

New ways of delivering public services and make better use of existing resources and infrastructure: smart cities

Abstract

The phrase of smart city is not new. It may have origins in the 80s and 90s, when a new way of thinking examining the role of new technologies in the operation, structure and planning of cities emerged. The theory of information society was formed, with the availability, presence and quality of information and communication technologies (ICTs) with the centre of it.

In the 2000s a new concept came to fore emphasizing not only the technology itself, but its role in human, social capital and the usage of these technologies. In recent years the concept of smart cities drew attention of many researchers dealing with urban development and competitiveness, experts of urban planning and management and leaders of big multinational IT companies.

Today smart city is in the mood, not only in academic researches, but in public government choices and projects. In spite of the very broad usage of the notion of smart city, shared and sound definition of the concept still lacks. The usage and content is mainly depend on the context, background and interest of different stakeholders using the smart city definition. Although there is no general consensus on the concept, the idea of smart cities is rooted in the creation and connection of human capital, social capital and ICTs infrastructure to generate greater and more sustainable economic development and a better quality of life (“Doing more with less.”). According to European Parliament, factors for successful smart cities include active participation of citizenry to create a sense of ownership and commitment, local level coordination to ensure the integration of solutions across the portfolio of initiatives and participation of local governments in networks to share knowledge and experiences.

In the past years, cities are increasingly aware of the concept of “smart city” and actively developing strategies towards the goal of becoming “smart” and manage, more efficiently, city resources and addressing development and inclusion challenges. The growth of smart cities is helping the increase of government use of ICTs to improve political participation, implement public policies or provide public sector services. Local governments are called to be key actors to create an interactive-, participatory- and information-based urban environment with the ultimate aim at producing increasing wealth and public value, achieving higher quality of life for citizens. Empirical studies on smart city initiatives indicate that despite some peculiarities and differences between the initiatives the principles of open, transparent, and participatory government appear to be integral part of them.

There are also sharp critics of smart city concept, regarding it only a marketing tool applied by all the cities using some forms of ICT, as a label or brand of successfulness. That is why the elaboration of smart city assessment tools and performance measurement systems are needed in order to sort out real smart cities and effective smart city methods and solutions.

In my paper I would like to present the terminological aspects of smart city concept, its heterogenic theoretical background, the role of smart governance in it, possible forms of measurement and the limits of assessment with some empirical evidences from Hungary.

Introduction

The theoretical thinking on information society come to the fore at the beginning of the 1990s, although the concept of information society itself was controversial (Élő-Pintér 1999). In spite of it the notion was ubiquitously used not only in academic but in public life as well.

Other concepts connected to the phenomena of information society were known earlier as post-industrial society (Bell 1973) or post-capitalist society (Drucker 1993).

In the European Union it was the Bangemann report in 1994 which made information and communication technologies and information society an official union policy. At the beginning of this new era mainly the economic and infrastructural aspects of information society were emphasised. As a consequence of the Bangemann report information society strategies were born affecting different spatial levels.

At the beginning of the 21st century a new way of thinking emerged, where new technologies were not aims but tools, where municipalities, different communities, actors of business life, citizens of settlements cooperating on applying innovation based on participatory planning, aiming at establishing low energy consuming, liveable city. This is the “smart” city concept.

Smart city concept

Smart city concept appeared, not only in academic researches, but in public government choices and projects. In spite of the very broad usage of the notion of smart city, shared and sound definition of the concept is still lacks. Although there is no general consensus on the it, the idea of smart cities is rooted in the creation and connection of human capital, social capital and ICT infrastructure to generate greater and more sustainable economic development, and a better quality of life (“Doing more with less.”). The usage and content mainly depends on the context, background and interest of different stakeholders using the smart city definition.

According to the origin of elaboration, the smart city concept can be:

- academic
- industrial or corporate
- governmental
- term of the media (Mosannenzadeh,- Vettorato, 2014).

