

PEOPLE-ORIENTED SMART CITY POLICY IN RIGA AND ISTANBUL URBAN PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Eugenijus Krikščiūnas

Klaipėda University,
H. Manto g. 84, LT-92294, Klaipėda, Lithuania

<https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.25.3.44015>

Abstract. *Becoming a smart city is a widely pursued objective for cities around the world. Over time, this concept has not been limited to technology but has become mainly focused on people. This article examines urban planning documents for the development of two cities (Riga and Istanbul) into smart cities in countries with different political regimes (Latvia and Turkey). A document analysis and its comparison revealed that, contrary to what might initially be assumed, the flawed democracy of Riga reflects policies that aim to meet people's needs; however, they are not actively included in the decision-making process. Meanwhile, in the hybrid regime city of Istanbul, people's participation in smart city governance processes is institutionalized and embedded in structures, with specific roles assigned in the urban planning document.*

Keywords: *smart city, people, city policy, urban planning documents, policy documents.*

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *sumanysis miestas, žmonės, miesto politika, miesto planavimo dokumentai, politikos dokumentai.*

Introduction

In recent decades, smart city initiatives have become a priority for many cities worldwide. Traditionally, smart cities have been associated with the deployment of the latest technologies; however, it is increasingly emphasized that their primary goal is to improve people's quality of life and involve them in decision-making processes. Furthermore, as with most policies, the implementation of smart city strategies depends on many factors, such as the political regime, governance structures, institutional readiness, and citizen participation practices.

Smart city policy is largely shaped by urban planning documents. Such documents are not merely technical tools: they embody the municipality's own understanding of a smart city, the goals it sets for itself, and the roles it assigns to various stakeholders in pursuing those goals. Therefore, planning documents reveal the role they assign to people – whether they are viewed as recipients of services and technological solutions or as participants in urban governance. At the same time, it is important to recognize that the intentions declared in these documents do not necessarily align with actual practice; nevertheless, they reveal the kind of relationship with residents that city authorities consider desirable and are prepared to publicly commit to (Barrett and Fudge, 1981).

Research problem. There are a number of scientific articles that analyze practical examples of people's participation in the life of a smart city (Przeybilovicz et al., 2020; Goodman et al., 2020; Landa Oregi et al., 2025). However, there is a lack of studies that investigate how a people-oriented approach is enshrined in urban planning documents, especially across countries with different political and institutional contexts, which can shape the approach to people in a city. There is also a shortage of comparative analyses on this topic. This raises the question: how are people conceptualized in smart city planning documents in countries with different political and institutional regimes?

Two cities in different countries – Riga (Latvia) and Istanbul (Turkey) – have prepared planning documents that outline the development of smart city principles by 2030. Riga is the largest city in Latvia and the country's capital, while Istanbul is the largest city in Turkey and is geographically part of Europe. Both cities play an important role in the economic, social, and cultural life of their countries, so their urban policy choices have broader national significance. At the same time, both cities are historically multicultural port cities facing similar contemporary urban challenges, such as mobility, infrastructure renewal, population diversity, and climate change management (Riga City Council, 2014; Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, 2026).

The differences between these two countries form the basis of the comparative analysis. According to the Economist Democracy Index 2024, Turkey is classified as a weak 'hybrid regime', whereas Latvia is categorized as a strong 'flawed democracy'. Similarly, the Freedom in the World 2025 report rates Turkey as 'not free' and Latvia as 'free'. The nature of a political regime shapes opportunities for public participation and is also associated with the openness and transparency of government (Hollyer, Rosendorff, and Vreeland, 2011; Norris, 2022). Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the planning documents of a city in a more democratic country would assign a more active role to people than those of a city in a country with a hybrid regime. Whether this expectation is confirmed can only be determined by comparing documents from both cities. Such a comparison of contrasting cases makes it possible to examine whether the political and institutional context is reflected in how people are defined in smart city planning documents.

The article proceeds with a presentation of the research methodology, followed by an analysis of the evolution of the smart city concept from a technological to a people-oriented approach, an examination of the urban planning documents of Riga and Istanbul, and a comparison of these documents. The findings are then discussed, and the research concludes by summarizing the results and identifying directions for further research.

Methodology

The aim of this article is to examine how people-oriented smart city principles are embedded in the urban planning documents of Riga and Istanbul.

