

Organizational Structure and the Brazilian Government Actions for the Creative Territories Development¹

Magnus Luiz Emmendoerfer²

Alexandre Abrantes Sette Fioravante³

Paper to the 2th International Conference on Public Policy, Milan, July 2015⁴

Paper: 6,602 words

References: 522 words

Abstract/key-words: 256 words

Footnotes/Endnotes: 318 words

Total length: 7,653 words

¹ **Acknowledgements** – The Brazilian National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq) supplied funding for this research (Process: 474053/2013-0). Also, the first author thanks CAPES Foundation, Ministry of Education of Brazil, for the post-doctoral research fellowship (CAPES Process: BEX-1254/14-6).

² Professor at Federal University of Viçosa, Department of Administration and Accounting, Leader in the Research Group on Management & Development of Creative Territories, DAD/CCH, Av. P.H. Rolfs, s/n. Campus Universitário, CEP 36570-000, Viçosa, MG, Brazil, magnus@ufv.br E-mail: magnus@ufv.br. Endereço postal: UFV - DAD, CEP 36570-000, Viçosa, MG, Brasil.

³ Professor at SENAC São Paulo. Doctoral student at University of Campinas (UNICAMP). Member in the Research Group on Management & Development of Creative Territories. E-mail: alexandresettefioravante@gmail.com

⁴ This is entirely a work in progress – questions about it, proposed improvements to it, and the identification of problems with it will be gratefully received. Feel free to quote or reference it in this form even if it will be rewritten at a later date. My thanks to Joaquim Filipe Esteves Ferraz de Araujo, Universidade do Minho, Portugal, for your comments on an earlier version of this paper: responsibility for its current contents remains with us.

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to analyze the organizational structure and the actions promoted by the Brazilian Federal Government for the development of territories through the Creative Economy. In Brazil, the creation and the development of creative territories is part of a National State culture public policy. The framework of the analysis covers the period beginning in 2011, the year that the Secretariat of Creative Economy in Brazil was created and the launch of the national plan guidelines for the development of this sector until the year 2014, when it finalized the first three years of work and structuring actions focused on the national creative field. As methods, bibliographical and documentary researches were applied and in a complementary manner, in-depth interviews targeting the actions of the Ministry of Culture were essentially performed, which obtained data using the thematic content analysis technique. It was found that the Brazilian government has recognized the potential multiplier embedded in the creative segments, actively positioning itself through the formulation and implementation of recent policies, transversely structured between the spheres of government. However, after three years since the establishment of the Secretariat, it is now evident that a structural organization still incipient to foster creative sectors in Brazil, in which dispersed advancements have been perceived. It is worth noting that there is much discussion around the concept of the creative economy to be worked nationally, this is important, but the discussion needs to go beyond the conceptual and gain a practical field.

Key-words: public policies; creative economy; culture sector; public management.

1. Introduction

On the last 20 years, creative economy has been highlighted and fostered in international public agenda as in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (Unctad, 2012) and at United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco, 2013), in public policies, and national development plan of several countries (Cunningham, 2009; Madeira, 2014), having culture and creativity's indication and articulation as contributive resources to local and regional development (Furtado, 1981; Florida, 2011). These resources has enabled to employ an intelligent expertise aiming to make those territories more attractive in cultural, social, economic terms, through the possibility of generating new and innovative jobs, products, and services opportunities; as well as helping to create new abilities and skills.

Creative economy amalgamates sectors of which resources are renewed and multiplied as they are used; they are, therefore, an activity of strong economic performance and social interaction, environmentally correct and it strengthen values, differences, and companies and communities credibility. According to Unctad (2012), creative economy is responsible for more than 10% of global GDP, and creative services and products grow in average rate of 8.7%, four times more than commodities' industry.

The Creative Economy Report 2010, published by Unctad (2012) highlights the need of dedicating growing importance to segments of the creative economy, due to its socio-economic return, which are significant in global and local scale on differentiated territories' constitution, they are also called as creative.

To leverage this thriving growth and development strategy based on creative sectors, it has been important to formulate policies not limited to "classical" cultural policies perspectives, focusing on the fostering, distribution, and on consumption, essentially, in material of cultural, artistic, and intellectual goods (Mulcahy, 2006). On

the context of creative economy, public policies could, hence, focus in organizing and inserting cultural goods and services beyond the classical activities, in such a way that national economy could be more dynamic with products and experiences of high added value, through immaterial work of different (and new) professional occupations, valuing cultural diversity.

Focusing on public policies on the creative economy context has been visible (Madeira, 2014) in countries like Australia, United Kingdom, the United States, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, South Africa, India, and China have indicated economic growth allied to sustained development, through job and income generation in creative industries.

However, despite being one BRIC's countries and having a recognized international image due to its diversity, creativity's input (De Marchi, 2014), Brazil is not mentioned on the list of the main creative goods and services' producers and exporters, even with its contribution around US\$ 33 billion or 2.84% of its GDP in 2010 (Brasil, 2011). Faced with it, the question is: why?

