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GENERAL INTRODUCTION OF D.5.2.

This section aims to introduce the research contributions proposed in the framework of deliverable 5.2.

To do so, it repositioned these results with regard to:

1.1. The general framework of the study carried out in WP5, by reviewing:

- The general objectives;
- The theoretical reference framework;
- The general methodological adopted approach.

1.2. The main results of the study carried out in WP5, with reference to:

- The main contributions of the 1st phase of strategic diagnosis carried out in the framework of D.5.1.
- The expected results of the 2nd phase of formalization of the territorial process of co-creation of a territorial cultural strategy.

1.1. Reminder of the general framework of the study conducted in WP5: What are we working on?

General objectives

The WP5 aims at formalizing a global process of co-creation adapted to the field of territorial cultural strategies.

It assumes that a territorialized strategic process of co-creation involves various stakeholders (public agencies, operators of the field and citizens) within 3 different phases: the co-design, the co-production and the co-evaluation of a strategy.

The WP5 focus on the mechanisms that facilitate the participation of various stakeholders in each phase of the territorial project and that can be activated by a leading public organization: in this case, a metropolitan organization.

As a reminder, the research objectives of the WP5 are therefore the following:

- In a first phase, to carry out a territorial strategic diagnosis, analyzing the strategic practices of the stakeholders (institutional; operators; citizens) to identify the main strategic ingredients of co-creation within collective projects ➔ D.5.1.
- And in a second phase, formalizing a global co-creation process of a territorial cultural strategy ➔ D.5.2. and D.5.3.

The general purpose of the WP5, fitting with the global COGOV purpose, is to provide both an analytical framework and an operational tool to public agencies, that wish to develop at a territorial level, inclusive strategic mechanisms of co-creation in the field of cultural strategies. We hope that this framework will be replicable to other territories facing similar contingencies.
Analytical framework of the WP5: A territorialized approach of the Democratic Public Management Model

The WP5 is funded on a territorialized approach of the public governance and refers to the "democratic public management model" (Soldo, 2018a) (cf. D.5.1. Interim Report on stakeholder strategic management in the cultural field (Aix-Marseille) - Part 1. General Presentation of the Research).

This model is broad, and integrates different post-NPM approaches, such as public value, multilevel governance and networked governance. It makes it possible to bring out what we can call “strategic ingredients” of the co-creation. These ingredients operationalize the model.

The “Democratic Public Management model” (Soldo, 2018a) advocates the participation of three types of stakeholders (public agencies, private and public operators of the field and citizens) within the three phases of a territorial strategic process (co-design, co-production and co-evaluation of a strategy).

A multi-stakeholder and multi-level approach to the territorial governance of cultural strategies

Anchored in a territorialized approach and applied to various researches in the field of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) in the French context, this model considers that since the first decentralization law of 1982 and 1983, the "territorialization" of French cultural policies provides a relative autonomy to the local public agencies (Soldo, 2018a and b). Nowadays, such territorial strategies are implemented by local territories, involving multilevel public administrations, who work together to preserve and promote artistic, cultural and creative products. In addition to the public agencies, other stakeholders act collectively to keep the cultural policy alive, namely through the diversification of funding sources such as citizen-based crowd funding and enterprise sponsoring and patronage (Soldo, 2018a). Moreover, the social solidarity economy (SSE) organizations play a major role in cultural activities¹. Indeed, "the local associative networks form one of the most active stakeholder in terms of local cultural offering and support to cultural practices" (Soldo, 2018a: 117). In that sense, cultural strategies are local and adapt themselves to a territorial context, but they also involve numerous stakeholders (Soldo, 2018a).

The local public actor then becomes a strategist since he/she must define a strategic intention (Hernandez, 2011) and ensure the implementation of a strategy to generate outputs (results) and outcomes (long term effects) (Arezki, 2019). Soldo (2018a) explains that cultural territorial strategies are implemented using a new strategic instrument: the territorial cultural project, mobilized as an intermediary strategic objective that involves numerous stakeholders. Thus, the territorial public actor must adopt a leadership to federate, mobilize and involve numerous stakeholders (Arnaud, Soldo, 2018a).

¹ SSE is an important part of the artistic activities; here are a few statistics of the cultural SSE produced by the SSE national observatory (CNRESS, 2017):
- 26.3 % of cultural jobs in France
- 96.3 % of cultural SSE organizations are associations
- 87.7 % of cultural SSE jobs are found in organizations with less than 50 employees
- 54 % of jobs are full time positions
- 54.5 % of women and 45.5% men
- 49 % of employees are under 40.
Within this model, the citizen is clearly identified as the central actor of a democratic process in the formal sense of N. Bobbio (1991)².

A theoretical framework for modeling the participation of various stakeholders in the territorial strategic process

The definition and implementation of a territorial CCI’s strategy form an experimentation space for the democratic public management (Soldo, 2018a). Materialized through a territorial project anchored in a local space, the last purpose of the co-creation strategic process is to foster sustainable territorial attractiveness (Soldo, 2018a). Indeed, artistic, cultural and creative activities produce powerful economic spinoffs and have impacts on the territory image and notoriety. But they also produce effects on local animation, on the diffusion of culture, on the local mobilization via voluntary work or even the integration into local life...

The co-creation strategic process which implies the participation of the three main categories of stakeholders (public agencies, public and private operators of the CCI and citizens) can be modeled around three phases: the definition of the strategic intention (co-design), its implementation within the framework of a territorial cultural project (co-production), and its evaluation (co-evaluation), that form a democratic public management model (Soldo, 2018a).

² Two main formal rules define a democratic process: all citizens must participate in the decision “directly or indirectly” and the decision must be taken after free discussion, by ”the majority”. This first formal approach, specifying the few essential rules of the game of democracy, is based on the need to set up effective institutions that guarantee a collective decision acceptable to all citizens (Bobbio, 1991, pp. 4-5).
The strong anchoring of the WP5’s research in a territorialized approach helps us understand how the co-creation process of a territorial strategy may be analyzed within a given context. In the WP5, the context is then defined by two variables: the territory and the CCI domain of activity. In that respect, the research is set within an environmentalist and systemic contingent approach to the co-construction object and more widely to the renewal of public action.

The anchoring of the Democratic Public Management Model in the public value approach assumes that the creation of public value is based on the politically mediated expression of collectively determined preferences, i.e. what citizens consider to be valuable (Alford 2002; Kelly et al., 2002; Moore 1995). As Moore and Braga (2004) point out, citizens decide together, through elected officials, what they consider to be a collective set. The process of defining and creating public value is thus very different from the direct economic exchange relationships that take place in the private sector, so it can be argued that public value is something that government organizations provide to their citizens rather than to individuals (Alford, 2002).

In this sense, WP5 particularly advocates citizen participation in determining territorial public value and calls for the active approval of citizens to be taken into account in decision-making (Stoker, 2004). This appears all the more relevant since, as Horner and Hazel point out in their contractual approach, citizens can be conceived as true shareholders of public value. "Consider citizens as shareholders in the way their taxes are spent. Value can be created through economic prosperity, social cohesion or cultural development. Ultimately, value - such as better services, increased trust or social capital, or fewer or avoided social problems - is decided by the citizen. Citizens do this through the democratic process, not only through the ballot box, but also by taking part in elections - consultations and surveys, for example. » (2005 p.34).
Global research design

We have chosen to adopt an inductive methodology based on the analysis of existing and observable strategic co-creation practices in the case of Aix-Marseille Provence Metropolis, with a partial replication on the London’s Metropolis. The main objectives are to identify and characterize the relevant mechanisms of co-creation and then, go back to a more formalized level, allowing us to design a global strategic model of territorial co-creation process.

To do this, we have therefore adopted a mixed-method research design based on a mapping of the territorial actors involved in the CCI sector. In the case of AMP Metropolis, this let us to build up a database of 23,000 identified actors.

Based on this mapping, we had then conducted a set of interviews with a relevant sample of 66 persons who represent private or public operators and the main public institutions involved in the CCI local sector.

We have completed the data by a survey addressed to the citizens of the AMP Metropolis and collected more than 800 responses.

Finally, we have also added some insights related to the case of London Metropolis and various cases studied in the WP2.

Figure 2. What are we working on?

What are we working on?

Research Objectives
- Phase 1: Territorial strategic diagnosis - analysis of the strategic positioning and practices of the stakeholders (institutional; operators; publics)
- Phase 2: Formalization of the Co-creation Process of a Territorial Cultural Strategy

Research Design
- AMP case study and partial replication on London
- Mixed methods (database of territorial actors: 23000, Qualitative interviews: 66, Quantitative citizen survey: more than 800 respondents...)
- Insights based on in-depth WP2 strengthening the links between WPs

The democratic public management model: a framework for analysing co-construction

Territorial environment
- Phase 1: Co-design
- Phase 2: Co-production
- Phase 3: Co-evaluation

Definition of Strategic Intent
Implementation of the territory’s cultural project
Stakeholders

Value Creation: Sustainable territorial attractiveness

Source: adapted from Soldo (2018)
1.2. The main results of the study carried out in WP5

What have we achieved? Phase 1 (D.5.1.)

We have produced a first deliverable, responding to the objective of strategic diagnosis of co-creation practices observed on the territory of AMP Metropolis.

The main results of this diagnosis revolve around three levels of analysis: territorial level, inter-organizational level and organizational one.

The STD1 focuses on the territorial level and is based on the mapping of CCI actors. It analyses their territorial and sectoral logics.

It reveals that the CCI sector includes a large number of stakeholders with many factors of contingencies. For instance, and without exhaustiveness, they can be involved in one of the 12 different activity domains of the CCI, including traditional artistic activities but also activities linked to digitalization.

It is also striking to observe that 50% of the ICC organizations were created less than 10 years ago, showing a great heterogeneity of legal statuses, ranging from public or nonprofit organizations to commercial firms.

The territorial distribution of these ICC stakeholders reveals also logics of clustering.

These initial results enabled us to identify the main criteria for selecting the sample of CCI actors to be interviewed. They also enabled us to identify contingency factors, specific to the metropolitan territory and the activity sector.

The STD2 focuses on the inter-organizational level. Based on the analysis of the strategic practices of actors involved in collective projects, the 66 interviews enabled the identification of strategic ingredients which can be defined as drivers for co-creation processes: practices, spaces or tools have thus emerged and seem to facilitate the co-creation of projects between organizations.

For instance, and without exhaustiveness, we have identified that practices of pooling or labeling can facilitate co-creation. These kinds of practices need some relevant spaces to be implemented, such as mega events or digital platforms that facilitate information exchange and collaboration. In terms of tools, a large range of conventions or tools of formalizing networks are already mobilized by the organizations to co-create collective projects.

The strategic diagnosis of co-creation practices in the cultural and creative field in the Aix-Marseille Provence area has identified 4 strategic meta-ingredients of co-creation of collective projects (STD2):

- The strategic choice of the nature of the collective projects: analyzing the “what”;
- The strategic choice of method within the framework of collective projects: analysis of the “how” stakeholders work together;
- The strategic choice of stakeholders within the framework of collective projects: analysis of “who” work together;
- The end-purposes assigned to collective projects: analysis of the “why” co-creating projects.
The STD3 finally completes the diagnosis, by focusing on practices implemented within organizations.

