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When we talk about “global cities” we think of them!
How about Canberra? A global city?
**Patrick Geddes**: places where a disproportionate amount of the world’s business is conducted (*Cities in Evolution*, 1915).

**Peter Hall**: centres of political power, both national and international, and of the organisations related to government; centres of national and international trade, acting as entrepots for their countries and sometimes for neighbouring countries also; centres of banking, insurance, and related financial services; centres of advanced professional activity of all kinds; centres of information gathering and diffusion; centres of conspicuous consumption; and centres of arts, cultures, and entertainment, and of the ancillary activities that catered for them (*The World Cities*, 1966, 1984).

**John Friedmann**: ‘articulators’ of larger regional, national and international economies as centres through which money, workers, information, commodities, and other economically relevant variables flow apart from being headquarters and financial centres; these centres are defined by the scale of ‘spatial articulation’ rather than by political administrative boundaries and extend their influence into a surrounding field or region to articulate into the global economy as centres of representation, social interaction, and innovation; It is the scale of spatial articulation that orders cities in a world urban hierarchy (*The World City Hypothesis*, 1986).
Saskia Sassen: a recent phenomenon of globalization process to particularly capture both dispersion and centralisation of economic activities in an integrated global economy: the increasingly integrated global economy has been generating simultaneous processes of dispersion and concentration – the dispersion of production and retailing activities across the world and the concentration of specialised services and command within a few global cities (The Global City, 1991, 2001).

Peter Taylor: world city network emphasising the relationships between cities, rather than city attributes, built upon Saskia Sassen’s ‘global city’ and Manuel Castells’ global ‘spaces of flows’ (The World City Network, 2004).
Globe Encounters

In the Information Age, the flow of Internet traffic between locations is nearly ubiquitous. Globe Encounters visualizes the volumes of Internet data flowing between New York and cities around the world over the past 24 hours. The size of the glow on a particular city location corresponds to the amount of IP traffic flowing between that place and New York City. A larger glow implies a greater IP flow.
# The World According to GaWC 2010

**Alpha++**
- LONDON
- NEW YORK

**Alpha+**
- HONG KONG
- PARIS
- SINGAPORE
- TOKYO
- SHANGHAI
- CHICAGO
- DUBAI

**Beta**
- MILAN
- BEIJING
- TORONTO
- SAO PAULO
- MADRID
- MUMBAI
- LOS ANGELES
- MOSCOW
- FRANKFURT
- MEXICO CITY
- AMSTERDAM
- BUENOS AIRES
- KUALA LUMPUR
- SEOUL
- BRUSSELS
- JAKARTA
- SAN FRANCISCO
- WASHINGTON

**Alpha-**
- MIAMI
- DUBLIN
- MELBOURNE
- BOSTON
- ZURICH
- NEW DELHI
- MUNICH
- ISTANBUL
- BOSTON
- WARSAW
- DALLAS
- VIENNA
- ATLANTA
- BARCELONA
- BANGKOK
- TAIPEI
- SANTIAGO
- LISBON
- PHILADELPHIA
- JOHANNESBURG

**Beta+**
- DUSSELDORF
- STOCKHOLM
- PRAGUE
- MONTREAL
- ROME
- HAMBURG
- MANILA
- HOUSTON
- BERLIN
- ATHENS
- TEL AVIV
- BANGALORE
- COPENHAGEN
- CAIRO
- BOGOTA
- VANCOUVER

**Beta**
- BUDAPEST
- BEIJING
- LUXEMBOURG
- GUANGZHOU
- SEOUL
- CARACAS
- HO CHI MINH CITY
- AKLUND
- OSLO
- KIEW
- CHENNAI
- BUCHAREST
- MANCHESTER
- KARACHI
- LIMA
- CAPE TOWN
- RIYADH
- MONTEVIDEO
- MINNEAPOLIS

**Beta-**
- ABU DHABI
- Nicosia
- BIRMINGHAM (UK)
- RIO DE JANEIRO
- BRISBANE
- GENEVA
- CALCUTTA
- DETROIT
- DENVER
- MONTERREY
- BRATISLAVA
- PORT LOUIS
- CASABLANCA
- MANAMA
- STIRIPEART

**Gamma+**
- GLASGOW
- NAIROBI
- BRISTOL
- HANOI
- CINCINNATI
- CHARLOTTLE
- ANTWERP
- DOHA
- LAHORE
- BALTIMORE RE
- JEDDAH
- EDINBURGH
- AMMAN
- HYDERABAD (IN)
- ZAGREB
- ADELAIDE
- KUWAIT
- PORTLAND
- BELGRADE
- SAN JOSE (CR)
- TUNIS
- SAN JOSE (US)
- RIGA