That is this paper's challenge, starting from the assumption that Brazil has, oppositely of what happens on the worldwide scenario, a recent institutionalization of the creative economy. Although, there is mounting evidence that governmental actions in local, regional, and national level directed to creative sectors on the last 35 years. It is valid to reinforce that this paper will focus on governmental actions to creative territory development lately in Brazil, hereby understood as the last 12 years (from 2003 to 2014), and led by Labor Party called *Partido dos Trabalhadores* (PT).

On this context is relevant to investigate those actions configurations in developing countries from Latin America such as Brazil, in order to understand how the government has taken a stand to promote national development of creative economy.

Thereby, the objective is assessing the organizational structure and the actions promoted by the Brazilian federal government towards creative territories' development.

There is a set of approaches and concepts about both the terminology territory and territorial development (Pecqueur, 2004). On the other hand, there are not debates of what is territory development based on creativity or, as we are going to address in this paper, creative territories. Whence, two propositions were adopted aiming to make this paper's reading and discussion even more instigating, starting from a study about Brazil, which is likely to be object of future surveys of compared perspective with other countries: 1) emphasis on creative economy development is more city-centered or in municipalities grouping; 2) there is no broad nor any adequate definition of what is creative territories, that can be discussed and applied on the empirical context of culture and economy public policies.

2. Methodological procedures

It is interesting on this study to focus on creative territories, since they are recognized, due to State's intervention, as *loci* spaces directed to creation, production, trade, creative activity flow, thus, it is one of the expected outcomes of public policies to creative economy development.

On this sense, this study has two analytical foundations extracted essentially from a bibliographic databank (books, theses, and papers from journals) and governmental documentation (acts, action plan, norms, minutes, projects, and agendas) of public domain, cited on the references of this paper. To complement and understand the government actions being studied, a profound interview was carried out, having no structured script, and been led in an informal way with two active professionals on the

federal and state government on the fields of culture, tourism, and creative economy, in order to collect data about the object in analysis. The accessibility and typicality of the interviewees were fundamental to their participation on the survey, since these women have more than 30 years of experience on the sector, besides their intertwined work to creative economy. Furthermore, those people interviewed act on the governmental sphere of culture, showing themselves as key players to the understanding and validation of the actions indicated by the federal government.

All of the data collected was analyzed through content analysis (Bardin, 2013), specifically by the thematic technical analysis, allowing titles and subsequent topic content to be composed, in terms of description, analysis, and reflection regarding organizational structuring and governmental actions to creative territories' development.

3. The Creative Economy's Institutionalization and Territory Development in Brazil.

The Brazilian federal government by the Ministry of Culture (MinC) led the organizing structure to the creative economy development. Throughout 2003 and 2010 initiatives and discussions to place on the ambit of public policies culminating in a favorable environment (De Marchi, 2014; Madeira, 2014) so that culture's policy would have a national character in a more participative and ample manner.

By the State initiative, the dialogue among the three government level (municipal, state, and federal) was retaken in Brazil and civil society, through the first National Culture Conference, in 2005 and 2010 respectively. It is valid to mention that international bodies as Unctad, cultural organization of the third sector, and Brazilian universities took stands on the dialogues (conferences, forums, seminars, public interest

meetings) on this period in order to stimulate and to debate the theme “Creative Industries and Economy”, in big cities Brazilian urban centers, mainly on the Northeast and Southeast regions. The first book organized and published with academic researchers’ viewpoint about different regions in Brazil, this was the topic of “*Indústrias Criativas no Brasil*” a work organized by Bendassolli, Wood Jr., Kirschbaum and Cunha (2009), containing different cases of creative sectors existing in the Brazilian national territory.

It is valid to highlight that the public conferences organized by the State also occurred in local and regional levels; moreover, they were the base for institutionalization of the National Culture Plan (Plano Nacional de Cultura-PNC-In Portuguese), Federal Law number 12.343/2010, and to the monitoring of culture public policies from 2011-2020. Besides, according to Madeira (2014, p.194), it was the first time the term “creative economy” was ever mentioned in a governmental national plan as an inducing axis, starting from the establishment of goals, a development strategy, associated to elements as “culture financing, productive chain sustainability, and jobs and income generation”.

Thereby, culture has become a State policy, enabling the planning of the Secretariat of Creative Economy – SCE (*Secretaria da Economia Criativa – SEC*, in Portuguese) in 2011, being institutionalized by the Decree number 7.743/2012, as a MinC’s body and the main responsible by the fostering and following up of the creative sectors in Brazil. Such responsibility is associated to the National Culture Plan’s strategy (NCP) aiming to “amplify culture participation on the sustainable socio-economic development” (Brasil, 2013b, p.7).

It is valid to mention that on the XX century, mainly after the 30’s, important events and legal frameworks took place toward culture institutionalization through public policies in Brazil. Hence, such discussion will not be retaken in this paper, since the governmental actions evidence toward national development of creative public economy

in Brazil, were only approached on the XXI century. Furthermore, there are studies dedicated with adequacy to the evolution of cultural policies in Brazil as Calabre (2009) e De Marchi (2014) works.

In their reflections about culture and creativity, Furtado (1981) wanted to Foster Brazilian creative processes as a strategy to overcome underdevelopment. Furtado (1981) pointed out actions to assure development that would be translated in culture's enriching in all of its dimensions, having creativity as a way of preserving identity. This theoretical framework was one of the main guidelines from SCE, including its governmental plan, focusing to develop creative territories on the cultural arena. SCE's Institutionalization and its action plan signalized in a expressive way to the Brazilian society, a more anthropological notion of conceiving and coping with culture from the citizen, symbolic, and economic dimensions.

