

## IGF 2016 Workshop Report Template

Session Title	WS187 - Smart Cities and Big Data: Boundless opportunities?
Date	Thursday, December 8, 2016
Time	11:30 – 13:00
Session Organizer	Karisma Foundationa (Colombia) Privacy International (UK)
Chair/Moderator	Alexandrine Pirlot de Corbion
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Juan Diego Castañeda
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	Mr. Guilherme CANELA DE SOUSA, UNESCO Office for the MERCOSUR Mr. Amber SINHA, Centre for Internet and Society (India) Ms. Gemma GALDON CLAVELL, Eticas Research and Consulting & Universitat de Barcelona (Spain) Mr. Max SENEGES, Research & Education Program Manager, Google Mr. Niels TEN OEVER, IETF member Ms. Jamila VENTURINI, FGV (Brazil)
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no clear narratives about what smart cities initiatives are.</li> <li>• Are smart cities a global or local solution?</li> <li>• There are still too many doubts about the impact of smart city initiatives on citizens and their participation in decision making, their privacy, their consent, who are involved, etc.</li> <li>• There is a lack of public policies to help shape these initiatives.</li> </ul>
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation	<p><b>Mr. Sinha:</b> There are few assumptions of the big data discourse: (1) data driven technologies are neutral, when they are not; and (2) there are global solutions, when there are not, especially if it is considered that public spaces evolves with time. Context is very important, and there is a need to consider local solutions for local and/or contextualized problems. In India, the discussion on smart cities is circumventing certain processes. There is no understanding on what does it means to have smart cities, and the discourse is dominated by the State not citizens.</p> <p><b>Ms. Venturini:</b> In Brazil, the narrative on smart cities is unclear. There are no comprehensive policies on access to information, digitization, and data protection. However, there are unified commands and control centers, and center for public and private sources, and other initiatives that were deployed around mega events, although with no coordinated efforts and no transparency. Ms Venturini noted that when we speak about smart cities, consent to collect and use data from citizens must be required. There various actors involved including local authorities and the private sector. There is a need for more multi-stakeholder dynamic.</p> <p><b>Ms. Galdon Clavell:</b> There is a need to rethink smart cities as there is a situation of 'data despotism'. Those leading smart city initiatives are not winning hearts of minds of the people as failing to included them. This is the shift that is being seen in Barcelona, Spain, where</p>

	<p>citizens are trying to gather new ideas about smart cities. But, Ms Galdon Clavell explained that there are some challenges such the incapability of mapping data architecture and data life cycle. The market cannot solve everyday problems in a city or of a persona.</p> <p><b>Mr. Sengel:</b> Google is undertaking effort to develop unbiased machine learning and come up with differential privacy techniques. Mr. Sengel provides some example to illustrate the work of Google, such as the Google car that gathers and aggregates data fed to Denmark and other country to figure improvements to traffic. Responding to argument made by Mr. Sinah, a fellow panelist, he emphasized that more local solutions were not possible in a globalized world. Technical solution is the same globally, as human rights apply worldwide regardless of cultural differences.</p> <p><b>Mr. Ten Oever:</b> Smart cities are creating problems very similar to industrial control systems. Mr. Ten Oever explained that there already are great standards for authentication, security and privacy but these are not – yet - being applied in the field of smart cities. There are standard bodies slowly understanding impact on human rights. But the reality is that with smart city initiatives, cities are outsourcing ethics and responsibilities on algorisms. Citizens in general must be provided process by which they can take control of their devices.</p> <p><b>Mr. Canela:</b> Today, cities are overcrowded and with that more social and urban problems are arising. Ms. Canela argued that local authorities fear the problem this poses, and this is the reason why they are buying technological solutions. But the big issue is that there are nice projects being deployed, but there is no policy to provide a framework. In addition, technological solutions such open data are substitute of fundamental rights as access to information. He stressed the right of citizens to access information as they related to decision-making processes that impact them.</p>
<p>Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>The participants and the audience debated the concepts of smart cities and big data and agreed that these terms still have to be understood, in particular, to understand their impacts on privacy, consent, citizen participation, etc., and who is involved. Concerns about data architecture and its life cycle are also important in determining smart city initiatives that improve the management of increasingly populated cities. The implementation of these solutions is even more problematic if they do not go hand in hand with the development of adequate and effective public policies, and the development of regulatory frameworks.</p> <p>It is imperative also that all people are provided with the possibility to engage and inform themselves to understand how things work, what language they use to be able to audit, and for accountability and transparency. In that sense, smart city initiatives that promote only the economic and efficiency angles dominated and promoted by the private sector can be dangerous because tends to only addresses what offers economic profit margin, without considering needs that</p>

	<p>arise naturally in societies (e.g. disabilities, aging, vulnerable groups, etc.) for not being profitable.</p> <p>Finally, it was debated whether technological solutions are global or not. On the one hand, part of the panelists understood that it is dangerous to consider “one size fits all technologies” and local problems required local responses in some circumstances. On the other, the private sector understands that in a globalized world there is no space for local solutions.</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>There is a need for all stakeholders to develop an understanding of systems, modals and codes, from an economic, tech, legal, and social perspective, and submit them to clear transparency, accountability and audit requirements. Once a stock take of existing legal and other frameworks is undertaken, and there is a better understanding of the shortcoming and flaws of the current approach, ethical as well as legal frameworks need to be developed to ensure the necessary safeguards mechanisms are in place.</p> <p>There is explore whether there is a need to re-think how privacy is interpreted. Privacy is not only individual; it is also collective. This means that sharing data about us is also about the people that we interacted with. Citizens cannot let companies to decide on how to collect and use their data. In that sense, Google pointed out that the decision is not going to be only on the company, it'd come from dialogue. Adding to this, CIS stressed that a dream smart city will be one where decisions are based on the collective.</p> <p>The challenge still falls in making smart city initiative to work for development, democracy and human rights, and not against it. In order to have successful smart cities, citizens need to understand the system. One last thought may lie in going back to basics and principles, we must challenge the discourse. And ask ourselves, why do we need all this? And if we do, what should it look like?</p>