Mexico Declaration on Cultural Policies (1982) put forward a new definition of cultural heritage that included both tangible and intangible aspects and stated that “every culture represents a unique and irreplaceable body of values.”
* Final 1982 conference report included 181 recommendations.
* Culture and Sustainable Development Media library (UNESCO website)
* Unanimously adopted by 150 states at Mondiacult 2022, Declaration for Culture affirmed culture as “a global public good” to be “a goal in its own right in the development agenda beyond 2030.”

**Long-terms outcomes and impacts**

* Redefinition of culture to include “intangible heritage” such as value systems, modes of life and traditions (Mondiacult 1982)
* Establishment of World Forum on Cultural Policies to be organised by UNESCO every four years from 2025 (Mondiacult 2022)
* Shift in thinking about culture. Prior to Mondiacult, UNESCO's objective was to persuade global policymakers that culture could play a substantial role in attaining the goals of sustainable development. The 2022 Mondiacult Declaration calls “to firmly anchor culture as a global public good and to integrate it as a specific goal in its own right in the development agenda beyond 2030.” This change would mean that a sustainable development agenda beyond 2030 will introduce fresh perspectives, reshaping the way development organisations approach culture and how universities educate on the connection between culture and development. This shift may lead to increased financial support for culture, addressing the growing issue of underfunding from governments.
* A follow-up action plan focussing on conditions of implementation is being developed to mobilise stakeholders to embrace outcomes ahead of the 2024 UN Summit of the Future. The extensive list of stakeholders includes a broad range of organisations, such as International Council on monuments and sites (ICOMOS), International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT), International Council of Museums (ICOM), Institute for Development and International Relations, World Federation of Engineering Organisations, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) Committee on Culture, Climate Heritage Network, Culture Action Europe, Childhood Education International, World Leisure Organisation, The British Council and many more.

**Points discovered in evaluation**

Fundamental interconnectedness of Mondiacult and other UNESCO/UN activities, and the way they feed into each other were noted.

Some believe that the scale and complexity of the recommendations and the absence of prioritisation will inhibit their practical implementation by most stakeholders. An adequate labour force, appropriate skill sets, and the basic resources required to deliver the step-change reflected in the Mondiacult 2022 Declaration are missing.

**Conclusions**

Mondiacult 2022 was a major milestone in UNESCO's work as a global platform for intergovernmental dialogue and policy development. It is firmly embedded in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and is an ongoing project which itself is part of a long-term strategy/process reflecting the 1982 – 2022 timeline. Its decision-making power helps shape cultural policies and shift attitudes to culture around the world.

**Learning for EICS**

Although hosted by the government of a sovereign state, the primary focus of Mondiacult is not dominated by the soft power strategies of governments but development of cultural policy in the context of sustainable development. Its success in securing ministerial participation is entirely due to the UNESCO support, leadership and global convening power. It underlines the importance of a powerful umbrella organisation but also highlights potential programming limitations and the need for long-term planning, substantial partnership development and a dedicated fundraising team. The involvement of a remarkable diversity of stakeholders, the intense level of preparation (research, policy papers, written submissions), and the combination of plenary sessions with an extensive number of “side events” that focus on specific issues that brought together organisations (large and small) with common interests were key success factors. In addition, the tangible outputs and outcomes (declaration, reports, specific recommendations) that will be followed up by the UNESCO secretariat and Mondiacult Bureau through action plans and informal monitoring will ensure continuity that will help ensure momentum for 2024 UN Summit of the Future and the next edition of Mondiacult.

Areas for further research may focus on partnerships with specialist agencies and intergovernmental organisations, the role of observer organisations and consultation process leading up to the summit.
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**E. World Cities Culture Summit**

**Introduction**

The World Cities Culture Summit (WCCS) is an annual flagship event of the World Cities Culture Forum (WCCF), a global network of 40 cities that convenes representatives from major cities around the world to discuss and share their experiences related to urban culture, creativity, and cultural policies. Edinburgh and London are members. Both WCCS and WCCF were initiated by the city of London in the context of the 2012 Olympics to mark the launch of the World Cities Culture Report 2012. The Summit and Forum are coordinated by Burns Owen Partnership (BOP), an independent consulting company, The WCCF has been constituted as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation-Association (WCCF Charity). Hosted on a rotating basis by city partners, the Summit is informed by the outputs of smaller WCCF events, such as themed symposia and regional summits, and is closely aligned with WCCF’s extensive programme of research and publications (e.g., World Cities Culture Report).