The results are based on an in-depth analysis of 3 public and private operators and illustrate the mechanisms for integrating stakeholders in the co-design, co-production and co-evaluation of collective projects. It allowed us to identify some innovative practices.

They also illustrate the results of STD2 and corroborate the identification of strategic ingredients of co-creation that revolve around relevant practices, spaces and tools. For instance, citizen participation is mobilized during the design phase by a festival, through a council of spectators. This council constitutes, as it is said by the leader of the festival, "a space for reflection and action to increase the power of citizens’ action within the Festival".

✓ We observed in our research process that the results are context-dependent. For example, a co-construction practice would be more or less relevant from one public organization to another.

Thus, in WP5, we have mobilized the contingency theory in order to take into account the environment of co-creation projects.

Moreover, the results are dependent on current events. We observe in WP5 the effect of digitalization on co-created projects.

✓ In addition, the main results of the preliminary strategic diagnosis of co-creation’s practices (D5.1.) revolve around three levels of analysis: territorial level, inter-organizational level and organizational one. Territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation therefore seem to be able to be activated at these different scales. For instance, we can observe that during the co-production phase of the territorial cultural strategy, the ICC operators can themselves implement participative approaches, at an organizational level, as shown in STD3. Additional elements also result from this analysis: beyond the 3 levels previously mentioned, the individual level also appears to be relevant for identifying and explaining the drivers of co-creation. For instance, the involvement of volunteers, very present in non-profit organizations, can be facilitated at each phase of the co-creation process through adequate practices, spaces and tools.
What have we achieved? Phase 1

Strategic territorial diagnosis (STD) - D5.1 : Report 5.1 AMP (March 2020),
Output London’s case insights (August 2020), Global synthesis of 5.1 (September 2020)

Analysis of the Territorial Environment
- Characterization of the Metropolitan Value Chain of the ICC
- Identification of Territorial and Sectorial Logics

Analysis of the Inter-Organizational Environment
- Identification of the Strategic Ingredients in Co-creation Processes
- Analysis of the impacts of Contingency Factors

Analysis of the Organizational Environment
- Illustration of the organizational use of Strategic Ingredients in Co-creation Processes
- Monograph of Relevant Organizations

Descriptive Statistical Analysis
Simple Descriptive Spatial Analysis

STD1: Global Territorial Diagnosis – Stakeholders’ Cartography of the Cultural and Creative Sector on the Metropolitan Territory

Mixed Thematic Analysis

STD2: Analysis of Professional Stakeholders’ Strategies – Analysis of Co-creation Practices

Conceptual Matrix

STD3: Focus on the Organizational Logics – Monographic Approach of a Representative Sample of Professional Actors

Figure 3. What have we achieved? Phase 1

What are we working on? Phase 2 (D.5.2 and D. 5.3.)

On this basis, the final model (progressive formalization in D5.2 and D5.3) will integrate, in the territorial global strategic process (within three phases of the policy design: co-design, co-production, co-evaluation), the different strategic ingredients articulated in “territorial governance mechanisms”.

The WP5 analysis focus on the mechanisms that facilitate the participation of stakeholders in each phase of the territorial project and that can be activated by a leading public organization: in this case, a metropolitan organization.

Based on the diagnosis of strategic stakeholder’s practices, we have already identified and classified the strategic ingredients that appear relevant in a co-creation process.

This first typology has been completed by the results of the survey conducted among citizens and by the specific insights of the London’s case and different cases analyzed in the WP2. To finalize the typology, we have also decided to complete by an overlook in the French professional literature.

This deliverable shows the results related to the formalization of an operational portfolio, including all the practices, spaces and tools which constitute the mechanisms that facilitate the co-creation in a territorial strategic process. This portfolio could be a relevant tool for public territorial agencies that want to pilot this kind of process.

In the portfolio, each strategic ingredient of the co-creation mechanisms, have been positioned on continuums. For instance, the different practices have been positioned on a continuum that goes from informal to formal. The spaces facilitating co-creation have been positioned on a continuum that goes from physical to virtual. The tools have been positioned on a continuum that goes from intangible to material.
We are now working on the operationalization of this portfolio, illustrating different mechanisms and their mobilization in various collective territorial projects. Based on real case narratives, this part of the research aims at showing, via some vignettes, how these mechanisms can enhance strategic management of co-creation process.

Figure 4. What are we currently working on? Phase 2
I. SP1. TYPOLOGY OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE’S MECHANISMS PROMOTING CO-CREATION IN A TERRITORIAL STRATEGIC PROCESS

Introduction

This SP1 is the first step in the formalization of a strategic co-creation process. The production and analysis of the territorial diagnosis (STD1, 2 and 3) lead us to identify strategic ingredients that improve the democratic public management model. Thus, following the exploration of this model in the previous phase, we propose here to focus on the managerial recommendations that emerge from the diagnosis. The aim is to provide a typology of the governance mechanisms of co-creation. More specifically, our inductive reasoning offers us the possibility of drawing up a portfolio of mechanisms for the attention of territorial managers. These are the mechanisms that ensure the governance of the strategies of the democratic public management model.

In a first part, we will come back to the methodology of construction of the portfolio of mechanisms. These mechanisms have numerous natures and levels and are based on the linking of three strategic ingredients: practices, spaces and tools of co-creation; illustrating the plurality of the mechanism forms. The environmental and contingent approach adopted in this research has also made it possible to show that these mechanisms are multi-level: individual, organizational and inter-organizational. It is the linking of practices, spaces and tools on these three levels that leads to the portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation.

In a second part, we will expose the individual mechanisms of co-creation. Following the same logic, in a third part, the organizational mechanisms of co-creation will be presented and, in a fourth part, the inter-organizational mechanisms.

Figure 5. SP1 outline
1.1. Methodology for the construction of the portfolio of governance mechanisms of co-creation

In this first part, we propose to explain our methodology of construction of territorial governance mechanisms. We will define the nature of the mechanisms (1.1.) and their levels (1.2.)

1.1.1. The nature of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: between practices, spaces and tools

The results of the previous phases of strategic territorial diagnosis (STD1, 2 and 3) enable us to identify strategic ingredients to create mechanisms of co-creation governance.

The mechanisms are the managerial variables that allow professionals to define, implement and evaluate inclusive strategies. By inclusion we mean involving and empowering stakeholders in each phase of the strategic process. This inclusion allows for effective co-creation.

The three strategic ingredients are co-creation practices, spaces and tools.

Co-creation practices are voluntary acts that take a more or less formal form. They pursue the objective of co-creation, i.e. including stakeholders in the strategic process of democratic public management. This inclusion is carried out in a variety of co-creation spaces by mobilizing tools.

Co-creation spaces are places where co-creation is practiced. These more or less virtual spaces allow actors to implement co-creation practices by mobilizing tools.

The tools are more or less material objects, mobilized during the implementation of co-creation practices.

1.1.2. Territorial governance mechanisms of multi-level co-creation: an individual, organizational and inter-organizational approach

The strategic territorial diagnosis showed that the co-creation process is thought of at several levels:

- Individual level: it concerns the ingredients mobilized by a person during a co-creation process. They allow an actor to mobilize his network in order to prefigure the realization of co-created projects.

- Organizational level: it concerns the ingredients that will be used by an organization to mobilize its teams in co-creation dynamics.

- Inter-organizational level: the inter-organizational level concerns the ingredients that allow two or more stakeholders to realize co-created projects.

In order to establish the portfolio of governance mechanisms, we propose to classify them according to these three scales.

To model the portfolio of mechanisms, we borrow a figure proposed by Carmouze (2020). She reclassifies the elements conducive to collaboration in a factorial plan with three entries. We adapt her tool to our mechanisms. Three variables (practices, spaces, tools) are analyzed according to their scale.
**Box 1. Proposal for a definition of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation**

**Definition of the territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual co-creation</td>
<td>The linking and articulation of individual co-creation practices, spaces, and tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational co-creation</td>
<td>The linking and articulation of organizational co-creation practices, spaces, and tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-organizational co-creation</td>
<td>The linking and articulation of co-creation practices, spaces, and tools between several stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These territorial governance mechanisms promoting co-creation are complementary (none of them prevails over the others). They are considered in a complex perspective (the mechanisms being distinct and complementary to the whole, which refers to the co-creation strategy) and contingent (adaptation according to territorial, cultural, social specificities, etc.).
1.2. Individual co-creation mechanisms: mobilizing one's network towards co-creation dynamics

In this section, we focus on individual co-creation mechanisms. These aim to create, animate and sustain the social and professional network of each person.

We detail the individual practices (1.2.1.), spaces (1.2.2.) and tools (1.2.3.) of co-creation. In synthesis, we will outline the portfolio of individual co-creation mechanisms.

1.2.1. Individual co-creation practices

Figure 6. Individual Practices of Co-Creation

Individual practices tend to be less formal and aim to create, maintain and animate individual social and professional networks that allow the initiation and insertion of co-creation dynamics. These practices can also be deployed once the co-creation process is underway, to overcome a conflict or to restart a stopped project, for example.

We find a cluster of informal practices that are part of a reticular sociability.

These practices aim to create and maintain links with the other actors who make up the territorial value chain of arts, culture and creation. In this respect, STD1 reveals a cluster of activities. This grouping of activities can encourage professionals to go and meet the other actors in the value chain.

While STD2 has shown that the activity chain is conducive to co-creation dynamics, the results also show that these dynamics are largely based on the mobilization of individual social and professional networks.
Individuals will then **dialogue, listen and try to create affinities** with the other actors. These first three individual practices of reticular sociability allow actors to engage individually in co-creation projects by **providing assistance** to other actors in the value chain.

These informal practices lead to a second cluster of practices: the **practices of formal sociability**. Within the framework of these practices, persons will try to make their individual social and professional networks active and sustainable by trying to **maintain good relations** with other actors. To do this, they will go to professional, cultural (festivals, exhibitions, openings, etc.) or non-professional events (press conferences, events of metropolitan authorities, etc.).

Finally, the practices allow us to identify individual postures promoting co-creation. The actors adopt a **transformational leadership** that is exercised through **sensemaking** practices. Thanks to a simple form of charisma, persons will try to animate their network by proposing and motivating the members to engage in co-creation dynamics. These dynamics are based on projects that make sense to the actors in an artistic and professional sense (artistic line) and/or when they meet a sustainable territorial attractiveness objective. The actors then identify themselves with the sector of activity (professional logic) and/or the territory (territorial logic).

In this sense, they will spread this dynamic through organizational and inter-organizational practices. These individual practices are carried out in individual spaces of co-creation that we propose to present.

### 1.2.2. Individual spaces of co-creation

**Figure 7. Individual Spaces of Co-Creation**
Individual co-creation practices take place in **virtual and physical spaces**. These spaces ensure presence and visibility within a social and professional network.

Actors invest in virtual spaces to promote their activities. They can invest in professional **social networks**, such as LinkedIn, non-professional social networks, such as Facebook, and "mixed" social networks, such as a Twitter account.

They can also have a **personal website**, as artists and craftsmen do.

