

Arina Chatigny-Vincter  
Supervisor: Prof. Renee Sieber

## Introduction

In cities across the globe massive amounts of data are being gathered by local governments and private sector firms. The data, which come from wired networks of sensors and personal mobile devices, is fed into complex algorithms for analysis (Allama and Dhunnyb, 2019). These systems—the sensors, the software, the hardware, the algorithms, the data, and the individuals who collect the data—comprise the “smart city.”

Private sector firms argue that their products hold transformative potential to provide new insights to city managers, engineers, and planners. And some make even greater claims, asserting that by adopting smart technologies, governmental decision-making processes will be more open, accessible, and transparent (Wilhelm Siegfried Ruhlandt, 2018).

Yet, academic research suggests that the benefits of smart city technology are less clear when we examine their implementation in the real world (Dameri & Benevolo, 2016). Overall, many discrepancies emerge between the corporate smart city narratives around and the ways in which cities adopt smart city technology. Large bodies of literature on smart cities have been focused on the technology, big data, and the infrastructure needed to analyze the data.

However, little research, thus far, focuses on how Canadian smart cities are governed and planned, and whether these projects will achieve their ambitious goals.

## Montreal: A Global Leader

Aiming at becoming a worldwide pioneer among smart cities (P. Lauriault & al., 2018), Montreal has maintained a presence on the smart city scene for some time now (Deakin & Waer, 2011). The city distinguishes itself by its focus on civil engagement in articulating smart city projects (P. Lauriault & al., 2018). In 2014, Montreal launched its Smart and Digital City Office to oversee Montreal’s 2015–2017 Smart and Digital City Action Plan. In 2018, the Urban Innovation Lab was created. In 2019, the metropolis won the Smart Cities Challenge, getting \$ 50 million from the federal government.

## Purpose of the Research

The purpose of the research is to investigate civic engagement in current and proposed smart city projects in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Within the scope of civic engagement, the research focuses on inclusion and participation, with emphasis on the novelty of smart city urban data. One of the objectives is to gain a better understanding of how “participation” and “inclusion” differ and manifest themselves in the different projects. Another is to explore the unprecedented role of urban data in shaping “participation” and “inclusion”, again under the scope of civic engagement.

## Methodology

Semi-constructed interviews of people piloting smart city projects.

Degree of agreement	1	2	3	4	5
Citizen influence should not interfere with the completion of this project.					
The average citizen lacks knowledge to make informed decisions about this project.					
Having socioeconomic, gender and racial diversity in the voices being heard by decision makers ensure inclusion.					
Advisory committees should educate citizens.					
Smart city services will accentuate and worsen segregation of marginalized groups					

Passive Data

Active Data

## The Smart City, Participation and Inclusion

The smart city is multifaceted, including not only information communications technology (ICT) but people and communities as well (Albino et al., 2015). When inquiring about how ICT impacted city governance and decision-making, Castelnovo et al. (2016) stressed out the need for a holistic approach adapted to smart cities, highlighting the need for new approaches and further research. Some scholars are critical of the smart city, arguing it serves to “sell” a city in the global economy than to actually address urban inequalities (Hollands, 2008; Wiig, 2016).

As citizen engagement emerges as a vital element of smart city governance (Castelnovo et al., 2016), scholars have argued that a new form of public participation is necessary (Castelnovo et al., 2016; Nam & Padro, 2011; Savoldelli et al., 2013).

Participation and inclusion are independent dimensions of public engagement (Quick and Feldman, 2011). There are different degrees of citizen participation (Arnstein, 1969).



## References

Albino, Berardi U., & Dangelico, R-M. (2015). Smart Cities: Definitions, Dimensions, Performance, and Initiatives, *Journal of Urban Technology*, 22(1), 3-21 ; Allam, Zaheer & Dhunny, Zaynah A. (2019). On big data, artificial intelligence and smart cities, *Cities*, 89, 80-91.; Arnstein, Sherry R. (1969) A Ladder Of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224; Castelnovo, W., Misuraca, G., & Savoldelli, A. (2016). Smart Cities Governance: The Need for a Holistic Approach to Assessing Urban Participatory Policy Making. *Social Science Computer Review*, 34(6), 724–739. ; Dameri, R. P., & Benevolo, C. (2016). Governing Smart Cities: An Empirical Analysis. *Social Science Computer Review*, 34(6), 693–707.; Florida, R. (2004). *The Rise of the Creative Class: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*, New York: Basic Books. ; Hollands, Robert G. (2008). Will the real smart city please stand up?. *City*, 12(3), 303-320. ; Mark Deakin & Husam Al Waer (2011) From intelligent to smart cities, *Intelligent Buildings International*, 3(3), 140-152. ; Nam, T., & Pardo, T. A. (2011). Smart city as urban innovation: Focusing on management, policy, and context. *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on theory and practice of electronic governance*. ; P. Lauriault, Tracey & Bloom, Rachel & Livingstone, Carly & Landry, Jean-Noé. (2018). Open Smart Cities in Canada: Environmental Scan and Case Studies - Executive Summary. ; Quick, K. S., & Feldman, M. S. (2011). Distinguishing Participation and Inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(3), 272–290. ; Savoldelli, A., Misuraca, G. & Codagnone, C. (2013) Measuring the Public value of e-Government: The eGEP2.0 model, *The Electronic Journal of e-Government*, 211(21), 373-388. Wiig, A. (2016). The empty rhetoric of the smart city: from digital inclusion to economic promotion in Philadelphia, *Urban Geography*, 37(4), 535-553.; Wilhelm Siegfried Ruhlandt, Robert. (2018). The governance of smart cities: A systematic literature review, *Cities*, 81, 1-23.