The participating cities represent diverse cultural landscapes, and the discussions at the summit cover a wide range of topics, including heritage, cultural policy, creative industries, urban planning, community engagement, climate change, tech developments and more. The summit aims to explore how cities can leverage their cultural assets to address social and economic challenges, enhance quality of life, and foster cultural diversity and innovation. It provides a safe space for city leaders, cultural practitioners, academic experts, and policymakers to learn from each other's successes and mistakes without media and political scrutiny, leading to the development of more effective strategies for promoting culture and creativity within urban environments.

The specific themes/key questions and outcomes of each World Cities Culture Summit vary depending on the host city and the prevalent cultural and urban development trends. Previous themes included *Beyond the Creative City: new civic agendas for citizens and by citizens* (Seoul, 2017) and *Culture and New Technologies Transforming World Cities* (San Francisco, 2018).

**Case Description**

**Vision, mission and purpose**

Noting the rapid pace of global urbanisation, WCCF recognises the pivotal role that culture plays in establishing thriving urban environments and believes that many pressing socio-economic issues affecting humanity are best addressed at city, rather than national level. In this context, WCCF envisions a global network of cities collaborating to leverage culture as a catalyst for urban development. Its mission and purpose are aimed at:

* facilitating honest dialogue and knowledge exchange.
* enhancing the quality of life in urban areas through cultural engagement.
* developing cultural policy underpinned by evidence, inspiration, global cooperation and strong cultural leadership.
* enabling collaborations between cities to advance the arguments for culture in urban policy.

**Precise objectives and deliverables**

Each summit features an array of activities, including speeches, panels, networking dinners, receptions and lunches, and cultural site visits.

By making the Summit the main meeting hub for its city members and supporters, and using it as a platform for promoting its ideas, WCCF seeks to

* highlight and champion the crucial role of culture in driving the economic and social achievements of world cities.
* build a foundation of empirical knowledge about the diverse and far-reaching influences of culture on world cities and its residents.
* develop strategies for cultural investment through mutual exploration of common challenges and successes.
* Formulate and follow a prospective research agenda while collaboratively forging strategic projects for cultural enrichment in world cities.

**Timing and location**

Three-day events in October or November in different member city locations, incl. London (2012 and 2015), Istanbul (2013), Amsterdam (2014), Moscow (2016 – no longer part of the network), Seoul (2017), San Francisco (2018), Lisbon (2019), Helsinki (2022). Notably, every event involved multiple venues, allowing for local partner institutions to showcase their work and for participants to get a better idea of the host city. Next summit is set to take place in San Paulo, Brazil in October 2023.

**Partners**

Aside from the Mayor of London Office and BOP Consulting, every edition of the summit is fundamentally dependent on the metropolitan and regional authorities of the host city that provides both financial and in-kind support. Exact number and range of partners vary depending on the local conditions, but most tend to also involve knowledge partners (e.g., Seoul Foundation for Arts and Culture, Seoul Design Foundation, San Francisco Arts Commission)**,** tourism bodies (San Francisco Travel), corporate sponsors and philanthropic donors.