As individuals, actors can also invest in physical spaces. Three types of places are emerging: **dedicated cultural places**, **non-dedicated places** and **third places**.

As the event offer in the metropolitan area is extremely rich (STD3), individual co-creation practices can also be carried out in cultural events. STD3 shows that cultural events can take place in dedicated cultural places, in the public space or in places not dedicated to culture which will host an event for a limited period of time (e.g. a conference centre).

**Dedicated cultural places** are professional places that include permanent facilities providing a cultural offer such as music halls, museums, theatres, cinemas, etc.

The practices of co-creation and animation of the social and professional network can also take place in **non-dedicated places**. These are customary places, *i.e.* ordinary places, not dedicated to culture and non-professional, such as restaurants, cafés and private parties.

Finally, these individual co-creation practices are also carried out in **third places**. The latter are protean. We can distinguish two main forms: spaces that allow people to work collectively, such as co-working spaces and fablabs, and multi-purpose spaces with a cultural focus, such as cultural wastelands or micro-folies⁵.

In order to implement co-creation practices within spaces, the actors will mobilize a range of tools.

---

³ [https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Regions/Drac-Provence-Alpes-Cote-d-Azur/Politique-et-actions-culturelles/Micro-Folies](https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Regions/Drac-Provence-Alpes-Cote-d-Azur/Politique-et-actions-culturelles/Micro-Folies)
1.2.3. Individual tools of co-creation

Figure 8. Individual Tools of Co-Creation

In order to create, maintain and animate his or her social and professional network, a person can use intangible and material tools.

The intangible tools can be used to promote oneself and one's work. Actors will have accounts on professional, non-professional and mixed social networks. These digital tools allow them to expand their network (e.g. by adding a person to LinkedIn) but also to promote themselves through publications, posts, etc. Individuals can therefore use social networks and their personal websites to highlight their work by using a digital portfolio.

They will also personally use software for professional use. They will use generic, non-specialized software to communicate with their network. For example, they will use Outlook from the Office suite to exchange emails.

They can also use specialized software to animate their network using Smartphone applications (e.g. LinkedIn). Specialized software can be used to create an artistic proposal such as video and photo editing software or music composition software. These proposals can be fed into digital promotion tools in virtual co-creation spaces.

In order to mobilize these immaterial tools, the actors will use different material tools:

- **Fixed IS terminals** like desktops;
- **Mobile IS terminals** such as mobile phones and laptops...;
- **Specialized technical equipment** such as motion sensors, connected pianos, etc.
Summary: Individual mechanisms of co-creation

Figure 9. Individual Mechanism of Co-Creation

The factorial plan shows that co-creation practices tend to be mostly informal. These practices aim to create, maintain and sustain a social and professional network. These practices will mobilize immaterial and material tools in physical and virtual spaces.

1.3. Organizational mechanisms of co-creation: mobilizing members of the organization towards co-creation dynamics

In this section, we focus on organizational mechanisms of co-creation. These aim to mobilize teams towards co-creation dynamics.

We detail the organizational practices (1.3.1.), spaces (1.3.2.) and tools (1.3.2.) of co-creation. In summary, we will present the portfolio of organizational co-creation mechanisms.
1.3.1. Organizational practices of co-creation

Organizational co-creation practices have a common purpose: to mobilize teams in co-creation dynamics.

To do this we find several clusters of formal and informal practices. The organizations will structure their activity around projects to be carried out. We will see in the next section that these projects often include other stakeholders and are the subject of co-creation.

This mode of management by project structures the organizations of the arts, culture and creation sector: organizing a festival, producing and distributing a record, a film or a TV series are examples of projects.

Then, depending on their degree of management implementation, organizations will develop more or less sophisticated practices. They may launch calls for projects and/or respond to calls for projects in order to pilot co-creation projects which may lead to inter-organizational co-creation practices.

In addition, there is the label practice, which allows an actor to establish his/her legitimacy in a given field. For example, an organization that runs a permanent cultural facility can, if it operates in the field of modern music and respects a set of specifications, become a "modern music place", a label given by the Ministry of Culture. This legitimacy can allow, within the framework of inter-organizational practices, to be the driving force (not to say leader) of co-creation dynamics on the territory.

The project mode adopted by these structures implies strong time planning. The structures use time management in order to manage the various projects they are piloting or participating in.

This project mode structuring may involve two main human resource management practices:
- The distribution of tasks according to the main areas of activity: administration, production, logistics, artistic, etc. This can be explained by the heterogeneity of the types of jobs present in the field of arts, culture and creation activities.

The actors in these clusters may work together within the structure (organizational logic), but they may also work with actors from the same professional job outside the organization (professional logic).

- Multiple contracting practices: these organizations juggle permanent and temporary staff. The latter are recruited according to their legal status, with contracts under private or public law, permanent contracts, fixed-term contracts, work-study contracts and casual entertainment workers. Contracting can also lead to the outsourcing of certain activities such as accounting.

Managers in artistic, cultural and creative organizations will try to mobilize their teams towards co-created projects. To do this, they will use the previous formal practices, but they will also rely on more informal practices.

Here again, they will try to "work" on the sense of the project (see previous section: professional logic and/or territorial logic), by adopting a transformational leadership. In order to disseminate meaning to the project within the teams, and to ensure empowerment, they will share leadership and power. In addition, the 'ideal' governance model of co-creation includes a representative from each job. This exercise of leadership is in line with the work organizational model of these organizations. They tend to structure their teams in an ad-hoc manner. This implies multidisciplinary teams (in this case, the heterogeneity of the jobs) which will work on projects. These teams will then use mutual adjustment as a means of coordination, leaving a strong place for informality. The representatives of the job families (at a managerial level) and the teams (at an operational level) will then coordinate their work through informal mechanisms, discussions and compromises (thus explaining the characteristics of leadership presented in the previous paragraph).

If these practices can encourage co-creation dynamics, these ones are sometimes threatened by the internal environment of artistic, cultural and creative organizations. The latter can lead to partitioning and even conflict between the organizational actors. Indeed, the different characteristics of cultural employment: legal status, job family, temporality (permanent, temporary...) pushes the actors to develop strong heterogeneous professional identities. These identities can lead to partitioning, a lack of cooperation, and even conflicts which can have a negative effect on the dynamics of co-creation. Managers will therefore use intra-organizational sociability practices within different co-creation spaces in order to create links between teams and promote a climate conducive to collaborative dynamics.
1.3.2. Organizational spaces for co-creation

Organizational co-creation spaces have two purposes: to promote the organization’s activities and to mobilize teams towards co-creation dynamics.

Like individual co-creation spaces, organizations use social networks and their website to display and promote their activities.

Their website can also host an intranet and shared spaces so that members of the structure can work together to co-create projects, allowing in part for mutual adjustment through digital communication.

This mutual adjustment also takes place in physical and virtual spaces via meetings. These meetings allow for verbal communication, thus reinforcing mutual adjustment.

Finally, we find spaces similar to those of individual spaces: dedicated cultural places, third places that will house an organization.

Managers will also use non-dedicated places to organize ‘off’ work times to implement intra-organizational sociability practices.

Some activities may be itinerant and/or "outside the walls", thus taking over the public space of the metropolis: urban, peri-urban and rural spaces.
1.3.3. Organizational tools for co-creation

Organizations use immaterial and material co-creation tools.

The immaterial tools aim (1) to ensure the digital promotion of organizations and (2) to ensure the internal dynamics of co-creation.

The digital promotion tools aim to promote the organization’s activities in virtual co-creation spaces. They allow it to be viewable by its territorial network and its stakeholders.

In order to do this, just like individual tools, organizations will have accounts on professional, non-professional or "mixed" social networks. Like artists and craftsmen, they will have an organizational booklet promoting their activities and their artistic, cultural and creative projects. The organizations will also promote and communicate on the project via an agenda of activities and projects on the website and will send information via a newsletter.

In order to mobilize teams in co-creation dynamics, organizations use immaterial collaborative tools that facilitate communication and ultimately mutual adjustment. They will then use software to support meeting spaces. In order to facilitate physical and virtual meetings, teams will also mobilize facilitation tools that enable co-creation. Finally, organizations will use information sharing tools: email, drive and online box.
Organizations will also use **activity and project management tools**.

They will use strategic planning tools to define the **strategic intent of projects**, monitor and frame the implementation of these projects and their evaluation. Organizations will also use **tools to structure the organization**, the activity and the members around the co-creation projects. In order to implement the activities, they use **management software packages** for the support functions: accounting software, human resources management software, etc. In addition, because they are part of a chain of activities, they will also use **software specific** to some of their functions. For example, for ticketing activities, they will use ticketing software. Finally, organizations use **technical hardware tools**, with **fixed and mobile IS terminals** similar to individual co-creation tools (e.g. desktop and laptop computers). They will also use **technical equipment specific** to the field of activity (e.g. stage equipment).

Finally, the organizations will use **material tools for facilitating meetings**, particularly for face-to-face meetings, which again will help to promote communication and strengthen mobilization towards co-creation dynamics.

**Summary: Organizational mechanisms of co-creation**

**Figure 13. Organizational Mechanisms of Co-Creation**

Organizational co-creation mechanisms aim to mobilize teams towards co-creation dynamics. These dynamics are based on formal practices that structure the organization around projects to be carried out, and practices that are contingent on the activity sector. These practices tend to be informal, which
can be explained by the organic nature of the organizations. Indeed, as the projects progress, the organizations restructure, leaving little place for formal practices. In this sense, the mobilized tools tend to be more intangible.

If practices tend to be informal and mobilize more intangible tools, on the other hand, the place of physical spaces is bigger.

1.4. Inter-organizational co-creation mechanisms: mobilizing stakeholders in collaborative dynamics

Inter-organizational co-creation mechanisms aim at mobilizing stakeholders in a co-creation project.

We detail inter-organizational practices (1.4.1.), spaces (1.4.2.) and tools (1.4.3.) of co-creation. In synthesis, we will outline the portfolio of inter-organizational mechanisms of co-creation.

1.4.1. Inter-organizational co-creation practices

Inter-organizational co-creation practices aim to mobilize stakeholders in co-creation dynamics.

Professionals will then use a set of practices to ensure the design, implementation and evaluation of co-created cultural and creative arts projects.

They will use five clusters of formal practices.

Co-created projects, being part of the democratic public management model, involve the use of collective innovation practices that allow different stakeholders to have a 'voice' and participate in
decision making. Different collective innovation practices let stakeholders to be included in the project: **reflection**, **prototyping** and **project construction workshops**. Professionals will also use more or less sophisticated innovation practices: **design thinking**, **problem solving** or **smart design**.

Co-created projects can be the subject of **mutualization practices**. These aim to pool skills, tangible resources and intangible resources in order to make the co-created project viable. These practices are evolving and can lead to an ultimate stage: **administrative fusion**. While this allows professionals to "grow" their organizations, it also has the effect of ensuring coherence in the territorial network and, **ultimately**, of ensuring better coherence between the links in the territorial value chain of the cultural and creative arts.