**Gamma**
- VALENCIA (SP)
- KANSAS CITY
- PHOENIX
- ALMATY
- GUADALAJARA
- LYON
- QUITO
- ST PETERSBURG
- LEEDS
- SANTO DOMINGO
- SAN SALVADOR
- VILNIUS
- ROTTERDAM
- TAMPA
- COLUMBUS US
- INDIANAPOLIS
- PITTSBURGH
- EDMONTON

**Gamma-**
- TALLIN
- PUNE
- PORTO
- PORTO ALEGRE
- ORLANDO
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL
- PORTUGAL

**High sufficiency**
- JACKSONVILLE
- LEIPZIG
- RALEIGH
- STRASBOURG
- TUJANA
- BRESLAU
- SALT LAKE CITY
- ANKARA
- PRETORIA
- TIANJIN
- BILBAO
- AHMADABAD
- LAS VEGAS
- BELO HORIZONTE
- LIVERPOOL
- MALMO
- NUREMBERG

**Canberra**
- WHOLESALE
- QUEETARO
- NASSAU
- Utrecht
- HARRITFORD
- SEVILLE
- LILLE
- KRAKOW
- NASHVILLE
- SALVADOR
- ALGIERS
- DRESDEN
- THE HAGUE
- POZNAN

**Sufficiency**
- FLORENCE
- MEDELLIN
- WINNIPEG
- NANTES
- SACRAMENTO
- TOULOUSE
- RECURFE
- DARE SALAAM
- KAOHSIUNG
- MANAGUA
- PUEBLA
- SURABAYA
- HAMILTON
- CHRISTCHURCH
- BORDEAUX
- TULSA
- DAKAR
- HALIFAX
- SAN ANTONIO
- JOHOR BAHRU
- TIRANA
- CARDIFF
- QUEBE
- LAUSANNE
- BAKU
- LUANDA
- BREMEN
- APEERDEEN
- BIRMINGHAM (US)
- DHAKA
- NAMIBIA
- CHIHUAHUA
- HANOVER
- NAPLES
- PROVIDENCE
- PENANG
- OMAHA
- CHENGDU
- ABUJA
- PORT OF SPAIN
- LUSAKA
- ARUBA
- LEON
- FUKUOKA
- TAIPEI
- HONOLULU
- GENOA
- KAMPALA
- HANGZHOU
- PALO ALTO
- CORDOBA
- ABIDJAN
- TER KI

---

**Sydney**

---

**Alpha++**
- LONDON
- NEW YORK

**Alpha+**
- HONG KONG
- PARIS
- SINGAPORE
- TOKYO
- SHANGHAI
- CHICAGO
- DUBAI

**Beta**
- MILAN
- BEIJING
- TORONTO
- SAO PAULO
- MADRID
- MUMBAI
- LOS ANGELES
- MOSCOW
- FRANKFURT
- MEXICO CITY
- AMSTERDAM
- BUENOS AIRES
- KUALA LUMPUR
- SEOUL
- BRUSSELS
- JAKARTA
- SAN FRANCISCO
- WASHINGTON

**Alpha-**
- MIAMI
- DUBLIN
- MELBOURNE
- BOSTON
- ZURICH
- NEW DELHI
- MUNICH
- ISTANBUL
- BOSTON
- WARSAW
- DALLAS
- VIENNA
- ATLANTA
- BARCELONA
- BANGKOK
- TAIPEI
- SANTIAGO
- LISBON
- PHILADELPHIA
- JOHANNESBURG
## Global Cities Index

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Values calculated on a 0 to 10 scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>New York</strong> 6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>London</strong> 5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Paris</strong> 4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Tokyo</strong> 4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Hong Kong</strong> 3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong> 3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Chicago</strong> 3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Seoul</strong> 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Brussels</strong> 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Washington, D.C.</strong> 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong> 3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Sydney</strong> 3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Vienna</strong> 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Beijing</strong> 3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Boston</strong> 2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Toronto</strong> 2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>San Francisco</strong> 2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Madrid</strong> 2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Moscow</strong> 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Berlin</strong> 2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Business activity (30%)**
- **Information exchange (15%)**
- **Political engagement (10%)**
- **Human capital (30%)**
- **Cultural experience (15%)**