This demanded from SCE in Brazil, the non-reproduction of international creative economy concepts happening in countries possessing divergent political, economic, cultural, and social realities. The Creative Economy foundations in Brazil were guided by social inclusion, sustainability, innovation, and cultural diversity principles (Brasil, 2011).

On SCE's perspective, a simple translation of creative economy from English speaking countries was feared, since lots of times there are semantic misunderstandings due to cultural differences, mainly if the common association made in Brazil between "industry" and high scale production activities, massified, and serialized. Then, to conceptual definition of what is "*The Authentic Creative Economy Made in Brazil*" to propose public policies, federal government adopted the term "creative sectors", as representative of diverse organizations acting in sector groups, called as "fields", instead of creative industries (Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005).

The creative economy in Brazil (2011), therefore, is composed by five fields: (1) property: material and/or immaterial property, archives, and museums; (2) cultural expressions: handcraft, popular, Brazilian native, and afro-Brazilian cultures, visual and digital arts; (3) spectacle arts: dance, music, circus, and theater; (4) audiovisual, book, reading, and literature: cinema and video, publishing, and printed media; and (5) cultural and functional creations: fashion, design, and architecture.

All of these economic sectors would be the initial reference base to denomination, articulation, and development of creative territories in Brazil. It is valid to emphasize that these sectors are included on the creative economy field because in their activities, individuals in their occupations have creativity as the base of the creative process of their services being embedded on the symbolic dimension, which the value is aggregated by the consumers, on the contrary of other business areas that insert in their products, key elements such as preferences, life style, status quo, consumption standard, among others.

Thus, goods and services originated from productive sectors from in the creative economy are not valued exclusively by its materiality and practical usage, existing in commodities and industrial products of low aggregated value. Thereby, creativity and culture turned to be important elements (Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005) on the establishment of commercial affairs, competition, and global socio-economy insertion, in need to be planned in a territorial development plan.

Moreover, Brazilian position on creative economy encompasses, beyond creative industries, the relationship and impact of its goods and services in other sectors and processes and the connection established among them (Hartley, 2005), provoking and embodying deep social, organizational, and educational changes when elaborating and managing culture public policies.

On this sense, SCE's plan (2011-2014) forebodes a Creative Brazil in which it was elaborated based on two drivers or central vectors, so that the governmental action could execute its 16 skills, that will be mentioned here as objectives of this public organization. Having one macroeconomic vector (directed to structuring, development, and monitoring) of creative economy, and another microeconomic vector (directed to entrepreneurship, management, and innovation).

According to SCE's Management Report (Brasil, 2013b, p.20-21), the macroeconomic vector has axis of action aiming to generate conditions to the creative economy to be developed, involving "institutionalization processes of creative territories [districts, productive regions, cities, and creative basins], articulation and performance of studies and researches, beyond the debate's promotion and of the elaboration of adequacy proposals of legal frameworks". Acting axis of the microeconomic vector are directed to the "fostering of incubators and services bureaus, financing to creative and innovative skills training, and support to formation of collective chains" of professional on the creative sectors.

Out of the 16 goals concerning to SCE on the creative economy development, there is one which aimed to Foster "identification, creation and development of regions, cities, and creative territories to generate and potentialize new investments, jobs, and income on the creative sectors". It is observed that this goal is a synthesis integrating the two central vectors of governmental action in Brazil.

In order to make CNP's (Culture National Plan – *Plano Nacional de Cultura*, in Portuguese) strategies feasible, as well as action vectors operation and action axes toward creative economy development, federal government passed the Ministry of Culture's Internal Norm and its executive bodies (Directory number 40, April 30, 2013, published

in May 06, 2013) in which the skills were predicted, the organizing structure and the directors attributions, besides positions tied to SCE.

SCE's organizing structure was organized based on central action vectors, composed by 17 work units, and divided in 3 hierarchic levels. On this structure, the Directory encharged by the macroeconomic vector was composed by two General Coordinations. One is the Action Structuring General Coordination, which had 8 main tasks, two of them are directly related to creative territories, and they can be summarized by the scope of identifying, planning, and supervising program and projects "promoting the creation and development of existing creative territories or that could be optimized to the development of creative investments" (Brasil, 2013b, p.15).

In order to operate this task, there is a work unit under its supervision called Creative Territory Coordination, responsible for stimulus activities to creative territories' institutionalization, and worked as follow up of its institutionalized chain by the Ministry of Culture.

The other General Coordination was the Integrated Project Development one, responsible for planning management, SCE's budget, and for the elaboration of convene instruments and program articulation, and transversal projects with other SCE units. These articulation instruments also aimed to involve external SCE's organizations, as financial institutions, public companies, "S"ⁱ Systems organization, and research and creation agencies, aiming to obtain shared financing of the public actions.

4. Organizational structure and governmental actions to creative territory development in Brazil

Due to the needed transversality actions to the creative economy development in Brazil, SCE's organizing structure used to have certain autonomy, requiring partnerships, intersectorial articulation, and actions integrated to planning of other governmental and international bodies (Madeira, 2014) so that the results toward a Creative Brazil would be attainable from 2011 to 2020.