To this end, **institutionalized networks** are emerging. Initiated by professionals and/or political actors, these networks make it possible to gather actors and legitimize their actions. The networks will implement three types of practices:

- **Membership practices** that allow for the prospecting and recruitment of members.
- **Network animation practices**, which make it possible to make the network active and to bring the actors together. These facilitation practices also make it possible to initiate co-created projects between actors.
- **Network promotion practices**. These practices, like the ambassadors, make it possible to promote the network's actions.

Due to their insertion in the arts, culture and creation activity sector, two clusters of specific practices appear: **mediation practices** and **residency practices**.

Mediation practices aim to bring a public more or less distant from culture closer to a form of artistic expression. These practices can take two forms: **artistic awareness** (e.g.: an opera that intervenes in schools to present a work) or **artistic practice** (e.g.: intervention in schools to set up a singing workshop).

Actors can also set up residency practices. The residency allows artists to create a work. Professionals will then **welcome** amateur, semi-professional and/or professional artists by making their infrastructures (e.g. recording studio), their resources (e.g. stage manager) and their skills **available** to them. The provision of skills translates into the implementation of a **support system**, which aims to make an artistic creation project viable.

The last inter-organizational practice of formal co-creation is **labeling**. The metropolitan public actor can set up labeling systems for **events** and **facilities** in order to designate 'driving' actors in the territorial value chain (links with the individual mechanisms presented above). In this sense, for each link in the chain, the metropolis can nominate one or more actors and/or flagship projects that become institutionalized. This translates a political legitimacy of the activities and a belonging to the cultural project of the territory.

The co-created projects also rely on a range of practices, both formal and informal, similar to individual and organizational practices.

The actors implement **practices of formal sociability** in order to mobilize their stakeholders in co-created projects. They will **create and maintain relationships with stakeholders**. They will try to
sustain these relationships by giving a good image of their organization. Finally, they will network in order to enlarge their relationships.

Inter-organizational co-creation practices will use the same leadership and coordination practices as those at the organizational level; the difference being that leadership and coordination do not stop at the boundaries of the organization. For example, a cultural event project co-produced by several stakeholders may result in the establishment of a steering committee that facilitates power sharing (shared leadership) ensuring the representation of each stakeholder.

Finally, inter-organizational co-creation dynamics also rely on clusters of informal practices.

STD2 highlighted social exchange practices, which are based on informal partnership practices via the mobilization of the actors through social and professional network. Actors can also make a donation. When this donation calls for an exchange, bartering practices can emerge.

Stakeholders can also demonstrate altruism, thus reinforcing the dynamics of co-creation. Citizens can become involved in co-created projects through volunteering. Other stakeholders can implement solidarity practices. Indeed, STD2 shows that stakeholders can become involved in co-creation dynamics by offering resources, skills, etc., without expecting a counter-gift.

1.4.2. Inter-organizational spaces

We find different inter-organizational spaces supporting co-creation dynamics.

Three types of virtual spaces can be distinguished.
Public actors set up **administrative spaces**. These spaces allow stakeholders to be informed about cultural policy. They can also be used to initiate processes that encourage co-creation: grant applications, label applications, etc. Virtual spaces can also be spaces for exchanging information and communication between the stakeholders in a project. They can then be **collaborative online spaces**. Finally, co-created projects can have their own **website** and be present on **social networks**.

Actors involved in co-creation dynamics can meet in physical and virtual spaces. Like organizational spaces, we find **meetings**. Stakeholders can also meet in **collective innovation spaces** to ensure the inclusion of stakeholders in the different phases of a co-created project (co-design, co-production and co-evaluation). They can meet in spaces to ensure collective reflection on the **design** and **prototyping** of the project. They can meet in **third places** to set up **workshops, master classes**, etc.

**Mega-events** are also spaces that allow actors to implement co-created projects. Actors can collectively set up **one-off** or even **recurrent** mega-events, which are events of international scope. These events can be **localized** or **itinerant**, offering events in the metropolitan area.

Finally, the **institutionalized networks** also constitute spaces, bringing together virtual and physical spaces allowing the members of the network to meet and co-create projects. These networks are of two kinds, they can be spaces of gathering according to an economic logic or according to a **field of activity**.

The mobilization of stakeholders in co-creation dynamics takes place in spaces similar to organizational spaces.

### 1.4.3. Inter-organizational co-creation tools

**Figure 16. Inter-Organizational Tools of Co-Creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intangible</th>
<th>Material and Intangible</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td><strong>Announcement</strong> tool for networks and co-created projects</td>
<td><strong>Inter-organizational technical tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative tools</td>
<td><strong>Charter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notes &amp; Quips</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information exchange tools (mail, IM, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong> tool</td>
<td><strong>Teams &amp; files</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room tools (microphones, smart boards, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>Management</strong> tool</td>
<td><strong>Specialized technical equipment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting support (Skype, Zoom, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>Collaborative tools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharing facilitation tools (i.e. chart, etc.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital tools to promote networks and co-created projects</td>
<td><strong>Newsletter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A range of immaterial and material tools encourage the mobilization of stakeholders in co-creation dynamics.

There are three types of intangible tools: agreements, collaborative tools and promotional tools.

Conventions allow contracting, *i.e.* to establish and clarify the nature of the relationship between stakeholders, and the rights and duties between them. These agreements, like sponsorship agreements, can be used as tax incentive tools allowing tax reductions. We find collaborative co-creation tools similar to those at the organizational level ensuring co-creation between stakeholders: tools for exchanging information, facilitating meetings and meeting materials.

Finally, institutionalized networks and co-created projects will also use promotional tools similar to those of the organization, allowing the promotion of co-created activities.

Institutionalized networks and co-created projects will also mobilize intangible and tangible tools to formalize the relationships between stakeholders. The charters make it possible to clarify the rules and the functioning of the network/projects.

Then, we find the previously mentioned tools (cf. organizational practices) with tools for promotion, management and collaboration between the stakeholders of the network/project.

Finally, concerning the material tools, we find the same as the organizational tools of co-creation ones.

**Summary: inter-organizational co-creation mechanisms of co-creation**

![Figure 17. Inter-Organizational Mechanisms of Co-Creation](image)
Inter-organizational mechanisms link the most different strategic ingredients. These aim at mobilizing stakeholders in co-creation dynamics. In this sense, and in order to formalize and structure the relationships between actors, a set of formal practices can be used. Then, a set of formal and informal practices can be used to include stakeholders in the design, production and evaluation of co-created projects.

This inclusion of stakeholders in co-created projects takes place in a multitude of physical and virtual spaces and tools, both tangible and intangible.

**Conclusion: Synthesis - the territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation**

The previous diagram presents the portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation. It synthesizes all the strategic ingredients that are conducive to (1) the mobilization of a social and professional network, (2) the mobilization of the members of an organization and (3) the mobilization of territorial stakeholders in co-creation dynamics. These ingredients act directly or indirectly on the inclusion of stakeholders in the design, production and evaluation of co-created projects.

We also note a territorialization of strategic ingredients: the higher the level of analysis, the greater the scope of the ingredients. For example, individual leadership is transformed and shared across organizational and inter-organizational strata. It is accompanied by the setting up of organizational ad-hoc teams (multi-disciplinary professions within a structure), then territorialized (multi-disciplinary stakeholders within a co-created project).
In the second part of this deliverable, we propose to apply this portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation to four territorial co-creation projects.
II. SP2: Focus on Innovative Governance Mechanisms: Vignettes - Practical Cards

Introduction

This SP2 aims to illustrate the portfolio of co-creation mechanisms. We have selected four French cases that embody this portfolio. More specifically, these cases aim at presenting the mechanisms of co-creation mobilized by four territorial projects.

In order to restore the presentation of the mechanisms of co-creation, we propose vignettes that allow us to carry out analytical monographs of territorial projects. In each of the vignettes, we make a global presentation of the project and of the organization that pilots it. Then, we present the stakeholders of the project, using Soldo's (2018) typology as an analytical grid: public actors, private for-profit actors, private SSE actors, citizens. Moreover, we reveal the individual, organizational and inter-organizational mechanisms in order to draw the territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation.

The four cases illustrate the plurality of forms that these projects can take:
- A collective of festivals that illustrate network projects (COFEES) (2.1.);
- An itinerant cultural event outside the AMP metropolitan area (Festival de Chaillol) (2.2.);
- A travelling cultural mediation project (Resistance Project) (2.3.);
- An itinerant cultural event in the AMP metropolitan area (Train bleu) (2.4.);

These four vignettes are thus in line with STD3. Territorial cultural strategies are increasingly based on an event-based approach to culture (STD3), so we propose vignettes that illustrate the innovative mechanisms of the territorial governance of the co-creation of artistic, cultural and creative event-based projects.

This SP2 aims at illustrating the portfolio of co-creation mechanisms. To do so, we have selected four French cases that embody this portfolio. More specifically, these cases aim to present the co-creation mechanisms mobilized by four territorial projects.
2.1. Collectif des Festivals Écoresponsables et Solidaires en Région Sud (COFEES)

The objective is first to present the design of the project, its stakeholders, then the portfolio of strategic governance mechanisms of co-creation, distinguishing between individual, organizational and inter-organizational mechanisms and finally, a synthesis.

2.1.1. Project design

In 2005, six Breton festivals began to reflect on their ecological impact, leading in 2007 to a first "Charter of festivals committed to sustainable development and solidarity in Brittany". This first festival initiative was followed by others, in particular thanks to the creation in 2012 of the "R2D2 (Réseau des dispositifs régionaux d’accompagnement des éco-manifestations)" of which the COFEES (Collectif des Festivals Écoresponsables et Solidaires en Région Sud) is a part. The COFEES was created in March 2014, then supported between April 2017 and April 2020 by the UDCM (Union des Diffuseurs de Création Musicale) and, as of April 2020, has become a full association. The project is based on four principles:

- Furtherance of experiences and good practices encouraging all actors (audiences, artists, partner teams, etc.);
- Territoriality in order to be as close as possible to the local problems of festivals;
- Transversality to enable close and constructive collaboration with stakeholders in the field (environmental and social associations, NGOs, researchers and universities, companies and clusters, local authorities, etc.);
- Sharing of means and resources to reduce the costs of festivals’ environmental initiatives.

COFEES now has seventeen member festivals and runs workshops and training courses to propose eco-responsible approaches (recyclable structures, transport policies, etc.). COFEES also proposes evaluation approaches in order to define areas for improvement in the implementation of eco-responsible approaches. COFEES then proposes networking to provide solutions. For example, COFEES proposes to put the festivals concerned in contact with companies that produce structures made of sustainable or recyclable materials or to put festivals in contact with specialized associations. This can lead the festivals concerned to obtain the ISO 26000 standard⁴ dedicated to corporate social responsibility.

