REIMAGINING URBAN GOVERNANCE IN THE DIGITAL AGE: FROM SMART CITIES TO WISE GOVERNANCE

By Nina Alvandipour

Image generated by the author using DALL•E (OpenAI), 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of urban governance marks one of the most profound shifts in how cities operate in the twenty-first century. With more than half of humanity now living in cities—and nearly 70 percent expected by 2050—urban areas have become both the epicentre of global challenges and laboratories for innovation (United Nations, 2019). From climate adaptation and affordable housing to community development and economic opportunity, cities face mounting pressures that demand new modes of governance (Becker et al., 2022; Concilio et al., 2019; Frem et al., 2018).

Urban leaders have responded by embracing the broader idea of urban innovation, expressed through models such as e-government, smart government, co-creation, and urban living labs. What began as basic digitization has evolved into sophisticated smart city initiatives that deploy artificial intelligence, automated decision-making systems, and data analytics to govern essential urban services (Angelidou, 2014; Yigitcanlar et al., 2018). Cities from Singapore to Stockholm, from Barcelona to Bangalore, have invested billions in technologies that promise efficiency, responsiveness, and evidence-based decision-making (Neirotti et al., 2014; Yigitcanlar et al., 2020). Yet this digital revolution has produced an unexpected paradox: as our urban systems grow more digitally sophisticated, our communities often become more disconnected from the governance structures designed to serve them.

What researchers increasingly identify as an "excessively technocratic and efficiency-driven mindset" has emerged—one that prioritizes algorithmic efficiency over human wisdom, data streams over community knowledge (Bibri, 2021; Blasi et al., 2022; Yigitcanlar et al., 2018). The smart city movement, initially celebrated for its potential to enhance sustainability and quality of life (Costales, 2022), has instead revealed deep governance flaws. Early optimism gave way to scrutiny as projects across the world consistently prioritized technological solutions over social needs, corporate interests over civic participation, and efficiency metrics over democratic legitimacy (Bibri, 2021; Lim et al., 2019).

These tensions are vividly illustrated by emblematic failures. Songdo in South Korea, envisioned as the "world's first smart city," became a symbol of infrastructural hubris—an empty, top-down megaproject that privileged sensors and LEED-certified buildings over social life, leaving neighboring communities like Hambak Village disconnected and marginalized (Huh et al., 2024; Jeon, 2021; Jung, 2024). In Toronto, the cancellation of Sidewalk Labs' 2020 project underscored how even in strong democratic contexts, public resistance to surveillance and opaque data governance can derail billion-dollar initiatives (Goodman & Powles, 2019; McCord & Becker, 2019; Wang, 2021) In New York City, the LinkNYC program, once heralded as a bridge across the digital divide, became a cautionary tale of surveillance capitalism (Amsellem, 2021; Bode, 2022; McCormack & Schwarz, 2023). In India, the Smart Cities Mission displaced informal settlements and disrupted local commons, demonstrating how top-down digitization can deepen inequality (Housing and Land Rights Network, 2017; Panwar, 2025; Prasad et al., 2024).

Across these varied contexts, a clear pattern emerges: technological sophistication cannot compensate for weak governance, absent participation, or disregard for community knowledge. The integration of artificial intelligence has only deepened this divide (Yigitcanlar et al., 2020). Many digitally powered city initiatives have produced governance systems that are computationally advanced but democratically impoverished (Costales, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021; Ziegler et al., 2022).

The symptoms are global. In Asia, top-down megaprojects prioritize infrastructure over social inclusion (Yigitcanlar et al., 2018, 2020); in Europe, smart city programs often display "paternalistic" patterns that

treat residents as data sources rather than partners (Costales, 2022); and in North America, digital innovation frequently reinforces existing inequalities instead of challenging them (Lim et al., 2019; Rodríguez Bolívar, 2016; Zhao et al., 2021). The problem is not implementation alone but a deeper misunderstanding of what governance requires in the digital age (Alvandipour, 2024a; Esashika et al., 2021; Pereira et al., 2018; Przeybilovicz & Cunha, 2024; Repette et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2021). We have confused computational sophistication with practical wisdom and algorithmic optimization with democratic legitimacy. As a result, cities risk building technically impressive infrastructures but hollow governance systems—precisely when participatory foundations are most needed to confront climate change, inequality, and other collective challenges (Bryer & Alvandipour, 2021; Tomor et al., 2019; Ziegler et al., 2022).

