Connected Smart Cities Conference 12th January 2017 13:30-15:30

Afternoon parallel session: ***Cities by and for People – co-creation, ethics and privacy***

Chaired by Marita Holst

Fellow panelists/speakers: Belen Palacios, Anna Ståhlbröst, Benjamin Aaron Snow, Luca Bolognini

Introduction by chair Marita Holst started the session by setting the scene: Both Open and Big data have become part and parcel of our times. Data has a huge impact in our lives and it often makes our lives easier. There is large potential for both engagement and impact. There are differences in how people are being addressed. Are they (the citizens) factors or actors?

There is a strong focus on data generation through sensors, social media flows, open government data etc. All this data generation there is a growing risk that people will be viewed mainly as data providers/generators. We need to address the privacy elements. People and their need should be at the center of innovation not the data creating value of them.

Ms Holst ran through the agenda

- Co-creating Experimentation as a Service in Smart Cities
  - Belen Palacios, Future Cities Catapult (Organicity/Synchronicity)
- Users as Actors or Factors in Smart Cities - Design For, With or By the User.
  - Anna Ståhlbröst, Botnia Living Lab/Luleå University of Technology
- Civocracy for co-creation
  - Benjamin Aaron Snow - CivocracyEurocities
- 3D ETHICS & PRIVACY FOR SMART CITIES
  - Luca Bolognini (IIP/Privacy Flag/Organicity/IoT Lab)
- Ethics in end-user engagement in Large Scale Pilotes. Lessons learned from projects where a very high level of privacy was implemented.
  - Anna Ståhlbröst (Botnia/IoT Lab/U4IoT and EARIT)

Decentralised city making through co-creation, by Belen Palacios

Ms Palacios started her session with the question of how many members of the audience feel they know what co-creation is? About half the audience felt they could answer affirmatively to this.

Co-creation needs to be demystified. It has always existed. It centers around collaboration with stakeholders. Stakeholders can be involved in creation but how many stakeholders and have they had decision making power in the collaboration? Have they been part of defining AND solving the problem? Consumer has been involved in designing new projects for a long time now, we are now moving into the era of citizen collaboration.

However commercial participation is usually driven by market mechanism but this is not likely to be a good model for urban participation. No good mechanisms currently exist for measuring real impact of urban participation.

Digital cities need to be legible now. We cannot evolve the digital city without the citizens. Therefor relationships are now being reshaped. How do we make structures accountable and trustworthy? Citizens are spoiled, they vote very four years and that is it. That is not good enough! Citizens need to be much more effect and shape much more themselves.

We need more conversations. Real people to people interactions. We need to define together how we make the digital cities. People do not really know how to talk. We need conversations in a TOP-UP approach. Top-Up approach in between top-down and bottom up. Citizen entrepreneurship is an example.

The Incredible Edible Topmorden project was mentioned where citizens planted vegetables in a deprived city. An example of citizen initiatives fostered by authorities. This example shows that a city is too complex for dashboards. Decentralisation is needed.

Cities can benefit from the natural selection that happens by itself by users, social media, consumers etc. Urban experimentation need to continue.

City as a Commons means a city benefit everybody that takes part of the cities. Examples of projects such as Cities for Life which is a project on solving urban challenges. The challenges are being identified with the citizens. Other examples were mentioned. Experimentation should be considered a service

It was stressed that smart cities happen every day, it is not a platform, it is a movement that is organic. Anybody who wants to experiment should come forward.

Users as actors or factors in smart cities – Design for, with or by users Anna Ståhlbröst

Ms Ståhlbröst started by the reflective question: What is a smart city? She underlined that it is about being smart rather than ICT solutions. That we should allow ourselves to be critical in the process as well as positive. It is about serving the needs of the citizens, about being connected, about being safe, it is about being sustainable. It is about using citizens as contributors to their own environment and use what is there: The natural light for example.

Citizens must remain the central focal point. How are citizens involved, how can they be involved in addressing challenges for smart cities such as: Jobs, Climate change, Traffic, Energy supply, Population growth, Water scarcity, Waste management, Increased social inequality, Citizens Quality of Life

Ms Ståhlbröst underlined that she in her literature study of Smart City Initiatives. All seem to have to do how to enhance the quality of life for the citizens but how exactly is often left unanswered and real citizens engagement is often lacking. Often it is merely about testing proposed solutions.

There seem to be three views of citizen participation: (i) Participate and contribute to the city as data providers motivated to contribute to services they can use themselves (ii) Participate in urban planning initiatives and give local input to decision making (iii) Participate in development of smart city services that enables the smart cities (a more uncommon approach to smart cities – unfortunately)

Citizen actors or citizen factors? It is very common that citizen are viewed as actors not understanding the actions and the reasons. We need to factor in citizens as real factors with knowledge, needs, reasons and work towards systems where we develop WITH citizens and even foster structures where we design BY citizens/users.

Why important? We know that people want to be involved, not only contribute. People want to feel that their contributions matter and give results. End-users are innovative. Ethical right

Ask not what you can do for the citizen, but what the citizen can do with you

Civocracy by Benjamin Aaron Snow

Mr. Snow is co-founder of the Civocracy organisation and he started by introducing his organisation and their approach which is all about community. Civocracy is two years old.