---

2.1.2. Stakeholders in the co-created project

The table below summarizes the main stakeholders of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actors</th>
<th>Private for-profit actors</th>
<th>Private SSE actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agence de la transition écologique (ADEME) Provence Alpes Côte d’Azur</td>
<td>Limited Liability Companies MIMI Festival</td>
<td>Associations under the 1901 law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Région Sud Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institut Supérieur des Techniques du Spectacle (ISTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Régionale des Affaires Culturelles (DRAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>French Tech Grande Provence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Département des Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audiens (Collective of culture and communication professionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transdev, Isilines PACA (Subsidiary of the Caisse des dépôts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecocscience Provence (environmental preservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Public Management and Territorial Governance (IMPGT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Wheel (circular economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Chambre Régionale des entreprises d’économie sociale et solidaire (CRESS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plus Belle La Nuit (party support service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero Waste Marseille (recycling and responsible behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associations under the law of 1901, members of the Network of Regional Eco-Event Support Systems (R2D2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eco-Manifestations Alsace (EMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Big Office (Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le collectif des festivals (Brittany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terre du Son Festival (Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Réseau des Indépendants de la Musique (New Aquitaine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Element’terre (Occitania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The cooperation centre for contemporary music in Pays de la Loire. Réseau Eco-Evenement (REEVE) Pays de la Loire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marsatac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aix-en-Provence Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Festival d’Avignon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avignon le Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resonance Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zik Zac Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Envies Rhônements (organised by the association “Le citron jaune”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Festival les Printemps du Monde (association Le chantier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Nuits Carrées (Label notes association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Suds, in Arles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Fest (association Inove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Escales du Cargo (Andromède association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Festival de Chaillol (association Espace culturel de Chaillol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooksound Festival (association plage sonore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Festival International de Piano de La Roque d’Anthéron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les plages électroniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3. Portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation

The main driver of co-creation here seems to be the shared sense of purpose among the members of the COFEES. This commitment to sustainable development is reflected in the articulation of different strategic ingredients at individual, organizational and inter-organizational levels.

**Individual level: meaning as a driver of sociability**

At the individual level, the practices of reticular sociability are the first strategic ingredients identified because, beyond skills, the actors share, and foremost convictions related to ecology and sustainable
development. Leadership as a practice is based on the inter-individual sharing of these convictions. This translates into recurrent practices of sociability bringing together actors around pre-established subjects or preferences and a protocol (such as the annual COFEES conferences⁵). To this we can add an ability to convince other actors interested in their approach. The protocol is therefore also a way of ensuring personal visibility, particularly in certain dedicated spaces. Finally, although the actors make little mention of their individual tools, the virtual spaces for individual promotion appear to be important, insofar as each individual involved in COFEES personally embodies the project: not hesitating to display their convictions and/or promote organizational events (for example on Twitter and Facebook).

This applies first of all to dedicated cultural places, both to exchange with similar actors and to convince other cultural actors on the basis of personal convictions. The interweaving of individuals and the organizations in which they operate is important here. In addition to dedicated cultural places, individuals also frequent third-party places, particularly fablabs⁶ or innovation workshops. These places allow the expression of a know-how inherent to the co-creation mechanisms that we are observing here.

**Organizational level: a committed organization**

At the organizational level, the type of coordination undertaken is extremely flexible and is based on the great diversity of the actors, as illustrated by this job description. This flexibility, a driving force for co-creation, is based on a shared sense of commitment to the environment on the part of the actors who make up COFEES. The internal structure of the organization is democratic: all decisions are taken by a board of directors composed of elected members. As such, the leadership capacities are based on the elected Board members.

The dedicated cultural places represent the first places of expression of the collective's co-creation project, since the COFEES adapts its task according to the festivals with which it works (as in the case of the modification of the lighting of the different places of the Marsatac festival). On this basis, permanent coordination is exercised through the IS spaces, which provide a stable database and expertise on which each member of the organization must rely. Therefore, the organizational technical tools are central, both to keep the link and to propose evaluations (and the corresponding solutions) in a constant way from one member of the organization to another. More concretely, the COFEES has a framework for action: evaluation according to the field (carbon footprint for transport, energy footprint for lighting, etc.), stakeholders (partners or professionals useful for a particular practice) and results (evolution according to the indicators defined during the assessments). Finally, these technical tools are essential because these approaches require a high degree of coordination.

Inter-organizational level: ingredients for spreading a belief

COFEES is a collective that relies on the convictions of its members and especially on their ability to share them. This implies a permanent flow of social exchanges. These exchanges provide opportunities for contact with other organizations that COFEES seeks to bring together. More concretely, the impact of COFEES on the organizations it works with is based on its leadership practice. COFEES recommends a certain type of structure, material, organization, etc., which it can adopt. Their adoption depends on its ability to motivate and convince festival directors, especially about the impact that such an approach can have on audiences. Co-creation practices are therefore based on the meaning given to them and shared by the different actors (internal and external to the organization). This leadership practice is supported by practices of formal sociability that is essential for maintaining the relationships of trust that COFEES maintains with its partners. This capacity to spread conviction on an inter-organizational scale requires mediation practices that can be provided by COFEES or by specialized partner associations (such as Ecoscience Provence, La Roue, Plus Belle La Nuit or Zero Waste Marseille). As a corollary of the organizational and individual format defended by COFEES, collective innovation practices are part of the services offered. Here again, COFEES relies on partners if necessary: the aim is to articulate these collective innovation practices in a perspective of co-creation of ecological solutions. All of these services are part of the overall labelling practices. In fact, the COFEES is practically a label in itself. The ecological transition that it proposes to the various festivals it supports is based on a national (or even international) network and a number of specialized associations that can provide guarantees (such as the R2D2 network7 or the Ecoscience Provence8 association). Although it is not a label in the legal sense of the term, membership of the COFEES, backed by these institutionalized network practices, is practically a label of use. In this sense, the COFEES articulates its practices around the ISO 26000 standard which, without containing any legal value, refers to a certain number of criteria that attest to the commitment of an organization to an eco-responsible approach.

In terms of spaces, the COFEES works with the dedicated cultural places of festivals (halls, amphitheaters, etc.). This practice of space is however original since space is not only a framework but an object to be transformed. The inter-organizational space therefore constitutes, through its capacity to house numerous network actors, an institutionalized network space. Faced with this, third places embody the spaces closest to the aspirations of COFEES: their nature makes them transformable and makes them spaces of collective innovation conducive to co-creation dynamics. It emerges that IS spaces are indispensable insofar as they are a permanent resource and a space for communication.

COFEES relies on both material and immaterial tools. More concretely, it relies on digital tools to promote the network, which formalize a committed discourse, aiming to link practices and spaces to strategic choices. This is evidenced by the very active COFEES Facebook page9, which also promotes

7 https://cofees.udcm.net/content/home/presentation-r2d2.pdf
8 https://ecoscienceprovence.com/
9 https://www.facebook.com/COFEES-649672571756438/
the partners’ events. Finally, the mobilization of a set of agreements also makes it possible to formalize the established nature of the relations between COFEES members and their partners.

Summary
Two lines of force seem to be driving the co-creation projects carried out by COFEES: the commitment of its members (at the individual and organizational level) and the capacity of the collective to rely on a network of solid partners with a view to committing the festivals to the ecological transition. This is summarized in the figure below.

Figure 21. The territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: COFEES

Only dedicated cultural places and digital promotional tools embody a three-dimensional integration of co-creation ingredients. Dedicated cultural places represent spaces at the crossroads of all possible dynamics:

- An object of work for the COFEES (which transforms them) and for their partners who manage the festival;
- A meeting point for all actors, which can lead to new opportunities for partnerships and collaborations;
- A place of expression and creativity useful for the dissemination of the convictions held by the members of COFEES.

Digital promotional tools are important at all levels: they serve to illustrate ecological and environmentally oriented convictions. It is not only a bias, but also a positioning in the sense that the organization and its individuals are working in a certain direction, which gives meaning to their actions.
The impact of this dynamic can be seen on an inter-organizational scale by influencing the partners with whom COFEES works. For example, the Aix Festival, which has benefited from COFEES services, now shows a commitment to the environment.

2.2. Festival de Chaillol

The objective is first to present the design of the project, its stakeholders, then the portfolio of strategic governance mechanisms of co-creation, distinguishing between individual, organizational and inter-organizational mechanisms and finally, a synthesis.

2.2.1. Project design

The first edition of the Chaillol festival, organized in the Hautes Alpes, dates back to 1996. Since then, the successive editions have grown and the events take place all over the territory concerned in village halls, concert halls, theatres, cinemas, churches, but also in public spaces (castle courtyards, public squares, schools, social centers) and natural spaces (mountain passes, car parks for hiking trails). It is mainly a question of concerts but also of musical siestas, storytelling and wanderings in exceptional sites (natural, urban, museums, etc.). The aim of the festival is twofold:

- Encouraging the public to travel throughout the territory;
- Opening up audiences to new tourist areas while bringing cultural life to remote locations.

The organization that runs the event is called the Espace Culturel de Chaillol, it is established under the framework of the 1901 association and employs seven people. Initially formed by fifteen musicians (fourteen members of the Board of Directors and Michaël Dian, musician and director), its activity also mobilizes volunteers who contribute locally to the realization of each event. This cultural space proposes to support musical activity by commissioning composers, organizing artists’ residencies and producing records and books. The association also offers introductory workshops in schools and in prisons. The office of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol is located in Gap. As the first travelling stage, the festival is supported by the State, the Alpes de Haute Provence department and the local town halls, which provide theatres and premises.
2.2.2. Stakeholders in the co-created project

The table below summarizes the main stakeholders of the project.

Table 2. The main stakeholders of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actors</th>
<th>Private for-profit actors</th>
<th>Private SSE actors</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Lopain de terre Bakery (TPE)</td>
<td>Cooperative Societies of Collective Interest (SCIC)</td>
<td>Regular volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Régionale des Affaires Culturelles (DRAC)</td>
<td>Limited Liability Companies</td>
<td>SACEM</td>
<td>Occasional volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Région Sud Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur Département des Hautes Alpes</td>
<td>Real estate agency Chaillol loisirs</td>
<td>Society for the Collection and Distribution of Performers’ Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of municipalities</td>
<td>Blanchard Sport</td>
<td>Associations under the 1901 law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champsaur Valgaudemar</td>
<td>Bookstore at the corner of passing words</td>
<td>New Music on the Move</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serre Ponçon Val d’Avance</td>
<td>Simplified Joint Stock Companies</td>
<td>Théâtre de la Passerelle (Gap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buëch Dévoluy</td>
<td>Ski Tonic</td>
<td>Caves des haute-vignes Valserre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serre Ponçon</td>
<td>Pellerin brothers</td>
<td>(Agricultural cooperative society)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays Gapençais</td>
<td>Intermarché</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town halls</td>
<td>AXA Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Cart’com (subsidiary of Keemia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallard</td>
<td>Piano Qu’on Sert (piano tuner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaillol</td>
<td>(self-employed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre National de la Musique (public establishment of an industrial and commercial nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Fayore (Chaillol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salle des fêtes (Montgardin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salle polyvalente (Ancelle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pôle Culturel le XXe (Savines-le-Lac)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salle de la Tour (La Bâtie-Neuve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3. Portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation

The Chaillol festival offers musicians the opportunity to go beyond their performance: to socialize and enjoy exceptional sites. Added to this, the itinerant nature of the Chaillol festival is a strong organizational choice that promotes all the ingredients of co-creation at the individual, organizational and inter-organizational levels.