In academic research papers and documents we can find a very broad range of smart city definitions and concepts covering very different terms and phenomena. Despite of the variety of definitions, it is obvious that technological and social innovation are basic components of the smart city concept. One of the earliest explanations of what smart city means is coming from Hall (2000): “A city that monitors and integrates conditions of all of its critical infrastructures, including roads, bridges, tunnels, rail/subways, airports, seaports, communications, water, power, even major buildings, can better optimize its resources, plan its preventive maintenance activities, and monitor security aspects while maximizing services to its citizens”. One of the most influencing term in this field can be found at Giffinger et al. (2007): “A Smart City is a city well performing in a forward-looking way in six characteristics. It is built on the ‘smart’ combination of endowments and activities of self-decisive, independent and aware citizens.” Others try to connect smart city to other notions and terms: “The Smart Cities concept is connected to notions of global competitiveness, sustainability, empowerment and quality of life, enabled by broadband networks and modern ICTs (Kominos et al. 2011). Caragliu, Del Bo and Nijkamp (2011) give a holistic definition of smart cities: “when investments in human and social capital and traditional (transport) and modern (ICT) communication infrastructure fuel sustainable economic growth and a high quality of life, with a wise management of natural resources, through participatory government.”

In the past years, cities are increasingly aware of the concept of “smart city” and actively developing strategies towards the goal of becoming “smart”, managing city resources more

efficiently and addressing development and inclusion challenges. The growth of smart cities is helping the increase of government use of ICTs to improve political participation, the implementation of public policies or the provision of public sector services. A smart city from the governmental aspect can be seen as an urban strategy aiming at improving quality of life in the city, safeguarding the environment and reaching economic development at the same time.

The industrial interpretation of smart cities supplements the term with several practical elements. Big multinational companies like IBM, CISCO, Siemens elaborated their own smart city concepts and smart city solutions and applications. The smart city concept for IT companies means the elaboration, installation and application of complex information systems aiming at integrated operation of cities' infrastructure and services. The blurred boundaries between a policy concept and a business model that is focused on profit maximization, can give rise to semantic confusion and, more relevantly, to ethical issues.

According to the main topic of smart city articles and researches we can differentiate the following concepts:

- ICT oriented. With information and communication technologies in its center, enabling cities to fulfil their future objectives. (Joss 2013, Mitchell et al. 2013). Smart cities combine smart technologies with a new holistic way of thinking, leading to positive changes in cities' behavior, helping to overcome challenges of rapid urbanization (Hill-Watts-Buscher 2011).
- Sustainability oriented. Most of the smart city articles are focusing on sustainability as main topic. In this approach smart city is working in a built environment as an effective integration of physical, digital and human systems, helping to achieve a sustainable, prosperous and inclusive future for the inhabitants of the city (Cavada-Hunt-Rogers 2014).
- Mobility oriented.
- Innovation oriented.

In the numerous definitions of Smart City, which vary according to the origin of the concept, the point of view and the stakeholders the common aspects are the following:

- social and environmental sustainability as strategic priority,
- importance of network infrastructure,
- entrepreneurship as a crucial force of development that needs to be accompanied by other such forces,
- maximizing access of citizens to public services, improving social inclusion,
- crucial role of creative industries,
- the role of social and relational capital in smart city projects (Manitiu-Pedrini 2015).

Challenges in the urban system

The Central-European – and the Hungarian in it – settlement network is significantly different than the West-European. The extent of urbanisation lags behind the average of Western areas, the number of settlements with city rank is rather high; the population of cities is quite low. Another characteristic is that the European level cities with population over 500000 or million, and with the exception of Poland the bigger city districts with regional economic role are missing. Hungary is in a particularly unfavourable position, as it is one of the most monocentric countries in Europe (Schneider 2008). According to the European Union typing, areas with more than 500000 inhabitants are called metropolis regions, settlements with

inhabitants less than 500000 inhabitants are city areas. There are significant difference between functions and performance of different areas. Due to the peculiarities of the Hungarian settlement structure only Budapest and its agglomeration belongs to the metropolitan areas, the cities with county status and their neighbourhoods are city areas. Thus, the Hungarian cities of magnitude smaller than the Europeans essentially correspond to the European third city level (Hegedüs 2008).

The integrated thinking, local independence, local cooperation are new notions in urban development in Eastern European, in former socialist countries. It is difficult to understand and accept for local governments and inhabitants of the settlements that their life improvement is depends on their local cooperation, foresight, not on outside forces. That is how - with the help of outside resources - the jointly formulated goals can be implemented successfully (Barta, 2009).

