

Artur Ochojski, Ph.D.*

*University of Economics in Katowice, Faculty of Economics, Department of Strategic and Regional Studies,
ERSA Polish Section*

Adam Polko Ph.D.

*University of Economics in Katowice, Faculty of Economics, Department of Spatial Economy and Environment,
ERSA Polish Section*

* presenter and corresponding author

Enabling governance in knowledge cities. Is there a place for urban commons?

Cities grow faster than ever in history of human-kind. Their prosperity is said to almost perfectly correlate to urbanisation processes (Glaeser 2011). There are many alternative pathways to the growth that have been given the focus. Indeed, it is for city 'offers' that become more spatially and economically dense (Rosenthal & Strange 2004) and allow to save on costs. It is for the variety of labour and capital that boosts the new opportunities and market potentials (Jacobs 1969) by enhanced interactions. It is for the availability, and excellence of amenities in cities that allows to compensate the net costs of doing business or living (Storper & Scott 2009). Alternatively, it is for the networks of cities that provide benefits reported as borrowing the city functions or markets (Meijers, Burger & Hoogerbrugge 2016). Growth is also created by the need of experiences and validation of identity that attracts so called creative class (Landry 1994, Florida 2003). It is also the institutions (Lundvall, 1992) or the 'milieu' that turns knowledge to economic value (Crevoisier 2016) and gives growth to cities. Van Oort and Lambooy (2014) explain the link between city and knowledge economy by assigning agglomeration economies to knowledge spillovers of firms in cities and innovative growth opportunities in cities to knowledge workers. There is however, another fast-growing stream of literature that recognises the true growth of new opportunities as well as public (and business) sector innovations that bring more public value (Heartley 2005) and are made substantially viable due to the territorially embedded knowledge (Crevoisier 2016) and the sharing of (city) resources (McLaren & Agyeman 2015). That links to the logic of using and opening the knowledge to other actors and learning the valorisation methods. In fact, knowledge in cities is not just the resource that is tacit and codified and thus may be materialised in products or services. It becomes part of the culture (Crevoisier 2016). Moreover, it may be seen as the commons, namely urban commons (Hess & Ostrom 2006, Hess 2008) that generate externalities or even collective benefits (Polko 2016).

The problem is that the more we systematically investigate, the more we understand that the driving forces that stimulate growth; be it more the local capitals or the external factors and trends; are in reality radically challenged by complex and wicked problems (Huggins & Hilvert 2013) appearing in territorial systems that cities form or belong to. So is the development of cities. It becomes extremely challenging for those governing. The research on cities then becomes eager to grasp the catchy concepts

such as *smart city* that look for evaluating effectiveness of performance against political or strategic setting instead of growth patterns.

It might be interesting then to ask whether, what belongs to a wider category of learning city and we give it a more sexy label of the *smart city*, tends to rather be a political idea and a direction to overcome the disadvantages of lagging behind (to paraphrase the learning region typology as described by **Simmie** 2012). The smooth rationale for smart city is what **Caragliu et al** (2009) see as fuelling sustainable economic growth and high quality of life by means of specific policy interventions rich in knowledge infrastructure. That means in fact governing in knowledge cities.

To first decompose and then recompose the meaning of **governing the knowledge city** we diverge the concepts and use another term: intelligent (growth of) cities, a similar one but still not exactly the same as the term already coined by **Komninos** 2002. **Ochojski** (2017) understands intelligent cities as territories that are formed on the 'in-city grown' capacities to generate new economically valuable knowledge that leverages the sustainability of economic and social growth of the city. What potentially makes the concept interesting is the attempt to unveil at least parts of the economic model of intelligent city. Be it the notions of knowledge that is embedded in local social services or infrastructure, the networks, platforms, places and events, all of them can give the keys to update, upgrade or innovate with the city service and justly, efficiently and effectively deliver it. Here or with the ICT-based smart systems and the dashboards that cities are acquainted with, their intelligence start with the moment we can valorise the knowledge useful for city and economise on the value it brings. That sounds like new type of externalities to business that is produced by the above-mentioned 'knowledge pools' and ICT systems or simply the open data. Smart systems and the speed-up in the 'how' and the 'when' we are being informed is a fact. The information asymmetry on 'what' is happening in cities (and their business markets and proficiencies, education and R&D offers, land and houses, utilities and events, etc.) requires more city intelligence.

Local governance as a concept that served as democratisation of political decisions (**Hajer** 2003) and market or growth-enhancing good governance practices (**Khan** 2007) held in territories may need to step up. A new mechanisms that triggers the very well valorised knowledge or externalities needs to be capable to turn them into success drivers of the city economy. Knowledge flowing in either ad-hoc groups or sustainable networks can be a threat if made a technocratic tool with the ICT-led smart solutions, but wisely governed results of valorised knowledge should enable the upgrade or innovation of city services as well as local economy. The new and still unnamed local governance mechanisms that governs the results of transferred, shared and integrated knowledge among the local service and infrastructure producers and users, between and within firms is needed (**Ochojski** 2017). The *enabling governance* that Ochojski explains, bolsters the results of city knowledgeability and allows the 'new economisation' of knowledge embedded in and flowing into cities. For intelligent city, then, he argues, the new governance mode is basically the mechanisms that enables the city learning and invention processes that rises its sustainability in both public and business spheres rather than the old-school of hollowing-out of state (**Rhodes** 1994, **Klijn** 2002) or the philanthropy – i.e. private contributions towards social problems (**Jung & Harrow** 2015) offered to support the actors legally capable of ruling and managing.

The main aim of the forthcoming paper is to investigate then whether knowledge cities (**Carillo** 2004) seen as knowledge-rich cities that offer shared resources, a complex ecosystem of urban commons (**Hess and Ostrom** 2006) can be successfully transformed into sharing or collaborative action that is key for (governing) the city growth. We argue here that the new framework of both public and private institutions is set upon the creation of value basically with, and not exclusively for, the community users (modified **laione** 2016). It becomes then subject to social dilemmas and governance is here to legitimise the value of knowledge by means of collective identification, negotiation or regulation of economies for citizens and business. That means in fact a new understanding of embodying knowledge in new products and services or embedding knowledge into local culture and its capacities (**Crevoisier** 2015).

For that reason, we would argue, governance as a mode needs to offer the learning on capabilities to valorise the knowledge that is both available thanks to the critical mass of IoT and smart ICT solutions (**Talbot, Warner, Crawford, White** 2017), knowledge hubs and consumer hubs (**Penco** 2015) as well as the knowledge commons (**Hess & Ostrom** 2006). The question then is how to valorise the economised knowledge in new utilities, new benefits, dynamic externalities among the economic actors in cities. As we've moved to the reputation economy, where the balance sheet is as valuable as the connections (**Phillips & Jung** 2016), the data and knowledge pushes for the explicitly different governance mechanism.

This conceptualisation is extended with examples and as research-in-progress it needs further discussion that we would be happy to initiate with the participants of the G12 session on Regional or Urban Policy, Governance.