SCE's plan (Brasil, 2011) in international level predicts partnership with organizations such as Unesco, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), and Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI), focusing on education, management, studies, creative economy creation. On the representation level and national acting, contemplates partnership on the federal government to policies execution and those public actions integrated with four secretariats related to the Republic Presidency (strategic issues, social communication, policies to women, and micro and small-sized companies) and with 14 out of the 24 existing ministry, those are: Ministry of Social Development – MSD; Ministry of Labor and Job – MLJ; Ministry of Education – MEC; Ministry of Sports – MS; Ministry of Industry Development and International Trade – MIDIT; Ministry of Science and Technology – MST; Ministry of International Affairs – MAF; Ministry of Communications – MC; Ministry of the Cities – MCities; Ministry of Tourism – Mtur; Ministry of Environment – ME; Ministry of Justice – MJ; Ministry of Agricultural Development – MAD; Ministry of National Reserve; MNR (Brasil, 2011, p. 56-57).

Specifically to make it feasible the focused axis on the creative territory development, SCE's plan pointed out the articulation need, and governmental partnership with 6 ministries, according to Chart 01.

Chart 01 – Ministry partnerships and governmental action to creative territories' development in Brazil.

Ministry Partners	Actions
Sports	Qualification of the territories actions development on the World Cup and Olympics host cities
Industry Development and International Trade	Identification and creation of Local Productive Arrangements of creative sectors; Mapping of regional vocations on the World Cup host cities and spaces qualification via urban design
Science and Technology	Creative territories institutionalization articulated with Intelligent Cities Project
Communications	National Broadband Plan Implementation on the sense of qualifying infrastructure of the creative territories; Creative territories institutionalization articulated with Digital Cities' project.
Cities	Articulating creative territories' institutionalization
Tourism	In convergence with Communitarian Tourism and Tourism Cities projects, articulating and promoting creative territories' institutionalization.

Source: Elaborated by the author with data collected from (Brasil, 2011).

It is important to mention that all of the partnerships were pointed out not only to make it SCE's feasible, but also to help on the 53 NCP (2011-2020) goals' achievements. From them, 16 goals are toward creative economy development (Brasil, 2013a) and they are pointed out at the NCP's webpage (<http://pnc.culturadigital.br/tema/economia-criativa/>). Anybody in Brazil or abroad may follow up government actions on culture via this webpage, which is periodically updated by MinC, allowing one to know all of the goals (current situation and action outcomes of the actions coordinated by the federal government along with partners) to culture development in Brazil.

There is NCP goal of which is exclusively to creative territories, so the Federal government searches "recognizing 110 territories with requirements to be qualified as creative ones". It is seen that this goal is related to the macroeconomic action axis of

SCE's plan. On the document "The goals to the National Culture Plan" this goal is mentioned creative territories' definition adopted by MinC (Brasil, 2013a, p.40-41, **our emphasis**):

Creative territories are districts, cities, or regions presenting creative cultural potential capable to promote integral and sustainable development, allying preservation and promotion of their environmental and cultural values. [...] creative economy is the strategic and dynamic sector, as much on the economic as on the social perspective: their activities generate works, jobs, income, and social inclusion. **A territory is legitimated by the Ministry of Culture (MinC) as creative territory via a certification (label)**. Having that, a governance system can be created with public authority and civil society participation. After this recognition, MinC will give resources to those development plan formulation having creative economy as strategy.

It is observed that Brazil has adopted by the first time a more comprehensive definition of the creative territories in terms of territorial scale level, encompassing districts, cities, and regions as spaces to creative economy development. This definition is broader than the one of Unesco (2013), which defines creative economy center in the cities; or rather, Unesco does not used creative territories term, only the expression "creative cities".

Despite the comprehensiveness demonstrated on the creative territories definition made by the Federal government in Brazil is limited, since it encompasses few types of territories that can developed on the creative economy context. Corroborating with Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), it would be more adequate in public policies of

creative territories' development to contemplate diverse scale levels existing on politics of territorial order of each country, as a manner of respect to diversity of the existing socio-cultural capital on these spaces.

To Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), There are three creative territories levels that contemplate different spaces: 1) micro-territorial (street, avenue, district, village, neighborhood); 2) meso-territorial (district's grouping, borough, cities, and municipalities); and 3) macro-territorial (districts' grouping, councilor groups, regions, provinces, and states) Thereby, when considering this scale diversity to creative territory definition, it would be avoided the risk of being technically inaccurate and possibly exaggerated, when institutionalizing a municipality as a creative city starting from a territory with small dimension as a district, which possess structural requirements qualified as creative. This practice happens when on Unesco's context a city is designated as creative.

When analyzing the current situation of this goal and how it is measured on NCP' webpage (Brasil, 2015), it is observed a MinC inclination in identifying creative territories, via a macro-territorial scale, based on the "amount of basins and creative cities recognized by the Ministry of Culture after 2011". To fulfill this goal, MinC still recognizes that more than articulation with federal ambit with the ministries, specially, the Ministry of the Development (MSD) and the Ministry of International Trade (MITID), and the Ministry of the Cities (MCities), it is necessary:

[...] that **convenes are made altogether with municipal and state governments, academic institutions [and financial], civil society, labor and patron entities' representation, among others, to identify and recognize creative territories** (Brasil, 2013b, p. 41, **our emphasis**).

