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Summary. This article conceptualizes the building of Innovation: for modeling Smart City, the case study of comparative analysis on the Smart City of Buea in Cameroon and Vilnius in Lithuania over the last five years (2013–2017). The main objective of this research is to show the innovation process of the BMC in Cameroon and VMC in Lithuania and to understand how the inhabitants of the cities have been benefiting from their environment whether positively or negatively. The sources of data were journals, articles, newspapers and a questionnaire that will be completed by experts (politicians, entrepreneurs, university lecturers, doctoral, masters and bachelor degree students). Furthermore, the goal of most countries nowadays is to enjoy the benefits of Smart City (e.g. smart governance, mobility, environments, economy, technology, infrastructure and smart living), however, because of the over growing world population, most countries in Europe, for example Lithuania, and other countries in Africa, especially Cameroon is working hard to improve on their economic, social and political facilities (Entrepreneurship & Opportunity; Governance; Education; Health; Safety & Security; Personal Freedom; and Social Capital) so that citizens will enjoy better standards of living. Hence, the creation of the new policy for regional development in Cameroon as well as in Lithuania has brought tremendous aid to the economy, it is assisting the countries to realize their 2020 and 2035 vision of economic innovations; it has increased the levels of citizens’ awareness; created employment, increased productivity for both agricultural and industrial products and improved on the living conditions of citizens. In addition, social capital, partnership, entrepreneurs and non-governmental organizations are also vital tools for economic innovation and social innovation, they bring in new ideas in workplaces,
improvement of quality of life and ensure qualitative and more efficient social solutions, while Research (social partnership, social clustering, NGO) and networking aid development by linking people together through communication such as the social media, cell phones, and create strong social capital. Nevertheless, some hard barriers separate the BMC and the VMC from their smart city innovative development, which therefore weakened the provisions of social and economic amenities. Such barriers are poor leadership, insufficient financing obtained from the central government, bribery and corruption.
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## Introduction

Global changes, predetermined by accelerating development of science, socio-economic changes, social industries and knowledge-based solutions, introduce qualitative modifications to society’s lifestyle. The Europe 2020 Agenda also centers around the three earlier established pillars: innovation, sustainability and social cohesion by renewing the underlying approach of the Lisbon Strategy, based on a partnership for growth and job creation that relies on a mix of the commitment of Member States to take action at the national level (including the usage of indicators and target levels), while making also the best use of governance mechanisms and instruments at the EU level. In that regard, also greater emphasis on the coordination of those levels, hence national and European policy, has been given as well as a more binding character for the achievement of the goals as underlined in the final agreement (Barroso, 2010; Natali, 2010). According to G. Kvieskienė (2003, 2005, 2012), R. Putnam (1993) the growth of socioeconomic dynamics depends on the quality of smart education, positive socialization, whereas the perspectives of individual’s life are predetermined by possibilities of individual’s involvement in the socioeconomic system, results and accessibility of education.

The **objective** of this research is to conceptualize the smart innovation ecosystem characteristics in research and practical experience that elucidates the assembly of all smart city notions and elements like green, interactive, happiness, interconnected, instrumented, open, integrated, intelligent, and innovating layers composing a planning framework called **Smart City Reference Model**, which was analyzed by Sotiris Zygiaris1 and others2. Smart Cities3 research can be performed in different shapes and sizes, the models can be created or adopted in a range from smart policy paradigms, policy elements that embrace
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the green, broadband, and urban economies. Smart cities researchers and planners could use the reference models to define the conceptual layout of a smart city and describe the smart innovation characteristics in each one of the six layers. Cases studies about smart cities, such as Barcelona, Edinburgh, Amsterdam and USA smart cities⁴ were examined and evaluated in relation to the Smart City Reference Model. With the majority of the world’s population residing in urban areas for the first time in human history, cities are emerging as key sites of social experimentation and problem solving in the 21st century (Glaeser, 2011; Grabar, 2013; Lehrer, 2010; Katz & Bradley, 2013, Kvieskienė & Kvieska, 2012). This demographic pressure, coupled with the twin crises of a rapidly warming global climate and lingering economic instability has led to a range of new conceptualizations of the city and concomitant policy prescriptions that place cities at the centre of solutions to these problems. One of the more significant examples is that of the ‘smart city’, a somewhat nebulous idea which seeks to apply the massive amounts of digital data collected about society as a means to rationalize the planning and management of cities (Townsend, 2013; Resolution No XI-977 of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania of 30 June 2010 approving the Guidelines for Change in the Lithuanian Culture Policy⁵).

