

Maintaining open and honest conversations about governance is extremely important within a smart city. The addition of technologies can serve to cause alienation from institutions and create an increased abstraction of rules and accepted norms. Maintaining a connection to government institutions is crucial to mediating this alienation and ensuring public comfort and trust. It is also vitally important that the control of collected data remain in the hands of the people producing the data, rather than that of the companies doing the collection and analysis, especially when that data is used for profit.

The continuation of public involvement in data collection and use is also important for codifying the goals of that data. Rather than collecting for vague and ambient purposes, it is important that everybody know exactly what data they are providing and the intentions behind its collection. This will ensure that the data is put to use in productive, rather than restrictive, ways. The gap in public understanding regarding the capabilities and potential misuses of their data will be extremely relevant to public opinion regarding the implementation of these technologies, and it is crucial to ensure that the public's voice is stronger than that of companies and their interests.

Cities that are built based on smart city innovations are typically built with ideology in mind, above all else. They focus on hyperefficiency and ignore the important human aspects of the city. Cities like Brasilia, Masdar, Songdo, and PlanIT Valley have all had issues with central planning and real-world use by people. Instead of ramming through utopian concepts of the future, we should embody Jane Jacobs' philosophies of what makes a city click – the most important of which is building for the people that are already there. What is a city but the people? We need to make sure that those people are not alienated from their society or their government, and increasing the relevance of the social contract is the only way to ensure that.

As it stands, there is no clear-cut way to reconcile modern technologies with existing frameworks of governance. Concepts of rights and privacy are based in arcane language and old-world circumstances. They must evolve and adapt for the changing situation by creating new ideas of private space and rights related to data collection, analysis, and control. This evolution must come from a combination of legislation and court rulings, both of which public voice has a clear-cut role in, so long as it is acknowledged. Public access to institutions allows for discourse regarding the implementation and use of technology, accountability of such implementation, reciprocity of the benefits (of which there are many), and, most importantly, maintains legitimacy in governance's increasing state of abstraction. We can look to Medellin, Columbia, as an exceptionally pure and effective implementation of these values.