These articulations and partnerships treated as convene by MinC (Brasil, 2011, p.68) aim to create creative poles (array of creative investments geographically close to each other and subscribed in a territory of small dimension) and creative basins (geographical basins formed by diverse territories with common cultural identity), reiterating the emphasis in a development of the creative economy in a macro-territorial scale (Emmendoerfer and Ashton, 2014).

Nonetheless, MinC has up to now pointing out its NCP webpage on the Internet (Brasil, 2015) “is elaborating the methodology to the identification and creative territories recognition”, what certainly depends on the amplification of the Brazilian databank on information about creative fields and about the cultural sector as a whole. This is an antique critical point on the country, affecting directly the formulation and implementation of public policies to culture. So, there was neither any creative territory institutionalized nor disclosed by the Brazilian federal government until 2014, despite of the fact that two cities on the South region of Brazil, conquered on that year, Unesco’s Creative City designation (2015), those are: Curitiba – the capital of design, and Florianópolis – the capital of the gastronomy.

It is valid to mention that it is indicated on NCP economic dimension (Brasil, 2013a, p.20) that in 2020, it is expected “that lots of creative territories will have been recognized and the local cultural production will have support to its economic sustainability”. However, this recognition a priori is not happening by the federal government stimulus, but via global bodies as Unesco (2015). As it is also valid to mention the insertion in 2014 of two Brazilian municipalities at Unesco creative city network may make the Brazilian Network of Creative Cities – BNCC (*Rede Brasileira*

de Cidades Criativas - RBCC – in Portuguese) constitution in something indicated to the expected outcome at SCE's plan (Brasil, 2011, p.68).

All of this articulation move can be seen in actions and policies fostered by MinC via SCE of which was complemented with National Observatory of Creative Economy – NOCE (*Observatório Brasileiro de Economia Criativa - OBEC* – in Portuguese) institutionalization and on Creative Bureau.

MinC instituted the National Observatory of Creative Economy – NOCE of which institutes an instrument of quantitative and qualitative information production and diffusion on Brazilian creative economy. This Observatory predicts partnerships with regional research institutes and universities aiming to produce information, knowledge about experiences and local, regional, and national creative economy experiments. NOCE's creation reveals the overcoming attempt one of the biggest problems investments on this sector face, which is information and data absence, and produced and systemized analyses.

To articulate federal along with state and municipal levels, Creative Bureau was created. The initiative consists on fixed offices implementation and/or itinerant ones directed to care and support professionals and entrepreneurs, aiming to promote and strengthening productive arrangements and chains on the Brazilian creative sectors. States in which Creative Bureau implementation took place a set of imposed demands made by the Ministry of Culture toward the physical structure implementation to its operation. This space features consist in:

[...] having a place where an auditorium could exist [...] to promote training courses, having a cyber café where the creative entrepreneur could have conviviality with others and use Internet process, with meeting rooms so people could develop

their works in this space of creative economy, having part of the computers used to think about public notice, **hence a set of commitments that the states has to fulfill to obtain, then, the creative. [...] the project also works with the consultancy part, so that the creative entrepreneur search on this space their demands**, such as elaborating cultural project, then, creative bureau will have a determined number of courses to offer so the project's elaboration may happen [...] there is a set of cultural artistic demand where they do not know where to search [...] Individual starts to have a support and auxiliary place. That's why one of creative bureau's intention is to create a set of action to be performed, which is why **creative economy observatory** was created by the ministry [...] because **one of the creative bureau's action is mapping who they are, who we are**, as we are going to deal with a public that we have no idea of their amount, where they are located, and they work. (verbal information, **our emphasis**).

Creative Bureaus translate a sort of public policies promoted by the federal Government, aiming to reach new state and municipal governments through partnerships. In 2014, Creative Bureaus in state level were working in 13 out of the 27 Brazilian states, and they become renowned as incubators, forming Creative Brazil Incubators' Network (<http://culturadigital.br/brasilcriativo/>).

It is observed in spite of this structuring policy comes from federal government it was not imposed (Sabatier, 1986; Secchi, 2013), and it is adapted on the regional interests and peculiarities, giving this initiative a differential factor:

[...] the ministry clarify that **it does not bring a ready product, the bureau creative of each state is going to be constituted in accordance with each state's need** [...]. The process of creative economy passes by a total systemic vision (...) on this process there is a huge need of being organized in such a way that cultures allied to technology and innovation may become creativity's pillars [...]. **It would be easy to the secretariat of creative economy to create a model and send it to the states, every state has its manner, though** [...] **these actions been promoted has to do with state's voting as well as state vocation** [...] that creative economy came to treat all of differences differently, she illustrates it very well [...] **"it wouldn't help to receive it all closes, because it is not closed"** [...]. (Verbal information, **our emphasis**)

Planned public events organization, institutionally organization (among ministries and bodies), intersectors (creative sectors), and generators of non-imposed policies is one of the crucial action instruments as Barbosa mentions (2011). These organized interventions allow strategic investments realization by public and private agents, valuing and developing institutions, equipments, and human resources.