The object of the research is people-oriented smart city policies, reflected in the urban planning documents of Riga and Istanbul.

Research objectives:

1. To demonstrate the development of the smart city concept from a predominantly technological to a people-oriented approach.
2. To determine how people are defined in the smart city planning documents of Riga and Istanbul.
3. To identify the role of people in smart cities in the largest cities of Latvia and Turkey, based on urban planning documents.
4. To compare the approach expressed in the urban planning documents of Riga and Istanbul towards the role of people in shaping smart city policy.

This article employs a qualitative comparative case study. This strategy was chosen because the aim of the study is not to measure the outcomes of smart city policies, but to reconstruct meanings, that is, how people are conceptualized in urban planning documents and what role is assigned to them in those documents. Therefore, this issue is examined by thoroughly analyzing and comparing a small number of cases, rather than relying on statistical generalizations (Ayres, Kavanaugh, and Knafl, 2003). Riga and Istanbul were purposively selected as contrasting cases due to their different political and institutional contexts, as outlined in the Introduction.

The research consists of two main parts. The first part analyzes the scientific literature to trace the de-

velopment of the smart city concept and substantiate the people-oriented smart city approach. It examines how the understanding of a smart city has changed over time, with particular emphasis on the shift from a focus on technology and infrastructure to a focus on quality of life, residents' needs, and their participation in city governance.

The second part of the research employs qualitative document analysis to examine urban planning documents. The main documents analyzed are the Riga Smart City Guidelines for 2025–2030 and the Istanbul Smart City Strategic Plan 2030. These documents were selected because they directly define the concept of a smart city for both cities, as well as their main policy directions, priorities, and the anticipated roles of stakeholders. In addition, they are the primary, highest-level smart city policy documents for each city.

Both documents were read in full, and passages referring directly or indirectly to people (residents, citizens, communities, stakeholders) were identified. The analysis first examined how a smart city is defined in the documents and what place people occupy in this definition. It then focused on which needs of residents are identified, what roles are assigned to them, what forms of participation are envisaged, and whether specific mechanisms for participation in decision-making processes are established. Finally, it was assessed whether people are primarily understood as recipients of services and technological solutions or as active participants in urban policy-making and governance.

Following an individual analysis of the documents for each case, a comparative method was employed. The cases of Riga and Istanbul were compared to identify their similarities and differences. Particular attention was paid to public participation, the role of people in decision-making processes, and the enshrinement of this participation in the documents.

The evolution of the smart city concept: from a technological to a people-oriented approach

One of the first more comprehensive definitions of a smart city was developed in Robert E. Hall's paper 'The Vision of a Smart City,' published in 2000. In it, the author defined a smart city as an urban center of the future characterized by safety, environmental friendliness, and efficiency, because all structures – electricity, water, transport, and others – are designed, built, and maintained using advanced, integrated materials, sensors, electronics, and networks that are connected to computerized systems consisting of databases, tracking, and decision-making algorithms (Hall, 2000). Similar technologically oriented definitions have been further developed. For example, Nancy Odendaal described a smart city as one that exploits the opportunities offered by information and communication technologies to promote its prosperity and influence (Odendaal, 2003). This tendency is also evident in subsequent scholarly literature (Washburn and Sindhu, 2010; Chen, 2010; Hernández-Muñoz et al., 2011).

However, as the world changed and technologies became an integral part of everyday life, the understanding of a smart city also evolved. Based on previous definitions of a smart city, a shift in understanding of the concept has been observed in the academic literature since around 2011–2012; it has become broader, more inclusive, and increasingly people-oriented. Taewoo Nam and Theresa A. Pardo defined a smart city as an urban entity in which not only technological but also management and policy innovations are widely implemented (Nam and Pardo, 2011), while Patrice Rios described a smart city as a city that inspires, shares culture, knowledge, and life, and motivates its residents to create and thrive (Rios, 2012). In subsequent years, the smart city became even more people-oriented. It has been argued that smart cities use information and communication technologies to improve the quality of life of their population and contribute to sustainable development (Capdevila and Zarlenga, 2015), and that smart cities must involve local communities, promoting a citizen-oriented approach to solving urban problems and ultimately improving people's quality of life (Kang et al., 2018). Similar ideas have been expressed in many other scientific papers (Mohanty, Choppali, and Koungianos, 2016; Kvieskienė, 2018; Vishnivetskaya and

Alexandrova, 2019). Along with the increasing prevalence of a people-oriented approach, the concept of a smart city is increasingly linked to sustainable development goals in the academic literature. For example, Hee-Sun Choi and Seul-Ki Song argued that technological solutions alone do not ensure urban sustainability, and proposed a shift to a smart sustainable city model in which technology is integrated into city operations and services to promote the well-being of residents (Choi and Song, 2023).

