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Over the last nine months the British Council and the Young Foundation have been working together to develop the Urban Ideas Bakery as part of the British Council’s Creative Cities project. Within this collaboration, the British Council commissioned the Young Foundation to carry out research which has culminated in the publication of *Breakthrough cities*. The aim of this work was to inform our thinking in the task of developing the concept of the Urban Ideas Bakery into a reality. In first scoping the whole field of social creativity and innovation, and then exploring some possible forms the Urban Ideas Bakery might take, this report provides an invaluable tool for which we are deeply grateful to the Young Foundation.

As the Creative Cities project is currently active in 15 countries across the Russia and North Europe region, we were keen to complement *Breakthrough cities* with examples from people and places within this region. You will find these at the end of this report. They demonstrate that social innovation and creativity is working in the countries of this region and we hope that they will serve as inspiration for others working in this field, just as we hope that the main body of the report will provide ideas, understanding and guidance.

The British Council has developed Creative Cities as part of its global work as the UK’s international organisation for educational opportunities and cultural relations. Our programmes aim to connect people worldwide and create opportunities to share knowledge and ideas. In so doing, we build new networks that work together to identify shared solutions to common challenges.

One such common challenge is to build a strong and successful creative and knowledge economy. Creative Cities is just one of a number of British Council projects working on this theme, but the project also links in with the British Council’s other two programme areas of intercultural dialogue and climate change.
In Europe, where over 70 per cent of the population now live in urban areas, culture and creativity is central to addressing the challenges cities face. A new, emerging generation of urban influencers and innovators recognises this, but so far they are receiving limited support, are often outside the traditional spheres which influence policy making, and therefore lack the means to bring about change. Creative Cities seeks to support this new generation by providing opportunities to make new contacts, and to develop and share ideas in order to make Europe’s cities better places to live, work and play.

The Urban Ideas Bakery is one of the three strands of Creative Cities. It seeks to build on the first strand – the Future City Game (a team-based process designed to create new thinking and actions to improve quality of life in cities) – by providing a method for young professionals to work together to develop and put into practice solutions to urban challenges across Europe. The third project strand – Exploratory Activities – provides a forum for ongoing debates on the role that creativity, entrepreneurship and innovation play in urban development; it also provides a platform to showcase practical examples of creative events developed by and for people living in cities.

As well as providing invaluable guidance in developing the Urban Ideas Bakery, we believe that the Breakthrough cities report serves as a unique resource for anyone working in the field of city policy – whether policy makers, consultants, public employees, workers in the arts or education sectors, NGOs, or simply private individuals committed to improving city lives.

Therefore, we invite you to make use of this resource in whatever way you feel appropriate. We hope it will give you new ideas and new enthusiasm for solving problems in your city.
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Preface

Geoff Mulgan and Charlie Leadbeater

We are at our best and our worst in cities.

Cities are where creativity and culture flourish. They are home to many of our proudest achievements – great libraries and hospitals, schools and parks, art and culture. Cities are synonymous with civilisation, civic governance and progress. The diversity, bustle, trade and civic life of cities makes them dynamic and exciting.

But cities are also where we are at our worst. It is in cities that our biggest challenges are to be faced – inequality, poverty, crime, violence, environmental degradation, exploitation, corruption. These all thrive in cities as much as learning and culture and in many modern cities alongside one another. Cities encourage mass innovation as people learn new habits from one another, observing what their fellow citizens are doing. Everything propagates faster in cities: disease, fashion, ideas.

The challenge for cities that aspire to be truly creative is how to connect these two stories of life in the city. The Urban Ideas Bakery is a set of methods that are designed to help cities mobilise their creativity to better solve – together – the big problems they face, from recession to crime, high carbon emissions to poor education.

Creativity in cities is usually thought of in relation to culture and the arts, knowledge and learning. Cities have always been centres of learning, the first home to libraries and universities, museums and galleries. Cities provide some of the vital ingredients for cultural creativity: diversity, density and proximity. Seeing cities as dynamic places of culture and learning took on new life in the last two decades thanks to Peter Hall’s work on creative cities, and his magisterial book, Cities in Civilisation. He, alongside other academics such as Manuel Castells, showed that cities with a thriving creative and cultural sector would then attract other high-end knowledge jobs and set off a spiral of economic and social growth. The road to economic salvation for a city lay through the cultural quarter of galleries, clubs, restaurants and studios, as well as the right mix of business services – finance, consulting, law, conferences – and the right clusters of high technology activity. Often the key to cities’ creativity was their ability to attract in skilled migrants, and give them opportunities to innovate.

The recipes which followed were being put into practice by many British cities (such as Glasgow or Manchester) in the 1980s: investment in cultural institutions; renewal of the city’s historic core; and bohemian cultural quarters, as the basis for the wider economic regeneration of a city that will bring investment in new retail and leisure facilities, apartments and knowledge worker jobs. Similar strategies have been implemented all across the world, as well as being popularised more recently by writers such as Richard Florida, who talked of a ‘creative class’ – artists, designers, media folk – which signals to other knowledge workers that the atmosphere in a city is vibrant, open and tolerant.
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Yet a generation on, not all of these strategies have succeeded. Some simply copied other cities’ strategies rather than embedding them in local conditions and histories. Even the more successful cities that have pursued these strategies have often found it hard to connect the suburbs to the city core and to connect people outside the ‘creative class’. And although many cities have become adept at managing how people feel about the city, its buzz and its brand, many have worried that this is too narrow an idea of creativity to guide cities into the 21st century.

A second approach is broader in scope: cities have to be creative about all aspects of city life, not just culture. Truly creative cities are as creative about transport, housing, energy and waste as they are about culture and learning. The density and scale of cities pose significant innovation challenges, to create mass forms of housing, transport, health, utilities, waste disposal or education. That is why cities created shared institutions — libraries, fire services, maps, parks, postal systems. Cities require continuous social and political creativity to address the problems that they throw up as they grow, mutate and decline.

Those challenges are only going to become more intense with migration into growing cities and away from declining ones; the very different demands of an ageing population and young singles in the same city; changing patterns of employment and family life; the need to shift to more environmentally sustainable forms of energy and transport; the extremes in inequality that are increasingly a part of city life in the developed and developing world.
These social challenges have traditionally been tasks for specialists – planners, architects and engineers – to reimagine the city from on high. Most famously this gave rise to the modernist vision of the city as a machine, a lattice work of roads, factories and high-rise apartment blocks.

Top-down city planning all too often extinguishes vernacular, everyday innovation or drives it underground. All too often the places created by these top-down plans sap the spirit, suck out hope and ambition, wreck community and family bonds, and draw in apathy and nihilism in their stead.

This was one of the main themes of Michael Young’s writings back in the 1950s, and his work went on to have a big influence on Jane Jacobs and a global movement that came to see cities less as machines to be planned by engineers, and more as organic, self-organising systems. Their influence grew as the many top-down schemes failed. As a result cities are looking for a better balance between necessary top-down investments and infrastructures – for example in new transport systems or energy – and bottom-up engagement. Creative cities are too large, open and unruly to be regulated in detail, top-down, by an all-seeing state or experts. They have to encourage collective, voluntary, self-control. Successful cities allow a lot of room for adaptive mutation, encouraging their citizens to invest their ideas in the spaces they inhabit.

This broader idea of creativity is more social, cumulative and collaborative than the traditional idea that creativity comes from a spark of individual genius. And this broader idea of creativity
applies to activities that are not widely seen as worthy of creativity: waste disposal, health provision, housing and transport.

The narrower accounts of creativity have always emphasised the role that outsiders play in challenging orthodoxy, bringing new ideas, making new connections and providing new recipes for food, culture and social problem solving.

But how should outsiders contribute to these broader kinds of creativity? What creates the right chemistry of outsider challenge and input and insider engagement and action?

That is the issue the Urban Ideas Bakery seeks to address: how cities can address the challenges they face more creatively by intelligently drawing on the advice, ideas and resources of outsiders.

This project is an attempt to create a more systematic set of methods for cities to choose how to make some of these connections, depending on the challenges they face, the resources they have, their political leadership and social networks.

For some cities the challenges are those of rapid growth – which stretches the social fabric, pumps up property prices and threatens to overrun older infrastructures for transport and business. For others the challenge is the risk of a cycle of decline in which people, businesses and jobs leave, setting off a downward spiral of economic and social disinvestment which is difficult to arrest. Cities need creativity both when they are ‘going up’ to cope with growth and when they are going down, to arrest and reverse decline. The make-up of a city’s social networks matter hugely to this process.

The diverging stories of Allenstown, Pennsylvania and Youngstown, Ohio, both steel towns that went into steep decline in the 1980s, show that the social structure of cities, how power is shared and connected, matters hugely to how cities respond to shocks and challenges.

Youngstown’s inward-looking and conservative social networks converged around the old business establishment. As a result Youngstown found it difficult to mobilise new ideas and resources to respond to the savage contraction in traditional manufacturing. In contrast, Allenstown has many more diverse social and business networks that were loosely coupled and came together around a shared civic agenda for renewal. Crucially, Allenstown’s networks were outward-looking and welcoming to outsiders. As a result, Allenstown attracted new businesses and talent, which brought with it new ideas, connections and capital. Allenstown renewed itself; Youngstown succumbed to a spiral of decline which it is still struggling to reverse two decades later. The difference in their experience turned on the way they mobilised their social networks of business and civic leads and, critically, how they attracted outsiders with ideas and capital.

Some of these issues are coming to the fore in new ways as the recession bites. Urban unemployment is rising rapidly; developments are stalled; shops are being boarded up. Some of the responses are putting in place new structures and infrastructures: fiscal stimulus packages that emphasise building new schools, home insulation, broadband networks and energy. Some cities are, for example, using the recession as a stimulus to put in new infrastructures for electric cars.

The recession is also bringing forth a wave of bottom-up innovation: the spread of urban agriculture turning unused plots, roofs and even boats into urban farms; timebanks and exchange systems; projects for unemployed graduates and volunteering schemes for the recently unemployed.
Over the next two years, the crisis will both amplify the pressures on cities, but may also make it easier to pull through more radical innovations that in normal times would be considered too risky, or too threatening to vested interests. After all, in the past, crisis, frustration and the struggle for survival have all played their part in city creativity: fires and disease led to new approaches to building and public health just as war accelerated the spread of new kinds of urban design and management.

All of that makes the timing of this project propitious. The very severity of the crisis will make innovation even more of an imperative, and our hope is that this project will help cities take on these challenges more systematically, mobilising and connecting coalitions for social innovation within the city and connecting them in the most effective way to advice, ideas and support from the outside.

Engaging civic and business leaders in those conversations is absolutely critical. But it is rarely enough. Creative cities need many places in which these creative conversations can take place – in council debating chambers, university seminars, coffee shops, community groups and squares. Successful cities – Portland, Oregon, Curitiba in Brazil, Barcelona in Spain – have many, distributed spaces for civic creativity. This project is an attempt to show how these conversations can be stimulated by the thoughtful and sensitive injection of ideas and insights from outsiders, finding recipes that work for different cities.

Not all of this can be easily planned. Cities rely on a mass of localised, adaptive creativity which is vital to people’s quality of life: how people living in a tower block look after the land around it, create benches and gardens, a playground and place for older people to sit. And there are many other spaces – marginal, unlicensed, criminal even – in which creativity thrives, where people have to improvise because they have few resources or are outside traditional institutions. Civic creativity is spurred by a sense of pride, belonging and attachment to a city. Outsiders cannot just walk in with solutions ready made. They have to be sensitive to context, their ideas pulled and adapted by insiders. It requires clever ways to combine, connect and blend ideas, from outside and inside. Good ideas spread usually because they are simple but also highly adaptable, so they can be remade to work in different contexts. Ideas spread not simply by being transferred but by being adapted in situ. Intelligent and thoughtful outsiders have to provide their ideas in ways that are most useful to a city. Most creativity is highly dialogic, it involves batting ideas back and forth. It cannot be delivered in the way that DHL delivers a parcel. This is not a recipe for experts to waltz into a city with ready-made solutions.

Cities are cradles for innovation because they are where knowledge, culture and self-governance come together. In 1800 only three per cent of the world’s population lived in cities, even though cities had been around since about 6000 BC. By 1900 it was 14 per cent. At the turn of the century about half the world’s population lived in cities and by 2050 75 per cent will. Cities’ ability to solve their problems creatively now matters more than ever.
Introduction
Aims and outline

Europe’s cities need entrepreneurship and innovation to secure their long-term economic, cultural and social prosperity. This report proposes a set of tools cities can use to stimulate the creativity and social innovation they need by drawing on external innovators and advisers.

Our aim is to create a network of people who are active innovators in their cities and open to this approach of sharing and blending ideas. The Urban Ideas Bakery is a method for putting these ideas into practice.
Cities in the 21st century: trends and challenges
Cities around the world are grappling with significant social changes, including:

- an ageing population, associated with increased financial burdens on health and welfare systems
- economic restructuring and increased unemployment and informal work
- disasters, including natural catastrophes, terrorism and epidemics
- issues of crime, safety and security
- migration and immigration, segregation and poverty
- social cohesion and inequality
- sustainable development and economic growth
- environmental degradation – including pollution in all its forms, waste and water shortages
- unsustainable energy consumption and high energy prices
- provision of good quality, affordable housing
- connectivity – including effective public transport and electronic motorways.

At their best, cities are exciting, diverse and dynamic places. Yet in most cities that sense of dynamism can go along with growing social division and fragmentation, increasing fear and alienation, dissatisfaction with the physical environment and anxiety about failing infrastructures and feelings of entrapment and loneliness. For many people in the city, perhaps especially the very old, lack of cheap transport, money and fear lead to minimal mobility. Yet many people – among them the most mobile – feel a diminishing sense of locality, shared space and identity.

Cities are poised between a sense that they are falling to bits or flying apart and the sense that they are stagnating.

The social challenges facing cities are likely to be exacerbated in the next two years due to the global economic recession, which will lead to rising unemployment, greater demands on public services and tighter public finances.

Many cities and countries are addressing these challenges and opportunities by adopting innovative approaches to urban planning and management that are responsive to changing and emerging needs. Across the globe, cities are making critical choices and developing innovative institutional reforms to promote prosperity, while minimising inequity and unsustainable energy use.

Many of these innovative responses will be highlighted in this report.

Cities, however, need to accelerate the rate of innovation and, critically, the propagation of successful innovation.