1.1. THE CENTRAL QUESTION AND APPROACH

This raises the central question guiding this essay: How can cities harness the transformative potential of digital technologies while strengthening—rather than undermining—the democratic participation and community resilience essential for addressing twenty-first-century urban challenges? More specifically, how can planners develop wise governance frameworks that move beyond the false choice between technological efficiency and community empowerment?

I address this challenge through two interconnected arguments. First, I show how smart city initiatives have systematically prioritized technological sophistication over social intelligence, creating governance systems that are computationally advanced but democratically impoverished—and thus inadequate for confronting challenges such as climate change, inequality, and social fragmentation. Second, I propose practical principles for wise governance that combine digital capabilities with deep community participation, demonstrating how technology can enhance rather than replace the collective intelligence required for resilient and inclusive cities.

This analysis builds on a systematic review methodology examining urban innovation governance across 41 peer-reviewed articles, using qualitative thematic analysis to identify dominant patterns in smart city development (methodology detailed in (Alvandipour, 2024a). The stakes extend beyond planning practice: as digital technologies become central to urban governance, our choices will determine whether cities become more or less capable of fostering the community resilience and democratic participation essential for confronting complex challenges and building inclusive urban futures.

2. THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICITS OF SMART CITY GOVERNANCE

To understand why initiatives from Songdo to Toronto have failed to improve urban life for all residents, we must examine the fundamental assumptions embedded in their design. The promise was compelling: digital technologies would make cities more efficient, responsive, and capable of addressing complex urban challenges through data-driven decision-making (Angelidou, 2014; Blasi et al., 2022). Yet the reality has been far more troubling, revealing what scholars increasingly identify as a systematic erosion of democratic governance in favor of technocratic control (Bibri, 2021; Costales, 2022; Ziegler et al., 2022).

2.1. THE TECHNOCRATIC STANDARDIZATION PROBLEM

The most visible manifestation of this trend is an "excessively technocratic and efficiency-driven mindset" that dominates digital urban governance (Bibri, 2021; Blasi et al., 2022; Yigitcanlar et al., 2018). It reduces the complexity of urban life to computational problems, producing systems that optimize technical metrics while neglecting the social and political dimensions of livability (Bibri, 2021; Lim et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2021).

Smart traffic management offers a telling example: while it may reduce congestion, it rarely accounts for how different communities experience mobility or how routing algorithms can systematically disadvantage certain neighbourhoods (Lim et al., 2019; Neirotti et al., 2014). The same pattern—technical efficiency achieved at the expense of social equity—recurs across housing platforms, environmental monitoring, and economic development systems (Costales, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021; Ziegler et al., 2022).

This bias is reinforced by what scholars call the "decontextualization problem"—the imposition of standardized, corporate-designed technologies that ignore local conditions and governance traditions. Developed for global scalability, these systems often fit poorly within the diverse political and cultural realities of the cities that adopt them (Gupta et al., 2019; van der Heijden, 2019).

Songdo in South Korea illustrates this problem starkly. Designed as the "world's first smart city," it became a showcase of ubiquitous computing and LEED-certified infrastructure but failed to generate social life or community engagement. Built as a technical model rather than a living city, Songdo remains a sterile urban environment, while adjacent low-income neighbourhoods such as Hambak Village were excluded from its planning vision (Eireiner, 2024; Huh et al., 2024; Jeon, 2021; Jung, 2024; Venerandi et al., 2023).

A similar logic unfolded in India's Smart Cities Mission, where uniform digital platforms were imposed across cities with vastly different contexts. Instead of addressing local needs, projects displaced informal settlements, restricted access to commons such as water points and parks, and replaced organic urban networks with rigid, high-rise developments. In privileging standardization over social complexity, these projects deepened inequality rather than reducing it (Ghosh & Arora, 2022; Prasad et al., 2024; Sugandha et al., 2025).

This one-size-fits-all model is not confined to the Global South. Even affluent cities suffer when standardized solutions override participatory traditions, reducing citizens to data providers rather than partners in governance (Anthopoulos, 2015; Bellini et al., 2022; Clark, 2020; Costales, 2022). Whether in developing or developed contexts, the result is the same: governance systems that are technically sophisticated but socially detached, efficient but unwise.

2.2. THE PARTICIPATION AND POWER PARADOX

Perhaps most troubling is what can be termed the "participation paradox" in smart city governance: while digital technologies theoretically enable greater citizen engagement through online platforms, mobile applications, and real-time feedback systems, in practice they often diminish meaningful democratic participation (Tomor et al., 2019; Ziegler et al., 2022). This paradox reflects a fundamental confusion between information provision and genuine participation, between consultation and empowerment (Costales, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021).