This articulation between federal government on Brazilian states and municipalities to stimulate, raising and organizing data about creative economy context in Brazil on the period from 2011 to 2013, with organizing structure and SCE's publishing contributed to an ambit creation, culminating on the production of an intersector socio-economic development plan called Brazil Creative Plan, contemplating something beyond creative incubators.

Brazil Creative Plan mentioned by De Marchi (2014) and Madeira (2014) was not even launched and implemented, but it was elaborated with the scope of being an

integrated development plan between the social projects of the federal government, executed since 2003, with an industrial development proposal in Brazil to the new presidency tenure (2015-2018).

The question is how long this creative economy shadowing is going to take on federal government's stand, in which is observed including on social media and on MinC's webpage, having little published data about SCE and its actions that were in execution because of Culture National Plan (2011-2020). Furthermore, up to now, no SCE's management plan was disclosed (2015-2018). Such remarks are relevant because SCE was a dialogic locus and of intense information exchange from 2011 to 2013, provoking according to Chapman (2002), multiple collective and institutional lessons regarding culture and creativity, as well as about the way of formulating and implementing culture public policies, with society's participation and diverse sectors' agents of cultural and creativity in national and international levels.

5. Reflections about culture public policies on the creative territories' development context

Despite the existence of few studies concerning public policies and creative economy in Brazil and Latin America, it can be expected that all of this federal government movement to foster on this area, in spite of being less intense at the moment, it may stimulate several studies on culture public policies, involving institutions, chains, and ideas to the next years.

On the organizing structure exhibit and on the governmental actions to creative territories' development in Brazil, it is observed existing evidence of congruence in terms of territorial scale employed as much by Brazilian federal government as by Unesco. Such

congruence shows the analysis compared likelihood about creative sector development in different cities around the world. On the other hand, the challenge generates challenge to the population and local government managers in cities outside metropolitan regions, of analyzing creative economy's possibilities in their municipal directive plan and on territorial development.

On this sense, considering the limitation showed in this paper about the creative territory notions, based on Emmendoerfer & Ashton (2014), it was opted in contributing with this terminology debate in order to amplify the understanding regarding creative territories. Thereby, it is proposed that the creative territories should be perceived as multi-scale spaces, constructed out of a formative process adopted by a group of people in a determined time, aiming to offer authentic and singular cultural products, resulting from dynamic and creative actions, these are attractive and valued mainly by its subjective interpretation of a (co)created meaning by their inhabitants and by travelers experiencing these products on these spaces.

Thus, a creative territory, is potentially competitive, being able to promote good quality of life levels, cooperating to welfare elevation of its population, in such a way that this is entailed from the sustainable development, being able to encompass all of its dimensions – economic, social, environmental, and cultural. Cultural dimension mains due to its diversity is very peculiar and demands, hence, cultural policies beyond the traditional ones, but also new cultural policies, more adequate and aligned with each territories' reality.

New cultural policies work supporting cultural and creative companies, articulating subsidy and incentives with co-financing mechanism (private and public), stimulating culture's usage as a regional identity element and a factor on territorial base competitive differentiation.

On this sense, creative territory is the space in which people are capable of stimulating and attracting talents, respect, and innovate from diversity and enabling conditions so that economic value may be aggregated. Such value allows business generation and stimulates connections among social actors, as governments, entrepreneurs and businesspeople, institutions, schools and universities, making it possible to develop a structure that can be called as intelligent, bringing benefits and opportunities to all with more equality. When uniting the tangible and intangible, the creative territory enables a policy to development, making use of cultural and creative sectors, to generate jobs, income, and social inclusion, favoring territorial sustainable development.

According to Delgado, Bonnal, and Leite (2007), the issue of territorial development is tied up to the way the State acts on the national space, which means, how public policies are articulated in every organization's administrative scale. With the discussion of the data performed in this article, it was observed on the Brazilian case that the State's importance of not being absent so that social development could receive its deserved attention and not only creative economic sectors.

It was observed in Brazil, transversal governmental actions, needing a dialogue to avoid duplicity or action diffusions in short term, being MinC a national policies development hub (De Marchi, 2014). MinC's articulation via SCE with different government sectors reveals changes on the creative economy recognition as a means of territorial innovation. Then, it is necessary to stimulate creative economy investments.

Excepting the fundamental education public policy, federal government authority's concentration characterize federative relations on the federative affairs on politics management, since it is the government duty to be the main financier, as well as creating guidelines, and coordination with inter-governmental affairs. The management

format concentrating authority on the federal government presents advantages to coordinate public policies targets on national territory, since it permits reducing the risk that different governmental levels impose conflict among programs and implementation cost's raise, which the occurrence is more likely in Federative States (Weaver and Rockman, 1993). Nonetheless, talking about creative economy, thematic involving a very singular aspect with regional specific traits, those action axes combining interdependence and autonomy of sub-national units to federal sphere should be followed. Thus, top-down public policies on the creative economy context would not lead to any positive effects wished through time. This a relevant evidence for a multi-level public governance in this context.