There is a pressing need for cities to identify new approaches and solutions, to draw on insights from different disciplines and networks to meet their social challenges.
Trends affecting the strategic agenda of cities

PricewaterhouseCoopers, in a study of *Cities of the Future*, highlight some of the trends shaping the strategic agenda for cities: trends which affect the majority of areas of civil, business and public life.

An increasingly important social trend is **individualism** – which has an important impact on the dialogue between a city and its citizens, who are increasingly demanding an informative and interactive and responsive service. ‘Today, we talk about the “I-generation”, which means people who are: individualistic, informal, informed, interactive and international … Cities need to think of their citizens as consumers, and public services need to match standards of the best in the private sector.’

**Acceleration** – Speed is increasing in many areas of life, driven by information and communication technology and the search for growth. Citizens and customers want online access to all public and private services and the ‘democratic dialogue’ increasingly demands rapid exchange of information between government and citizens. (One important exception for many people is the speed of travel in many cities: in London many journeys take as long as they did a century ago.)

**Hi-tech and hi-touch** – Technology is creating many new possibilities for the public sector, and has many implications for the delivery of services including administration, education, healthcare, communication, transport, etc. Yet the ‘hardware’ of technology must be accompanied by the ‘software’ of emotions, nostalgia, values, architecture and design, visions and dreams. ‘The environmentally-friendly, safe, secure and aesthetic city is imperative for modern civic pride.’

**Demographics** – The ageing population will have a major impact across the globe. In many developed countries, birth rates have fallen dramatically. There are fewer economically active people. An ageing population will cause increased burdens on health and welfare systems.

**Scale** – The United Nations HABITAT report finds that half of humanity now lives in cities, and within two decades, nearly 60 per cent of the world’s people will be urban dwellers. More than 70 per cent of the population of the developed world is already urban. Urban growth is most rapid in the developing world, where cities gain an average of 5 million residents every month. In this context, it is also relevant to talk about a trend called ‘metropolitanisation’ which refers to the growing influence of large cities on the economic health and prosperity of wider regions and in some cases nations.

**Climate change** – Urban sprawl, high dependence on motorised transport and urban lifestyles that generate excessive waste and consume large amounts of energy: cities are the major contributors to the global increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Many of the solutions will also only be found in cities.

**Migration** – Urbanisation is linked to increased global migration, from rural to urban and between global cities. Migration brings huge opportunities and challenges for cities, with implications for social cohesion, social capital, identity, integration, employment and knowledge.
The menu of social challenges and opportunities for cities is very large. It is fair to say that most of the big challenges we face, globally, are to be found in cities. So will their solutions. That is why social innovation is cities should be at the top of the global agenda.
What is social innovation?
Social innovations are new ideas, institutions, or ways of working that meet social needs more effectively. Often social innovation involves not just new ideas but the remaking and reuse of existing ideas: the new application of an old idea.

Social innovations can take the form of a new service, initiative or organisation, or, alternatively, a radically new approach to the organisation and delivery of services.

Innovations in all of these senses can spread throughout a profession or sector, such as education or healthcare, or geographically from one place to another.

Social innovations are predominantly developed and diffused through organisations whose primary purposes are social. However, social innovations can spread in the form of ideas, values, software, tools and habits. Not all are products and services of organisations.

Social innovations can come from many sources and be applied to many fields. Sources can include academic research, political campaigns, social businesses and new technologies. In the past, cities have been home to innovation in transport, energy, housing, communications, health and welfare. Cities work only because they mobilise a mass of ideas from many sources and apply them to a wide range of issues, from borrowing and lending, to learning and culture. The people and organisations who are involved in social innovation are diverse and wide ranging: some good examples, and profiles and case studies of people and organisations, are presented in Appendices A and on p. 67.

Innovation involves creativity and sometimes invention but is not confined to that. Innovation is the structured development of new ideas to turn them into more effective solutions to social needs. Innovation is a process of developing, testing, refining and scaling products, services, tools and organisations. Idea generation is just a small part of a long and cumulative process. A socially innovative city has to have a way both to generate ideas in response to changing needs and to turn those ideas into action.

In a city many power-holders and stakeholders have to be involved in social innovation. These could include individual leaders (e.g. in politics, business, or entrepreneurship) and central and/or local government, third sector organisations, activists and pressure groups, and the general public. Engaging multiple stakeholders, who may often have competing demands or interests, can pose challenges on multiple levels – but is often a critical part of social innovation. It is often more like leading a campaign or movement than simply scaling up a service or selling a product.

Many of the problems facing the cities of today require a focus that goes beyond the physical, with the need for creating more sustainable environments addressing how people mix and connect and how capacity and partnerships are developed, by establishing a sense of place and mutual responsibility in communities and neighbourhoods, to ‘own’ where they live and change their lifestyles appropriately. Creativity needs to be embedded through both hard and soft infrastructure – that is, through the built environment, as well as through ‘feel’, ambiance and atmosphere.

Cities face complex challenges that require new, creative solutions. Many strategies and plans adopted by cities in the interest of becoming more creative are concerned with strengthening the arts and cultural assets. Cultural industries strategies were pioneered in the UK in the mid 1980s, often involving the creation of creative or cultural quarters centred around public institutions and public spaces; investment in dynamic industries such as design, advertising,
film and video, music and publishing; buildings to serve as incubators providing common services; and cultivation of a milieu of creativity. These models have spread around the world to influence the urban strategies of cities as varied as Shanghai and Hong Kong, Austin and Toronto.

However, in the words of Charles Landry, ‘this is not what the “creative city” is exclusively concerned with – it is merely an important aspect’. As Charles Leadbeater notes of Curitiba, in Brazil, known as one of the most creative cities in the world, ‘it has not ... created a cultural quarter, for especially creative people, members of the creative class, to do special work. Instead, Curitiba has applied creativity to the most important aspects of city life: how people live together, housing themselves, moving to and from work, educating themselves, looking after the sick and poor, and most tellingly in collective rubbish.

Cities need social creativity, which draws on many ideas from many sources, to apply to a wide range of issues. It cannot just be a pipeline of special ideas from a few people. Those ideas need to apply to both hard and soft aspects of city life, infrastructures and institutions, but also culture and quality of life.

Social innovation is needed in all aspects of the city’s life, not just in its cultural life. Social innovation is often more akin to a process of mobilisation and campaigning than rolling out new products and services. It is often critical to get the support of multiple stakeholders.
Why bring ‘outsiders’ into cities to stimulate social innovation?
Innovation is invariably a process of combination: combining different ideas, insights and people, to come up with new recipes and methods.

That process of combination is much more likely to be creative if the people involved think in different ways and bring diverse skills and outlooks.

Often innovation is a process of moving between different modes of thought and action, between reflection and action, divergent and convergent thinking, between small, close-knit groups, committed to making an idea or business a success, and larger groups to draw in new ideas and perspectives.

Ideas are rarely developed unless they can be tested and challenged. Challenge, often from outsiders, makes ideas stronger.

That is why it is invariably important in any process of innovation, whether in a city or in a company, to have outsiders involved: to provide more diverse ideas, skills, perspectives; to make connections that insiders have missed; to provide external yardsticks, reality checks and challenges.

Openness to ‘outsider’ influence and knowledge is a key feature of creative cities and regions. Highly networked, non-hierarchical regions such as Silicon Valley and the so-called ‘Third Italy’ around Emilia-Romagna, are tolerant, diverse and networked. They combine diversity with collaboration and openness to ideas from the outside to stimulate learning.

The capacity to absorb external knowledge was identified as early as the 1950s as playing a major role in bridging economic development gaps between places. The capacity of places to innovate depends on both internal as well as external sources of knowledge, which complement each other.

Innovation policy has tended to focus on internal capacity. Yet a city’s absorptive capacity is just as critical.

Absorptive capacity is the ability to access international networks of knowledge and innovation; its capacity to anchor external knowledge from people, institutions and firms; and its capacity to diffuse new innovation and knowledge in the wider economy.

Outside opinion and influence can be brought into cities in a number of ways. Officials or politicians can access information and documentation on urban best practice or innovation through a range of traditional channels, such as seminars, publications, or being part of city networks.

They can travel, speak to peers who work in different contexts and share best practice experiences.

Other approaches can involve bringing outsiders into a city: be it someone ‘imported’ from another city, or a consultant, an expert, mediator or decision-maker, or even migrants. In this kind of approach, the advantage is that skills, disciplines and views, and cultural values are harnessed and often unsuspected opinions, opportunities and challenges for urban policy makers can emerge.

Landry et al. argue that outsider talent needs importing on occasion, because cities tend to operate within the habits, traditions and cultures of a particular place – ‘the inside looking out, rather than the outsider looking in’. An outsider (consultant/mediator/decision-maker)
can have more freedom from institutional pressures and constraints, can offer up new perspectives, challenge traditional ways of doing things. Their different point of view can identify potential in the city that insiders overlook.

An outsider can spot opportunities for new connections in a city that insiders can miss often because they are locked into separate and disconnected social networks.

Yet outsiders – and the cities they advise – need to be keenly sensitive to culture, history and context. Ideas cannot be simply transferred from one location to another, like a parcel. Ideas spread by propagating and mutating: they adapt in context. Really useful outsiders do not just bring in ideas from the outside, they help a city develop the capacity to absorb and remake the idea in context. As Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, at Arup put it:

“You have to be very careful which precedent you choose. Because it has to be consistent with that common vocabulary ... There’s no use talking about the beautiful square in Siena as we’re talking about a project in East Africa. It may not be relevant. So I think precedent is culturally specific, culturally sensitive as well ... And that’s the challenge that I think we all have to do, living in an increasingly global community, of not just translating solutions from one world to another world.”
What works and what doesn’t?
A diversity of approaches is available for cities to draw upon in engaging outsider expertise in a more systematic way, tailoring the method to the city, its history, politics and culture and the challenges it faces.

The central questions are:
- How do the methods work, why they work, and what techniques are used?
- What are the limits to transferability?
- What are the drivers and motivations behind people’s use of these techniques?
- Who needs to take part to make it a success?

Power mapping in cities

To stimulate social creativity and innovation in a city it is vital to understand its power structures (public, private, civil society) and the dynamics between groups and key individuals is critical.

Gaining an insight into the power dynamics in a city is essential to prepare the ground for choosing a social innovation method.

One of the critical factors in determining the relative success of external engagement of any kind will concern the power structures and dynamics of a given city, and the success of any given method will depend upon a nuanced understanding of these. As Schiffer observes: ‘Questions of power and empowerment have gained momentum as experience shows that technically sound interventions regularly fail to achieve their intended goals, because of adverse power structures.’

Social innovation will be crucially affected by whether power-holders commission, support or resist an innovation. A first step is to establish who the stakeholders might be in a given social innovation initiative.

Every city has a different range of actors who drive social innovation. There may be strong individual leaders who are motivated to achieve social change (such as politicians, business leaders, entrepreneurs). There may be weak or strong networks of third sector organisations, vocal or organised activists or pressure groups, or strong connections between central and local government.

There are a number of existing useful frameworks/tools for generating a clear picture of power in cities. Some of the names for these types of tools include ‘power mapping’, ‘power analysis’, ‘stakeholder analysis’ and ‘social network analysis’. Here, we will focus attention on power mapping.

Power mapping represents an innovative participatory method that helps social innovators to visualise and assess both quantitatively and qualitatively the power of different actors in a field.

Power mapping involves identifying key actors within a particular field of action, defining the power that these actors have in relation to particular decisions or resources, and assessing the relationships of these actors with each other and oneself.

Power mapping has been widely used by community, labour and social movement organisations in developing strategies and campaigns to achieve social change. Multiple, sophisticated forms of power mapping exist, and those involved in community organising and developing are creating new forms all the time.
Power mapping can be used to:
- understand power structures within one’s own organisation and promote organisational learning
- start a dialogue that spells out (in a non-confrontational way) where one stands and what other actors’ positions are
- evaluate and review whether the actors involved share key goals and values.

Power mapping’s strengths include:
- low-tech and low cost
- applicable to complex situations, including those where there is a low level of formal education or high illiteracy rates, a high diversity of facilitators and interviewees in terms of culture and language, and where technical infrastructure is limited
- visualising a high number of actors and the relations between them
- intuitive and is easy to grasp.

Limitations, critiques and special considerations include:
- dependency on the interviewer/facilitator can be quite high
- the need to ensure the governance field being examined is clearly defined and not too complex
- linkages between actors can be hard to establish.

Appendix D includes some examples of power-mapping tools.
Engaging and leading social innovation: lessons from UK social innovators
In-depth conversations with four UK social innovators provided these insights into how they engage and negotiate relationships with multiple stakeholders.

- **Engaging with multiple, diverse stakeholders is critical to social innovation.**
  
  *People are at the centre of social innovation*
  
  ‘I think the main point, from my perspective, is when people go round doing social interventions, innovations or problem-solving, that it’s really important to put people at the centre of that. And without getting buy-in from the relevant people, you just might as well not bother.’ *(Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)*

- **Who are the potential power-holders/stakeholders implicated in a social innovation initiative?**
  
  These can encompass a diverse spectrum of society, including: local and national authorities; individuals and organisations across the public, private and voluntary sectors; business, political and civic leaders; professionals from a variety of disciplines, the media, and members of the public/citizens.

- **Resistance from stakeholders should be expected**
  
  ‘Ah, there’s always resistance. You know that you’re innovating when there’s resistance.’ *(Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)*

- **Acknowledge and manage risk**
  
  ‘It’s not good enough to just do the innovation and not manage the risk ... And in order to manage risk, you’ve got to manage the parameters that cause the risk, whether it’s political exposure, or cost or time, or economics ... But you’ve got to understand that that person sitting on the other side of the table who is hesitant, who is anxious about your very innovative idea, is often sitting there thinking “it’s just too risky for me”.’ *(Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)*

- **Get people outside their silos**
  
  One critical task is ‘getting people to own others’ problems’ and to build a common language as a starting point:
  
  ‘I guess what we believe is to try and get a commonality of language, vocabulary and belief, before you start having the fun stuff of doodling diagrams on pieces of tracing paper ... What that means is that we often have big workshops at the beginning of projects that include the clients, the major stakeholders, sometimes the planning authorities, where we try to set very clear objectives for the project: that can be energy, that can be numbers of jobs, whatever. And they become a reference point for us. And at that point we’re getting a sense of what the constraints are ... [and] what the issues are that people think are there. And in sharing that before any design solutions hit the consultation trail, we feel that you build at least a language of commonality that can come together ... The city-maker has to bring these languages together ... It’s got to be this kind of collective language.’ *(Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)*

- **Build mutually rewarding relationships among all who are involved**
  
  Achieving success in any given project is not generally about the sheer number of actors who are brought in but the quality and commitment of the relationships they build.
  