Research Project Aim is to analyze the Smart Communication for Modeling Smart cities. The case study of a comparative Analysis on the Smart City of the Buea in Cameroon and Vilnius City in Lithuania.

Tasks:
1. Analyze elements integration in the ‘Smart City’ model conception;
2. Analyze the building of smart regional policy Capacity;
3. Modeling Smart City growth, regional development and Social Capital.

Research Methodology

Summarizing, the overall mapping exercise of this article aims to show how regions in Europe score at half time of the Europe 2020 and being somewhat influenced by crises by looking at the last six years of performance. Especially for the latter one, this article aims to narrow them down by comparing Elements of Smart City in the Buea Municipal Council in Cameroon and Vilnius City Municipal Council in Lithuania. Thus, the central research question of this research therefore reads: ‘Benchmarked with European reference regions, how does the Cameroon integrated Concepts of Smart City and Smart Specialization compare with Lithuanian Cities and perform with respect to innovation, taking into account the strategic goals of the Europe 2020 flagship initiative Innovation Union throughout the years 2007 till 2013. Hence qualitative research approach is valid

for these analyses. The reason for this method is that the qualitative analyses including structured interview researches, entrepreneurs and stakeholders allow secondary method of data collection to be used in obtaining information for the study. Moreover, we chose 12 questions for seven selected experts (politicians, entrepreneurs, scholars and lecturers). Based on their profession, they could clearly understand the meaning of innovation and how it improves our cities, whether negatively or positively. In addition, the time spent by each expert ranges from 10 to 15 minutes for all 12 questions. The secondary method of data collection includes research surveys, books and articles, sources, documentaries and online information, to generate valid data for the research. In this research, we analyze the City of Buea and Vilnius City like two prototypes of example styles of smart cities, which are in different levels and have different specific attributes.

Smart Communication in Buea (Cameroon) and Vilnius (Lithuania) Cities

In the world today, business owners want to establish in areas that will be a magnet for customers and most excellent workforce, while people want to move, work and live in areas where they can enjoy better quality of life and have access to smart education, smart healthcare, smart agro, smart disaster management, smart safety and security, smart transport and mobility, smart digital infrastructure (ICT), smart development infrastructure, smart waste management, smart water management, smart energy and smart governance. Nevertheless, states in Europe, e.g. Lithuania as well as local governments in Africa, e.g. Cameroon are working hard to improve living conditions and working conditions for citizens and entrepreneurs so as to achieve the smart city concept. The following principles are used to effect this changes, they include:

• To provide variety of transportation choices;
• By encouraging communities and stakeholders to collaborate in decision making;
• To make developmental decisions predictable, cost successful and fair;
• To preserve open space, farmland, and environmental areas;
• To foster distinctive, attractive communities with strong sense of place;
• To direct development towards existing communities.

Furthermore, the world is changing constantly and because of this, there is a need for states to adopt some principles that will sufficiently equip, to face these changes. Cameroon as well as Lithuania has a vision to achieve social and economic progress on development by 2030 and 2035. Consequently, these countries are working hard to make their cities smarter. After a careful study about Lithuania, it was implicit that it is a country surrounded by the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway, Finland, Iceland and Sweden) which are rich because of their wellbeing creation policies. Therefore Lithuania is striving to become successful; politically, socially and economically. Furthermore, Lithuania being
a member of the EU and NATO is serving as an easy means for the country to become more modern, energetic, and have a strong sense of national unity in order to achieve its smart city objectives. Cameroon, on the other hand, is a country with happy people; many natural resources, fertile lands for agricultural production and many minerals. The government in order to improve on the social, economic, and political environment has set up a vision to achieve regional innovations by 2035 for better living. Moreover, after the completion of the questionnaire by the experts, analyses were drawn, which prove the lessons learned from the smart city innovation in the BMC of Cameroon and the VMC of Lithuania. The experts were both men and women and their ages range from 25 to 50 years. Furthermore, 3 out of 7 experts agreed that the vision of the Cameroon state to achieve smart regional socio-economic and smart city development till 2035 is succeeding. According to them, the government has been promising this for a long time and now it is successful because there are lots of innovations going on in every domain that is from the presidency, to the local authorities, dilapidated houses have been demolished in most parts of the country while new roads have also been constructed in many cities in the country. The government is training more qualified teachers in the educational sector, creating jobs for them and for other unemployed citizens.