Most smart city platforms encourage what researchers call "sensing citizenship"—treating residents as sources of data instead of partners in governance (Lara et al., 2016; Tomor et al., 2019; Yigitcanlar et al., 2020). Citizens may report potholes, rate municipal services, or provide feedback through mobile apps, but such tools rarely extend to shaping priorities or contesting policies. This paternalistic form of participation offers the appearance of engagement while preserving centralized control (Costales, 2022).

The Sidewalk Toronto project exemplifies this paradox. Marketed as a model of participatory co-design, it emphasized community workshops and digital engagement platforms. Yet beneath this participatory veneer, key decisions about data governance, surveillance infrastructure, and corporate control remained opaque. Citizen concerns about privacy and accountability ultimately led to the project's cancellation in 2020—revealing how apparent consultation can conceal deep power asymmetries (Austin & Lie, 2021; Goodman & Powles, 2019; Participedia, 2024).

A similar logic characterized New York City's LinkNYC program, launched to bridge the digital divide through public Wi-Fi kiosks. Instead, it evolved into a system dominated by advertising and data extraction, with minimal public oversight. Privacy advocates documented how residents were transformed into data points within a commercial infrastructure—an instance of surveillance capitalism embedded directly in urban space (Amsellem, 2021; McCormack & Schwarz, 2023; Reitman, 2018).

Across such projects, decision-making authority over the data that citizens generate remains concentrated among a few institutional or corporate actors. Algorithmic systems shape policies without clear channels for input, oversight, or contestation, creating what scholars describe as "black box governance" (Azevedo Guedes et al., 2018; Pereira et al., 2018; Repette et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2021). Even municipal officials are often constrained by vendor-controlled platforms that rely on proprietary algorithms (Repette et al., 2021).

Moreover, the public–private partnerships that often underpin smart city initiatives complicate the question of accountability. When technology firms retain control over both the data and the analytical infrastructure, the boundary between public interest and commercial strategy blurs, leaving little room for democratic deliberation (Repette et al., 2021; Wirtz & Muller, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021).

Singapore's Smart Nation strategy illustrates this dynamic at scale. While often celebrated as a global benchmark for efficiency, it operates through pervasive surveillance with limited public debate about privacy or civil liberties. Its success in service delivery underscores a deeper cost: the consolidation of state and corporate power under the banner of innovation (E. Ho, 2017; Jiang et al., 2022).

In each of these cases, smart technologies promised participation but delivered control—creating governance systems that are technically data-driven yet democratically opaque. Without mechanisms for transparency and shared authority, digital governance risks reproducing the very inequalities it claims to overcome.

2.3. THE INEQUITY AMPLIFICATION EFFECT

The inequity amplification effect operates through multiple, interlocking mechanisms. Digital divides ensure that smart city benefits accrue disproportionately to educated, affluent residents with reliable internet access and digital literacy, while systematically excluding elderly, low-income, and marginalized groups (Gupta et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2019). Algorithmic bias embedded in urban data systems perpetuates historical patterns of discrimination in housing, employment, and service delivery—often in ways that are invisible and difficult to contest (Blasi et al., 2022; Clark, 2020).

Spatial inequalities deepen these divides. Smart city investments tend to cluster in affluent downtowns and business districts, while peripheral neighbourhoods—home to many low-income residents—receive limited attention (Florida, 2017; Tan & Taeihagh, 2020). Concentrating digital infrastructure and services in already privileged areas creates a self-reinforcing cycle: advantage attracts investment, while marginalized communities fall further behind in accessing the benefits of urban digitalization (Tan & Taeihagh, 2020).

These patterns of uneven innovation have given rise to what Clark (2020) calls "innovation districts"—zones designed to stimulate knowledge economies but often producing new forms of exclusion. **Atlanta's Tech**

Square Innovation District exemplifies this dynamic: while it successfully attracted investment and high-tech firms, the gains accrued primarily to the creative class, offering little improvement in housing affordability or access to opportunity for nearby low-income neighbourhoods (Clark, 2020; Clark et al., 2015). **Chattanooga's Innovation District**, launched to diversify a smaller city's economy, followed a similar trajectory. Scholars describe it as a program that intensified gentrification and market-driven polarization rather than inclusive growth (Morisson & Bevilacqua, 2019).