  ‘I think our work is to tackle as many of the issues simultaneously as we can, and not do it in a kind of sequential process.’
“We talk about finding the virtuous cycles of solutions. So ... the economist gets an advantage from something that the energy consultant does, and the energy systems get an advantage from something the waste guy does.”

This approach has the added advantage of being politically ‘more attractive’ because ‘when you connect systems together, you de-risk strategies’. When you try and solve each issue one by one, ‘you have very high-risk strategies, because each is vulnerable ... You’ve got to find that network operating, of inter-relationships ... It’s about trying to distribute the risks of place-making.’ (Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)

- **Demonstrate the potential for mutual reward**
  ‘Pitch your project in a way that shows local authorities that it is going to help them to meet certain targets, to achieve certain goals that they already have in mind, then your project is more likely to get permission ...’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)

- **Offer the prospect of clear solutions**
  ‘We never just say: here is a problem; we say, here is a problem – here is something we could do ... It’s being able to offer a solution; it’s more and more being able to offer evidence ...’ (Geraldine Blake, Head of LinksUK, Community Links)
  ‘Demonstrate the need for the projects on the ground through very practical pilots.’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)

- **Encourage multiple perspectives on any challenge**
  ‘It’s not just about us saying it: it’s supporting local people and young people to speak up for themselves, say what the need is ... This can be enormously effective.’ (Geraldine Blake, Head of LinksUK, Community Links)
  ‘It does go back to that issue of listening to people and identifying the common things.’ (Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)

- **Build networks, relationships and mutual respect across sectors**
  ‘We have very good networks with the local council, with national government, with businesses, and with all sorts of independent funders ... Make every effort to involve all three sectors, and then the potential to scale up, to make something really large-scale, is really there.’ (Geraldine Blake, Head of LinksUK, Community Links)
  ‘Approach things in a spirit of collaboration.’ (Geraldine Blake, Head of LinksUK, Community Links)

- **Engage the media**
  ‘We have to fight our corner, certainly. The media are very important to us. But, equally, not very interested in us. They’re not really interested in ordinary people effectively. They’re interested in celebrities and traditional politicians ... We have to live with that.’ (Neil Jameson, Executive Director, London Citizens)

- **Expect and manage tensions**
  Innovation is fraught with difficulty. It challenges the status quo. It should be no surprise that stakeholders feel challenged by the process. These tensions are vital to innovation. Rather than avoid them, they have to be managed and resolved. Only through their creative resolution will innovation emerge.
For example, bringing in citizens’ views can sometimes be resisted by decision-makers or authorities:

‘There are always barriers when it comes to trying to persuade decision-makers that involving citizens is a good idea ... I think it comes to this almost theoretical tension which is played out quite practically when it comes to representative versus participative politics. So often people, they feel like ... where somebody is an expert in what they do, they are a professional, and they are in some way put in that position to represent your best interests – whether it be through a professional qualification – for example, they are your doctor or teacher – or whether they are formally elected as your MP, for example. Those kinds of individuals, there are definitely tensions for them – between, I have been elected to this position or put in this position to make the best decision on your behalf, and the idea that, by involving the people that they are to represent, that they could make a better decision.’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)

However, under the right conditions, this can also be experienced in positive terms by decision-makers:

‘People who do get in touch with us, they are inspired often by the idea that you can have people who benefit from the services, involved directly in delivering or making decisions about the services. So ... it is quite empowering for the decision-maker too, because it connects them with the people that they are hired to represent.’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)

- **Win the support of political and business leaders**
  ‘Local leaders at that very micro-level, to be heading up these projects and really getting involved personally in delivering them.’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)

- **Make sure stakeholder engagement is committed**
  Stakeholders can easily lose interest in a project if they feel that their input is ‘token’, or if they do not see anything happening as a result of their input.
  ‘We engage business in all sorts of different ways. We’re very clear: our business partners are not just there to give us money; we make every effort to engage them in all sorts of different ways, we have secondees in and out ... Business is also looking for something else from their engagement.’ (Geraldine Blake, Head of LinksUK, Community Links)
  ‘I think there’s a big problem ... people get consulted all the time. And they often feel that nothing actually happens, or that they don’t get good feedback or result for getting involved. So they’ve given up their time, but they can’t see any change; they can’t see what happens ... And people get a bit tired of it really. And when people feel nothing is happening as a result, then they’re not so interested in getting involved ... The only solutions (to this problem) are old-fashioned ones: having integrity, doing what you say you’re going to do and, showing people that you are genuinely running this project in a different way... if you go with a lot of enthusiasm, and a not very corporate way of coming across. If they can tell you are very committed to the issue, I think that means something to people, and they are willing to try and get involved.’ (Alice Casey, Project Manager, Involve)
Advice for aspiring innovators – from European innovators

If it’s possible to do it, then just do it … People should use their instincts, just get out and do it, and then let the thing go. If you sit down and discuss it all and plan it all … you control an idea too much. If you start on your own, but in a way that is open to people’s reactions and responses, then the idea has the potential to go off in different directions. (Richard Reynolds, Guerrilla Gardening, UK)

Be determined. You have to give 100 per cent and keep going to the end. Don’t stop; keep fighting for results. The fact we enjoy it is important – we enjoy everything we do for the city. You have to love what you do. (Szymon Kwiatkowski, Grupa Pewnych Osób, Poland)

Be open; be flexible. You need passion and to enjoy what you do and get networking. Get out there and learn from other people. If you are open to new ideas, you’ll be more creative. (Madle Lippus, New World Community, Estonia)

The most important thing is to follow your heart, your gut feeling. Always look for the unexpected. Don’t follow the well-trodden path – find your own way. That’s what we did and I know it makes it more interesting. Be open to new situations and learn to say yes. Understand that all people are prime movers in some way – all people have some sort of gift. (Erlend Blakstad Haffner, Fantastic Norway, Norway)

Take one step at a time, both in your project and your ambitions for changing the world. You can’t change it all at once and you can’t create the perfect project from day one. You have to start somewhere. We learnt a lot from starting the Human Library and now we see what the next steps are to create even bigger changes. (Kathrine Overgaard Ramsussen, Kultour, Denmark)
Methods that could be applied to encourage social innovation in the city context
The table below sets out a range of methods which could be applied in a city context to encourage social innovation, setting out some of the potential benefits as well as the limitations of such approaches. Web links to the approaches listed below are included in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/technique</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applications, strengths, weaknesses and special considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy (Traditional/</td>
<td>‘The practice of giving expert advice within a particular field’ – consulting agencies deliver efficiencies, strategy and innovation.</td>
<td>Strengths: transfer and diffusion of expert knowledge and skills; consultant’s experience means a minimal learning curve; cost-effective. Weakness/special considerations: client scepticism and resistance to consultants; management consultants sometimes lack legitimacy of established professions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-disciplinary) e.g. PwC; Arup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review model for city plans</td>
<td>'Critical friends providing independent assessment of progress towards benchmarks'</td>
<td>Applications: Evaluating progress/performance; capacity building; identification of inconsistencies in existing plans; stimulating internal and external communication; kick-starting and supporting more effective and useful inter-departmental/sectoral working; good way of exchanging experiences between municipalities and for doing city-to-city co-operation; acting as peer provides better understanding of own city's performance. Strengths: Cost effective; more PC alternative to consultants; adds credibility to work/demonstrate role models; powerful tool for revealing strengths and weaknesses in a city; peers give new views on old problems. Weaknesses/special considerations: Effectiveness depends on value-sharing, adequate levels of commitment and mutual trust, and requires credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Liveable Cities; IDEA; BUSTRIP;</td>
<td>'Independent audit against benchmarks of a publicly available report providing assurance for stakeholders.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUD; EMAS Peer Review for Cities;</td>
<td>The ‘considered judgement’ (assessment) of the experts on the ‘progress being made’ (performance) by municipalities towards a benchmark (or ‘ideal’).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aalborg Commitment Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkers in Residence e.g. South</td>
<td>Internationally renowned experts invited to a country to help explore and find original solutions to policy issues and challenges; provide strategic advice to government, non-government, business, industry, community organisations. Programme run in collaboration with universities, business sector and government.</td>
<td>Applications: Addressing wide-reaching policy issues, including health, education, social innovation, homelessness, the environment, water, new media, governance, science, research and economic development. Strengths: Transferring skills; generating new ideas, programmes, alliances and collaborations; building local capacity; developing industry; providing world class advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia; plans for Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/technique</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Applications, strengths, weaknesses and special considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Issue-focused peer networking  
e.g. Eurocities; C40 | Networks of major cities committed to close cooperation, in the interest of developing dialogue and solutions to common problems. | Applications: Problems that are common among participants, wide in scope, and solutions which require collaborative efforts i.e. wide-reaching social, economic and political challenges.  
Strengths: Give cities a ‘voice’ on critical issues; provides platform for cities to share knowledge and ideas, exchange experiences, analyse common problems and develop innovative solutions; pool buying power; mobilise expert assistance; creating and deploying common measurement tools. |
| World Cafés | Innovative methodology for hosting conversations about pressing problems. A conversational process based on seven integrated design principles: set context, create hospitable space, explore questions that matter, encourage everyone’s contribution, connect diverse perspectives, listen together and notice patterns, share collective discoveries. Conversations link with and build on each other as people move between groups, cross-pollinate ideas. | Applications: Being used by a growing community of people, groups, organisations and networks; has led to discovery of innovative approaches to healthcare, education, socially responsible business, environmental protection, social welfare, conflict resolution, sustainable development.  
Strengths: Can evoke/make visible collective intelligence of a group, increasing capacity for effective action in pursuit of common goals; wide applicability of core design principles; process resonates with traditional processes of dialogue and deliberation in many cultures; ability to mobilise collective intelligence across traditional boundaries (generations/countries/fields/disciplines etc.) for discovering innovative ways to proceed. |
| Deliberation methods  
e.g. Adam Kahane’s Solving Tough Problems: An open way of talking, listening and creating new realities | Kahane’s techniques for conflict resolution/solving complex problems. Methods include four conversational modes – Downloading, Debating, Reflective Dialogue, and Generative Dialogue – if we want to change the world, we need to recognise and navigate through all modes. | Applications: Solving ‘tough problems’ – problems which are complex in three ways: dynamically complex, generatively complex and socially complex; conflict resolution – can be applied where participants do not share common views, goals, experiences (even adversaries).  
Strengths: Approach is about changing the future, not just anticipating change and preparing for it.  
Special considerations: Requires sensitive and skilled facilitation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/technique</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Applications, strengths, weaknesses and special considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design methods</strong>&lt;br&gt;e.g. Doors of Perception; EMUDE; IDEO</td>
<td>Doors of Perception: Organises an international conference, an event in India and a website, which together form a knowledge network aiming to set new agendas for design.</td>
<td>Application: Focus on information and communication technologies and helping organisations learn how to innovate; translate knowledge and ideas into action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEO: An innovation and design firm that uses a human-centred and design-based approach to help organisations in the business, government, education, healthcare and social sectors innovate. Uses ‘Design Thinking’ – an inherently shared approach, brings together people from different disciplines to explore new ideas. Methods include observation, prototyping, building and storytelling.</td>
<td>Application: Methods can be applied by a wide range of people to a breadth of organisational challenges; facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration; focus on bringing innovation strategy to life. Strengths: Focus on collaboration; ‘people-centred’ approach; stress on fast prototyping of ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMUDE: Network of teams of researchers and students from European design schools, aimed at identifying cases where individuals and communities use existing resources in a sustainable way, pinpoint demand, and point to how to improve efficiency, accessibility and diffusion.</td>
<td>Application: facilitating collaboration, transferring knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Educational programme which brings together leaders of all ages, backgrounds and sectors – e.g. health, education, arts, media, local government, business and charities. Takes ‘community’ as both subject and venue: participants go out into their own communities and grapple with real-life problems first-hand, visiting prisons, housing developments, businesses, hospitals and manufacturing plants to find inspiration outside of usual experience.</td>
<td>Applications: Stimulating problem-solving and solutions to local problems; focus on solving ‘real-life’ problems first-hand, rather than meeting in rooms studying abstract management problems; facilitating cross-sectoral collaboration; developing leadership skills. Strengths: Wide applicability, addresses ‘real-life’ problems first-hand, embraces diversity, can serve to overcome biases among leaders, catalyst function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/technique</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Applications, strengths, weaknesses and special considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckminster World Game/Future Game</td>
<td>Original World Game developed by Buckminster; since adapted by YKON, Helsinki, to Future Game (a modern version). Game is about engaging people in discussions, to come up with ideas and solutions that would otherwise be left to ‘the experts’.</td>
<td>Applications: Increasing participation; facilitating collective problem-solving. Strengths: Inclusive – ‘anyone can play’ perspective on problem-solving and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Council – Future City Game</td>
<td>A two-day activity with the aim of generating the best idea to improve quality of life in cities. Local stakeholders such as municipal authorities, community groups, and regeneration agencies choose the theme, location and participants for each game to ensure that it is tailored to the local context. Each team is made up of players from different disciplines, backgrounds and outlooks. Teams have to use a range of skills to win – soft skills such as presentation, negotiation and reaching consensus; and hard skills such as design, research and interviewing. Games Master leads the players through three stages – visioning, testing and presenting – giving the players a set of tools to help them to work together and with stakeholders, develop ideas, and present their findings. The teams identify common challenges facing the city (environmental, social, economic and cultural) and design solutions which they test and refine with the help of practitioners and community members. At the end of the game the local stakeholders are presented with the ideas. Everyone gets to vote on the best ideas and to think through how they can be implemented in the city once the game has finished.</td>
<td>Applications and strengths: Stimulates new thinking in cities about ways to address global changes resulting from globalisation, migration, climate change, security and unmet social needs; encourages wider participation and facilitates partnerships between organisations and individuals to help address particular social challenges. Builds the capacity of professionals working in sustainable urban development, and the capacity of the wider public to become more socially active in their cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method/technique</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Applications, strengths, weaknesses and special considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbowls</td>
<td>A technique used to increase participation and understanding of other people's perspectives on a particular issue. Consists of an inner group of participants in a roundtable format, involved in conversation/decision-making. It is witnessed by a larger group who has the opportunity for input and questioning.</td>
<td>Applications: Highly applicable when consultation and/or interaction with the broader community is required; can be used to engage communities, discover community issues, develop community capacity. Strengths: Can create transparency in decision-making; generate creative dialogue; can overcome adversarial qualities of debate; build trust. Weakness/special considerations: Best when presentations are brief; requires organisers to be committed to a creative approach to consulting; people must be able to operate beyond their comfort zones; requires intensive set-up and publicity; and the need to hire skilled facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Thinking</td>
<td>A method developed for groups to come to new understandings of what is possible. The process can involve 100 people in tables or circles of around eight each with a convener. Involves a series of rapid circles involving all the participants to map out the parameters of the issue and the potential solutions.</td>
<td>Applications: Aim is not to create a single consensus. Rather, its aim is to generate new ways forward for groups, and to elicit personal and group commitments to act on them. Strengths: Can build group commitment; and access to diverse perspectives. Special considerations: Can be used with diverse groups, but the distance travelled depends critically on some common language and assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What makes a city fertile for social innovation?
Some places innovate successfully; others do not. The consensus of studies on the conditions conducive for social innovation is that the following factors are critical.