**Individual level: inter-individual sociability as a basis**

In terms of practices, the organization of the Chaillol festival relies on strong links of reticular sociability: the members of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol frequent their peers but also other actors in the territory (mayors, cultural officers, etc.). This is achieved through bonds of trust and friendship that can lead (on the side of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol) to events in places as diverse as schools or prisons and (on the side of the town halls) to the provision of infrastructure or equipment. Practices of formal sociability such as meetings play an important role insofar as the operation of the festival depends on patrons but also on links with local elected officials. This networking practice would be meaningless without a leadership practice in which Michaël Dian’s personal charisma, his ability to convince and federate various actors in the territory is an essential lever: he therefore maintains a rich
network of local and professional actors. In this respect, Michaël Dian’s personal career as a concert performer plays a major role: he is integrated into a milieu of national and international musicians to whom he regularly proposes collaborations. Musicians are also selected in a more informal way after a concert, which implies frequenting, on an individual basis, dedicated and non-dedicated places. The informal aspect of this approach is explained by the format of the festival: the musicians must be sensitive to the mission of bringing culture to rural areas that characterizes the festival, especially considering that it is a travelling festival. The last parameter inherent to the fact that the Chaillol festival is spread over a very large territory, personal software, especially that of the musicians (communication, sound and image processing), takes on great importance in the co-creation dynamic.

**Organizational level: a travelling festival**

Organizational sociability practices characterize the organization; they are based on affinities between actors and the fact that they have known each other for a long time. Let us propose two examples:

- Many of the founding members have known each other since their formation over 20 years ago;
- The photographer recruited by the Espace Culturel de Chaillol is a former volunteer who had collaborated extensively on many of the association’s events.

The association is similar to an adhocratic type of organization, based on the complementarity of the teams and great agility. The members therefore have specific, delimited skills, whose coordination is based on mutual adjustments, impulse by leadership practices.

In terms of space, regular meetings take place in premises lent by the town halls of Gap or Chaillol and constitute the main physical footprint of the Chaillol Cultural Space. As a direct corollary, IS spaces occupy an important place, whether internally (file exchange) or externally (promotion and networking). Collaborative tools occupy also a central place but remain relatively simple, the familiarity of the actors allowing them to communicate by telephone. This opens the field to strong dissemination mechanisms, the crucible of a communication effort articulated around digital tools for organizational promotion, such as the website10 of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol and its Facebook page11.

**Inter-organizational level: towards the structuring of a meta-organization**

Social exchanges are central to the Festival de Chaillol: the logic of gift for gift and informal partnerships are essential. In fact, the mayors of small towns can make infrastructures available (opening of rooms, authorizations, etc.) in exchange for workshops in schools, especially in isolated towns. Such a dynamic should not make us forget altruism, an essential component of any co-creation logic. This requires the regular employment of volunteers and the facilitation of services such as the

---

10 [https://www.festivaldechaillol.com/](https://www.festivaldechaillol.com/)
11 [https://www.facebook.com/EspaceCultureldeChaillol](https://www.facebook.com/EspaceCultureldeChaillol)
setting up of a carpooling system to get to an isolated event. To coordinate all these actions, the practice of leadership, particularly in its transformational leadership and sensemaking dimension, becomes a central component, particularly in its ability to motivate and involve the teams in the organization of the Chaillol festival. For example, each difficulty linked to logistical constraints, for example, takes on a new meaning in the light of the festival’s mission, which is to spread culture in remote areas. Practices of formal sociability remains an important point sofar as the artists are largely invited to interact with their often neophyte audience. Mediation practices are therefore also necessary to present the music produced. These practices constitute both a real choice for the organization and an argument for the local authorities. In material terms, the festival does not have its own infrastructure, which leads it to share equipment, spaces (such as the two they occupy in Gap and Chaillol) and certain skills. When it comes to using inter-organizational technical tools, such as sometimes expensive equipment (sound systems, instruments, etc.), pooling is frequently framed by the signing of agreements, a legal tool widely used within co-creation schemes. The provision of this equipment allows each festival to be accompanied by artistic residencies. This is necessarily articulated around an institutionalized network practice. This is evidenced by the various partnerships with other networks such as the Departmental Center of Resources and Arts. Finally, the labelling practices relating to the Chaillol festival are a way of ensuring maximum impact, both in terms of communication (particularly for the national and international visibility of the festival) and commitment (for example through a partnership with the COFEES).

In terms of space, the Chaillol festival depends largely on dedicated cultural places (Théâtre de la Passerelle, salle des fêtes de Montgardin, etc.). Their mobilization is one of the pivots of the co-creation dynamics, it is notably an argument sofar as the municipalities have every interest in making infrastructures available in the perspective of tourist frequentation but also of frequentation of non-dedicated places via workshops (schools, homes, etc.). This double exchange is one of the aims of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol, whose mission is to highlight an exceptional geological heritage (in the case of a concert in a mountain pass) and to introduce artists through unusual places and practices (musical naps). Public spaces (squares or communal buildings) are also enhanced by the festival, and all these cultural events are the result of regular meetings. These meetings can be physical or virtual, given the number of partners and the geographical extension of the festivals produced. The IS spaces therefore take on a central role sofar as the Chaillol festival has only minimal office space. The tools for formalizing an institutionalized network, such as collaborative and/or managerial tools, take on their full importance: the digital tools for promoting the network (newsletter, social networks, etc.) are not only tools for promotion and dissemination but also what materializes the organization.
Summary

Putting together the different levels observed allows us to characterize two co-creation mechanisms with three-dimensional integration, as shown in the figure below.

Figure 22. The territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: Chaillol Festival

The itinerant nature of the Chaillol festival conditions its sociability practices, which become central. On a personal level, the members have an important network of musicians, professionals and elected officials who allow the festival to function. These affinities, combined with relationships of trust, can be found at an organizational level. The members of the Espace Culturel de Chaillol know each other well and are therefore largely interconnected. These bonds of sympathy and sociability extend to the audiences of the Chaillol festival with whom the artists are widely invited to interact. The festival also depends on goodwill exchanges in a logic of give and take, allowing the pooling of certain services such as carpooling. The coordination of these practices implies leadership as a practice. The personality of the members of the organization, in particular their charisma and their ability to give meaning to all the actions undertaken, plays a major role. More concretely, the exchange of workshops in schools for the provision of theatres should not be thought of as a negotiation but as different facets of the cultural animation dedicated to the territory promotion.
2.3. Resistance Project

The objective is first to present the design of the project, its stakeholders, then the portfolio of strategic governance mechanisms of co-creation, distinguishing between individual, organizational and inter-organizational mechanisms and finally, a synthesis.

2.3.1. Project design

The Compagnie La Naïve\textsuperscript{12} is based in Pertuis and has been creating shows of a committed nature since 1999. The Resistance project is in this vein, it is a play and a concert built around a common theme dedicated to the memory of the resistance:

- The play "Un autre 11 Novembre" is based on a text by Jean-Charles Raymond telling the story of teenagers who fell under the yoke of the Nazis for having put flowers on the tomb of the unknown soldier;
- The concert "Le bal des révoltés" by the group Valmy offers an updated interpretation of militant songs such as Bella Ciao, Ay Carmela, etc.

The production of the play consisted of working with teenagers (aged 13 to 17), twelve of whom (three from the social center L’eau vive in the neighboring town of Coudoux, the others from the EVEA leisure center) were selected on the basis of improvisations. The rehearsals took place between January and June 2017 at the Espace NoVa Velaux at a rate of 3 hours every Monday. To this was added a week of residency from 18 to 22 April.

This led to a series of touring performances, the first of which took place on 10 June 2017 at the Espace NoVa Velaux. At the same time, the latter fulfilled a mediation function by opening the show to schoolchildren as a priority. A coordination with associations and schools of Velaux was also set up: it consists in reconstructing the village of Velaux during the war. This exhibition, open from 10 to 13 June 2017, has an educational purpose and has included pupils in an interactive approach (workshops, visits, etc.). From 8 July 2017 the troupe toured, offering performances in the towns of Aix-en-Provence, Manosque, Forcalquier, Pertuis, Cavaillon, Puylobier, Rians, La Bastide des Jourdans, Ansouis, and ending with the Avignon festival on 24 July 2017 as part of the festival off. This tour took place mainly on foot and in caravans to the rhythm of the horses. Finally, a documentary film called "À petits pas\textsuperscript{13}" directed by Arno Villenave is dedicated to the whole project and more particularly to the tour of the play "Un autre 11 Novembre" going from Velaux to Avignon. This documentary was screened at Espace NoVa Velaux on November 12, 2017 and in the surrounding towns until winter 2018.

\textsuperscript{12} https://www.facebook.com/CompagnieLaNaive/
\textsuperscript{13} https://vimeo.com/244007848
2.3.2. Stakeholders in the co-created project

The table below summarizes the main stakeholders of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actors</th>
<th>Private for-profit actors</th>
<th>Private SSE actors</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Département des Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
<td>Works Councils</td>
<td>Associations under the 1901 law</td>
<td>Adolescents from the &quot;Eau vive&quot; and EVEA social centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Caisse centrale d'activités sociales (CMCAS) (Central Works Council)</td>
<td>L'Eau Vive (youth hostel based in Coudoux)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town halls</td>
<td>EDF/GDF Works Council</td>
<td>Espace Velauxien d'Education et d'Animation (EVEA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Pennes - Mirabeau</td>
<td>Simplified Joint Stock Companies</td>
<td>Alternative Velaux (citizens' association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardanne</td>
<td>LAKE / EUROCOPTER</td>
<td>Tous en sons ! (festival)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puylobbier</td>
<td>CE Compagnie Pétrochimique de Berre</td>
<td>With Time (festival)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Bastide des Jourdans</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Naïve Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertuis</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCHAOS / International Circus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansouis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Biennial (BIAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tour d'Aigues</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture'Mania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roussillon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Social and Cultural Action Service (SCAS) of Aix-Marseille Université</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Council of the Caisse Primaire d'Assurance Maladie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comité d'Action d'Entraide Sociale (CAES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France Bleu Provence (radio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute of Public Management and Territorial Governance (IMPGT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA CADARACHE (public establishment of an industrial and commercial nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3. Portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation

In this case, the project is largely based on trust and familiarity between the different actors. This co-creation engine is perceptible at individual, organizational and inter-organizational levels.

**Individual level: articulation of an affinity sociability**

In terms of practices, all of the actors enjoy a great proximity that borders on familiarity: they know each other personally and have known each other for a long time, and they discuss easily on the fringes of their artistic and professional activities (which the documentary film "À petits pas" largely illustrates). If we can speak of reticular sociability and affinity links, it is also fair to mention complementarities of environment. More concretely, the actors mention shared drinks, lunches, etc. which enabled them to detail the projects undertaken. Co-creation here is therefore based on a tightly woven network of relationships of trust between actors. From then on, the question of leadership as a practice becomes essentially customary. This means that the actors are used to certain leaders with recognized charisma. In our case, this goes hand in hand with a real capacity to carry a project, in this case the Resistance project.