On the other hand, 4 of 7 experts disagree with the fact that the regional socio-economic and smart city innovation in Cameroon is moving on well. According to them the vision is not succeeding because there is no political willingness to achieve the vision, also politicians talk more than they can do because of the need to satisfy their quest for power without putting in place an efficient mechanism to achieve smart city development.

With the current political upheaval in Cameroon and the methods used by the government to bring solutions to it, it will be impossible for the government to achieve the innovation goal. There is also a high level of corruption, tribalism and lack of democracy. Again, the vision will be impossible because we are already in 2018 and the innovational developmental process is still in an experimental state, many other cities are lacking behind. The vision is possible for some cities but for the whole country is impossible. Into the bargain, 5 out of 7 experts suggested that to develop a sustainable government, municipal unity and collaboration of the smart city vision, relationships must be built at the mission and technical levels, to ensure that process hand-offs, key performance indicators and digital platforms will be interoperable. While 2 other experts suggested that it can be possible by facilitating development of interest and understanding of goals and pain points for all potential partners. Moreover, experts gave various suggestions. To assist the government to realize the smart city innovations they include the following. Moderate or manage smart city strategies, by connecting social and government goals with the ability in technology to execute and scale it across the citizenship. The government should appoint
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6 Cities and countries are turning toward the smart city task and asking the right questions. Available online at: https://blogs.gartner.bettina-tratz-ryan/2017/10/10/cities-countries-are-Turning-towards-the-smart-city-task-and-asking-the-rightquestions/
groups such as Urban Dynamics to run it, developing interesting projects in a bimodal and innovative environment. The government should sensitize citizens about the importance of development and encourage them to vote for new mayors in the municipalities when the need arises. Once more, jobs should be created to reduce unemployment and educate citizens how to become self-employed. Agriculture should be encouraged because it is the main source of income for the state, the state should also fight against corruption because it kills innovation. Finally, the government should create inspiration around projects needs and prioritization.

The experts gave their views about the Smart City innovation concept in the Buea and Vilnius Municipality, this will be explained using the smart diamond picture and it will be demonstrated using percentages for both cities.

![Smart City diamond diagram](http://goo.gl/images/8XKoYf)

*Fig. 1. Smart City diamond*

*Source: [http://goo.gl/images/8XKoYf](http://goo.gl/images/8XKoYf)*
Fig. 1. Smart City diamond
Source: http://goo.gl/images/8XKoYf

To begin with, Smart Economy comprises of innovation spirit, which is the strength to bring new ideas to the state to guarantee socio-economic development, high employment rate, presence of the culture and entertainment industry. Lithuania, as well as Cameroon, has a vision to achieve social and economic development until 2020, so the both countries have a lot of innovation spirit to achieve their developmental goals. Both countries also possess a spirit of competition for development, entrepreneurship is equally supportive, creativity is high while the labor market is flexible and linked to local and global markets.

Also, Smart People shows the qualification of citizens and their educational levels. However, the level of development in Lithuania is better than in Cameroon, but Cameroonians try to participate in public affairs, bring flexibility and creativity in both social and human capital, and integrate with the community to improve public relations. Lithuanians, on the other hand, can guarantee social and ethical plurality and cosmopolitanism.

Furthermore, Smart Governance consists of citizen contribution, the government provision of social and public services. In Cameroon, as well as in Lithuania, the government strives for transparency in state affairs, and facilitates citizens to participate in decision-making, as well as in collaboration between local administration and NGOs.