**Diversity and tolerance**

Landry argues that diversity and access to varied talent lie at the foundation of creative cities. He points out that, throughout history, outsiders and immigrants, from within or outside a country’s boundaries, have been central to establishing creative cities. Historical and contemporary case studies of innovative places – as diverse as Constantinople, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Paris, London, Berlin and Vienna – show how minority groups have fuelled the economic, cultural and intellectual rejuvenation of cities.

Social and demographic conditions can affect a city’s creative capacity – in conditions where social and cultural diversity foster understanding and learning, rather than xenophobia. A history of tolerance, a commitment to accessibility with ladders of opportunity and a broad sense of security are the foundations of a lively civil society, and increase vitality, raise levels of participation, transaction and interaction to levels which allow creative activity to take off. Cities with homogenous and static populations often find it more difficult to be widely creative. They are less likely to find the mix of imaginations required for the emerging complexities of urban life.

Cities with high levels of tolerance and diversity are also, according to Richard Florida, best placed to attract members of what he calls the ‘creative class’ – the sort of people with the power for innovation. Florida found a strong correlation between places that are tolerant and diverse (as measured by his ‘Gay’ and ‘Bohemian’ indices) and economic growth. Florida points out the performance gap between thriving cities in the United States, such as Austin and Seattle, and contrasts them with struggling cities, such as Pittsburgh. He contends that struggling cities like Pittsburgh are not behind because they do not want to grow, or encourage hi-tech industries but, rather, because they are either unwilling or unable to create the conditions needed to attract creativity and talent.

**Recognition of crisis and challenge**

Crisis has acted as a key driver within the innovation process, galvanising the need for change and aligning agents in the actions needed in order to bring about social change and meet social needs through new methods, products, services and systems. Crisis can communicate a forceful and acute message for the need for innovation, which in turn legitimises the need for change, and creates the sense of urgency needed to prompt action to respond to a social need. It can also lead to the mobilisation of resources required for innovation – both human and financial.

Social innovation is more likely when it becomes a necessity and when there is a powerful force to drive it. Pressures can include, for example, a very visible service or performance failure, extreme need (in comparison to peers), pressure from peers, or the requirements of government policy. In some contexts, social innovation may be driven by bottom-up pressure from citizens; in Portland, in the United States, for example, social innovation was driven, from the early 1960s, by activists – and the political leadership rose to the challenge, rather than...
resisting it. Crisis can even drive innovation in sectors that are notoriously difficult to change, due to the risks and expenses involved, and to organisational cultures and rigid structures that are resistant to change – as in the case of public services. Exceptional circumstances – such as a natural disaster (as in the case of Hurricane Katrina, discussed below), or political change and crisis can also have a catalysing effect on social creativity and innovation.

Landry observes that politically contested circumstances and socio-political change can provide fertile ground for creative experimentation. For example, Berlin’s post-war status and then re-emergence as a unified city created an opportunity to think afresh, helped by a climate receptive to new ideas in the public and private spheres. In this context, social and economic well-being became newly linked with environmental consciousness: for instance, unemployed people were taken on to conduct city-wide energy audits, and former squatters were given space they had occupied and trained to convert houses to modern ecological buildings. Conflicts, for example in Belfast, Beirut or Sarajevo, have also sometimes given rise to ‘incidental innovations’. In Belfast, conflict has led to a scenario where ossified local government structures were suspended to allow new partnership structures to emerge and develop their own organisational and governance procedures; a proposed university for Belfast’s disadvantaged citizens, which straddles the dividing line between Catholic and Protestant communities of west Belfast; and, more tragically, Belfast surgeons have become world-renowned for dealing with violent injuries.

Rebuilding New Orleans

In August 2005, Hurricane Katrina ravaged the city of New Orleans. When the levees broke, 80 per cent of the city was flooded; over 1,000 people lost their lives; some 150,000 evacuees never returned to the city and it is estimated that the total damage caused by Katrina (and Hurricane Rita less than a month later) cost just under $100 billion.

However, in the last three years, many have seen the destruction and devastation caused by Katrina as an opportunity to rebuild the city from the bottom up. And, over the last three years, a spirit of entrepreneurialism, innovation and radical social reform has taken hold of the city. Projects and start-ups span many fields – everything from the arts and culture to business, civic engagement, education and housing. For example, the Houdini project is transforming the bail bond industry by investing after-tax bail profits in early years’ literacy programmes; the online platform policypitch.com, is asking people to pitch their innovative new policy ideas; and the Receivables Exchange is helping small and middle-sized firms by providing them with quick and easy access to working capital.

Over the past three years, there has been a surge in the number of social mission start-ups. New Orleans lost almost 30 per cent ($5,192) of its businesses as a result of Katrina. Since 2006, there has been a marked recovery however, and by the beginning of 2007, the entire state of Louisiana had only 892 fewer employers than pre-Katrina levels. In part this has been facilitated by new infrastructures to support social entrepreneurs. Louisiana’s Governor Mitch Landrieu set up the Louisiana Office of Social Entrepreneurship in 2006 to find solutions to the social and economic problems
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facing New Orleans and the surrounding area and to build the sector’s capacity. Other support and advisory services have also sprung up: The Idea Village, social entrepreneurs of New Orleans, and the New Orleans Young Urban Rebuilding Professionals Initiative are but a few examples. Tim Williamson, President of the Idea Village, explains: ‘the sense of possibility is more than it was before Katrina ... if you’re into innovation and entrepreneurship, New Orleans is a laboratory for that right now.’

One of the most exciting developments is in the field of education. Before Hurricane Katrina, the New Orleans public school system had one of the worst records in the country for educational attainment and achievement; one in four students failed to complete high school and in 2004–05 63 per cent of schools in the city were deemed ‘academically unacceptable’. Now more than half of all public school students attend Charter Schools. Charter Schools receive public funds but are freed from many of the regulatory constraints facing other schools; they are managed independently from the central school district and are therefore free to hire and fire staff and to set the curriculum as well as employ innovative teaching and learning methodologies. In return for these freedoms, Charter Schools sign a performance management contract with the local state or school board which commits those schools to delivering improvements in children’s educational outcomes. If schools fail to meet their contractual obligations (improved outcomes) the charter is not renewed. This marks a dramatic shift in school governance and accountability and has the potential to transform educational outcomes for children across the city.32

Crisis alone does not necessarily catalyse creative responses, however: first, crisis needs to be recognised, which can be difficult for formerly successful cities. A city – or at least a core of innovators within it – needs to have the self-confidence that it is up to the challenge. When crisis is endemic this can have an incapacitating effect on a city’s capacity to respond effectively.33

It is much harder to generate the momentum and appetite for innovation in cities that are seen to be doing well, coasting. Generating constant challenge to the status quo is one of the main tasks of city leadership.

In places with ‘warm sun, good wine, and relaxed living’ ambition can be dented. Here, Landry34 suggests, one strategy can be to create a ‘crisis of aspiration’, where one strategically precipitates a culture of crisis. He points out that a crisis does not have to be negative, and can be pushed ahead by creating very high expectations for a city, so generating a crisis of aspiration – this can be created by appealing to people’s higher ideals, looking at ‘bigger picture’ issues like the future of the world, or the legacy people are going to leave for the next generation. The ensuing gap between existing realities and what a city wants to achieve ‘creates a self-generated crisis that can be a spur to action’.35

Pressure to change is a necessary but not sufficient condition for creativity and innovation: it also depends on a dispersal of power, and requires the right leadership, a particular kind of organisational culture, and the presence of and type of networking.
Dispersal of power

Power dispersal – on national and city level – can affect the extent to which cities harness creativity.

There are three critical factors that can stand as obstacles to city-level innovation:

**Over-centralisation**: In the words of Charles Landry, ‘cities are not islands with the power to shape their own future’. The degree of their control and scope for initiative depends on the country’s governance structures. The more federal the country – e.g. the US, Germany and Italy – the more likely larger cities are able to determine their own fate. Under the Scandinavian ‘free commune’ system, communities big and small can opt out of central government oversight and run their own affairs.

**Agglomeration of power**: ‘When political, economic and cultural power agglomerates in one place significantly it can act as an incapacitator and a means of reducing the potential for certain kinds of creativity.’

**Networks of patronage**: Networks among long-established elites can reduce access to power and information. This can serve to limit creativity by excluding people who have much to contribute. Innovative talent can come from anywhere, including, for example, less well-regarded areas of higher education. As Peter Hall’s analysis of innovative cities shows, outsider cities which are cut off from the mainstream are often the most innovative – such as Los Angeles, Memphis, Detroit, Glasgow or Manchester at different periods of their history.

Strong leadership

The presence of strong leaders – with a passion and commitment – is crucial to getting innovation started, providing it with political legitimacy and cover. Leadership can come from politics (politicians, activists, and think tanks), bureaucracy (civil servants), local or regional authorities, business, academia and/or NGOs. Examples of leaders who have driven social innovation in their city include: Jaime Lerner, several times mayor and original architect of Curitiba, Brazil; Antanus Mockus of Bogotá, Colombia; and London (under Ken Livingstone). Leaders from non-political backgrounds can add to the process. Since the 1970s, Curitiba’s leaders have been mainly non-politicians. For example, Jaime Lerner trained as an architect, Cassio Taniguchi (also mayor) was one of Brazil’s top architects. Both brought to the office a practical, technocratic problem-solving style. Taniguchi states: ‘Every time the public sector tries to do something on its own it tends to be a failure. The public sector works best when it encourages contributions from other people – the private sector and citizens – to solve problems.’

Many of the specific strategies taken up by Curitiba have been devised by the city’s Institute of Public Policy, where 300 people work in multi-disciplinary teams of architects, engineers, planners, designers and economists.

Antanus Mockus, the mayor of Bogotá, also came from a non-political background. Before running for mayor, he held the top job at the Colombian National University, as a mathematician and a philosopher. Despite a lack of prior political experience, he was successful mainly because people in Colombia’s capital city saw him as an ‘honest guy’ – a moral leader, when they needed one, rather than a bureaucrat. He drew on his inventiveness as an educator to turn Bogotá into a
‘social experiment’ of sorts – just when the city was on the verge of chaos, rife with violence, lawless traffic, corruption, and gangs of street children who mugged and stole. The fact that he was seen as an unusual leader gave the new mayor the opportunity to try extraordinary things. He often communicated through symbols, metaphor, humour and performance; for example, wearing a Superman costume, casting himself as a ‘supercitizen’, hiring over 400 mime artists to control Bogotá’s chaotic streets. He also launched a ‘Night for Women’, when the city’s men were asked to stay at home and look after the children (most did) and even asked the public to pay an extra ten per cent in voluntary tax (again, a large number did). Mockus does not like to be called a leader, saying: ‘There is a tendency to be dependent on individual leaders. To me, it is important to develop collective leadership. I don’t like to get credit for all that we achieved. Millions of people contributed to the results that we achieved ... I like more egalitarian relationships. I especially like to orient people to learn.’ His leadership style is based on a philosophy that sees the distribution of knowledge as the vital contemporary task. ‘Knowledge empowers people. If people know the rules, and are sensitised by art, humour, and creativity, they are much more likely to accept change.’

Cultures oriented towards ‘openness’

Organisational culture is another critical determinant of innovative capacity. Organisations that do not innovate tend to be hierarchical, over-departmentalised and internally focused, and those in which procedure is given pride of place, to the extent that focus on the end result can be lost.

Local social innovation is greater where there is a large number of organisations that avoid excessively bureaucratic, hierarchical methods that hinder innovation and encourage risk-taking, and which support this both individually and institutionally. A good example is Silicon Valley where networked, open approaches to entrepreneurship have migrated between the private and public sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The relationship between organisational culture and innovation potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centralism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ Less local innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, political leaders can establish a culture where innovation is seen as natural and, in such cases, innovative cultures can then become embedded for some time. The Scandinavian
governments, for example, have been successful innovators for several decades, and have
gone some way towards institutionalising innovation and formalising these routes. Denmark
has established its own internal consultancy, Mindlab, to promote creativity, while in Finland,
the main technology agency, SITRA, has turned its attention to public innovation.45

Networking and collaboration

Writing on what it is that makes a place innovative, Saxenian46 maintains that: ‘It’s not the
ingredients, but the recipe’. Her groundbreaking research, documented in Regional Advantage,
compares Silicon Valley with Boston’s Route 128, finding that ‘the performance difference
between the two technology regions was the “network model” in Silicon Valley that connected
companies and sped up the innovation process. Route 128 had similar assets but different
results because it failed to collaborate and build open networks for information sharing.
According to Saxenian, the important part is not the ingredients as much as how the community
leverages its assets.47

Networking is one of the major criteria embodied by innovative urban places, within a city and
internationally. The rise of Cologne as an arts city, for example, was facilitated by the power
of intra-city networking. International networking is equally important and valuable, because
competition and comparison with other cities can provide stimulus. In workshops with groups
from cities in the UK and Germany, for example, Landry and colleagues found that the brokering
of new connections and new economic, scientific and cultural collaborations was seen as
fundamental to the future prosperity of cities. The majority of the cities present at the workshops
were active in the organisation of and participation in trade fairs, the membership of international
networks of cities such as Eurocities, cultural and educational exchanges, staff exchanges,
co-operation between research centres as means of enhancing their receptiveness, open-
mindedness and international orientation.48

While networking capacity has been achieved in some successful commercial organisations,
especially in hi-tech and cultural industrial companies, it is far more difficult to achieve in the
urban context as a whole. Creating a felt, urgent need to network is much more difficult for a city
given its combination of actors – public, private and voluntary – each with its own organisational
culture and agenda.49

Benefits of collaboration are greatest in instances where there is a degree of ‘cognitive distance’
between organisations: that is, some level of difference in the way that two organisations view
a given situation, as this can provide novel insights.50 However, creative collaboration between
diverse players needs sophisticated management.