These outcomes are not merely spatial but political. Smart city initiatives frequently bypass participatory mechanisms that could amplify marginalized voices, consolidating decision-making among technocratic elites and private developers (Costales, 2022; Tomor et al., 2019). The result is a form of digital redlining in which access to smart city services becomes another axis of urban inequality—reinforcing rather than challenging existing exclusions (Lim et al., 2019).

2.4. BEYOND TECHNOLOGICAL DETERMINISM

The cumulative effect of these challenges reveals a deeper flaw in contemporary smart city thinking: technological determinism—the belief that technology itself drives social change and that complex urban problems can be solved primarily through innovation (Galego et al., 2021; Rana et al., 2014). This mindset obscures the reality that technologies are never neutral; they embody the values, priorities, and power relations of those who design and deploy them (Costales, 2022; Zhao et al., 2021).

In urban governance, technological determinism manifests as the depoliticization of public policy—the treatment of social and political conflicts as technical optimization problems. Questions of housing, sustainability, and inequality are reframed as issues of data collection and algorithmic precision rather than of democratic deliberation about values and resource distribution (Becker et al., 2022; Blasi et al., 2022; Carcasson, 2016; Tomor et al., 2019; Weber & Khademian, 2008).

These tendencies extend beyond smart cities to comparable models of digital governance. E-governance initiatives, while streamlining services and improving administrative efficiency, often replicate the same technocratic bias, privileging centralized decision-making over citizen participation (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016; Oliveira et al., 2020). In authoritarian contexts, this orientation becomes even more pronounced: China's social credit systems and urban surveillance networks use digital governance to enhance state control while foreclosing democratic contestation (Liang et al., 2018; Qiang, 2019). Even within "smart governance" frameworks in democratic settings, citizens frequently remain consumers of optimized services rather than partners in shaping collective priorities (Anthopoulos, 2015).

The limitations of this worldview are evident in Masdar City in the United Arab Emirates. Launched in 2006 as a carbon-neutral prototype of smart urbanism, Masdar sought to engineer sustainability through renewable energy, automated transport, and sensor-driven infrastructure. Yet despite massive investment, its ambitions have been scaled back, and the city remains only partially realized. Analysts attribute this shortfall to the neglect of governance, social integration, and economic viability—showing that technology, without institutional and civic capacity, cannot substitute for collective intelligence (Costales, 2022; Griffiths & Sovacool, 2020; OMAR, 2018; Reiche, 2010; Yigitcanlar et al., 2018).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, Singapore's Smart Nation strategy demonstrates technocratic governance at comprehensive scale. The city-state has achieved impressive administrative efficiency through data integration and real-time monitoring, yet its success has come with significant democratic trade-offs: limited public debate over privacy, concentrated state control of data, and a governance model that prioritizes stability and control over pluralism and contestation. Singapore exemplifies what "successful" technocratic governance looks like when efficiency is pursued at the expense of civil liberties and participatory legitimacy (Das & Kwek, 2024; E. Ho, 2017; Lee & Lee, 2020).

The depoliticization that underpins these models has profound implications for urban democracy. By treating governance challenges as technical rather than political, smart city systems exclude citizens from shaping the future of their communities. Participation is reduced to feedback on predetermined solutions instead of genuine deliberation about priorities and values (Costales, 2022; Kaluarachchi, 2022; Voorberg et al., 2015).

3. TOWARD WISE GOVERNANCE

The failures documented above are not inevitable outcomes of digital technology but the result of design choices that prioritize computational efficiency over democratic participation and community resilience. The challenge for planners is no longer whether to adopt digital innovation—that transformation is already underway—but whether these tools can strengthen, rather than weaken, the human connections that make urban life flourish.

Wise governance represents a deliberate departure from the technocratic assumptions that have dominated smart city thinking. Its premise is simple yet radical: the most sophisticated technologies are those that enhance—not replace—human judgment, community knowledge, and democratic deliberation (Alvandipour, 2024a; Klaus & Polsky, 2025; Wirtz & Muller, 2022). Building on evidence from successful community-driven governance innovations, wise governance operates through three core principles designed to repair the democratic deficits that undermine cities' capacity for resilience and equity (Alvandipour, 2024b, 2025; Bryer & Alvandipour, 2021).

This approach aligns with what scholars describe as extensive, distributed, and networked governance—frameworks that leverage technology to connect institutions and communities in addressing complex challenges such as climate change, housing, and inequality (Galego et al., 2021). It draws inspiration from bottom-linked governance models that pair institutional support with grassroots initiative, creating systems that are both adaptive and participatory (Ardill & Lemes de Oliveira, 2018; Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022; Galego et al., 2021).