In addition, Smart Mobility covers local and intercontinental accessibility, access to ICT and modern transport systems. In Lithuania the transport system is good with tarred roads, airport, railways that easy movement from one city to another and from one country to other. In Cameroon though the transport systems are not so good and there are some innovations going on, people still move from one city to another.

Again, Smart Environment can be described as preservation of natural urban environments, reduced noise, water and air pollution, managed environmental waste as well
as resources and other environmental defense process. In Cameroon the government is trying hard to fight against pollution and garbage disposal to ensure a safe and clean environment, it is also the same in Lithuania as there are garbage cans along streets, shopping centers and parks.

Moreover, **Smart Living** cover several aspects of quality of life, such as culture, health, individual safety, housing, tourism, energy, education and social cohesion (Vienna Univ. of Tech-Centre of Regional Science 2007, pp. 11–12). Within Cameroon, standards of living are poor with little provisions of health care services, poor housing, even though people are still satisfied with what they have. Lithuanians, on the other hand, have all the facilities for better life but the citizens are not so happy because they need more innovations from the government. The Cohen's Smart Cities Wheel Model (Boyd Cohen, 2011) is a holistic framework for considering all of the key components of what makes a city smart (Fig. 2). We used it as a touchstone to classify experts.

Finally, **Social Capital** is associated with trust, co-operation, mutual engagement and social unity. It can also influence development in the production of institutions, firms, and various other forms of capital, and it is used to create smart cities. Besides, social capital can improve the fast flow of knowledge between individuals, communities and firms. Human and social capital are effective instruments for individuals and societies to become accustomed efficiently and quickly to the economic and social changes. Social capital is the increase of trust of social relations (Fukuyama, 1995; Kvieskienė, 2005), civil participation (involvement) developed by participating in voluntary organisations (Putnam 1993, 2000), a structure of the society by creating willingness to participate in development of physical capital (Kvieskienė & Kvieska, 2012). Based on scientific research, the researchers of the Legatum institute, when assessing social capital, distinguish 3 classical groups of conceptions of social capital which are associated with a social unity, involvement and civic societies (networks of communities, non-governmental organisations, families). “The Social Capital sub-index measures the strength of personal relationships, social network support, social norms, and civic participation in a country”. According to assessment of social capital, it consists of social cohesion and involvement (a formal volunteering, assistance to strangers, donation, trust and networks of communities and family, etc.). Lithuania is ranked 66th, and Cameroon is in the 111th position.
Analyzing of the case studies (Buea and Vilnius Municipality)

Currently, nations (Lithuania and Cameroon) are working hard to promote and develop solutions for financing economic development in both urban and rural areas in order to create smart environment whereby the urban and local areas will access the necessary resources for developmental strategies. Also, the United Nation Habitat Local Government and Decentralization Unit work with local governments to reinforce their ability in three ways: firstly, to set up a dialogue between the local and the central government, public and private sectors; secondly, to create a management system and public financial system to generate capital for economic development and for the benefit of the poor and for public services; thirdly, to endorse transparency and to monitor the use of scarce public resources. Furthermore, development is the most significant trend of the society these days because of the increase in the world’s population, social segregation, gender inequality, climate change, environmental issues and urban sprawl. Fig. 3 shows the property prosperity index for Lithuania and other EU countries by Legatum institute ranking 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Economic Quality</th>
<th>Business Environment</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Safety&amp;Security</th>
<th>Personal Freedom</th>
<th>Social Capital</th>
<th>Natural Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>+45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Lithuania between competitive neighbours

The unstable economic situation, low social capital (trust) level has a direct impact on families and children living conditions. By Prosperity Index (2016) Lithuania is ranked
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10 Available online at: www.unhabitat.org.
in 42 place (Norway 2; Estonia 26, Latvia 37). Although the 42 place is high enough, but it is surprising that even the index compilors recognize that quality of life in Lithuania is ruined by “excessive pessimism” rather than the real situation, and the place could/should have been higher.