Collaboration can be held back by a lack of mutual understanding, or what has been termed
‘absorptive capacity’51. In any fundamental innovation things are new and familiar. A common
language still has to be developed. Innovation thrives on bringing together people with different
ideas. If they are not different there is no real learning. If their differences mean they cannot
be brought together there is little learning. Bridging the gaps between different players, skills,
insights is critical.

A second risk is that some partners seem to stand to gain more from collaboration than others.
This mismatch of risks and benefits often makes people wary of collaborating.52
What makes a city fertile for social innovation?

Linked to that is fear of dependence upon a partner who might let you down. People are more willing to make investments in collaboration when they expect that the relationship will last sufficiently long and will be sufficiently fruitful, to make the investment worthwhile."
When is a city ready for external input and in what form?
Each of the conditions that promotes social innovation in a city also has a bearing on whether a city will be ready for external input and in what form that should come.

Social and demographic conditions affect a city’s creative capacity: cities with social and cultural diversity, accompanied by a history of tolerance, foster social creativity. Such cities may also be most likely to be receptive to outside influence and input, and potentially have a greater capacity to absorb knowledge from an outsider, given existing cultures of openness.

Social innovation is also most likely to happen when it is a necessity, and when there is a powerful force to drive it. Crisis is a time in which to call on external advice and ideas. Insiders may be more receptive to help in time of crisis when old routines and practices have conspicuously failed.

City leaders who are open to innovation play a critical role in supporting and sustaining social creativity and innovation. The presence and support of such leaders will facilitate the process of bringing in an outsider to stimulate innovation. Leaders who welcome input from multiple sectors, professions and disciplines may pave the way for a productive relationship. Winning the support of political leaders is critical for outsiders to have legitimacy.

Over-centralisation, an agglomeration of political, cultural and economic power in one place, and entrenched existing networks of power and patronage can limit social creativity, and could make cities resistant to new ways of thinking and working that outsiders may propose.

Local innovation tends to be greater where there is a large number of organisations that avoid excessively bureaucratic, hierarchical methods that hinder innovation. Responsive organisational cultures, with a shared understanding of the task, which encourage risk-taking, and which support this both individually and institutionally can stand as a critical enabler of innovation. Cities that fit these criteria will have a greater organisational capacity to absorb and put outside knowledge into innovative action.

Collaboration (within a city, and between city and an outsider) will be best when there is an ‘optimal cognitive distance’ between actors (that is, when distance is large enough to yield novelty, but not so large as to block mutual understanding and ability to collaborate). Finding a good fit between ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ knowledge will be an important task. Cities will be more receptive to outside influence when there is a guarantee that the relationship will be sufficiently fruitful and enduring to make the investment worthwhile.

We have now provided the key conditions affecting a city’s capacity for social innovation, and receptiveness to external input and knowledge. The following section will map out the types of problems that could be solved within this process.
What kinds of problems are best fitted to a process that catalyses creativity and social innovation?
This section explores what kinds of problems could be solved through a process that catalyses creativity and social innovation in cities.

Social innovation, supported by outsider advice and influence, is more likely to succeed if cities choose the right methods to work on the right problems.

Critical criteria for problem-selection:

**Existing capacity** – choose problems that current capacity cannot solve:

“I think the environments that have yet to industrialise … have great potentials … In the west, in industrialised cities, we now have a different relationship with culture and the community. Whereas, in those cities which have yet to industrialise, there is still a kind of strength of communities, families and histories. And I think the industrialised cities are looking for that now. And the non-industrialised cities have got that as a core asset. And those cities can capitalise on those great assets of their cultural depth and resonance that we seem to have washed away from our industrialised cities … So I think there is a very important dimension of the work we are doing, and that’s the cultural dimensions of cities, that are becoming increasingly important.’

(Malcolm Smith, Director, Integrated Urbanism, Arup)

Take, for example, the challenge of providing service infrastructure for an increasingly ageing population. This is a pressing problem facing Europe, and countries in the developed world more generally and, in many of these contexts, needs to be addressed urgently. Many non-western, developing societies, on the other hand, despite rapid rates of urbanisation, are generally far more rooted in a strong human infrastructure and collective identities – which alleviate some of the problems associated with care for the elderly. In many of these cultures, the concept of family often extends beyond the concept of the nuclear family and encompasses a much wider set of relationships – for example, the joint family systems of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.49

A clear evaluation of existing capacity, which will be determined by contextually specific factors and processes, will thus be a necessary starting point for the process of problem identification.

**Scale of problem** – choose problems with boundaries.

While lack of existing capacity is important for adding relevance and impact of the process, there is also a danger of taking on problems that are too wide in scope. Problems that are too wide in scope may be experienced in overwhelming and incapacitating terms, which could potentially stand as a barrier to the process of innovation before it has even begun. Problems addressed should be small-scale and manageable – part of the process will involve clearly defining the problem to be addressed. The way a challenge or question is framed is vital to what kind of innovation results. If the challenge is framed in terms of existing services, it is unlikely that much innovation will take place – therefore, the challenge needs to be framed in terms of goals and values, and outcomes sought.

If the problem at hand is too broad or far-reaching – for example, climate change – it will be necessary to operationalise this problem, or break it down into sub-components – for example, transport (see examples below). Cities that are viewed as ‘leaders’ in relation to global problems are often those which take targeted approaches to sub-problems. Curitiba, for example, is a remarkable example of a large array of targeted urban design projects that are attractive, innovative, functional, cost-effective and replicable.48 Jaime Lerner, who led the city as mayor
breakthrough cities

for many years, was adept at using what he called ‘urban acupuncture’, whereby he used small-scale symbolic projects to unleash creative energies. He contends that a ‘simple touch’ in a ‘sick or worn-out point’ of a city can do much to revitalise it as well as the area around it: ‘urbanism requires setting off the city’s response, prickling an area in ways that it can also help to cure, improve, create positive and chain-reactions. It is indispensable to intervene as a way of revitalising, of causing the organism to function in a different way.’

**Scope of actors** – choose problems that cut across professions, sectors and organisational boundaries, and which involve multiple stakeholders.

Problems which cut across professions, sectors and organisational boundaries, and which involve multiple stakeholders, are generally best fitted to the process. The more stakeholders who are included in the process of generating solutions, the more far-reaching the potential of the solution. The success of Portland, for example, in generating social innovation, has been attributed, among other factors, to the fact that it has embraced civic participation and facilitated cross-sector partnerships. There is also more potential, in such a scenario, for solutions to be generated that have a positive impact beyond the narrow problem at hand, if people from diverse perspectives are brought together. This is evident in many of the examples of social innovations presented opposite: for example, in Curitiba, Brazil and Bangalore, India, waste management programmes are geared both towards environmental sustainability as well as poverty alleviation through income generation.

**Impact of problem** – choose problems with local impact, but broader relevance and scope as this will help to attract resources and support.

Problems addressed should have a social impact on a local city, neighbourhood or community level – but, ideally, should have wider, regional, national or even global importance. This is an important determinant of whether there is going to be potential for mainstreaming and up-scaling initiatives, which will require broad-based support from, for example, government and powerful foundations. If an initiative is to have the potential to spread throughout a profession or sector – such as education, or healthcare – or geographically, from one place to another, the problem it addresses needs to have relevance for a wider range of actors than one narrow locality, sector or profession.

**Unifying versus divisiveness potential** – choose problems that are not overly controversial, hence divisive.

A final salient point regards the avoidance of problems that might be overly controversial, and hence unbridgeable. A problem that is mired in controversy – for example, abortion – can potentially be divisive and create discord amongst participants, and thus not conducive to open collaboration.

It is necessary to build authority for innovation – and this often means building a consensus around a problem, a shared understanding of it. However, it is important to note that consensus-building is often something that has to be built through the process, rather than assumed. Also, in a way, one aspect of innovation is to make something controversial that has come to be seen as normal and accepted. In general, it is always important to remember that innovation involves some degree of both crisis and challenge to orthodox thinking, which can be very uncomfortable.

The examples below exemplify some of these issues of problem choice.
Examples of social innovation in cities

Problem: Climate change
Cities across the globe have been developing a diverse range of innovative solutions to the challenge of climate change.

Subcategory: Traffic – for example, congestion charging, initiated in London, and since taken up by Milan and Stockholm, represents an example of how major cities are reducing emissions; car free days in Seoul, a voluntary programme where people choose one day of the work week as a no-driving day, fuelled by incentives provided by the public and private sector, such as discounted petrol, free parking and car washing; promoting alternative forms of transport, such as the bicycle – including Bogotá’s CicloRuta (one of the most comprehensive bicycle path networks in the world) or Bicing in Barcelona (a public cycle hire network that is integrated into and complements the existing public transport network of buses, metro, tram and train); Bus Rapid Transport systems, pioneered in Curitiba and Bogotá, and which have been taken up by other cities, such as Jakarta in Indonesia; the SmartTrips awareness campaign, in Portland (US), which informs Portland residents about alternative forms of transport, and gives them incentives to adopt these.

Subcategory: Waste – for example, Curitiba’s ‘recycling entrepreneurs’, whereby micro-entrepreneurs who collect rubbish, together with householders, have created a self-organising solution within a framework provided by the council – resulting in a lower cost to the tax payer, a cleaner city environment, and a way of making a living for the recyclers; Bangalore’s Solid Waste Management Programme, which serves the purpose of both waste management and poverty alleviation through income generation; the Eco-Tickets Programme in Oswiecim, Poland, which encourages youth to combine leisure with environmental management, by giving young people incentives (cinema/swimming pool tickets) to collect waste paper for recycling, building environmental consciousness at an early age.

Problem: Changing demographics
An ageing population: for example, Supportmyparent.com, a UK-based website – the development of which will be strongly informed by users – which will help people track and manage their parents’ ageing needs requirements to help them be proactive about planning; forums for interaction and support; user-generated recommendations on products and services; and localised sites to allow individuals to connect with and understand the dynamics in their parents’ local communities. Or, for example, Aquarius (Eindhoven, Netherlands) a community where people over 55 live in a resource-sharing community suited to their diverse needs and lifestyles (an alternative to institutionalised care).

Problem: Slowing economy
Unemployment: for example, SYSLAB (Systems Laboratory for Innovation and Employment), a concept which was initiated and developed in Bergen, Norway, to create opportunities for highly skilled and educated unemployed people – the programme has been successfully transferred to Southern and Eastern Europe, showing equally good
results irrespective of cultural background and political settings; social enterprises such as the Mondragon group of co-operatives in Spain, BRAC (Bangladesh), or the Grameen Bank, serving the rural villages of Bangladesh – companies with a social mission, often socially owned and investing their profits in pursuit of their mission (through micro-credit).

**Problem: Governance**

Accountability and participatory governance – Numerous city-level (and sometimes nationwide) innovations are evident in the form of facilitating distributed accountability and democratic innovation. For example, **participatory budgeting**, where citizens define local priorities and allocate public money accordingly, as evidenced in, for instance, Ontario, Canada, or Porto Alegre, Brazil; **citizen petitions**, initiated by the German Parliament, to encourage citizens’ online petitions, and give petitioners with the most support a chance to discuss their ideas in parliament (requiring radical innovation to parliamentary procedure), or, in the UK, the **Number 10 website** which allows citizens to petition the Prime Minister; **ideas and imagination banks**, to draw in public ideas for improving public services (a noteworthy example being the Seoul metropolitan government); or innovations which engage user feedback on service quality – for example, **web-based models** such as patientopinion.org.uk and Iwantgreatcare.org that hold service providers to account; **Complaints Choirs** – which gather groups of citizens to discuss complaints and turn into lyrics and then perform as songs. The idea was first conceived in Finland; first put into practice in Birmingham in England, and has now spread around the world. There are, for example, 11 in Korea www.complaintschoir.org; or **user-generated feedback systems and response**, including, for example, fixmystreet.com.
Stimulating social creativity and innovation in cities: what might the Urban Ideas Bakery look like?
What kind of process might stimulate social innovation in a city?

The process itself would follow a common journey which draws on the Young Foundation’s work on social innovation methods.

In nearly every innovation there are some common stages. Although these are not always linear, they are nearly always present. This chart summarises the stages, beginning at the top left-hand corner and working clockwise.

These stages can then translate into a series of stages or events.

**Diagnosis:** working with a client (e.g. a mayor and his or her team) or with a larger group to diagnose the problem/issue, or what aspect of an issue to focus on. Where there is a very clearly identifiable client for the process this is best done in a contained way. It might lead to work on: how to use a large abandoned building or piece of land; how to better integrate migrants into the life of the city; how to create jobs during the downturn; how to improve standards of care.

**Design:** a second stage aims to maximise creativity and options. This can include scanning for examples from other countries; applying creativity methods in mixed groups, with frontline staff, users, experts and others.

**Pilots:** a third stage or set of stages then tries to narrow these down into models that can be tested or prototyped, with close involvement of whichever organisations are likely to be willing to fund or otherwise support them.

We would expect the subsequent stages – focused on sustainability, scaling and systemic innovation – to comprise a different cast of actors. However in some cases where there is
a sophisticated and enthusiastic client or set or partners, some attention should be paid to these issues earlier on.

Is there a ‘typical’ innovation journey?

While each city or locality will have its own unique journey, lessons from historical and contemporary cases show that there are distinct characteristics that are common across a variety of contexts.