Problems and challenges for local governments often rest on a poor dialogue with local citizens. Local governments have not adapted, they have not adapted to deal with communities, when this continues over time citizens become disengaged. Therefore, question is not if we should re-engage with the citizens but how. HOW to reactivate the dialogue, and HOW to use the input and HOW to consolidate for the long-term benefit of the community. Communication is key.

Mr. Snow presented their platform. A platform which is a technological solution that can support other means of engagement. The platform helps constructive dialogue and give context to users/citizens.

Mr. Snow gave a number of examples. For instance, Nice. Showing that the platform can give an introduction, to learn more, to engage, to consolidate towards decision makers. Local governments using Civocracy are many and for the moment located in Germany, France and the Netherlands. The system seems to have the advantage of making things concrete. Giving the example of dog poe >< more meta level strategies.

The platform has led to fast bottom-up generated ideas moving into the political agenda. Germans care about their data much more than the Dutch and the French.

Civocracy is often a neutral party in the middle. Being an agent in the middle when developing new platforms. Often city administrations carry too many connotations with citizens for citizens to be completely honest or constructive. If people do not have the change to be really honest then the processes have little chance of creating impact and be meaningful.

Ethics and privacy aspects in smart projects, by Luca Bolognini

Mr. Bolognini started his presentation by underlining that his interest is to look at the protection of the individual person. We must remember that the data subjects (ie those who create data) are people.

People's data are key elements in order to design effective and smart policies and services for citizens, in their own interest and for the global good. However, Big Data collected from cities' IoT environment can impact on citizens' life, freedom and rights. Today there is very little communication about the ongoing data collection and the purpose of these collections.

Mr. Bolognini listed a number of risks such as: Intruding into private life, User identification, Data transmission to unauthorized their parties, Geo-location, Data dissemination, Data transfer outside the EU, Excessive data retention, Incompatible data reuse, Cybersecurity risks (evil use of the facility), Risk of losing, hacking, pirating, falsification or interception data. Disclosure of sensitive data (e.g. health care, sexual orientation etc.). Behavioral monitoring. “Digital subconscious”: data mining could generate newborn data processing, unknown and unsuspected even by data subjects. Discriminating decisions. Silent impacts/effects on citizens’ life

To complicated things, things can automatically process, mine, exchange, analyze personal data and take decisions without human intervention, and create new data using old data. The accountability can and will be challenging.

Mr. Bolognini serves as an adviser on 2 Horizon 2020 projects: OrganiCity and Privacy Flag. These projects have undertaken steps and these steps can be of benefit to other projects and processes as well: Key steps of the Ethics & Privacy Strategy in a Smart Project:

1. Identify the main phases of the project, which are relevant for privacy/data protection or ethics

2. Identify the key privacy/data protection/ethics issues related to each phase of the project

3. Outline a strategy to tackle the identified issues

All the possible effects (and side effects) of an advanced smart city/IoT application should be cautiously assessed, trying to minimize the risks for individuals while strengthening their awareness and empowerment. Also positive effects should be evaluated.

Mr. Bolognini ran us through some of the dilemmas and opportunities addressed in the two H2020 projects.

He underlined that we need to first and foremost we need to put the safety of the citizen/user first, by preference a self-controlled defense option. The virtual and the physical world need further integration, right now the virtual world feeds on the physical world and it gives back but whereas we can chose if we go for a walk we cannot chose which sensors witness that. Mr. Bolognini introduced the concept of Self(ie) Control: empower the user/data users

Ethics in end-user engagement in large scale piloting, by Anna Stålbröst

Digitalisation of society: Digitalization is often viewed as the solution to societal problems. It can also increase the digital divide. It creates unintended consequences. Pokemon Go offering nerds exercise. Smart Phones creating car accidents, new paveways for pedestrians for mobile zombies……new traffic solutions. To avoid or know how to handle potential unintended consequences, involve the end-users!

Engaging with end-users should happen because: Get it right the first time, revising/changing is too expensive. End-users have a democratic right to have influence over things that will influence their lives. Realistic expectation setting so that no one has unrealistic expectations to the solutions.

It is not easy to involve end-users: So how do we do that? The needs of the end-users should drive innovation and growth: Find motivated end-users – Find representative end-users – But remember motivations and needs are a moving target.

Large scale piloting: LSP are about standards, scalability, flexibility and size – Reduces end-users' possibilities to influence the design and development of technology. This requires solutions that are mature. Where is the actual room for influence and adaptability? Honesty is key.

Challenging task to inform citizens about the ongoing research project and tests. Privacy aspects have great impact on the design of smart city solutions. How do we get informed consent when you work with sensors in cities during a LSP? So many questions relating to data protection and privacy. Questions relating to equality and inclusion.

End-user engagement and privacy: How do you motivate end-users to contribute: Main drivers seem to be Fun, Fame, Fortune, Fulfillment. More difficult when the privacy aspect has to be taken into consideration. How do we find the right balance? New technology leads to changes and we need to research and understand the potential change and assess potential unintended consequences with end-users before moving to action!