From this point of view, regular individual attendance at dedicated cultural places seems essential: the actors who are used to seeing each other outside of the shows they go to see know each other by the yardstick of these spaces (in particular the Alter café integrated into the NoVa space). In terms of tools, as is often the case in the field of live performance, virtual spaces for individual promotion play a full role, particularly the Facebook pages, which are very active for each of the actors concerned: this ranges from the individual Facebook page of the teenagers selected for the project.

**Organizational level: the organization as a driver for co-creation**

The link between individual and organizational IS spaces is, in this case, difficult to establish because the organization is embodied by Jean-Charles Raymond. Thus, a project, especially one that is internal to the organization, is based on an actor who embodies it: his words on an IS space commit him personally but also the organization he represents and the projects he carries.

Digital tools for organizational promotion, such as the websites of the theatres, the Festival Off d'Avignon or the La Naïve company, inform the public about dates, prices and show photos of the shows. Leadership as a practice is thus understood as a way of spreading the vision behind the project.

**Inter-organizational level: towards an integration of co-creation mechanisms**

At an inter-organizational level, two organizations complement each other: the company La Naïve and Espace NoVa. This synergy implies the inter-individual sociability practices mentioned above (drinks, dinners, etc.). The company La Naïve, based in Pertuis, has established a partnership with the Espace NoVa, from which it has benefited from the infrastructures in Velaux. This complementarity also leads to a particular structuring of the organization of the Espace NoVa, which follows La Naïve’s lead, following its rehearsals and adjusting its opening hours.
The social exchanges are also central. This reflects a practice of negotiated inter-organizational leadership. More concretely, the roles are divided in a logic of co-creation based on complementarity: on the one hand, the provision of a space and infrastructures, on the other, the development of an artistic project. In addition, the Espace NoVa Velaux allows the company La Naïve to benefit from a considerable network and infrastructure, which constitutes a practice of mutualization (neighboring town halls and the space's regular public). Indeed, the Espace NoVa Velaux is known and used to exchanging with a number of actors that can be useful for promotion (press, video makers, etc.). They also have sound and video recording equipment. That said, any co-creation within Espace NoVa Velaux includes a mediation function. In this case, Espace NoVa is taking advantage of the Resistance project to propose an exhibition on the theme of resistance, open to schoolchildren.

All of these cultural events are possible within a dedicated cultural space, namely Espace NoVa. In terms of co-creation ingredients, however, the space is sectioned: there is a clear separation between workspaces (rehearsal rooms, dance rooms, etc.) and sociability spaces (the Alter café) which serve as a support for negotiations and deals. This implies regular meetings around the co-creation projects: these meetings take place in the NoVa space but also in the Alter café, depending on the importance and formality of the meeting. The familiarity relationships mentioned above include informal meetings over drinks, which are all ingredients of co-creation.

Collaborative tools and particularly technical tools remain marginal and/or are reduced to their most basic function. They serve to maintain regular contact despite the geographical distance involved in the itinerant nature of the Resistance project. For example, the teenagers were able to talk to their parents regularly. As such, digital tools for promoting the network have a central place. It is in this perspective that the Resistance project led to the production of a video documentary. This last approach finally allows an opening on the pooling of inter-organizational technical tools. This mainly concerns physical tools (theatre or staging equipment) whose sharing is based on relationships of trust. The documentary mentioned above offers a synthesis and serves both as a digital promotional tool and as proof of the relevance and reality of the co-creative process undertaken.
Summary

Interactions and inter-individual dealings between actors seem to predominate in co-creation dynamics. However, it is possible to distinguish them according to their level of integration, as shown in the figure below.

Figure 23. The territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: Resistance Project

The mechanisms with a three-dimensional level of integration concern, first of all, leadership as practice. This concerns both the individual character of actors and their ability to embody an organization. The latter allows for the centralization of co-creation practices around the exchange between individuals, with Jean-Charles Raymond embodying La Naïve in front of other organizations. These exchanges take place in dedicated cultural spaces which are designed for this purpose. From then on, co-creation practices are illustrated on all fronts: they involve frequenting dedicated places and the organization that makes them up. This in turn produces a structuring of sociability practices. Digital promotional tools (on the occasion of the dedicated film) facilitate the implementation of co-creation mechanisms. To this can be added the rich, long-standing interpersonal links that are part of the affinity dynamics that enable co-creation work.
2.4 Train bleu Project

The objective is first to present the design of the project, its stakeholders, then the portfolio of strategic governance mechanisms of co-creation, distinguishing between individual, organizational and inter-organizational mechanisms and finally, a synthesis.

2.4.1. Project design

The Train Bleu project was born in 2013, under the impetus of Gilles Bouckaert, director of the Salins theatre in Martigues, in coordination with the Théâtre La Criée in Marseille, the Théâtre Sémaophore in Port-de-Bouc and the Théâtre Olivier in Istres. This consists of taking advantage of the railway line linking Marseille to Miramas via the Côte Bleue to set up a cultural and artistic itinerary based on visits to dedicated and non-dedicated places. The first edition was launched in 2015 and three others followed, including the one in 2018, which is one of the events of MP2018\(^\text{14}\). Other theatres are participating, the Cadran in Ensuès-La-Redonne, the Théâtre Joliette and the Théâtre Nono in Marseille, as well as the Pôle Instrumental Contemporain in Marseille. The project consists in making the public circulate by public transport and at preferential rates, between these different artistic and cultural places and to add other spaces to them. Over the course of the four editions, several dedicated places were visited (theatres, performance halls, museums, etc.). The tour has also included visits to exceptional natural sites through a navigation on the Etang de Berre and a visit to the Niolon and Redonne creeks, etc. In addition to this, there were strolls through urban areas such as the Joliette district and the Terrasses du Port shopping center, both in Marseille. A certain number of cultural events "outside the walls" (skits, recitation of poems, etc.) were also organized in public places. The current format has thus largely exceeded the original framework: the Blue Train project has become a global event including more and more spaces and widely extended beyond the Côte Bleue railway line.

2.4.2. Stakeholders in the co-created project

The table below summarizes the main stakeholders of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actors</th>
<th>Private for-profit actors</th>
<th>Private SSE actors</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Région Sud Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur</td>
<td>Ulysses bus</td>
<td>The Théâtre Joliette-Minoterie (Marseille) Scène conventionnée</td>
<td>Audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Département des Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
<td>Cartreize bus</td>
<td>Le théâtre des calanques (formerly Théâtre Nono) Le pôle européen de création des Suds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Salins (Martigues) Scène Nationale</td>
<td>CPAM boat</td>
<td>Le Pôle Instrumental Contemporain (Marseille) (Association loi 1901)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Théâtre de l’Olivier (Istres) Pôle Régional de Développement Culturel</td>
<td>Catering compagnies</td>
<td>La Criée (Marseille) SARL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions Stage and screen</td>
<td>Fruit company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Théâtre La Colonne (Miramas)</td>
<td>Seafoodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espace Robert Hossein (Grans)</td>
<td>Terrasses du Port shopping centre (Marseille)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espace Gérard Philippe Port-Saint-Louis (Cornillon-Confoux)</td>
<td>TOTAL Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Cadran (Ensuès La Redonne)</td>
<td>Municipal hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matraja College (Sausset-Les-Pins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCF (public limited company with public capital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3. Portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation

A project of the scale of the Blue Train involves numerous co-creation dynamics which are applied at individual, organizational and inter-organizational levels.

**Individual level: correlations between practices and spaces**

At the individual level, the practices of reticular sociability occupy a central place, and the actors report a vast personal network between peers who make up the collective of the "Train Bleu" project. For example, initially conceived by Gilles Bouckaert, director of the Théâtre des Salins in Martigues, the project really took shape when he came into contact with other directors of regional theatres he knew. From then on, the question of leadership arises, and we observe that the project leaders have many of the characteristics of a transformational manager: they are charismatic and capable of inspiring their entourage with sufficient motivation to carry out a project, as shown by the personalization of the entire communication of the Théâtre des Salins, of which this is an example15.

15 [https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x68mnan](https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x68mnan)
Thus, without the actors talking about it directly, **meetings and exchanges** are an integral part of their work but also of their function as cultural project leaders. Presentations of the seasons and shows are made in the form of evening walks\(^{16}\) and Gilles Bouckaert is used to organizing social events to improve attendance at the theatre. **Affinities** play a central role, as shown by the personal dimension of the management of the Train Bleu project, which is based on the friendly relations between the various theatre directors.

These affinities are cultivated in **dedicated cultural places** which are a privileged place for co-creation insofar as they frame interpersonal relationships. The aim is to attract partners to the theatres concerned (as in the Ti Quan Kairotopie\(^{17}\) project). Through the Blue Train project, other places can become the scene of meetings or **places** of individual creation that are **not dedicated**, such as natural sites (creeks of Niolon and La Redonne, among others). For example, the blue train included concerts and poetry recitations in the calanques.

**Organizational level: bringing an organization to life on a territorial scale**

The Train Bleu project is not an organization *per se*, particularly because it comprises several organizations, but its existence depends on the theatre to which it belongs: the Théâtre des Salins in Martigues. There is therefore a management system specific to the theatre itself which is consistent with that of the Train Bleu project. In organizational terms, both the Train Bleu and the Théâtre des Salins directed by Gilles Bouckaert, who is a **transformational leader**. This **leadership as a practice** is based on the director's energy and ability to give meaning to a season and to events as a whole, as shown by the numerous communications in the press and the media in the broad sense. The aim is therefore to attract the public through various actions.

This includes a visit to the regional **public spaces** highlighting the cultural, historical and natural heritage as well as an unusual visit to the theatre: on the one hand the historic buildings, urban spaces, natural sites, etc. and on the other hand, backstage at the Théâtre des Salins (machinery, lighting control, etc.).

The aim of this enhancement of **dedicated cultural places** in the same way as **metropolitan public spaces** is to attract a maximum number of audiences but also to push culture "outside the walls". These events are widely promoted by the Théâtre des Salins with the help of an **IS space** that ensures both overall coherence and communication. If the space of the Théâtre des Salins is determined, the space corresponding to the blue train exists with the help of **collaborative tools** which the members of the organization make little use of: they use a server to exchange files. Finally, all these dynamics are intensively promoted using **digital promotional tools**. The Théâtre des Salins uses its influence to improve its promotional impact, which can be seen on the Theatre's website\(^{18}\) and Facebook page\(^{19}\).

---

\(^{16}\) [https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x7wpauu](https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x7wpauu)

\(^{17}\) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YLLS7hmkzgc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YLLS7hmkzgc)

\(^{18}\) [https://les-salins.net/](https://les-salins.net/)

\(^{19}\) [https://www.facebook.com/TheatredesSalins/](https://www.facebook.com/TheatredesSalins/)
Inter-organizational level: towards a global event

The practices of inter-organizational sociability are found around exchanges between organizations (as illustrated by the original impetus of the Train Bleu project, which was conceived as a network) but also, more broadly, around practices of sharing communication and audiences. This implies practices of formal sociability, notably by extending the network of the Théâtre des Salins to other companies outside the cultural sector (such as transport companies, illustrating a difficult approach 20). The Blue Train must therefore be seen as a continuous process allowing various stakeholders to enter into synergy. Synergies induced by mediation practices enabling different audiences to be taken on board in worlds which may be unusual for them (creeks, Marseilles city center, etc.), this implies:

- The pooling of technical resources, in particular the means of transport which punctuate the various events, but also the skills of technicians;
- Institutionalized network practices that define inter-organizational spaces of co-creation, for example partnerships with transport (bus and train) or catering companies.