Challenges facing regions can sometimes seem so daunting that only a ‘big bang’ will address them; however, in reality, innovation tends to take place through an evolutionary series of small, achievable steps which build into more significant change. Benneworth (2007) provides a useful model that depicts the five typical stages of any regional innovation journey. The model is adapted from Van der Ven and colleagues’ idea of the ‘innovation journey’, developed to explain how innovations take place in large-scale organisations attempting radical, disruptive innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of innovation journey</th>
<th>‘Critical moment’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Gathering a cadre of enthusiasts: A community of change-makers, focussed on innovation, and with sufficient authority to deliver collective activities demonstrating its importance</td>
<td>1 Acknowledging the problem: Danger that this stage can become overly bureaucratic, favouring paper plans over real outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Arriving at an agreed vision and strategy: The partners jointly decide their regional strategic priorities and identify realistic activities that promise future change, capture people’s imagination, and capture the interests of the main partners.</td>
<td>2 Managing partners: Differences might emerge in setting priorities for action and endanger progression towards any collective action. Moving from vision to an agreed plan of action poses the challenge for leadership to be inclusive and representative, but also effective and efficient in order to prevent ‘too many cooks from spoiling the broth’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Piloting novel activities: Undertaking a small number of eye-catching projects aimed at generating wider interest and providing the various partners with a vehicle to drive shared interests.</td>
<td>3 From a plan for action to action: Few regions manage to mobilise resources from a state of strategising to the stage of doing. Early successes must be generated to create a momentum for future shared activity, and to gain the trust from a wide range of leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The event: diagnostic tool and menu of options

As a guiding framework for the event, two stages come in to play: stage one entails identifying and gaining a clear understanding of the needs/demands of the client (e.g. community activists/groups or officials) or target city, and stage two entails designing a process that fits different contexts/scenarios. Below, we sketch out a diagnostic tool that can be employed to guide the process of selecting countries/cities that are best placed to be targeted for the event, and present a ‘menu of options’ that maps out the various forms that the event could take, and the scenarios that would guide these forms.

Diagnostic tool: how many cities would we involve, and which cities would be best?

The overall event design will be guided by a decision of whether to do events ‘city by city’, or whether to have one large ‘picnic-style’ event, which brings in participants from a range of cities. This will, of course, affect decisions about where the event should take place. The value of one large event that brings in participants from a range of cities has the advantage of providing inter-city networking opportunities, and also serves to avoid a scenario where it appears that outside ‘experts’ are being parachuted in to a city to solve its problems. (At this point, it should be noted that the ‘experts’ who are involved should be a pan-European group, to facilitate inclusion of a variety of perspectives.)

Should a ‘city-by-city’ approach be adopted, we envision that the programme would be carried out in about ten cities, with the estimated outcome being that about seven of these cities could become advocates for the programme. The cities selected would ideally be:

- ‘second cities’ rather than first cities (e.g. Malmo, rather than Stockholm), as power dynamics may be more favourably aligned in favour of the event in such contexts
- cities with a hunger for the opportunity, where creativity is embraced, and where there is already a large existing community of social entrepreneurs
cities with clear problems, and with dynamic leaders who acknowledge the problems, and are willing to address and support creative and innovative approaches to tackling these problems.

Menu of options

An important guiding factor in the event design process will be a clear understanding of who the client is. There will be a continuum along which exist: 1) cities where there is a clear client; 2) cities where there is no client, and 3) cities that fall in between these two scenarios. Additionally, even where there is a clear client, there will be variation in the extent to which the client acknowledges and is ready to address the problem at hand. A ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach will therefore not be suitable. To this end, we have developed a ‘menu of options’ that can serve as a guiding tool that maps out three possible models or scenarios, and an accompanying framework for action that accompanies each.

Menu of options: three models/scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Framework for action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Client-type process</td>
<td>Description: Operate on a need/demand basis Involves identifying what the client wants (a negotiation process) and designing a bespoke process tailored to the client’s needs and demands. Requirements: Use only in a context where there is a clear client e.g. city/organisation/individual/mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Developmental approach</td>
<td>Description: A process that targets emerging influencers/leaders/innovators, geared towards training and developing ideas and capacity. Requirements: This approach may also require involvement and support from an established authority/leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Open, market-place type event</td>
<td>Description: An event that takes on the form of a ‘marketplace’ with various ‘stalls’ manned by experts who are able to assist clients with different aspects of the process of social innovation (e.g. mobilising or scaling). The client can follow the problem through during the course of an event, developing an idea of what works and what does not, at various stages of the innovation process. (See diagram – Appendix C). Requirements: An engaged city in which there are many people who could stand as potential clients/requires multiple experts to ‘man the shops’/applies for larger groups or teams of clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

An important factor to be bear in mind will involve how the success of the event will be measured or evaluated. Measuring success can involve all or one of the following: getting subjective feedback from the participants; assessing participants’ skills development through the process; and/or tangible outcome, i.e. whether the participants were able to put solutions into action successfully or successfully address the problem. Thinking about how the process will be evaluated should be incorporated into the event planning and design process.
Conclusion
Cities across Europe need a more systematic way to promote social innovation. Social innovation emerges from creative combination, challenge and collaboration. The event we propose would be one way to deliver some of these ingredients.

Cities face very different social challenges. Notions of social creativity and innovation will be culturally determined and specific. Cities differ in their appetite and capacity for innovation and their need for it.

However, we believe it is possible to design a simple, modular event which could be adapted to the very different circumstances cities face.

Selecting the right kinds of partners to address the right kinds of problems with the right support and methods will be critical.

The process itself could take numerous forms. Different methods or approaches can achieve different results. The process will need to disrupt existing ways of thinking, and catalyse new ones. The process will necessarily involve consensus-building, but emphasis will vary by city.
Appendices
Appendix A: People and organisations involved in social innovation

The people and organisations who are involved in social innovation are diverse and wide-ranging. For example:

- Organisations that are specifically centred around social innovation include the Young Foundation, based in London, the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto, or the Australian Centre for Social Innovation (ACSI), or the Lien Centre for Social Innovation, based at Singapore Management University.

- NESTA – the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts – a unique body with a mission to make the UK more innovative. They invest in early-stage companies, inform and shape policy, and deliver practical programmes that inspire others to solve the big challenges of the future.

- Mindlab, Denmark – a unit for strategic innovation in the public sector.

- The Hope Institute, Korea – many methods for engaging citizens in promoting ideas around public service improvements.

- Kennisland – an independent Dutch think-tank based in Amsterdam, whose mission is to establish the Netherlands as one of the key regions in the international knowledge economy, in a way that creates both economic and social value.

- TESE, Portugal – an NGO for development, whose mission is to contribute to the world’s partnership for development by promoting the union of efforts between all economic and social players around innovative and integrated actions. TESE aims to contribute to the improvement of living conditions of populations in Portugal and in developing countries, promoting respect for human rights.

- Research Institutes such as the Stanford Centre for Social Innovation or the Design and Innovation for Sustainability research unit at the Politecnico di Milano.

- Social enterprises, such as:
  - The Mondragon group of co-operatives in Spain (the world’s most successful social enterprise) which has doubled in size each decade for 30 years, and operates in sectors as diverse as banking, manufacturing and higher education.
  - BRAC, now the developing world’s largest NGO, which has spread from microcredit into an equally diverse range of activities in Bangladesh and around the world.
  - One of the most visible examples of social enterprise is the Grameen Bank and its network of 27 enterprises and imitators, whose driving goal is to improve the incomes and well-being of the poorest. Its work is centred in the rural villages of Bangladesh.

- Sitawi, in Brazil, which offers loans and advice exclusively to social impact organisations.

- Schools for social entrepreneurs in the UK (for example, the London School for Social Entrepreneurs, the original SSE, founded by Michael Young in 1997), and the many networks (like Skoll and Ashoka) based in the US.

- Banca Prossima, Italy, the first European bank fully dedicated to the non-profit sector.

- Incubators that support social entrepreneurs, such as the Hub or Launchpad, at the Young Foundation.

- Networks of people and organisations who are active in social innovation, such as Social Innovation Exchange.

- Individuals who champion social innovation – such as Michael Young, Muhammad Yunus (who founded the Grameen Bank, above) or Fazle Hasan Abed, who established BRAC (see above).
The Centre for Community Organising West Bohemia (http://www.cpkp.cz/) – a not-for-profit organisation in the west of Czech Republic, which provides services to support public participation in urban development and management. In the western Bohemia region CPKP focuses specifically on community planning of social services, and development of rural areas.

Proculture (www.proculture.cz) – a unit focused on research, information and education in the field of arts and culture to support the development of a strong and active civil society sector. Part of the Open Society unit.

The Creative Lodz Initiative, Poland (http://belocations.wordpress.com/creative-lodz/) – promotes creative entrepreneurship, culture and science as a crucial component of the City of Lodz economy and revitalisation.

New World Community, Estonia (http://www.uusmaailm.ee) – a small, community initiative with the aim of running small projects to change the neighbourhood into an enjoyable living environment.

My Estonia (http://www.minueestli.ee/?lng=en) – a grass roots ‘civil initiative’. Its first project ‘Let’s do it!’ brought out 50,000 volunteers to clean up illegal waste from all over the Estonian forests and countryside.

Kultour, Denmark (http://www.kul-tour.com/KulTour2007/InEnglish.html) – a local organisation set up to facilitate intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding between people in Denmark, to cultivate room for diversity, respect and tolerance.

Centre for Local Economic Strategies, UK (http://www.cles.org.uk/) – an independent, membership organisation involved in regeneration, local economic development and local governance.

Grupa Pewnych Osób: http://gpo.blox.pl/html – Grupa Pewnych Osób (A Group of Certain People) is an informal group of individuals who want to make Stare Polesie (one of the districts of the city), Lipowa Street and other parts of the city of Lodz into beautiful places.
Appendices

Appendix B: Web links to methods/techniques in chapter 7

Consultancies:
PricewaterhouseCoopers: http://www.pwc.com/
Arup: http://www.arup.com/

Peer review:
Liveable Cities: http://www.liveablecities.org/rubrique.php?id_rubrique=2
IDEA: http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=6462074
BUSTrip: http://www.bustrip-project.net
EMAS peer review for cities: http://www.ubc-action21.net/emascities.htm
Aalborg Commitment Peer Review:


Issue-focused peer networking:
C40: http://www.c40cities.org/

World Cafés: http://www.theworldcafe.com/

Deliberation methods:
Adam Kahane's methods:

Design methods:
Doors of Perception: http://www.doorsofperception.com/
EMUDÈ: http://www.sustainable-everyday.net/EMUDÈ/
IDEO: http://www.ideo.com/

Common Purpose: http://www.commonpurpose.org.uk/

Games:
Buckminster World Game:
http://www.bfi.org/our_programs/who_is_buckminster_fuller/design_science/world_game/introduction_to_buckminster_fullers_world_game
Future Game: http://www.ykon.org/news.html
British Council Future City Game: http://www.britishcouncil.org/futurecitygame

Fishbowls:
http://www.thataway.org/exchange/resources.php?action=view&rid=1509 and/or http://www.co-intelligence.org/y2k_fishbowl.html
Appendix C: Diagram sketching scenario 3 in ‘menu of options’ (chapter 11)
Appendix D: Power-mapping tools

Stakeholder analysis:


Stakeholder analysis helps identify the interests of different groups in a given activity, and find ways of harnessing the support of those in favour of the activity, while managing the risks posed by stakeholders who are against it. It can also play a central role in identifying real need. Stakeholder analysis can be used to identify:

- The interests of all stakeholders who may affect or be affected by a programme/activity
- Potential conflicts and risks that could jeopardise a programme;
- Opportunities and relationships to build upon in implementing a programme to make it a success;
- The groups that should be encouraged to participate in different stages of the activity cycle;
- Ways to improve the programme and reduce, or hopefully improve, negative impacts on vulnerable or disadvantaged groups

Stakeholder analysis involves:

1. Completing a stakeholder table
2. Completing a table of importance and influence
3. Drawing up an importance/influence matrix
Can also involve:
4. A participation matrix
5. Impact/priority matrix
6. Readiness/power matrix

1 Stakeholder table – List main stakeholders, their reasons for interest in a project, and whether the project will be seen in a positive or negative light

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest in project</th>
<th>+ve / -ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Table of importance and influence – ‘influence’ is the power a stakeholder has to facilitate or impede the achievement of an activity’s objectives, while ‘importance’ is the priority given to satisfying the needs and interests of each stakeholder. To score each stakeholder, use a five-point scale where 1 = very little importance or influence, to 5 = very great importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest in project</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Importance/influence matrix – Once each stakeholder has been scored (see 2.), transfer scores to the importance influence matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High importance/low influence – require special initiatives if their interests are to be protected</th>
<th>High importance/high influence – will need to develop good working relationships with these stakeholders to ensure an effective coalition of support for the activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low importance/low influence – unlikely to be focus of activity</th>
<th>Low importance/high influence – these stakeholders may be able to block the activity and therefore could be obstacles/strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Participation matrix – use to indicate the type of participation (from being informed about the activity to actually controlling it) by key stakeholders at different stages of the activity cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Impact/priority matrix – another way of presenting the interest of different stakeholders, and involves assessing the potential impact of different stakeholders. What power do different stakeholders have to facilitate or impede the successful implementation of the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Potential impact</th>
<th>Priority of importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Readiness/power matrix – used in assessing how ready different stakeholders are to participate in an activity, and how much power they have. ‘Readiness’ is defined as either the amount a stakeholder knows about the activity, or a stakeholder’s view of the activity, whether positive or negative. ‘Power’ is the influence a stakeholder has over the success of the activity. X is the position from which they start, 0 is the position we may decide we wish them to move to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New social innovations in Europe and profiles of social innovators
Social innovation in Europe: people and projects

**Name:** Kul;Tour  
**Date founded:** 2007  
**Location:** Århus, Denmark

**Purpose:** The purpose of Kul;Tour is to facilitate intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding between people in Denmark, to cultivate room for diversity, respect and tolerance.

**Need:** In Denmark, there are often tensions between Danes and different ethnic minorities: ‘We do not talk with each other, but about each other’. One of the reasons for this is a lack of knowledge, among Danes, about people from other countries and cultural backgrounds.

**Idea:** The mobile ‘human library’. The library tours around Denmark, by bus, for a week each summer and opens up in both big and remote cities. All the ‘books’ are young people with different cultural backgrounds. People come to the library and rent a ‘book’ (young person). The ‘book’ (young person) tells their story and answers all the questions the borrower has in their heart and mind. The ‘human library’ gives people an opportunity to meet people from diverse origins – Iraq, Iran, Bosnia, India, Turkey, Palestine, Somalia, Greece or Lebanon – to listen to their stories, find out why they are in Denmark, and see ‘who is really hidden behind their different faces’. The dialogue puts a focus on differences and similarities – a ‘mine, yours and ours world’ – clarifies prejudices, and satisfies curiosity. The dialogues in Kul;Tour are facilitated by an inviting reading room, workshops, ethical rules for borrowing, and assistance from real librarians. The idea is that integration in Denmark has to be brought down to ‘street-level’ – where people go about their daily lives. They do this through facilitating face-to-face meetings in places that people frequent – at festivals, in the square, the market place or the town hall square.