A.T. Kearney, 2012
Benchmarking the Future Competitiveness of Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY WEIGHTS</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC STRENGTH</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL CAPITAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL MATURITY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CHARACTER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN CAPITAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL HAZARDS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL APPEAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Economist Intelligence Unit 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bern</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nurnberg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Urban Competitiveness Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Liveability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour force participation</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and innovation</td>
<td>Greenfield development</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-intensive industries</td>
<td>Greenhouse pollution</td>
<td>Social diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly-level occupations</td>
<td>Water use</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>Ecological footprint</td>
<td>Safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections

- Human capital and connectivity infrastructure are crucial for productivity and competitiveness;
- Sustainability remains a challenge for competitiveness;
- Liveability is competitiveness, but high quality of life has a cost;
- Does size matter for cities? Critical mass remains important;
- Cities compete smartly: cities compete for smart people to deliver high quality services and innovation.
Canberra vs. Sydney

Canberra region defined by ACT and the Queanbeyan Statistical Area Level 3 (SA3)

Sydney region defined by the Sydney Greater Capital City Statistical Area (GCCSA)

Living Population: 410,098
Working Population: 220,524

Living Population: 4,391,673
Working Population: 1,874,116
Canberra vs. Sydney

Employment in Knowledge-Intensive Industries

Number of workers in knowledge-Intensive Industries

Percentage of workers in knowledge-Intensive Industries
Canberra vs. Sydney  Employment in highly-skilled occupations

Number of workers in highly-skilled occupations

- Managers
- Professionals
- TOTAL

Canberra region
Sydney region

Percentage of workers in highly-skilled occupations

- Managers
- Professionals
- TOTAL

Canberra region
Sydney region
Canberra vs. Sydney

Employment with high-level qualifications

**Number of workers with high-level qualifications**

- Postgraduate Degree
- Grad Diploma or Grad Certificate
- Bachelor Degree
- TOTAL

**Percentage of workers with high-level qualifications**

- Postgraduate Degree
- Grad Diploma or Grad Certificate
- Bachelor Degree
- TOTAL
Canberra vs. Sydney  
Foreign-Born Population

Number of foreign-born residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canberra region</th>
<th>Sydney region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of foreign-born residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canberra region</th>
<th>Sydney region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra vs. Sydney
Total People movement 2006-2011
Canberra vs. Sydney

Movement by people working in Knowledge-Intensive Industries
Canberra vs. Sydney

Movement by people working in highly-skilled occupations
Canberra vs. Sydney

Movement by people with high-level qualifications

Bar chart showing movement by people with high-level qualifications for Canberra and Sydney regions, categorized by origin (Australia and Overseas) and total.

- **Canberra region:**
  - Australia: [20,000, 40,000, 60,000, 80,000, 100,000, 120,000, 140,000, 160,000]
  - Overseas: [0, 20,000, 40,000, 60,000, 80,000, 100,000, 120,000, 140,000, 160,000]

- **Sydney region:**
  - Australia: [20,000, 40,000, 60,000, 80,000, 100,000, 120,000, 140,000, 160,000]
  - Overseas: [0, 20,000, 40,000, 60,000, 80,000, 100,000, 120,000, 140,000, 160,000]

Pie chart showing the percentage distribution of high-level qualifications movement for Canberra and Sydney regions, with categories for Overseas and Australia.
Canberra vs. Sydney

Total employment

![Graph showing total employment comparison between Canberra and Sydney regions, with Canberra having significantly lower employment than Sydney.]

![Graph showing working population as a percentage of resident population, with Sydney having a higher percentage than Canberra.]
## Canberra versus Sydney

### Make-up of Foreign-Born Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of FBP</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of FBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>14,807</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>151,996</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (mainland)</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>China (mainland)</td>
<td>148,559</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>87,874</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>84,948</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>69,780</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>62,841</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>55,018</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>41,783</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>40,175</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Hong Kong (SAR of China)</td>
<td>37,168</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canberra versus Sydney

Broadband Internet access (by dwellings)
Discussion

• Positives

  – High proportion of workers in high-level occupations such as managers and professionals.
  – High proportion of workers with high-level qualifications obtained from universities.
  – Attracting large numbers of new residents in high level occupations, and with high level qualifications.
  – Compares well to most Australian cities in terms of liveability, sustainability and productivity factors.
  – Liveability has been recognised internationally.

• Negatives

  – Proportionately small Advanced Producer Services sector, employing few people in staple Global City fields such as banking, finance, law, and consultancy.
  – Relatively small industry base.
  – Not attracting large proportions of skilled workers from overseas.
Canberra’s Next Centenary: towards a global city?