**Participants**

Cultural/business leaders, senior local and regional authority representatives responsible for culture, academics, consultants, and tourism boards. Many individuals are returning participants, which is likely to be due to the same people holding culture as part of their portfolio at municipal and regional authority levels. Growing numbers of participants is largely due to the expansion of WCCF network from nine cities in 2012 to 40 in 2023 In general, the summits typically have relatively low participant numbers. For example, the Amsterdam summit in 2014 had 60 participants from 22 different countries. The Seoul summit in 2017 drew in more than 100 delegates, while the 2018 event in San Francisco hosted 80 official guests from 32 cities. Among these, 14 were from Europe, six from North America, seven from Asia, two from Africa, two from Australia, and one from South America. The majority of attendees tend to hold high-ranking positions within their respective local and regional authorities, such as mayors, deputy mayors, directors of culture departments. While there is some representation from academic researchers and professionals in the arts and heritage fields, they constitute a minority. To illustrate, out of the 80 participants at the San Francisco summit, 9 were Mayors or Deputy Mayors, 31 held positions at the Assistant Director/Director level in Culture Departments, while only 12 were affiliated with universities or industry research, and merely 3 were directly involved in the arts and heritage sector, such as representatives from a city library and an artistic director of a theatre.

**Governance Structure**

The World Cities Culture Forum operates as an informal network. The network is convened by the Head of Culture at the Greater London Authority (GLA), upon the request of the Mayor of London. A member city is designated by the Chair to serve as the host for the World Cities Culture Summit. This selection initially occurred through exchanges between the host city and the GLA. Since 2018, the host city has been chosen by the Summit Advisory Committee via an application process known as Expression of Interest.

The host city appoints a local organising committee, collaborating with the advisory group of the World Cities Culture Forum, to delineate the summit's thematic content.

**Management/ Delivery structure**

The operational aspects of the World Cities Culture Forum are organised and executed by BOP Consulting, a dedicated consultancy, acting on behalf of both the GLA and the Forum's constituents. BOP Consulting holds a formal agreement with the GLA for this purpose. To involve members in co-designing its programme and research, since 2016 WCCF has had two Advisory Committees (Research and Event) of world city representatives.

Past Management teams broadly consisted of Director (BOP Consulting), Project Manager (BOP Consulting), two Researchers (BOP Consulting) and two Consultants (BOP Consulting), Researcher (World Cities Culture Forum), Writer and Editor (World Cities Culture Forum), two Advisors from Bloomberg Associates (NYC).

**Funding and budget**

Each member of the Forum independently remits a fee directly to BOP Consulting that covers the costs of organising and research initiatives. In addition to this fee, individual member cities secure funds or commit in-kind contributions from internal and external origins to support the Forum's activities.

Previous sponsorship and philanthropic funding came from a very broad range of supporters including Bloomberg Philanthropies, Google Arts and Culture, Hyosung, US Water Alliance, Hewlett Foundation, California Arts Council and Uber.

**Key Outputs**

* Policy briefings capturing key conversations (available on World Cities Culture Forum Website), e.g., Moscow Summit 2016 briefing “Creating the future: Culture taking the lead in world cities”, London Summit 2015 briefing “Culture and Inclusive Growth in World Cities: Seizing the Opportunity Policy”.
* Launch of WCCF’s annual reports.

**Long-terms outcomes and impacts**

* World Cities Culture Leadership Programme (launched in 2015).
* International survey of opinion of cultural leaders of member cities (2015).
* *World Cities Culture Forum: Seoul Declaration 2017* highlights the role of World Cities in championing culture as a critical part of the future of cities and strengthens connections to enhance cooperation between world cities.
* World Cities Culture Forum Leadership Exchange Programme (launched in 2017)
* *ACCESS*, a Europe-wide cultural policy network to develop inclusive access within culture and the creative industries.

**Points discovered in evaluation**

* Edinburgh has been involved in the World Cities Culture Summit since 2015. The city has been represented by The City of Edinburgh Council (Director of Culture, Cultural Venues Manager), Usher Hall (General Manager), Edinburgh Festivals (Director), University of Edinburgh (Data Innovation Director) and the Lord Provost.
* WCCS places a great deal of importance on confidentiality and operates under Chatham House Rules, i.e., “all participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of speakers or participants may be revealed.” WCCF’s limited social media engagement may be related to these rules.
* The Summit did not take place in 2020 or 2021. The most recent edition was Helsinki 2022. There is a considerable drop in resources and information available from 2019 onwards. This may be indicative of changes planned before the pandemic.