3.1. PRINCIPLE 1: TECHNOLOGY AS ENHANCEMENT, NOT REPLACEMENT

The first principle establishes that technology should augment rather than replace human decision-making capacity. This directly challenges the automation paradigm that dominates smart cities, where algorithms increasingly make decisions about resource allocation, service delivery, and urban planning without meaningful human oversight (Bibri, 2021; Wirtz & Muller, 2022). Wise governance preserves what researchers identify as "human-in-the-loop" systems—technological architectures that require human validation, interpretation, and judgment at critical decision points (Ansell & Torfing, 2021; Costales, 2022; Fuglsang et al., 2021). This means designing systems where: (1) Algorithms propose but humans dispose; (2) Data analysis informs but doesn't determine outcomes; (3) Technical optimization is balanced against community values; (4) Local knowledge can override algorithmic recommendations. The key distinction here is architectural: these systems are built with mandatory human checkpoints rather than full automation as the default (Bellini et al., 2022; Repette et al., 2021).

Digital participatory platforms embody this principle. When designed to expand deliberation rather than automate it, they allow residents to propose, debate, and prioritize local investments—making governance more transparent and inclusive (Repette et al., 2021; Kaluarachchi, 2022). Boston's Office of New Urban Mechanics exemplifies this logic. Established as a municipal innovation lab, it uses digital tools for small-scale experimentation rooted in community co-design. Rather than bypassing deliberation, it fosters iterative collaboration between officials and residents, strengthening civic agency through shared experimentation (Clark, 2020). Amsterdam's Smart Citizens Lab offers another model. It enables residents to deploy low-cost sensors to monitor air quality and noise pollution. The resulting data feed not into automated management systems but into public dialogue and advocacy, empowering communities to co-produce knowledge and influence policy (De Lange & De Waal, 2013; Gabrys, 2014).

Together, these examples demonstrate that technology enhances democracy only when human agency remains central. Digital innovation can expand access to information, enable broader participation, and foster consensus among diverse stakeholders—but only when it preserves space for deliberation, local judgment, and shared learning (Costales, 2022; Kaluarachchi, 2022; Shahani et al., 2022).

3.2. PRINCIPLE 2: DEMOCRATIC AMPLIFICATION THROUGH DIGITAL DESIGN

The second principle addresses power: how digital systems can redistribute—rather than concentrate—decision-making authority. Whereas Principle 1 focused on preserving human judgment, this principle concerns who exercises that judgment (Ardill & Lemes de Oliveira, 2018; Galego et al., 2021; Oliveira et al., 2020).

Wise governance platforms are designed to shift authority from centralized institutions to communities. They embed mechanisms such as binding citizen input, community veto powers, citizen-controlled data governance, and neighbourhood-level control over budgets and planning tools (Lopes & Farias, 2020; Voorberg et al., 2015). These features move participation beyond consultation toward genuine power-sharing, where citizen decisions have institutional force. Achieving this shift requires moving past the "sensing citizenship" model—where residents merely supply data—to what scholars call empowered participation: processes that grant citizens real influence over outcomes (Ardill & Lemes de Oliveira, 2018; Brandsen et al., 2018; Galego et al., 2021; Shahani et al., 2022).

This transformation is structural, not procedural: it changes who decides, not merely how decisions are made (Galego et al., 2021; Shahani et al., 2022). Wise governance treats residents as co-creators of urban policy, embedding their authority within institutional design rather than relying on one-off consultations (Galego et al., 2021; Moulaert & Sekia, 2003; Voorberg et al., 2015). This shift in power demands digital platforms that privilege accessibility, inclusion, and accountability over efficiency. Across the literature, these qualities appear in co-creation, user-centreed design, and citizen-driven innovation (Lim et al., 2019; Mu & Wang, 2020; van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016; Voorberg et al., 2015).