**Implementation, diffusion and dissemination:** The library has been running during the summer months of 2007 and 2008. Each year, around 2,000 borrowers use the library, and the initiative has been showcased in all the national papers and on television.

**Scaling up:** They are in the process of finding out how they should expand and develop the project. At the moment an idea is to make a ‘flexible library’ that people, companies and organisations can hire for a day or week. Another idea is to make a library that tours around Europe.

**International expansion:** They have been thinking about how to create a structure that empowers people to apply the project to their country.

**Challenges:** Making the project sustainable – and more than an annual, once-off event. The way it is structured now, it also takes a lot of hard work and man-hours for ‘just’ one week.

**Name:** ‘Elaboration of a participative cultural framework for the city of L’vit (Ukraine)’  
**Date founded:** 2007  
**Location:** L’vit, Ukraine

**Purpose:** The project’s purpose was to introduce a shared approach to the planning of cultural life and policy in the city of L’vit, with the meaningful engagement of local authorities, community, cultural organisations and experts. Ultimately, the hope is that it will lead to the elaboration of a ‘Ukrainian model’ of cultural planning which will influence other cities in the country to launch similar initiatives.

**Need:** In the pre-Soviet era, L’vit was the cultural capital of what is now western Ukraine. It was a dynamic environment – the result of its geographic position as a major crossroads for commerce. Culturally, L’vit generally was acknowledged as being on a par with Krakow, Vienna, Budapest and Paris. The Soviet era severely and negatively affected this position, but it did not eradicate this spirit completely – it simply sent it ‘underground’. The city of L’vit prides itself on this heritage, and now looks to further development of its cultural sector as an important catalyst for future economic growth. Culture is now a cornerstone of the city’s economic developing planning processes. The cultural community is eager to grow and influence the future of their city, and citizens want expanded opportunities, for themselves and their children.

**Idea:** In September 2007 the Centre for Cultural Management, with support from the European Cultural Foundation, initiated a pilot project directed at the development of cultural policy for the city of L’vit.

**Implementation:** The first phase of the project, recently finished, was Cultural Mapping. In that phase, crucial cultural players in the city were identified, the structure of the cultural sector was defined, and an online database of cultural institutions in the city, totalling more than 2,200 entries, was compiled. This work produced the Cultural Map of L’vit, a baseline documentation of existing resources, community dynamics, civil aspirations, and recommended next steps. Cultural maps are intended to be catalysts, prompting next steps in planning processes. L’vit’s Cultural Map has already spawned new initiatives from city administration, other community entities, and outside funders such as the European Cultural Foundation and the British Council.
Challenges: In the Cultural Mapping process, communications with different representatives of the local cultural community identified the following key issues:

- There is limited awareness and support from the municipality towards the necessity to build a strategic cultural plan for the city.
- There is a need for capacity development on multiple levels.
- There is little experience in or motivation for working collaboratively.
- People are not comfortable operating within a group exploration process.
- People want to focus on their own projects.
- People at this time are not able and not willing to address issues on a policy level.
- There is little experience in or motivation for building a ‘civic sector’ focused on culture.

The future: From this, it became clear that, in the next phase of the L’viv cultural planning process, the importance of cultural institutional partnerships needed to be reinforced and geared at building a sense of community empowerment in and responsibility for this process. To this end, over the next project period they are going to organise five interactive gatherings, focused on capacity building of a selected group of 22 young and most promising representatives of the local cultural community. These meetings will become a platform for professional intra- and cross-sector communication as well as catalyse their consolidation as the core group of the project.

The plan is to expose L’viv’s cultural managers to the best and greatest variety of new models for management and planning as well as for artistic development. It is believed that this information, which often stresses the benefits of co-operation and collaboration, will catalyse both growth and creativity. Cultural managers will be introduced to new models and best practices that can broaden their perspectives; and new colleagues – regional, national and international – who can share experiences and potentially create partnerships. This will help to generate new thinking on art and creativity.

Name: Fugl Fønix Hotel
Date founded: 1999
Location: Etne, Hordaland, Norway

Purpose: The project aimed to break down boundaries between city and countryside, and to be a meeting point – between the past and the future, young and old, locals and visitors, business and leisure.

Need: A small group of friends felt that certain ingredients would be missing if they were to go and back and live in the small rural town where they grew up. They now lived in big cities, travelled, worked and studied abroad, and felt that rural life would lack aspects of the urban culture – arts, music, events, ‘modern’ food and creative atmosphere – that characterised their urban existence.

Idea: The idea was that they would put untraditional elements – that is, elements of urban culture and existence – into a countryside hotel. They felt that a hotel was the perfect playground for developing their project and giving their ideas life.

Implementation: They realised this concept with the financial support from, and competence of their friendship group, parents and locals. In 2004, five years after opening, they won the ‘Askeladden Prize’ for young entrepreneurship in the countryside.

Outcome: The group have succeeded in attracting young people back to the countryside. Many of these people have been very productive and resourceful, opening new companies, creating jobs and a richer cultural scene, and helping to make Etne more vibrant than ever before, and more attractive to both locals and visitors. Fugl Fenix has now become an established and well-known brand.

Challenges:

Scepticism: The main challenge facing the group was initial scepticism from locals – who held the view that the concept could not be applied in the countryside, and thought that the group were ‘too urban’ to be accepted by the local population. They overcame this challenge through ‘being honest about what we were doing and true to the concept from the start’. People gradually started to buy into the idea, when they realised the group’s agenda was to develop Etne as an attractive place for all. Also, the fact that the group opened up the hotel to both locals and visitors (normally, countryside hotels are closed to locals) helped to get people in through the doors. The press also played an important role in gaining acceptance from Etne inhabitants – and also in strengthening a sense of local pride and identity: ‘We soon understood that locals were flattered by the fact that people from the outside looked at Etne as something cool and new.’

Economic: Like many other companies, the group struggled financially for the first five years, before settling into good routines, targeting the right markets, managing their budgets well, and developing staff competence. From 2006, they have had one of the best economic results of all countryside hotels in Norway.

Getting competent staff: The project has struggled to recruit and retain competent service and kitchen staff. While this is a problem for all who work in the hotel/hospitality industry, this is a particular challenge in the countryside. The group see the solution to this as lying in presenting themselves well, and building on their networks to attract skilled employees. By getting
involved with organisations such as ‘Norconserv’, ‘Fagforum for mat’ and the gastronomical institute in Stavanger they hope to become more attractive to future employees and trainees.

Scaling up: The project started as an idea generated by a group of friends with different interests and competencies, which led to starting up a café, and then buying a hotel. Now, they are running three different companies, including a holding company and two hotels. Additionally, they co-operate with many other companies – such as ABC studio AS, Fugl Fenix Galleri, Fugl Fenix Atelier, DLTH AS, Åkrafjorden Oppleving AS, Realmusic ENK, Balsam Lyd ENK and various other companies in the area. Many of these companies are directly connected to Fugl Fenix, and Fenix was the reason as to why they were started. The board of the holding company has developed a strategic development plan for a franchise of 25 hotels by 2020, and much interest has already been expressed by people, organisations and communities from different parts of Norway, who want to participate in this franchise.

International expansion: In the franchise, the geographic business area has been restricted to Europe. They believe that the idea could be implemented in numerous places throughout European rural areas – because the needs are global, rather than being specific to Etne.

Name: ‘Model 21’
Location: Pryluky, Chernihiv region, Ukraine
Date: 2008

Purpose: The aim of the initiative was to transform public cultural space in the town of Pryluky as a first step towards overall town and local community transformation. The project was geared at stimulating and providing a creative atmosphere and environment in the city. The main goal was to give each city resident a chance for self-organisation and self-actualisation. More broadly, the project ‘Model 21’ aimed to introduce new cultural policies on a local level, and generate understanding on the role culture should play in this context.

Implementation: The project was realised by a team of so-called ‘cultural transformers’ from the city of Pryluky, selected after a set of workshops. The project generated creative solutions for public cultural spaces (e.g. painting walls of a children’s library using the creative ideas of local young people). The project also attempted to engage the local community in creative transformations of their own public space, to give them a chance to work together towards a common goal. The project involved young people and adults, cultural operators and local businessmen.

During the course of the project, many changes were made in the city: two local libraries (one for children, and one for adults) radically transformed their spaces, and started offering new services. Consequently, a number of new cultural spaces appeared in the city: for example, an ‘art salon’ as a hub for artists and cultural operators, and an ‘art café’ as a meeting point for young people. The local initiatives attracted the interest of local donors, who then invested in further city development. During the last year, the city has reconstructed a central square, restored the house of culture and local museum, built three monuments, and has been working on a number of community projects. The general atmosphere in the city has also changed, in that being innovative and creative has become a ‘must’ in the local community. Practice in Pryluky has also inspired other pilot cities such as Nezhyn and Melitopol.

Challenges: All these changes took time and required huge efforts from the Development Centre ‘Democracy through Culture’, which initiated these changes, moderated, coached and supported.

Scaling up: The project ‘Model 21’ covered four pilot communities in Ukraine and during its three-year life shared experience with other cities.

International expansion: The project has resulted in cultural planning or inter-sector development strategies in pilot cities (e.g. Melitopol and Pryluky), and has been an important example for other communities. In May 2008, the international conference ‘Culture makes the difference’ was held in Kyiv, where representatives from various cities of Ukraine, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania, Poland, Spain, Russia and Kyrgyzstan adopted the Open Memorandum of creative communities in South-East Europe.

Name: The Centre for Community Organising
West Bohemia
Date founded: 1998
Location: Pilsen, Czech Republic

Purpose: The Centre for Community Organising (CPKP) West Bohemia is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation that provides information, advisory services and direct assistance to representatives from public administration, civil organisations, businesses and citizens in the following areas:
- citizens’ and NGOs’ participation in local and regional development
- local economic and community development
- regional policy of European Union and regional development of the Czech Republic
- education and training
CCO West Bohemia designs and implements public participation programmes in planning and decision-making – for example programmes for citizen participation in planning and designing of public spaces, in housing estate revitalisations, in preparation of community development strategies or in investment planning. In 2008 the Centre for Community Organising West Bohemia started to use the Future City Game (FCG) method, developed by the British Council, as an instrument for creative community planning and informal learning for active citizenship. The main goal of FCG is to work on ideas that solve specific problems of European cities and urban neighbourhoods in teams (see www.britishcouncil.org/futurecitygame).

**Need:** The city of Pilsen, in which CCO is based, has bid for European Capital of Culture in 2015. Preparation for the candidature requires intense involvement of Pilsen’s citizens, and a joint search for a way to improve the quality of life in the city, develop cultural and communal activities, and open Pilsen to Europe. It was necessary to find effective and attractive ways to address citizens and motivate them to come up with their own ideas and projects.

**Idea:** The British Council offered Pilsen the methodology of Future City Game. Then, CCO was contacted by the Department of Co-ordination of European Projects in the city of Pilsen (which is a part of the magistrature) to realise several Future City Games in Pilsen. The FCG method appeared to be the right approach, because it creates and environment that:

- is dynamic and energetic – players’ and teams’ desire to win serves as a motivating force throughout the two days of the game. Players follow simple rules but have the flexibility to develop their own strategies.

- unlocks problems – the game provides players and teams with the freedom to shape discussion and to find unconventional solutions to complex issues. The game zone is a neutral space where people are encouraged to think and act creatively regardless of their professional, social, and cultural backgrounds or status.

- is fun – the gaming aspects are a source of fun. While the topics under discussion are serious, the gaming elements serve to make the process enjoyable. It also helps to develop interpersonal skills, team-working and presentation skills of players.

**Implementation:** During autumn 2008 and spring 2009, four Future City Games were played; 95 people participated as game players and approximately 20 ideas have been collected. All ideas will be presented to the broader public during an exhibition. At the exhibition, the most interesting idea will be chosen by visitors. Players’ feedback has been very positive and the media were also interested in these games. Thanks to the games, communication among active citizens, NGOs and city representatives was facilitated and contacts were brokered.

**Challenges:**

- *Interest in FCG:* initial scepticism has been overcome, thanks to repeating the game. People with experience playing the game usually recommend it, and interest is growing continuously.

- *Interest of city representatives* (in the case that the British Council would not finance the game): the game has proved to be successful and city representatives were surprised by players’ enthusiasm and game results. This suggests that there will be continued support from the city, including financing the game from its own resources.

- *Support of the city when implementing ideas:* ideas from the games will be used as a base for the application for European Capital of Culture 2015 and, in respective city districts, it will serve as an inspiration. However, there is uncertainty as to whether the ideas will be implemented, as this is fully under the authority of the city of Pilsen.

**International expansion:** The Future City Game method introduced by British Council has also been used in the United Kingdom, Finland, Hungary, Denmark, Poland, Estonia, Slovenia, Slovakia and Latvia.
Name: Richard Reynolds  
Organisation: Guerrilla Gardening  
Web link: www.guerrillagardening.org/  
Country: UK

When did you start?  
In October 2004. The way I went about it was: there was a problem (with the state of the area) and a need (I wanted to garden). The obvious thing to do would have been to tackle one of those things – perhaps I should have complained to the council that the flowerbeds were in a state, or I could have got an allotment, but neither of those things satisfied what I wanted. I didn’t think about it in a regimented fashion; it seemed that the sensible and fun thing to do was to sort it out myself. I was well aware that what I was doing could potentially get me into trouble or could potentially be short lived, so I let people know what I was doing by blogging about it. That’s how the website began.

Is London a creative city?  
Definitely. I work in creative industries – my day job is in advertising. London’s creativity is a key reason why I am there. The price is not having lots of green space around me, or a garden, but it’s worth paying.

Does London learn from other international cities?  
At a people level, in terms of acquiring new tastes and habits, whether in food or fashion, then yes, I think Londoners do. On an institutional scale, I suspect London thinks it knows best in terms of how cities are designed, planned and laid out. But in terms of the people sharing creativity, then I think we do. That’s why London leads the world in creativity, in fashion, music, video production. It’s a great creative melting pot; I describe it to people as the world’s capital.

How has the international community affected London?  
I have noticed a change. For instance, in my tower block, I have one neighbour who is a Serb, another who is French, and there are many other nationalities. In London they are generally free to express themselves and their culture and so we’re a city that really is a global village, a place to sample, learn from and become involved with people from around the world, without jumping on a plane.