In terms of spaces, dedicated cultural places are essential spaces for co-creation: it is there that the different performances take place but also that the actors meet. These co-creation dynamics are also perceptible within non-dedicated places (creeks, cities centers, etc.), they bring other logistical, acoustic, etc. constraints that favor creativity (for example, it is necessary to adapt a concert that is held in a creeks). Such a level of inter-organizational coordination is only possible in the context of the institutionalized and coordinated network that the Blue Train project constitutes, particularly for logistical matters (transport of equipment in particular).

As for the tools, and despite their importance for the promotion of a network (as evidenced by their online prospectus), the Blue Train seems to remain a sensory event: digital tools occupy a marginal place (the project does not have a website, nor a dedicated Facebook page, just an event). The same goes for collaborative tools, which are present but reduced to their most basic function. Finally, the organization of an event of the scale of the Blue Train implies the formalization of a network that will be maintained with a view to the organization of other projects. In terms of co-creation, this project is therefore also a way of formalizing a network of actors. This is done through a multitude of agreements that establish these relationships.

Summary

In the light of the analysis above, we can distinguish three types of co-creation mechanisms: those relating to three-dimensional, two-dimensional and one-dimensional integration. Throughout this synthesis we will focus on the three-dimensional integration mechanisms, as shown in the figure below.

Figure 24. The territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: Resistance Project

The three-dimensional co-creation mechanisms only concern spaces and practices. Sociability practices are the central pivot of co-creation practices, allowing the creation of a link based on common practices that integrate the public into the co-creation dynamic. Three spaces encourage these practices. Dedicated spaces concern individuals, house organizations and bring others into contact. Non-dedicated spaces add an additional constraint that applies at all levels (individual, organizational and inter-organizational). This constraint forces each actor to find new solutions, which proves to be an effective logic of co-creation. Virtual spaces are dedicated to the promotion of a network or to the links between actors in individual terms (via Facebook for example).
Conclusion

The final report of the WP5 (5.3.) will propose to carry out a review of the literature on strategic management proposed in the framework of the WP1 of the COGOV. We feel that the "strategic territorial management" approach invites a "wide mix" between models as it was already revealed by some articles identified in the framework of the French literature review proposed in WP1. Co-creation at the territorial level is an approach which is not part of a top-down logic in France (cf. results observed in the framework of WP6) but rather results from a territorial will, the intensity and implementation of which can vary from one territory to another.
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Project Design

The London Borough of Culture is a flagship policy of the 2018 Cultural Strategy of the Mayor of London, a representative of the left-of-centre Labour party. Waltham Forest, a diverse, historically deprived, Labour-controlled outer London Borough, was selected as the inaugural London Borough of Culture. The London Borough of Culture scheme came with guaranteed funding (£1.35m) with the possibility to lever in more resource. There was a bidding process to become the London Borough of Culture (LBoC).

Waltham Forest is outside the affluent central London core where large, well-funded cultural organizations were traditionally concentrated. However, it has a strong tradition of community-based arts. This includes the E17 Arts Trail, a collation of artistic displays and performances often held in improvised venues and coordinated by Artillery, a small local arts organization.

Waltham Forest was successful in its bid to become London Borough of Culture. The original small internal culture team became part of a new, larger team with new recruits from cultural-sector backgrounds. They included borough residents and also externals, including some with relevant experience with ‘Area of Culture’ projects. This expanded team sat within the Council but was highly outward facing.

The programme had a diversity of ambitions, ranging from driving large-scale economic regeneration to social regeneration through hyperlocal co-created events. Consequently, LBoC offered a ‘mixed economy’ of events. First were so-called ‘hero’ events: large, high-profile events, often featuring well-known performers. Second were commissioned activities: smaller, but still generally run by established cultural organisations. Third were events funded by small grants to both organisations and individuals awarded by a panel of residents. These were complemented by a raft of supplementary activities, including a volunteer scheme and further grants.
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Table 5. The main stakeholders of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actors</th>
<th>Private for-profit actors</th>
<th>Private SSE actors</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture Media and Sport (DCMS)</td>
<td>Ubereats</td>
<td>Local non-profits (e.g., Artillery)</td>
<td>Volunteers and supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Culture (LBoC)</td>
<td>Real estate developers</td>
<td>London based non-profits (e.g., A New Direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest Council, council leadership and ward councillors</td>
<td>One Hoe Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of London and Greater London Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morris Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfolio of territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation

This section interprets this case to identify its wider implications. It draws on the section above, and a more detailed, thick description of the case created by the original case author, but reinterprets them to elaborate practices at individual, organizational and interorganizational levels.

**Individual level: spaces and tools geared towards sociability**

At the individual level, sociability practices have a central place which can be explained by the strong sense of community and mutuality present within Waltham Forest as a cultural territory. Cultural actors emphasised the importance of feelings of affinity and informal contact in selecting and maintaining relationships with collaborators. More successful collaborative work tended to extend beyond dyadic relationships to reticular sociability practices that spanned neighbourhoods or wider. It therefore takes on a territorial meaning. In other words, more successful collaboration was based on skills of personal openness and co-creative permeabilities.

These sociability practices take place in both dedicated and non-dedicated cultural spaces. For instance, the Council created a 'front door' to the programme, known as One Hoe Street. This was a physical location, metres from the Town Hall which hosted cultural events and invited people to drop in and discuss the programme. Equally, cultural events were often hosted in unconventional locations, which could become third spaces. These therefore create contacts between different environments (cultural but also business, institutional, domestic, etc.). Regarding the cultural sector, the role of third spaces is to create bridges between cultural actors and other actors.

Finally, individual virtual promotion spaces have an important function. Promotion was not only important to cultural actors to make themselves visible to current or potential funders, but also to potential audiences and participants. Ironically, this was perhaps most difficult for smaller, more
participative initiatives, for whom it was also more important. One cultural actor noted: 'I think it’s very difficult, in London, when you haven’t got the focus of a town, to let people know what’s happening, unless it’s something massive, across London, and you can do [London Underground] adverts or whatever'. Simultaneously, individuals sometimes utilized these spaces to maintain support networks and contacts. Several interviewees pointed to how something as simple as a group messaging app could help achieve this goal. This is naturally consistent with the importance of carried (or not) digital tools (smartphones, tablets, etc.).

Organizational level: space as a central linchpin

At the organizational level, LBoC involved making cultural spaces operational. This dynamic extended to public spaces, for example a concert from the trees organized in public parks. These spaces of cultural organization aimed to fit better into inhabitants’ lives. Council staff hoped creating cultural events there would reach a greater range of people, to whom the traditional 'designated [cultural] spaces...may not be affordable or may not feel particularly like it’s for them'. By involving a wider set of people in these activities, they hoped to improve social cohesion: they wanted 'people in Waltham Forest to feel part of something other than just the family inside their door or something like that; to be part of a sense of community'.

At this level, organizations mobilize material (fixed and mobile terminals, concert equipment, etc.) or immaterial collaborative tools (social media groups, etc.). We can conceptualise an organization as a space defined by action means and actors coordinated by shared tools. This must be supplemented by digital tools for organizational promotion. Indeed, if an organization is first and foremost embodied by the structure of its networks, it also exists through visibility on social networks, whether through referencing sites, a Facebook page or others. It is precisely the coordination that structures the promotion and dissemination that ensures visibility and gives an existence, even ephemeral, to the organization. In the case of Waltham Forest LBoC, social media groups and an extensive YouTube presence were important digital promotional tools.

Inter-organizational level: towards fixing networks

At an inter-organizational level, social exchanges are at the centre of practices. Social exchanges are the crucible of any inter-organizational practice. Personal affinities are the central key for any partnerships between actors. In the LBoC case, individual links, particularly those driven by personal affinities, were important to forming relationships. These could support improved interorganizational working, but positive attitudes towards one organizational member did not always imply positive orientations towards their organization. For instance, stakeholders sometimes perceived individual Council staff they worked with much more favourably than 'The Council' as an entity. It should be noted that these dynamics go far beyond the cultural sector, particularly with regard to events located in public spaces (park, street, etc.) which involve other actors. It is also through these inter-organizational links that partnerships are formed.
These can support mediation practices which occupy an important place given the programme espoused an aim to create links between populations. This takes the form of more or less formal partnerships which aimed to broaden access to, or participation in, funded cultural offerings. Some of these involved the organization of workshops of artistic practices or awareness. These dynamics are also based on formal protocol sociability practices, such as attendance at events, or the sending of newsletters. In the case of Waltham Forest, protocol is an indispensable practice situated between formal and informal practices. With staff observing that the programme's hurried timescales made it feel like a 'voyage of discovery', such practices arguably provided important fixed waypoints.

In general, this fixation of networks and sociability practices also finds its application within institutional network spaces: this represents a space that is both physical and virtual:

- Physical: any institutionalization depends on meeting spaces.
- Virtual: the actors are categorized in relation to their field of activity, their degree of involvement and the nature of the organization concerned.

In Waltham Forest, such dynamics took place in spaces dedicated and non-dedicated to culture. Let us start with the dedicated spaces: as we have seen, LBoC involved populating both traditional and non-traditional cultural spaces. From this perspective, any dynamic of co-creation is based on the animation of spaces dedicated in terms of sociability in addition to their primary cultural mission. Non-dedicated spaces also give more space to affinity links. In general terms, culture in non-dedicated spaces can be a powerful lever for social cohesion. In Waltham Forest, hero events – often in public spaces – were intended to welcome a wide range of residents. However, it should be noted that attendees tended to overrepresent those describing themselves as 'white British/Irish' relative to the population as a whole (Waltham Forest Council, 2020, p.144).

Collaborative tools, such as the resident panels involved in allocating grants, were among the tools involved in pursuing social cohesion and the programme's other aims. There were also more formal tools such as Gantt charts (a type of project plan) used to operationalize initiatives. Alongside these were formal devices used to cement the terms of relationships, such as contracts or agreements. In some instances, these various tools can be seen to play a role in creating cohesion among the groups involved. For instance, the distribution of grants was sometimes accompanied by regular support activities open to recipients: we encountered some evidence this helped foster longer-term links among groups involved.
Summary: from informal contacts to co-creation institutionalization

According all the strategic ingredients, the inter-organizational dimension is the most important for cultural co-creation in the case. The stakeholders involved sometimes moved from informal, sometimes individual encounters to inter-organizational agreed contacts.

Figure 25. The territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation: Waltham Forest

The only three-dimensional territorial governance mechanisms of co-creation concern spaces dedicated to culture. Deliberate efforts were made to create 'open' spaces like One Hoe Street in which both 'the ills and the merits of Borough of Culture [can be] discussed'. Spaces dedicated to culture can also be both organizational and inter-organizational co-creation spaces as they generate all kinds of encounters. Their creation can therefore have a positive impact on all these mechanisms.
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