On this perspective is important to highlight one of the greatest challenges to foster creative economy on developing country is the articulation of a social, economic, and political pact with civil society. It is up to the government guidelines to inter-governing (Radin, 2010) creative economy in different territories in Brazil, requiring according to Madeira (2014), the aligning of the sector policies, the institution of regulatory and juridical framework sustaining creative economy and active participation in international negotiations, fostering an environment that could recognize creativity's economic value, beyond a presidential political term, into something that was being constructed by SCE in MinC, on the period from 2011 to 2013 in Brazil.

Becoming relevant; thus, on the perspectives of local development generated by creativity foster via cognitive and cultural diversity, creating individual and collective investments. Fostering income generation out of creativity, of which potential is as business usually neglected, it is fundamental to the world and Brazilian economy once that it is established progressively job position's saturation on the manufacturing and conventional industry, and run out of such traditional forms of income generation.

Even with the existing cultural diversity and creative potential in Brazil, the country still lacks public policies of fostering on this field on municipalities, thereby; the institutionalization of the Secretariat of Creative Economy (SCE) at the Ministry of Culture inserted the theme linked with culture on the country governmental agenda, repositioning culture as an important axis to be developed by the Brazilian state. SCE's creation represents a important step, since the document ritualizes and inaugurates on the federal government MinC's commitment, as well as a register to new politics leaderships, in dialoguing with people inserted and interested on creative sectors, aiming to formulate, implementing, and monitoring public policies towards a new development. These things according Gray and Wingfield (2011) it is representing the new value of the Governmental Culture Departments in Brazilian case.

6. Conclusions

Creative economy institutionalization process via the Secretariat of Creative Economy (SCE) symbolizes a differential of the Brazilian government to achieve territorial development, evinced by the transversality of their policies and actions with public organizations and society. This is a institutional framework to transpose cultural and creative dimension of the ideological plan to practical dimension in terms of territorial development. This generates expectation of a possible Creative Brazil plan retake, even with shadowing evidence by MinC itself, a visible inclination to slow down SCE's actions and information since 2014, something that can be observed in its governmental website (<http://www.cultura.gov.br/secretaria-da-economia-criativa-sec>).

Regardless of the emerge and likely, but not wished, SCE's action reduction, it is agreed with Madeira (2014, p.263) that creative economy institutionalization in Brazil is

still “very recent to predict scaffoldings and possible outcomes, what should not impair affected public bodies to incorporate them in their policies and action lines”. It is also agreed with De Marchi’s stand (2014) that the Brazilian governors bring culture from the margin to the center of the political and economy thought, but not all of them are prepared, or rather, want to be prepared to this new way of conceiving culture in Brazil.

Fostering actions of creative economy in Brazil can be seen as a form of culture and creativity valuing of the individuals and not as actions that can lead to cultural essence loss. On the contrary, it is observed this new dynamic is searching to allow conditions so that culture and creativity could be sustained and permit, then, territories development, through local artistic and popular vocations.

The Secretariat of the Creative Economy, NOCE and Creative Bureau Institutionalizations reveal structuring a context development of creative economy in Brazil, more complex, transcending public organizations’ structure creation. Those are evidence that the Brazilian government has multiplier recognized potential embedded on creative segments, being positioned in an active way on this context. On this sense, it is highlighted that policies formulation and implementation on this area are not characterized by an imposing and standardized model, but are rather by flexibility on the characteristics and peculiarities of the creative economy of each location or region in every state in Brazil.

Thereby, when this paper focuses its debate in governmental actions to creative territory development, it allowed evincing and contributing with discussions about intelligent specialization territories. Added to that, it allowed delimit territories in analyses and development with the proposal of a broader definition to creative territories. It is broadly discussed in Brazil around a concept of creative economy to be worked, this discussion is essential; however, it must go further than the conceptual and encompass

the practical field. The focus on the cultural diversity is important, but as creative economy addresses much more than this, we have to go beyond cultural politics, redistribution, inclusion, and, then, emphasizing on integrated policies with industries and infrastructure.

However, a broader campaign about creative economy and creative territory development needs to be done to stimulate the population, since it is suspected that most of them in Brazil do not know this international term yet. Considering it, only after 2010 is that creative economy theme came to discussion and more effective disclosing on the governmental ambit, even though it is found information gap and absence of solidified theory and applied studies. MinC's actions through SCE have been demonstrated positive actions in order to raise, unite, and disseminate Creative Economy, so that it may subsidize public policies formulation aiming to promote territories' development and sustainable growth, including more creative ones in Brazil.

Finally, it is observed that creative territories' theme remain incipient in studies about planned studies, territorial order and development, especially on the context of management and public policies, bring the emerge potential of new interdisciplinary agendas on research and teaching, along with international cooperation. It is important to assess what has advanced in relation to structural barriers limiting the effective development of creative territories. In fact, the creation of the *Authentic Creative Economy Made in Brazil* is conditioned to those barriers overcome.

7. References

Barbosa, F. (2011), “Criativa: Políticas Públicas em Construção”, Ministério da Cultura, Brasília, available at: <http://www.cultura.gov.br/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/livro-portuguesweb.pdf>. (accessed 15 May 2015).

Bardin, L. (2013), “L'analyse de contenu”, 2nd.ed., Presses Universitaires de France Le Psychologue, Paris.