Participatory budgeting provides a flagship example. In Lisbon, the participatory budget launched in 2008 links digital deliberation with binding municipal action. Residents propose, debate, and vote on projects online and in person; winning initiatives are integrated into the city's annual budget. The process combines algorithmic transparency, open data, and public assemblies, demonstrating how technology can devolve power rather than concentrate it (Allegretti & Antunes, 2014; Bowlsby & Jemahika, 2018; Falanga et al., 2021)

Living labs extend this principle through continuous co-creation (Anthopoulos, 2015; Fuglsang et al., 2021; Yigitcanlar et al., 2018). In Helsinki, Forum Virium's city-as-a-testbed model allows residents, researchers, and public agencies to co-design and evaluate digital services. Citizen feedback directly informs policies on mobility, climate adaptation,

and accessibility—making experimentation a civic rather than managerial process (Anttiroiko, 2016; Florentin et al., 2024; Keinonen, 2025; Veloso et al., 2024). Amsterdam's Smart Citizens Lab offers a complementary bottom-up example. Residents deploy low-cost sensors to monitor air quality and noise, turning data collection into civic inquiry and policy advocacy. Here, technology facilitates dialogue and shared governance rather than data extraction (Hielscher & Smith, 2014).

Across these contexts, the distinguishing factor is not the presence of technology but the alignment between platform architecture, facilitation processes, and institutional reform. Where citizen input has formal consequence—through participatory budgeting, co-design, or hybrid governance arrangements—digital innovation strengthens democracy rather than hollowing it out (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022; Fuglsang et al., 2021; Galego et al., 2021).

3.3. PRINCIPLE 3: COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE THROUGH HUMAN-DIGITAL COLLABORATION

The third principle concerns epistemology—how cities produce and validate knowledge for decision-making. Rather than privileging either technical expertise or community wisdom, wise governance builds hybrid knowledge systems that integrate multiple ways of knowing (Chang et al., 2018; van der Have & Rubalcaba, 2016). Urban intelligence arises not from algorithms alone but from the interaction between computational capability and collective human insight. Research shows that the most effective problem-solving systems combine artificial intelligence with the diversity of human judgment (Malone, 2018).

This idea extends the notion of collaborative innovation—processes that bring governments, civil society, academia, and the private sector together to address complex challenges (Lopes & Farias, 2020; Lopes de Souza, 2011; Voorberg et al., 2015). Effective urban solutions emerge when technical expertise, local knowledge, and lived experience are combined through deliberate mechanisms such as living labs, quadruple-helix partnerships, participatory data collection, and multi-criteria evaluation (Fuglsang et al., 2021; Repette et al., 2021; Wirtz & Muller, 2022).

Barcelona's Decidim platform exemplifies this principle. Launched in 2016 as an open-source infrastructure for democratic participation, Decidim enables residents to co-design policies and budgets through digital deliberation. In its first strategic planning cycle, nearly 40,000 citizens and 1,500 organizations submitted and debated proposals, with results feeding directly into municipal decisions. By institutionalizing digital participation, Barcelona demonstrates how human deliberation and digital architecture can combine to produce both democratic legitimacy and policy innovation (Aragón et al., 2017; Barandiaran et al., 2024; Cardullo & Kitchin, 2025).

Taiwan's vTaiwan initiative offers a complementary global model. Using the Polis platform, vTaiwan structures large-scale online deliberation around contested policy issues—from ride-sharing regulation to online alcohol sales. The process enables citizens, experts, and officials to visualize consensus and disagreement in real time, with outcomes informing national legislation. Rather than token consultation, vTaiwan institutionalizes collective reasoning as a routine part of governance (M. Ho, 2022; Hsiao et al., 2018; Tang, 2019).

Together, these cases illustrate an epistemological shift:
from automation to augmentation, from expert dominance to distributed intelligence. Cities adopting such frameworks use digital tools not to replace human judgment but to connect diverse forms of it. Structured collaboration creates virtuous cycles—technical analysis informs community deliberation, resident knowledge shapes implementation, and outcomes blend computational precision with social understanding (Ardill & Lemes de Oliveira, 2018; Galego et al., 2021). In this model, civic intelligence and human judgment—not algorithms—define what counts as knowledge and success in urban governance.

4. BUILDING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR WISE GOVERNANCE

Implementing wise governance requires more than new technologies or participation methods—it demands fundamental changes in municipal institutions and professional practices. Research demonstrates that successful collaborative governance depends on what scholars identify as "institutional capacity" for managing complex multi-stakeholder processes while maintaining democratic accountability (Pereira et al., 2018; Rodríguez Bolívar, 2016; Vigar et al., 2020).

This transformation involves three key shifts.

First, municipalities must cultivate transformative leadership—the ability to mobilize collective action while upholding democratic accountability (Shahani et al., 2022). Such leadership requires skills in facilitation, conflict management, and translating between technical analysis and community priorities.

Second, cities need organizational structures that bridge technical expertise and civic knowledge. Examples include innovation offices, community liaison roles within technical departments, and institutionalized mechanisms for citizen input (Lopes & Farias, 2020). These structures must be embedded within municipal governance rather than outsourced to external consultation processes to ensure genuine influence on policy (Tomor et al., 2019).