The Hungarian urban network suffers from accumulated serious problems:

- forced industrialization during socialist era;
- confusing land use conditions (lack of real estate market, then non-transparent privatization);
- too slow dissolution of indifference against environment pollution;
- increasing social differences and segregation;
- problems requiring urgent solutions because of previously lacked development actions;
- the direct, local resources are playing relative small role in management and development of settlements (Barta, 2009)
- with the exception of today's Czech Republic the proportion of urban population is much below the West European level, moreover many of the cities have been created under the socialist political period;
- the older towns were mostly country towns, so appropriate service functions are missing;
- lack of citizens in the society of cities;
- the urban built environment is neglected, infrastructural investments are missing, housing estates (block of flats) are very serious problems (Enyedi, 2009);
- The special paradox of the Hungarian local governmental system is that while it broad rights were given for local governments in property management, borrowing and organising services, financing basically remained function of central controllers (support and transferred taxes). Development possibilities are determined by – besides the general financial conditions of local governments – sectoral programmes proposed by central government (Hegedüs, 2008).

Besides problems evolved and accumulated during socialist period and due to the features of transition, Hungarian cities as members of the European and global urban system are facing global challenges as well:

- urbanisation;
- ageing population;
- increasing unemployment;
- inadequate urban housing stock;
- climate change, environment pollution, unhealthy environment;
- traffic jams, inadequate public transport services (long travelling time, parking problems, problems of radial transport system);
- problems of waste management;

- inadequate support of regional and governmental authorities on sustainable urban development (need for more autonomy) (Smarter...2010).

The challenges can be answered by not only modernising urban infrastructure but by better usage and adaptation of already available, existing possibilities of information and communication technologies. Smart and liveable city creates the following conditions to be able to respond to new challenges:

- City administration putting inhabitants not services in to the centre (less bureaucracy, more electronic spread of information and data, better capability to share with other institutions, better transparency). A smart city cannot be imposed by decree, as the city is shaped by a large number of individual decisions and social and technological changes cannot be fully accounted for. The relationship between citizens and city services is changing. Citizens are increasingly becoming providers of city services and not only users (Orchestrating...2014).
- “Greener” and more efficient utility management. (Technology creates huge possibility to monitor every point of the process – especially useful in water and waste management – e.g. intelligent water meters helping to explore wasting points for inhabitants, more efficient management of public buildings.)
- Environment friendly and safe transport (intelligent transport systems).
- Better public safety (elaboration and usage of predictive models through previously available data, usage of special cameras to predict accidental incidents).
- Quality education ((cloud based sharing of universities’ computer capacity with other educational institutions dynamically adapted to the changing needs; distance learning, e-learning in higher educations and adult education, intelligent boards).
- Cost efficient social and health supply system (data integration, more easy access to information on one patient).
- More “convenient” and attractive tourism (adequate information and navigation systems combined with online booking possibilities) (Smarter...2010).

Smart city evaluation

Various evaluation methods, models for understanding and conceptualizing smart cities have been developed to explain smart city concepts, which aim to define their scope, objectives and architectures. The multidimensionality of smartness coupled with cities’ complexity, calls for specific assessments able to distinguish between different dimensions of smartness.

Evaluation helps:

- to explore the current status and position of settlements as smart cities,
- to present the relative position of cities to each other
- to explore the development or “movement” of cities towards becoming smart cities,
- to provide information and model future actions,
- to prepare, establish decisions and to determine development trends.

There are many different ways of assessing the smartness of settlements. The first way of evaluation of city smartness is the usage of indicators, elaboration of indexes and city rankings (Fast company 2013, Forum PA 2012, Giffinger et al. 2007, Zygiaris 2013). Indicators and indexes are useful tools of preparation of location choices for enterprises or investments. They are also aiming at positioning cities according to their competitiveness, strength and weaknesses. Indicators are helping to elaborate strategic priorities and development possibilities. There are many advantages of using indicators and indexes for the

evaluation of city smartness. City rankings attract lot of attention in both scientific and public life. They generate discussion and debate on smartness, competitiveness, quality of life, helping to rethink formerly elaborated strategies and development priorities. They also allow to position cities, can be marketing tools in city promotion and contribute to the success of city leaders (Giffinger-Gudrun 2010). The usage of indicators is relatively simple, clear, easily interpretable, easy to understand, visualize, compare and reproducible in time and space.

