

# Tables

---

2.1	The changes in the two application themes	26
2.2	The criteria for selection and evaluation – a ‘value framework’ to translate co-creation into action	28
3.1	Comparing the criteria for ECoC activities and the architecture of the Weave	38
4.1	The criteria used in project bids to select, evaluate and direct them	49
4.2	Program office processes for managing activity/project groups	51
4.3	The significant configurations of activity criteria	59
4.4	The significant configurations of areas of action	60
4.5	The significant configurations in the three project tracks	62
6.1	Number of articles in the local newspaper about the ECoC	83
7.1	The nature of Umeå’s marketing activity: communal, event and brand marketing	95
7.2	Categorization of the milieu actors used in the SNA analysis	96
7.3	Network milieu actors and the type of relationship connections between them	98
7.4	Network cohesion measures on each type of relationship connections between actors	103
8.1	Examples of the latest generation of ECoCs 2008–2016 (themes and emphases)	139
8.2	The critical aspects and lessons learnt from comparisons of 12 ECoCs	142
8.3	The good aspects, critical aspects and lessons learnt from the Umeå 2014 program organization	151
9.1	Initial best-practice framework for co-creation based on the Umeå 2014 case	164
9.2	Comparison between the creative city and the projective city	167