![Lithuania Welfare Index](image)

**Fig. 4. Lithuanian Welfare Index**

According to them, the Lithuanian economy is growing rapidly, but the population is still dissatisfied with the country’s economy; Lithuania’s communication infrastructure is better developed than in most other countries (ultra fast internet and mobile phone use), costs to establishment of business are low, but the Lithuanians still believe that business conditions are bad; the education situation in Lithuania is ranked in 43 place, but residents consider the education system as poor; health care system is adequate, and state security has no major hazards, but Lithuanians still feel unsafe in every sense. These are investigating London’s Legatum Institute findings.
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12 *Prosperity (Legatum) index; Available online at: http://www.prosperity.com/rankings.*
The Africa Prosperity Report searches for the level of prosperity in African countries that can and should be anticipated to deliver given their level of wealth. This is done by evaluating a country’s level of wealth (GDP per capita) modelled against its overall ranking in the Legatum Institute’s annual Prosperity Index (which uses eight economic and social indicators).

![The Legatum Prosperity Index of Africa Countries](image_url)

**Fig. 5.** The Legatum Prosperity Index of Africa Countries
The Africa Prosperity Report searches for the level of prosperity in African countries that can and should be anticipated to deliver given their level of wealth. This is done by evaluating a country’s level of wealth (GDP per capita) modelled against its overall ranking in the Legatum Institute’s annual Prosperity Index (which uses eight economic and social factors including Entrepreneurship & Opportunity; Governance; Education; Health; Safety & Security; Personal Freedom; and Social Capital.) Legatum prosperity index (2016) put South Africa in the first position, Botswana in the second position and Morocco in the third position meaning that the countries have good economy, governance, health system, safety & security, education, social capital, social factors, entrepreneurship & opportunity, needs & freedom. Cameroon, on the other hand, is on the eighteen position which is fairly surprising because Cameroonianis are dissatisfied with the fact that facilities such as health, safety & security, need and freedom are extremely low, because these facilities are poorly distributed equally to all citizens. Along with that, Cameroonianis believe that facilities such as education, social capital are moderate within the country while entrepreneurship & opportunity are low because of high taxes imposed for business owners. Furthermore, in the (2017) overall Prosperity Index rankings, Cameroon has fallen by 3 positions from 126 to 129 contrast to last year. From the time when the Prosperity Index has been introduced (2006), Cameroon has stayed at the same position. In addition, the prosperity pillar rankings show that Cameroon performs best on natural environment and social capital and attain a low mark on safety & security. The major positive change, contrast to last year, came in Safety & Security increasing by 3 places, whereas they dropped 31 places on Social Capital.\(^\text{13}\)

However, there are some shortcomings or drawbacks to socio-economic development faced by the BMC and the VMC municipalities in executing the various developmental projects in their constituency. Some of these drawbacks include the following. The deputies and councilors have no powers to challenge the Mayor especially when funds for socio-economic development are being misused or mismanaged by the Mayor. However, it is only the supervisory body, the Senior Divisional Officer (S.D.O),

\(^{13}\) Legatum prosperity report for African Countries (2016)
which has the right to question the activities of the Mayor or place a sanction on him or her when the need arises. Such a system weakens the powers of the Councilors because they have little privileges to be part of the decision making of the municipality. Hence, this helps to bring down the socio-economic development in the city.

Technically the municipality does not have a national standard to ensure the treatment and management of waste within the city, this is typical in the BMC, and the council focuses on the removal of waste from public places and show concern very little about the other parts of the city. In addition, there are no sanitary standards for the treatment of this waste in the city. Inadequate Financial Resources form a problem in the municipalities. The financial support that the municipalities get from the central government is usually very small to handle the needs of the cities. Sometimes the inhabitants are not ready or willing to pay the global tax, which brings and raises the financial status of the council, thus hindering innovational development in the cities. Unemployment is also a problem in the municipalities. The municipalities are faced with high level of unemployment; this is because of the lack of jobs for school leavers and because of the large number of students, who graduate each year from Universities and other educational institutions. This high level of unemployment is also one of the obstacles for socio-economic development in the municipality. Without the availability of jobs for graduate and other citizens, the socio-economic development is bound to be slow. There are constant violations of sanitary rules by the inhabitants and this has been a big problem over the years despite all the efforts put in place by the council to maintain cleanliness around the cities. The defaulters also violate the sanitary rules of the Municipal Councils and are not ready to pay penalties for their caused damage. Stray animals are also a problem; they go about destroying crops and sometimes people’s properties, this is very typical in the BMC. Bribery and corruption as a form of malpractice is also an obstacle hindering development in the world particularly in the BMC and the VMC. Some individuals are made to work or occupy certain positions of work based on power, family name and financial status rather than based on merit, which therefore makes development ineffective. There is a large degree of mismanagement and embezzlement in the municipalities, funds for developmental projects are either wrongly allocated or put in private pockets. Sometimes money allocated for development is abused; hence, these malpractices tend to hinder innovations. Still, the obstacle of tribalism has gradually eaten up the individuals in power and it has become a normal phenomenon in our societies. This form of malpractice is usually carried out during recruitment, where favors are granted to those much affiliated to the employer. This system of employment puts unskilled people in certain positions rather than those who have the qualifications and skills to take the position (Eyong, 2002).