Still, from the review of different smart city rankings and indexes some limits and problems can be derived:

- The problems of data collection. To conduct a successful smart city ranking, very well defined and available settlement level indicators are needed. The settlement level data are missing in most cases or not updated year by year. Using regional or national data is blurring the differences among cities. Most of the data arisen at city level are not collected and processed as there is no interest in them. Huge data sources owned by private enterprises are not available for research or analysis. To conduct a successful smart city assessment not only “big data”, but “right data” is needed.
- The weighing and aggregation of indicators will greatly influence the final results.
- The problems of transparency. Although the methods behind the indexes and rankings are complex, the used methods and the selected indicators are greatly influencing the results, the methodology of data collection and processing are usually not transparent.
- The correlation among indicators and different fields of analysis are quite strong.
- The problems of comparison. As the content of the indicators and the methods of data processing are not transparent and heterogeneous, there is a huge obstacle to enhance comparison. There are several studies based on indexes related to smart cities that are repeated annually (e.g. Smart cities in the world by Boyd Cohen), but even these cannot be compared to each other, as the indicators and methodology used to conduct them are changed every year.
- The lack of dynamic analysis. Indexes reflect the static state of a settlement’s “smartness” and livability at a specific time. Little knowledge can be obtained about how the development or behavior of a city is changing, how it reacts to certain situations or critical events. However this might be the true essence of smartness (reduced reaction time, rapid adaptation to abrupt changes). A city cannot be studied separately from its surrounding environment; its operation influences the neighboring areas and settlements that are also asserting a dynamic influence on each other. Using dynamic approach also allows you to provide a more appropriate definition of smartness. As well known, the physical space and the "place" are not equivalent (Giovanella 2013)
- The lack of individual aspects. There are people living in the city who are striving to utilize the resources of their city in an optimal way to achieve a higher quality of life. They have their own motivations, expectations, needs, their own lifestyles. When we only consider indexes, the study will lack this bottom up dimension. Several studies have experimented with including the individual dimensions into the analyses of smart cities (Monfaredzadeh-Krueger 2015). For example there are studies that try to research and present the emotional state of a given settlement from the quality and quantity of posts related to city. Utilizing text processor and analyzer software solutions, these studies measure the emotional state of the people living in or talking about the city. Emotions can be studied in the temporal dimension helping researchers

to clarify how the emotional state of the city follows the emotional state of its individual citizens.

- Last but not least there is a problem related to how much effort it presents to build qualitative factors into the indicator system (e.g. quality of services).

Another possible evaluation method is the factor analysis followed by clustering. With factor analysis we can eliminate the problem of having strong correlations between indicators and find the factors that have the closest relation to the “smartness” of the city.

With the help of clustering the data arrays available can be categorized into homogenous groups. These can help us to discover and analyze the spatial structure of cities. Spatial cluster analysis plays an important role in quantifying geographic variation patterns. Clustering can help us visualize the complex information behind the operation of a cities in a simplified way. It can also help us to eliminate the need for comparison from establishing a ranking of such information. There are many existing methods of clustering. The most well known and most used one to study the spatial organizational patterns of cities is the K-means cluster. During K-means clustering we assign all elements to the cluster with closest center point to that specific element.

The cluster is a spatial pattern that differs in important respects from the geographic variation expected in the absence of the spatial processes that are being investigated. Clusters can take on a variety of different shapes, but cluster tests are usually sensitive to only one profile (Sun 2002). Different techniques are sensitive to different aspects of cluster morphology –some detect boundaries, some detect outliers, some detect circular clusters, some detect elliptical clusters (Jacquez, 2008).

Cluster analysis although will not solve all the disadvantages of indicators and rankings, as indicators compose the starting point of cluster analysis as well. So the problems arising from data collection, comparison, lack of dynamic analysis and individual aspects remain the same.