What sort of people and institutions support you?  
There are two groups of people. Some are young people like myself, who don’t have huge responsibilities, who have an active social life and want new experiences. They are interested in theatre, clubbing, music and so on. Guerrilla Gardening interests them as it’s creative, and it’s in a public space. The other group are middle-aged and elderly gardening enthusiasts who are curious about what we are doing and want to learn about it and welcome us. They don’t see us as irresponsible; they see us as passionate and enthusiastic.

In terms of organisations, London ones have been less interested than international organisations: my first speaking engagements were in Austria, Paris and Moscow. That is changing, but in London now interest is from the liberal arts world, rather than politicians or official organisations.

What have been the barriers to your success?  
I have had issues with my local council, but it is a distraction, really. It doesn’t stop me, but it does serve as a reminder of all the petty bureaucracy that is out there. That is the issue – when you are engaging in and working with public space, there is always going to be bureaucracy that tries to trip you up.

The bigger barriers are winning support from members of the public. I wish more people were doing this and I get really excited when I get e-mails about it, when I see people taking part. That’s what makes me happy.

It’s not so much about changing the attitudes of the authorities, it’s about encouraging more people to get out and do it. Because those barriers are imaginary. The barrier is the worry that they’ll get into trouble, that the plants will get destroyed, and so on – in my experience, it’s not the case.

What keeps you going?  
The love of gardening. The daffodils are coming up, green shoots – this is a great time. There’s always something happening, there’s always something to experiment with. A garden is alive – even if I weren’t doing this, it would change. It’s a great thing to be creative with, as it’s not static, like graffiti, or so much art that is inanimate.

Do you think of yourself as an innovator?  
Yes, definitely. Partly because that’s my job, to bring creativity to business or change people’s behaviour. But I’ve always had projects and been creative. I’ve made t-shirts, or DJ-ed, or messed about with music. Doing it in public, whether it’s music at a party, or gardening in the street, it’s the same. It’s having an audience and influencing them, and changing their afternoon or evening or even more.

Is there anything that has particularly influenced or inspired you?  
My gung-ho mother and grandmother, teachers at school who took an interest in my more eccentric exploits such as gardening, when most people were kicking a ball around at break time. Also other guerrilla gardeners. That is a key purpose of the website, to influence and inspire each other.

What advice would you give to aspiring innovators?  
If it’s possible to do it, then just do it. A lot of people want to do something, but they feel they can’t – unless they have loads of other people involved. I’m a great believer that you need to use a range of skills and get something going, rather than rely on a huge...
team at the start. I know that sounds rather contrary to the mood of the times, when we are all supposed to be collaborative, but I think the risk is that gut instinct can get lost in the process of working out the division of labour in a team.

People should use their instincts, just get out and do it, and then let the thing go. If you sit down and discuss it all and plan it all, although you are bringing different ideas by having a plan, you control an idea too much. If you start on your own, but in a way that is open to people’s reactions and responses, then the idea has the potential to go off in different directions.

The internet has been absolutely invaluable. These solo tiny groups have been able to share and feel part of something bigger without the drag of being a big organisation and having to be together all the time.

The important thing is that as guerrilla gardeners we are as normal as possible, not superheroes, so that people can understand what we do and that it’s something anyone can do. We didn’t want to distance ourselves, dress up and cause loads of disruption – we are like other people and want them involved. It’s not an elitist activity.

Name: Szymon Kwiatkowski
Organisation: Grupa Pewnych Osób
Web link: http://gpo.blox.pl/html
Country: Poland

When did you start?
First of all, we are just an informal organisation, a group of people – hence the name (Grupa Pewnych Osób means ‘a group of people’). We decided to work together about three years ago, to clean up the city by getting rid of illegally displayed posters. It took some time, but we managed to persuade the authorities to make some places on buildings just for the posters. After about a year, the authorities provided some places on buildings where you can hang your posters legally and for free. That was the beginning.

Is Lodz a creative city?
Yes, I think so. The people certainly are creative.

Does your city learn from other international cities?
Yes. We met with the city Vice President and showed him the results of our Future City Game and he said what we had done was great and we needed to do something to implement our ideas. He recognised the value of the international learning. I think it’s a good place to implement ideas and best practice from all over the world.

How has the international community, migrants and so on affected your city?
Lodz has an international background, back to its founding in the 15th century. In the 20th century there was a mixture of cultures, with Jews, Germans, Russians and Poles. Today I can’t say that other nationalities influence our city and society, but the history is there. It shows up in theatre and cultural events – wherever you go you can see signs of the cultures that founded our city.

What sort of people and institutions support you?
The authorities are not supportive of our activity. In the beginning, they were against us. Now I think they are afraid of us. I think the next step is co-operation ...

The media are our main tool to influence the authorities and business. They are very helpful. Local businesses are supportive in what they say, but that’s as far as it goes.

What have been the barriers to your success?
There have been two main obstacles. The first is dealing with authorities at all levels. The second is apathy. We need people to join us and take part, be outside, have fun. It’s difficult in this city because people tend to stay in their own apartments, watch television and so on. They take care of their apartments, but don’t connect to their community and environment.

What keeps you going?
It’s obvious for me. What motivates us as a group is seeing the results of our actions and events. We see people joining us, having fun, we see authorities taking action thanks to what we have changed. Secondly, we are having fun. We think what we do works and we know we can change our city. It’s what keeps us going.

Do you think of yourself as an innovator?
What we are doing is innovative. It’s hard to say if I personally am innovative – I am doing what I like to do. When we compare ourselves to other cities we can say we are innovative, but for us it’s mainly about doing what we think is best for the city.

Is there anything that has particularly influenced or inspired you?
Not really. Nothing really springs to mind. It’s changed from when we started to where we are now.

What advice would you give to aspiring innovators?
Be determined. You have to give 100 per cent and keep going to the end. Don’t stop; keep fighting for results. The fact we enjoy it is important – we enjoy everything we do for the city. You have to love what you do.
Name: Madle Lippus
Organisation: New World Community
Web link: http://www.uusmaailm.ee/ or http://www.uusmaailm.ee/eng/
Country: Estonia

When did you start?
We started around 2006. My friends were restoring my old house and, while working on the porch, they noticed the same people passing by on the street, but they weren’t interacting. They thought there should be more of a community. They then developed the idea of forming new active communities.

Is Tallinn a creative city?
Have you been to Tallinn? I don’t really think it’s that creative. We lack public spaces in general, people can’t and don’t communicate, or have places to meet. It has started to be more creative; there are more people like us. But the city government isn’t prioritising creative ideas, as they don’t see the potential in bringing together people to generate new ideas.

Does your city learn from other international cities?
To an extent. As Tallinn will be Capital of Culture 2011, the authorities need to present some new ideas of development, culture, regeneration and so on. I don’t want to say bad things about it, as there is evidence of change, but these ideas around creativity, innovation and communities are so new. It will take time.

What sort of people and institutions support you?
People are really interested in this. When we started the community house and having our own space, where we could have exhibitions, poetry and so on, people came from all over the city and went away thinking they would like to see these things in their district.

The media gives us good coverage and are supportive. Young journalists are on our side. This is a small country – when something interesting is happening, the media want to know.

With official organisations, the problem is that there isn’t a long-term vision for our cities. I think now maybe that is changing.

What have been the barriers to your success?
Money – as always. It’s the same for everyone. We get some funding from Norway, and we report to them on our grant, so that’s a difficulty. That’s really it – we have practical problems. There are so many good ideas that it’s impossible to take them forward. We really need to build the organisation.

Dealing with city authorities can be difficult, because of the way they are structured. People are always coming and going, so it’s hard to build relationships and understanding. But we don’t have huge problems.

What keeps you going?
It gives me a happy life! It’s rewarding and I enjoy what I am doing. My role is to meet the people who have good ideas and help make them reality. We have a lot of volunteers who come in because they like the ideas and the energy of the place. It’s a job, and it pays my rent, but that’s not the main motivation. It’s making a difference to neighbourhoods.

Do you think of yourself as an innovator?
Yes, I think so. I’m not the most innovative person in our organisation. I’m the one in the middle trying to bring together the ideas and the organisation. But in general, I think I’m creative.

Is there anything that has particularly influenced or inspired you?
I’m passionate about Demos in Finland at the moment. They are thinking about planning cities and sustainable communities.

What advice would you give to aspiring innovators?
Be open; be flexible. You need passion and to enjoy what you do and get networking. Get out there and learn from other people. If you are open to new ideas, you’ll be more creative.

Name: Erlend Blakstad Haffner
Organisation: Fantastic Norway
Web link: http://www.fantasticnorway.no/
Country: Norway

When did you start?
We started in 2003, because we felt that architecture had too little focus on people, and that it was focused on design rather than content. So we wanted to see what we, as architects, could do, and focus on what architecture could do for society. We initiated projects involving prime movers and social innovators in projects in different cities. We linked different actors in society on how things could develop in a more interesting way.

Is Oslo a creative city?
The good thing about Oslo is that it’s not a beautiful city like Copenhagen or Paris, but more of a self-grown structure. It has room for more surprises and it leaves more room for individuals. In Norway, things are well regulated, and sometimes that can kill creativity. Interestingly, the current crisis may make people more creative. I certainly think you get more good architecture as people have time on their hands and have more good ideas.
Does your city learn from other international cities?
The current administration in Oslo is very innovative and progressive. They are very open to the importance of the knowledge economy and the creative industry, not just at the official culture level, but also smaller events. I think they realise they are not just competing nationally, but internationally too.

How has the international community, migrants and so on affected your city?
I moved away from Oslo in 1999 and came back in 2007, and the city had changed a lot. There were more visible immigrant groups, involved in small businesses, shops and restaurants and so on. The good thing is they are not invisible in the city centre now and that makes Oslo more interesting and diverse. It’s a positive impact and makes it richer. There are several venues with world music and international sounds. There are theatres and creative industries all showing the influence of new groups.

What sort of people and institutions support you?
In Oslo we are quite behind the scenes, working with developers or city councils. People don’t know much about us. When we arrive with the caravan, people are positive – people generally are when it comes to change. They are certainly curious. When we do things in public, people are welcoming and they want to have discussions and learn more. Architecture can be quite opaque and the language is complex and people want to get past that.
The city authorities can be conservative sometimes, and don’t seem to understand how much influence they can have on good development. Much city development has been handed to private companies.

What have been the barriers to your success?
It can be difficult to persuade investors of the importance of undertaking projects that are well rooted in the needs of people, society or place. In the long run, the project is stronger and more sustainable and there is huge benefit for the client, the society and the user. So we find it’s something we need to focus on.

What keeps you going?
We want to do something fun and still undertake projects that are good for society in general. We don’t work for free, this isn’t an NGO. But we do want to have a good feeling and think we are doing something interesting; we also want to contribute to a positive and open society.

Do you think of yourself as an innovator?
In our organisation we’re quite new to ‘being in an office’. So we have been able to find and shape our own roles as architects and we think that’s innovative. But we don’t wake up thinking ‘we’re so innovative’. We see a problem and we try to consider how we deal with it.

Is there anything that has particularly influenced or inspired you?
I sometimes think back to an era when people were more involved with building societies, not just about consuming. But I don’t think I have one specific inspiration. I am inspired by people who try to make something different. It could be a man with a food stand on the corner, if he’s has a new and interesting way of going about his business. I suppose I’m inspired by people who make things happen by thinking differently.

What advice would you give to aspiring innovators?
The most important thing is to follow your heart, your gut feeling. Always look for the unexpected. Don’t follow the well-trodden path – find your own way. That’s what we did and I know it makes it more interesting. Be open to new situations and learn to say yes. Understand that all people are prime movers in some way – all people have some sort of gift.
When did you start?
We started in 2006. Two of my friends were doing a project management course under the Danish Scouting Association. They had to come up with a project, and I had been working in the area of integration and multiculturalism in Denmark. We came up with the idea of founding this human library. We wanted to change the way things were approached at that time in Denmark. Integration was big issue in the media in a negative way. It seems that while we are a happy little society, integration is something we can’t seem to figure out how to handle.

Is Copenhagen a creative city?
Yes, it is a creative place. There’s a lot going on.

Does your city learn from other international cities?
All Danish cities have a ‘friendship’ city elsewhere in the Nordic countries. I admit that as a citizen of Copenhagen I don’t know what our friendship city is, so it doesn’t seem all that present in daily life.

I don’t think Danes like to learn from other cultures. We tend to consider ourselves in the top three of the world in everything we do. In issues such as environment, energy and so on, we look at what other people are doing and say ‘we’ve been doing that for years’. We don’t learn from other cultures and look to other places to see how they do things – we are very closed in that way. In innovation, we don’t look to other countries and cultures and see how they are innovating. And because of the way we manage integration and diversity, we are missing out on the potential for innovation within our country.

How has the international community affected your city?
It has made a difference. It has started to tear down barriers. But while we seem to think it’s only migrants who live in ghettoes, in reality most of us, at least in Denmark, live in ghettoes. It’s not intentional – it’s not that we don’t want to talk to each other – it’s just that there aren’t the spaces to do so. The aim of our project was to help with that. We found that at times we came up against certain attitudes. Someone might come in and said they would not talk to someone in a
headscarf. But when you highlight the human aspect, it changes. It’s really hard to look at someone in the eye and say you won’t talk to them because they are wearing a headscarf.

**What sort of people and institutions support you?**
Collaboration has been excellent. City councils, police, libraries, all those sorts of institutions have been great. And we have sourced a lot of funding – it’s amazing how many people have wanted to offer support.

People who visit the library have also been really positive, saying it’s a great idea.

**What have been the barriers to your success?**
There are always challenges. We sometimes open up to established groups of people working in integration. But we found often they turned it into something political, by which I mean party political. Of course it is a political issue, but we don’t take political viewpoints, nor do we want to force a stance on anyone. But as soon as you start inviting other people in, it becomes difficult to avoid that.

**What keeps you going?**
It has changed. I began wanting to create a change within the Danish society. Now I see the great gift it is for young migrants to be able to come together with other young people who feel the same as them, who have the same issues. It has been inspiring to see how they have taken the project into their hearts and how they can be themselves with the others. They are there to be proud of themselves.

**Do you think of yourself as an innovator?**
I would like to say yes! At least, I try to be innovative all of the time.

**Is there anything that has particularly influenced or inspired you?**
The Index Award – Design to Improve Life. [http://www.indexaward.dk/](http://www.indexaward.dk/)

**What advice would you give to aspiring innovators?**
Take one step at a time, both in your project and your ambitions for changing the world. You can’t change it all at once and you can’t create the perfect project from day one. You have to start somewhere. We learnt a lot from starting the Human Library and now we see what the next steps are to create even bigger changes.
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