Third, new metrics are essential. Wise governance must measure success not only by efficiency or cost-effectiveness but by community impact, participation quality, and social equity. This shift demands participatory

evaluation processes that align performance indicators with community-defined outcomes (Chang et al., 2018; Ruhlandt, 2018).

5. CONCLUSION: TOWARD CITIES THAT ARE WISE, NOT JUST SMART

The digital transformation of urban governance represents one of the most significant challenges facing planning practitioners today. As cities worldwide deploy increasingly sophisticated technologies to address complex urban challenges, we stand at a critical juncture. The path we choose will determine whether digital innovation enhances or undermines the democratic foundations essential for thriving urban communities.

This analysis has demonstrated that the dominant approach to smart cities—characterized by technocratic decision-making, standardized solutions, and limited citizen participation—systematically fails to deliver on its promise of improved urban life for all residents. Instead, current smart city models often amplify existing inequalities, concentrate power in the hands of technocratic elites, and treat citizens as data sources rather than partners in governance. These failures are not inevitable consequences of digital technology but reflect specific design choices that prioritize computational efficiency over human flourishing.

Wise governance offers a different path. By treating technology as enhancement rather than replacement, designing digital systems to expand rather than restrict participation, and fostering collaboration between human and computational intelligence, cities can harness innovation without sacrificing democracy. This requires reimagining planning practice itself: planners must facilitate multi-stakeholder collaboration, manage participatory processes, and translate between technical systems and lived experience. Municipal institutions must create structures that connect expertise with community knowledge, while evaluation frameworks must value inclusion and civic impact as much as efficiency.

The stakes extend beyond planning. As digitalization reshapes urban governance, the decisions cities make today will determine not only how they function but what kind of democracies they become. The contrast is vivid: from Songdo's empty smart-city experiment and Sidewalk Toronto's aborted digital enclave to the inequities of innovation districts in Atlanta and Chattanooga, we see the limits of technocratic ambition. Yet the successes of Helsinki's Living Lab, Lisbon's Participatory Budget, and Taiwan's vTaiwan initiative show that when designed for inclusion, digital platforms can amplify democratic voice rather than mute it.

The path forward requires collective effort. Planners must model human-centreed practice; planning schools must integrate digital democracy into their curricula; and professional associations like ISOCARP must promote standards for evaluating digitally enhanced governance.

Ultimately, urban intelligence is not defined by algorithms but by our capacity to combine computational power with collective wisdom—to unite technical analysis with lived experience, and efficiency with legitimacy. Cities that master this integration will not merely be smarter; they will be wiser, more just, and more capable of enabling every resident to thrive.

The choice is ours: continue down the technocratic path where algorithms define governance, or embrace wise governance—where technology amplifies human judgment in the shared work of building better cities. The future of urban democracy depends on this choice.

6. REFERENCES

Allegretti, G., & Antunes, S. (2014). The Lisbon Participatory Budget: results and perspectives on an experience in slow but continuous transformation. Field Actions Science Report, 2014.

Alvandipour, N. (2024a). Reconceptualizing Urban Innovation: A Community-Level, Self-Governing Perspective [Graduate Thesis and Dissertation 2023-2024]. University of Central Florida.

Alvandipour, N. (2024b). Tactical Urbanism as an Innovative Urban Governance Tool: Lessons from the COVID-19 Pandemic (pp. 69–84). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-8672-9_5

Alvandipour, N. (2025). Realizing Just Cities: A Scoping Review of Practical Implications (2000–2021). Journal of the American Planning Association, 91(4), 586–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2025.2517177

Amsellem, A. (2021). The Noise of Silent Machines: A Case Study of LinkNYC. Surveillance & Society, 19(2).

Angelidou, M. (2014). Smart city policies: A spatial approach. Cities, 41, S3–S11. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2014.06.007

Aragón, P., Kaltenbrunner, A., Calleja-López, A., Pereira, A., Monterde, A., Barandiaran, X. E., & Gómez, V. (2017). Deliberative Platform Design: The case study of the online discussions in Decidim Barcelona. ArXiv.

Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services. In Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services. Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315204956

Bryer, T. A., & Alvandipour, N. (2021). Public administration and citizen participation: From isolation to activism to skepticism. In Handbook of Theories of Public Administration and Management.