**Conclusions**

Operating within a timeline similar to EICS, WCCS has undergone a period of extensive growth, expanding from nine to over 40 member cities. Concurrently, there has been an increase in the numbers of philanthropic and knowledge partners (e.g. Bloomberg Philanthropies and Google Arts and Culture supported WCCF’s Leadership Exchange Programme) WCCF’s strategic emphasis on engaging local and regional governments, as well as garnering academic and business support may offer clues to its success and would merit further research into their recruitment and promotion tactics.

Another distinctive aspect of the Summit is the establishment of an evidence-based knowledge hub, which is not only a useful resource for its members' undertakings but also serves as a catalyst for international collaborations, such as the European cultural policy network ACCESS and WCCF’s Leadership Exchange Programme that facilitated interactions between 21 cities through 11 exchanges. The World Cities Culture Summit serves as a platform for launching the Forum's annual reports, with early summits additionally generating policy briefings. Furthermore, the WCCF has published significant reports such as the Transformational Cultural Projects report in 2014 and the World Cities Culture Finance report in 2017. The act of sharing research and intelligence stands as one of the core objectives of the WCCF, and the Summit represents its flagship event.

Despite the absence of an explicit political agenda, the global dispersal of the Summits to diverse cities and regions stands as a testament to the success of WCCF's approach in exerting cultural influence, a paradigm initially set in motion by the City of London and, by extension, the UK Government. The Forum is Chaired by the Deputy Mayor of Culture, Justine Simons OBE. Additional research into the role of GLA and the office of the Mayor of London could offer important insights into the purpose and ambitions of the WCCF.

Lastly, it is important to highlight that the lack of documentation regarding the two latest editions of the summit, coupled with the absence of news about future Summits, might suggest a potential shift in WCCF's strategic orientation. This could also merit deeper exploration and examination.

**Learning for EICS**

Transnational collaborations draw parallels with Edinburgh festivals and could potentially be contextualised within the framework of Scotland's international cultural strategy.

Edinburgh is currently an active participant in the WCCF network, signifying the city’s endorsement of the fundamental link between urban development and cultural engagement. This could be utilised by EICS as a theme and an opportunity for collaboration with WCCF.

BOP Consulting has been actively involved in organising WCCS since its inaugural 2012 edition. Collaborating with a consistent team—comprising individuals with profound institutional knowledge and partner relationships—could yield substantial advantages for forthcoming editions of EICS.
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## APPENDIX 8: EICSF Expenditure 2015-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EICSF Expenditure 2015 - 2022 | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| **Fees & Management** | Programming | 77,520 | 130,982 | 104,946 | 131,000 | 107,494 | 132,012 | 87,832 | 206,320 |
| Production, communications and event costs | 15,125 | 33,580 | 24,863 | 64,709 | 25,135 | 59,054 | 34,366 | 47,625 |
| **Other costs** | Speaker costs |  | 12,581 | 401 | 36,524 | 2332 | 5672 |  |  |
| Hosting and event costs |  | 66,186 | -187 | 87,329 |  | 4932 |  | 103,434 |
| Online event costs |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4470 | 19,310 |
| Youth forum |  | 10,000 |  | 5264 |  |  |  | 602 |
| Support staff |  | 3938 | 350 | 284 | 35 | 7112 | 13,082 | 33,288 |
| Digital marketing |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5280 | 17,008 |
| Design/print |  | 6566 |  | 11,509 |  | 840 | 540 | 2640 |
| Communication |  | 20,073 | 629 | 44,856 | 277 | 52,236 | 2400 | 29,624 |
| Volunteer coordinator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9757 |
| Event coordinator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,083 |
| Delegate support and liaison |  |  |  | 22,395 |  | 22,709 |  | 22,973 |
|  | Support costs\* | 27,545 | 40,627 | 24,397 | 59,576 | 40,601 | 26,913 | 33,399 | 48,804 |
| **TOTAL** | **120,190** | **324,533** | **155,399** | **463,446** | **175,874** | **311,480** | **181,369** | **560,468** |

\*Includes office costs, training, translation services, travel expenses, governance costs, etc.
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