An emerging method that has not seen much use in social studies yet is the Self organizing map (SOM). The SOM algorithm grew out of early neural network models, especially models of associative memory and adaptive learning (Kohonen 1984). A new incentive was to explain the spatial organization of the brain's functions, as observed especially in the cerebral cortex. With the help of SOM a problem space with many dimensions can be reduced to a space with less dimensions, mostly to a two-dimensional discrete space. Meanwhile we can visualize the most important aspects of the vector space of many dimensions in the topology of a two-dimensional space. This way we can simultaneously reduce the dimension of the inputs used and sort the elements into groups.

The third group of evaluation methods consists of different models and modeling techniques that enable us to predict future events from existing information and allow us to run a better simulation of complex city systems. One such model is a modified version of the triple helix model, relating the multiple and reciprocal relationships between the three main agencies in the process of knowledge creation and capitalization: universities, industry and government. To the previous three main agencies of knowledge creation, the authors added the civil society (determining a “four helices model”), and for each of the four different drivers of innovations, they indicated the possible indicators of a smart city (Lombardi et al., 2012). Another possible modeling approach can be the analytic network process. The ANP model consists of clusters (i.e. groups of homogeneous elements of a decision problem), elements (i.e. nodes of the network), interrelationship between clusters, and interrelationship between elements. It allows interactions and feedback within and between clusters and provides a process to derive ratio

scales priorities from the elements (Lombardi et al, 2012) The spatial autoregressive models are also possible modelling methods for evaluating smartness of cities.

The analysis of smart city projects and initiatives is an other possible way of evaluation of smart city performance (Perboli et al. 2014). Manitiu and Pedrini (2015) in their research defined a set of smartness and sustainability indicators applicable to European cities and to assess their outcome in an ex-ante perspective with regard to the implementation of Europe 2020 strategy.

Finally there are surveys on quality of life and different attempts to measure “happiness” of cities. These are qualitative researches surveying citizens of different settlements. In this case smartness is interpreted as a kind of well-being, satisfaction, happiness. They measure the effect of habitat on quality of life. In previous works the research was conducted by quantifying objective factors (Mercer Quality of Living ranking, CSR Hungary Livable City ranking), but there is an increasing demand for including subjective factors into the evaluation. For this reason citizens are asked to fill questionnaires where they have to evaluate their medical status, well-being, satisfaction and happiness. The cities that excel in objective studies are not necessarily the ones where people are most satisfied with their lives (Ballas 2013). This kind of approach is strongly connected to the “science of happiness” and draws attention that adding geographical dimension to happiness analysis is strongly needed.

Conclusion

This paper attempted to clarify the meaning of a concept that is getting increasingly popular—that of the smart city, and to explore the possible evaluation methods of cities’ smartness. The overview is systematic but can not be complete. The definition of smart city is multi-faced. The usage of ICT, sustainability and better quality of life for people are common elements in the concept.

The paper showed that the assessment of smart city performance is complicated. The aim of this paper was not to define one exclusive way of measurement. The evaluated cities are greatly differing in infrastructural, cultural and governmental terms, so there is no one, universal evaluation model for smart cities. The local facilities, capabilities and limits are determining the road to becoming smart city. A meaningful smart city assessment method should be able to measure individual well-being and satisfaction in the city in a comparable and dynamic way which is a very complex goal. Methodological limits, practical and economical obstacles of data collection at settlement level are also affecting the elaboration of better evaluation system. More specific, focusing on city’s vision, strength and weaknesses, using bottom-up approach assessment methods are needed.