Esashika, D., Masiero, G., & Mauger, Y. (2021). An investigation into the elusive concept of smart cities: a systematic review and meta-synthesis. TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS & STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT, 33(8), 957–969. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2020.1856804

Goodman, E. P., & Powles, J. (2019). Urbanism Under Google: Lessons from Sidewalk Toronto. Fordham Law Review, 88(2).

Griffiths, S., & Sovacool, B. K. (2020). Rethinking the future low-carbon city: Carbon neutrality, green design, and sustainability tensions in the making of Masdar City. Energy Research & Social Science, 62, 101368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.101368

Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., & Jaiswal, M. (2019). Classification of Smart City Research - a Descriptive Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. INFORMATION SYSTEMS FRONTIERS, 21(3), 661–685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-019-09911-3

Keinonen, E. (2025). Community participation in urban open innovation projects: Case study of the innovation intermediary organization Forum Virium Helsinki [Master's thesis]. University of Turku.

Klaus, I., & Polsky, B. (2025). Reimagining People-Centreed Smart Cities: A Consultation on the UN-Habitat Guidelines. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Lara, A. P., Moreira Da Costa, E., Furlani, T. Z., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2016). Smartness that matters: towards a comprehensive and human-centred characterisation of smart cities. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 2(1), 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40852-016-0034-z

Lee, T., & Lee, H. (2020). Tracing surveillance and auto-regulation in Singapore: 'smart' responses to COVID-19. Media International Australia, 177(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X20949545

Liang, F., Das, V., Kostyuk, N., & Hussain, M. M. (2018). Constructing a Data-Driven Society: China's Social Credit System as a State Surveillance Infrastructure. Policy & Internet, 10(4), 415–453. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.183

Lim, Y., Edelenbos, J., & Gianoli, A. (2019). Identifying the results of smart city development: Findings from systematic literature review. Cities, 95, 102397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102397

Oliveira, T. A., Oliver, M., & Ramalhinho, H. (2020). Challenges for Connecting Citizens and Smart Cities: ICT, E-Governance and Blockchain. SUSTAINABILITY, 12(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072926

OMAR, W. F. (2018). ZERO CARBON CI ZERO CARBON CITY- MASDAR CITY CRITICAL AN TICAL ANALYSIS . BAU Journal - Health and Wellbeing:, 1(3).

Panwar, T. S. (2025, August 24). India's tech-driven Smart Cities Mission has destroyed the commons. Scroll.

Reiche, D. (2010). Renewable Energy Policies in the Gulf countries: A case study of the carbon-neutral "Masdar City" in Abu Dhabi. Energy Policy, 38(1), 378–382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.09.028

Reitman, R. (2018, July 10). Grassroots group confronts privacy-invasive WiFi kiosks in New York. Electronic Frontier Foundation.

Repette, P., Sabatini-Marques, J., Yigitcanlar, T., Sell, D., & Costa, E. (2021). The Evolution of City-as-a-Platform: Smart Urban Development Governance with Collective Knowledge-Based Platform Urbanism. LAND, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/land10010033

Wang, J. (2021). Why Did Sidewalk Labs's Quayside Project Fail? The Practical and Institutional Difficulties of Smart City Practice.

Weber, E. P., & Khademian, A. M. (2008). Wicked Problems, Knowledge Challenges, and Collaborative Capacity Builders in Network Settings. Public Administration Review, 68(2), 334–349. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00866.x

Wirtz, B. W., & Muller, W. M. (2022). An Integrative Collaborative Ecosystem for Smart Cities - A Framework for Organizational Governance. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.2001014

Yigitcanlar, T., Desouza, K. C., Butler, L., & Roozkhosh, F. (2020). Contributions and Risks of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Building Smarter Cities: Insights from a Systematic Review of the Literature. ENERGIES, 13(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/en13061473

Yigitcanlar, T., Kamruzzaman, M., Buys, L., Ioppolo, G., Sabatini-Marques, J., da Costa, E. M., & Yun, J. J. (2018). Understanding "smart cities": Intertwining development drivers with desired outcomes in a multidimensional framework. CITIES, 81, 145–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.04.003

Zhao, F., Fashola, O. I., Olarewaju, T. I., & Onwumere, I. (2021). Smart city research: A holistic and state-of-the-art literature review. CITIES, 119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103406

Ziegler, R., Balzac-Arroyo, J., Hölsgens, R., Holzgreve, S., Lyon, F., Spangenberg, J. H., & Thapa, P. P. (2022). Social innovation for biodiversity: A literature review and research challenges. Ecological Economics, 193, 107336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107336