In addition, the council does not follow any strict control on town planning, either because of the inhabitants reluctant to accept changes, poor communication in the work place or too much procrastination and laziness. This action has hindered the socio-econo-
nomic development in cities principally in the BMC, now people are forced to leave their present locations because the council has destroyed their houses for innovational purposes. The poor maintenance of public properties is another shortcoming in the municipalities. The council is putting very little effort to maintain its public properties. For example, no measures have been taken to reinstall street lights in the city of Buea since the old ones could no longer brighten the city, and to serve for security – the purpose for which it has been installed. There are also no proper care for public toilets and roads. Furthermore, the BMC lacks construction machines, which are used for the construction of council markets, houses, farm-to-market-roads and the construction of bridges that link Buea to other cities like Limbe, Mutengene and Kumba. Most of the machines used are either borrowed or given as contract to other International construction companies.

Conclusions

1. This article has offered a strategy for grappling with the actually existing smart city and its more subtle impacts on urban governance and planning. While the as-of-yet unrealized marketing rhetoric of the big technology companies has provided fertile ground for critique, it is not enough to limit our attention to these discourses. Instead, we have argued for a focus on the relationalities through which the smart city, as it actually exists, has been produced, and on the territories in which this idea has taken root and effected change. We have shown the ways that data has historically been mobilized as a kind of depoliticizing device, obscuring how data are conceived, collected and legitimized for use in urban politics and policymaking (Wilson, 2011).

2. Top-down governance approaches are gone for good and we need to shift the relation between city governments and residents taking it one-step further (Ugo Valenti, director Smart City Expo World Congress 2017).

3. We propose for future research not to over valorize the smart city as something wholly new and separate from that which has come before, or that which will likely come after. Rather, it is clear that the power of the smart city imaginary to capture the minds of corporations, policymakers and average citizens makes it an important means through which cities are being (re)constructed in the 21st century. While we remain critical of the smart city large technology, corporations offer model, both as it up and as it has not so actual in the cities like Vilnius or Buea, we highlight the alternative possibilities opened up by Social Capital and other new forms of data-driven governance. However, it is only through a grounding of our analysis in the actually existing cities, territories and relationalities where these policies are being constructed and implemented that we can understand both the promise and the peril of the smart city model.

4. Smart Communication and sensitization campaigns are still needed to make sure the citizen understand its obligations and rights. The local government must also create
effective communication channels to receive the citizens’ enquiries and feedback. Related communication campaigns showing how funds are being used are crucial to make sure that extra revenue is reinvested in public services and that the citizens know it.

5. Combine traditional and innovative solutions. The administration encountered resistance from the citizens who still fear to use technology or do not have the capabilities to do so; so it has to offer alternatives adapted to different category of people (elderly, illiterate, rural population, etc.).

6. Developing projects based on the use of tools such as Google Maps, GSM or more complex Geographic Information Systems (GIS) that enable cities to gather data and better visualize the dynamics of their territories.

7. Deploying SMART applications that aim at increasing citizens’ participation in services management, mainly composed of tools to report incidences or corruption (for example Kigali, Rwanda).

8. Deploying SMART systems that enable municipalities to remotely control their street lighting systems which make it easier to achieve important cost savings (for example Salé, Morocco).
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Anotacija


Esiniai žodžiai: socialinis kapitalas, sumanusis miestas, savivaldybės taryba, inovacijos, ekonominė plėtra.
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