Bendassolli, P. F; Wood Jr, T. Kirschbaum, C. and Cunha, M. P. (2009), “Indústrias Criativas no Brasil”, FGV, Rio de Janeiro.

Brasil (2011), “Plano da Secretaria da Economia Criativa: políticas, diretrizes e ações 2011 – 2014”. Ministério da Cultura, Brasília, available at: <http://www.cultura.gov.br/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/livro-portuguesweb.pdf> (accessed 5 April 2015).

Brasil (2013a), “As metas do Plano Nacional de Cultura”, 3th. ed., Ministério da Cultura, Brasília, available at: http://pnc.culturadigital.br/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/As-metas-do-Plano-Nacional-de-Cultura_3%C2%AA-ed_espeelhado_3.pdf (accessed 8 June 2015).

Brasil (2013b), “Secretaria de Economia Criativa - Relatório de Gestão”, Ministério da Cultura, Brasília, available at: <https://contas.tcu.gov.br/econtrole/ObterDocumentoSisdoc?codArqCatalogado=7268279&seAbrirDocNoBrowser=1> (accessed 5 April 2015).

Calabre, L. (2009), “Políticas culturais no Brasil: dos anos 1930 ao século XXI”, FGV, Rio de Janeiro.

Caves, R. (2000), “Creative Industries”, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chapman, J. (2004), “*System failure: why governments must learn to think differently*”. Demos, London.

Cunningham, S. (2009), “Trojan horse or Rorschach blot? Creative industries discourse around the world”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 375-86.

- De Marchi, L. (2014), “Análise do Plano da Secretaria da Economia Criativa e as transformações na relação entre Estado e cultura no Brasil”, *Intercom: Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, Vol.37 No.1, pp.193-215, available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1809-584420140001000010&lng=en&tlng=pt.10.1590/S1809-584420140001000010. (accessed 5 April 2015).
- Emmendoerfer, M. L. and Ashton, M. S. (2014), “Territórios Criativos e suas Relações com o Turismo”, *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*, Vol.4 No.21/22, pp.459-68, available at: <https://www.ua.pt/ReadObject.aspx?obj=34847> (accessed 15 May 2015).
- Furtado, C. (1981), “Créativité et dépendance”, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Florida, R. (2014). “The Rise of the Creative Class”, revisited: revised and expanded. Basic books, New York.
- Gray, C and M. Wingfield (2011), “Are Governmental Culture Departments Important?: An Empirical Investigation”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol.17, pp.590-604
- Hartley, J. (2005), “Creative Industrie”, Blackwell, London.
- Madeira, M. G. (2014), “Economia criativa: implicações e desafios para a política externa Brasileira”, FUNAG, Brasília, available at: <http://funag.gov.br/loja/download/1096-economia-criativa.pdf> (accessed 5 April 2015).
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2006), “Cultural policy: Definitions and theoretical approaches”, *Journal of arts management, law, and society*, Vol. 35 No.4, pp.319-30.
- Pecqueur, B. (2004), “Le développement territorial: une nouvelle approche des processus de développement pour les économies du Sud”, Institut de Géographie Alpine, Grenoble.

Radin, B. A. (2010). “Os instrumentos da gestão intergovernamental”, in Peters, B. G. and Pierre, J. (Eds.), *Administração Pública: coletânea*, UNESP, São Paulo; ENAP Brasília, pp.597-618.

Sabatier, P. A. (1986), “Top down e bottom-up approaches to implementation research: a critical analysis and suggested synthesis”, *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 6, pp. 21-48.

Secchi, L. (2013), “Políticas públicas: conceitos, esquemas de análise, casos práticos”. 2nd. ed. Cengage Learning, São Paulo.

Unctad – United Nation Conference on Trade and Development (2012), “Creative Economy Report 2010: A Feasible Development Option”, available at: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/webflyer.asp?docid=9750&intItemID=4494&lang=1&mode=downloads> (accessed 5 April 2015).

Unesco - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2013), “Creative Economy Report 2013 Special Edition: widening local development pathways”, available at: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/pdf/creative-economy-report-2013-en.pdf> (accessed 5 April 2015).

Unesco - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2015), “Creative Cities Network”, available at: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/creativity/creative-cities-network/who-are-the-members/> (accessed 5 April 2015).

Weaver, K. R. and Rockman, B. (1993), “Do institutions matter?”, Brookings Institutions, Washington, DC.

ⁱ “S” System Organization are those of professional and economic interest categories, established by the Brazilian Federal Constitutions, aiming professional development and workers social welfare improvement. These organizations are mainly sustained by compulsory contributions instituted by the Federal Government. Moreover, most of these organizations initiate their names with letter “S”(in Portuguese), they are SENAR –National Service of Rural Learning; SENAC – National Service of Commercial Learning; SESC – Commerce Social Service; SESCOOP – National Service of Cooperative Learning; SENAI – National Service of Industrial Learning; SESI – Industry Social Service; SEST – Transportation Social Service; SENAT – National Service of Transportation Learning; SEBRAE – Brazilian Service to Support Micro and Small-sized Companies; Aircraft Transportation Fund – Fund Directed to the Air Force Ministry; DPC – Port and Shores Directorship of the Navy Ministry; and INCRA National Institution and Colonization and Land Reform.