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Introductions & Welcome Remarks

Dr. Nat Vorayos, Chairman of the CMCC Development Committee. Dr. Nat told the gathering that he felt the CMCC initiative could “create more opportunity for the people of Chiang Mai and make sure development is sustained and environmentally aware.”

Governor M.L. Panadda Diskul remarked that he had been following the proceedings of the CMCC with great interest and enthusiasm. “The CMCC is an excellent initiative,” the Governor said, “economically, socially and culturally the increased branding of Chiang Mai would help all of us to attract more investment and development, create more jobs and opportunities for the citizens of Chiang Mai, development that is based on Chiang Mai’s strengths.”

Mayor Tussanai Buranupakorn stated that he also fully supports CMCC and the UNESCO Creative City application.

Presentation of Analysis

The working team (Martin Venzky-Stalling, Ajarn Khongphu, Ajart Rattapong, Ajarn Pradorn, Ajarn Tanyanuparb and Khun Natthatida) presented their analysis of the UNESCO Creative City Network, the process and criteria for joining, the benefits, the categories, and which categories would be more suitable for Chiang Mai. Two UNESCO categories were considered in detail: (1) Craft and Folk Arts) and (2) Design. The team concluded that both categories offer benefits to Chiang Mai but that Design might offer broader and deeper impact benefits than Crafts and Folk Arts.

The presentation and a pre-meeting discussion document can be downloaded at: http://www.creativechiangmai.com/en/activities/unesco-creative-city

Martin Venzky-Stalling also explained that the Ministry of Culture, Office of Contemporary Arts & Culture has approached the Governor and the Mayor to support Chiang Mai with the UNESCO Creative Cities Network application and that CAMT of CMU is working for the Ministry on this assignment (also covering Phuket and Pattaya). The Ministry of Culture is currently proposing the Crafts and Folk Arts Category.
In any case, Mr. Venzky-Stalling also explained that Chiang Mai Creative City is an umbrella concept, vision and strategy for the future of Chiang Mai. Under this umbrella or locally agreed development concept, there will be many different projects of which the UNESCO Creative Cities Network is only one (though an important one). Therefore CMCC is not the same as UNESCO Creative Cities Network, CMCC is broader.

Discussions

Ms. Susan Stevenson the U.S. Consul General made suggestion that Design Category could offer more benefits to Chiang Mai and support a broader range of objectives than Crafts and Folk Arts. Chiang Mai could still work with cities in the network such as Santa Fe to learn about their experience in for example tourism.

Dr. Pradit, President of Payap, wondered if it is possible to later change to another category. Since this is not likely, he suggested that the Design category would offer more benefits in the long term.

Mr. Smith, from FTI Chiang Mai, suggested that that the main benefit from being part of UNESCO Creative City Network is branding. Branding serves in two areas 1) external branding, to promote Chiang Mai to tourists, investors, and business partners (what Chiang Mai is about), and 2) internal branding among people in Chiang Mai to have a shared vision. Design category would better appeal more people especially in the young and new generations, since the young can easily relate to design.

He also suggested that people may not be aware how broad the scope of design can be and what the Design Category means. Design is not about architecture or modern design only, but design also links back to traditional and contemporary local designs and art. Similar to Bali (Indonesia) promotes Balinese design, Chiang Mai can also promote Lanna design at a global level, therefore Design does link to crafts and folk arts but is broader and also cover urban development, packaging, food design, software and digital content, and other products.

Dr. Pakdeekul Rattana shared that Chiang Mai has lots of temples and cultural places, so Chiang Mai should focus on the existing strengths that Chiang Mai already has. Designs in Chiang Mai are based on Craft & folk art. Chiang Mai should begin with the culture part and she proposes the Craft and Folk Arts Category.

Khun RaiRay from the BOI Chiang Mai office suggested that the people of Chiang Mai may feel more excited and involved in application for the Craft and Folk Art Category since this category represent the identity and spirit of Chiang Mai. This would encourage more participation from the people.

Ajarn Khongphu Nimanandh explained that the UNESCO Creative City is not about preservation and that there are other project that address this. Chiang Mai and its
people may actually be more sustainable developed and receive more value from Design.

Ajarn Chalermchai from Far Eastern University said that he initially was in favor of Crafts and Folk Arts, but now he heard the arguments and pros and cons and he changed his mind and support the Design Category. Products in OTOP and Baan Tawai still lack design, so design will help to develop and improve these products. He

Mr. Songkran (Industry Section, Provincial Government) suggested that maybe currently more people in Chiang Mai understand the Crafts and Folk Arts category, therefore he proposed that perhaps it would be useful to hold seminars for the public to inform the about the pros and cons of each category.

Mr. Venzky-Stalling suggested that right now is a good timing for the application. The letter of intent should be submitted to UNESCO before Songkran in mid-April and that the full application should be submitted to UNESCO by September or October 2011. Therefore time is critical. He agrees to involve more people but that the CMCC Development Committee already represents many groups of Chiang Mai. This view was shared by several people in the meeting.

The Governor of Chiang Mai Province, ML. Panadda gave a closing remark and agreed with the timing issues. If Crafts and Folk Arts is more easily done in the time available, it might be the better choice, and would design would flow automatically.

Mr. Venzky-Stalling added that it was not the intention to decide in this meeting which category to select. There would be an Application Team that would further evaluate the issue.

Ajarn Nat, the Chairman, suggested that in one of the next CMCC meetings, he would invite the team from CAMT to present their findings.

The meeting closed at: 12.00 am.