References

- Barta Gy. (2009): Integrált városfejlesztési stratégia: a városfejlesztés megújítása. *Tér és Társadalom* 3., pp. 1–12.
- Bell, D. (1973) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. Basic Books, New York.
- Beluszky P.–Sikos T. T. (1984): A faktor- és clusteranalízis. In: Sikos T. T. (szerk.): *Matematikai és statisztikai módszerek alkalmazási lehetőségei a területi kutatásokban*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 91–132.
- Caragliu, A.- Del Bo, C,- Nijkamp, P. (2011) Smart cities in Europe. In: *Journal of Urban Technology*, Vo. 18. n. 2. pp. 65-82.
- Cavada, M. – Hunt, D. V. L. – Rogers, C. D. F. (2014) Smart Cities: Contradicting Definitions and Unclear Measure. *World Sustainability Forum 2014 – Conference Proceedings* Paper. http://www.academia.edu/9133545/Smart_Cities_Contradicting_Definitions_and_Unclear_Measures
- Drucker, P. (1993) *Post-Capitalist Society*, Harper Collins, New York.
- Élő, G. – Pintér, R. (1999) *Finnország - út az információs társadalomba*. Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest.
- Enyedi Gy. (2009): Városi világ. *Magyar Tudomány* 3., pp. 295–302.
- Fast company (2013), <http://www.fastcoexist.com/1680856/the-top-10-smartest-european-cities>
- Forum PA (2012), ICity Rate. La classifica delle città intelligenti italiane. <http://www.icitylab.it/il-rapporto-icityrate/edizione-2012/metodologia/ranking>
- Giffinger, R. – Gudrun, H. (2010) Smart cities ranking: an effective instrument for positioning of the cities? *ACE: Architecture, City and Environment*, 2010/12. p. 7-25.
- Giffinger, R. et al. (2007) Smart cities. Ranking of European medium sized cities. Centre of Regional Science, Vienna UT.
- Giovannella, C. (2013) “Territorial Smartness” and Emergent Behaviors. In *Systems and Computer Science*, pp. 170-176.
- Hegedüs J. (2008): A nagyvárosi kormányzatok és az önkormányzati rendszer. *Tér és Társadalom* 1., pp. 59–75.
- Hill, D, - Watts, M. – Buscher, V (2011) *Arup UrbanLife-SmartSolutionForCities*. Transforming power-hungry urban areas into low-carbon smart cities via the creative use of technologies. . 28
- Jacquez, G M. (2008) Spatial Cluster Analysis. Chapter 22 In “*The Handbook of Geographic Information Science*”, S. Fotheringham and J. Wilson (Eds.). Blackwell Publishing, pages 395-416.
- Joss, S. (2013) "SMART CITIES: Reflections on Efforts to Standardize a New Concept".
- Kominos, N., Schaffers, H., Pallot, M. (2011). “Developing a Policy Roadmap for Smart Cities and the Future Internet”. In: *Proceedings of the eChallenges 2011 Conference*, 24-26th October, 2011, Florence. Hall, R. E. Hall, R. E. (2000). The vision of a smart city. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Life Extension Technology Workshop* (Paris, France, Sep 28).
- Lombardi, P., Giordano, S., Farouh, H., Yousef, W. (2012) Modelling the smart city performance, *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 137-149.

- Manitiu, D. N. – Pedrini, G. (2015) Smart and sustainable cities in the European Union. An ex ante assessment of environmental, social, and cultural domains. SEEDS Working Paper13/2015
- Mitchell et al. (2013) The Internet of Everything for Cities CISCO
<http://www.cisco.com/web/strategy/docs/gov/everything-for-cities.pdf>
- Monfaredzadeh, T. –Krueger, R. (2015) Investigating social factors of sustainability in a smart city. *Procedia Engineering*. 118 (2015) pp. 1112-1118
- Mosamenzadeh, F.- Vettorato, D.(2014) Defining smart city: a conceptual framework based on keyword analys. In: TEMA Input 2014 Special Issue.pp. 684-694
- Orchestrating infrastructure for sustainable Smart Cities (2014) IEC White Papers, Geneva.
- Perboli, G – De Marco, A. – Perfetti, F. – Marone, M. (2014) A New Taxonomy of Smart City Projects. *Transportation Research Procedia* 3 (2014) pp. 470 – 478
- Schneider G. (2008): Városi kistérségek vizsgálata az uniós fejlődési irányok tükrében. A funkcionális városi térségek csoportosítása. LRMI Helyi obszervatórium, Budapest.
- Selhofer, H.–Lilischkis, S.–Alkas, H.–O'Donnell, P. (2010): ICT and e-business for an innovative and sustainable economy. European Communities. Brussels.
- Smarter Cities as a European Agenda (2010). IBM és SMO, Prága.
- Smarter Cities for Smarter Growth (2010). IBM Institute for Business Value.
- Sun, Y. (2002) Determining the size of spatial clusters in focused tests: Comparing two methods by means of simulation in a GIS. *Journal of Geographical Systems* 4:359-370.
- Zygiaris, S. (2013) Smart City Reference Model: Assisting Planners to Conceptualize the Building of Smart City Innovation Ecosystems. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. 4:2 (2013)