It is worth noting that the concept of a people-oriented smart city is even more prominent in the documents and reports of international organizations. The European Cyber Security Organization defines a smart city as the integration of data and digital technologies into a strategic approach to economic, environmental, social, and technological sustainability in order to ensure the well-being of its citizens (European Cyber Security Organization, 2018). The United Nations' proposed development guidelines emphasize that technology in a smart city should not be an end in itself, but a tool to meet the needs of people and communities (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2025). Meanwhile, the European Commission defines a smart city as a place where traditional networks and services are made more efficient through the use of digital solutions that benefit its residents and businesses (European Commission, 2025). This trend is also confirmed by reviews of international standards and policy guidelines. Elsa Estevez and colleagues, after comparing documents prepared by various organizations, note that these documents increasingly emphasize social inclusion, governance, education, and sustainability aspects (Estevez et al., 2021). These developments only reinforce the idea that smart cities and people-oriented approaches require practical preparation and implementation.

Alongside these conceptual developments, a distinct strand of research applies the smart city concept empirically, assessing the progress of cities and municipalities. Nikolay Tsonkov and Kamen Petrov, who developed a model for analyzing and evaluating the sustainability of Bulgarian cities, emphasize that the development of a smart and sustainable city depends on public policies implemented at the local level (Tsonkov and Petrov, 2024). Other studies follow a similar direction: geographic information system (GIS) solutions are used to assess the level of smart and sustainable development in Bulgarian municipalities (Tsonkov and Kostev, 2023), while an analysis of municipalities in the Black Sea region examines the implementation of information technologies as a prerequisite for smart development (Tsonkov, Petrov, and Berberova-Valcheva, 2022). However, such studies primarily measure the outcomes and indicators of smart city development, rather than how people are defined and what role they are assigned in urban planning documents.

People in Riga's smart city policy guidelines

On March 26, 2025, the Riga City Council approved the Riga Smart City Guidelines for 2025–2030 (*Rīgas viedās pilsētas pamatnostādnes 2025.–2030. gadam*). It is the primary document that reveals the understanding of the smart city concept and its practical implementation in the Latvian capital, as well as defines the municipality's strategic direction for smart city development. The guidelines define a smart city as the use of data, information, and communication technologies, and innovative solutions in local government to improve the quality of life in the municipality, ensure climate neutrality and sustainable development, promote safety and resilience, and improve local government administration (Subsection 2.1). It is emphasized that Riga's smart city should be a comfortable place to live, business-friendly, climate-neutral, resilient to extreme situations, and efficiently managed, using innovation and smart solutions to ensure a high quality of life and competitiveness (Section 1). The smart city development policy in this document is considered a horizontal policy area (Section 1).

The guidelines indicate that the development of a smart city requires broad involvement from various parties. People are clearly identified as one of the main stakeholders in a smart city, participating in urban development processes. The document identifies three residents' needs: 1) quality of life (safe and comfortable environment), 2) high-quality and accessible municipal services (transport, social care, health

care, and education), and 3) climate neutrality and urban sustainability (Subsection 2.3). It also outlines three ways in which people can participate in the development of a smart city: 1) by using services and solutions (as consumers), 2) by informing local authorities about their needs and problems, and 3) by participating in policy-making and decision-making processes (Subsection 2.3).

The role of people is also emphasized in various priority areas of the Riga smart city. In the area of mobility, solutions are envisaged that would promote cultural change in the field of active mobility, involving residents and supporting changes in their behavior (Subsection 6.1), while in order to promote digital development, the importance of effective data exchange between institutions, businesses, and citizens is stressed to achieve more effective urban management and decision-making (Subsection 6.2).

The guidelines also clearly aim to protect people from the negative effects of the environment and external factors. They express a desire to monitor and reduce air pollution in order to make the city more sustainable and attractive to residents (Subsection 6.1), improve the preparedness and capacity of local authorities to respond rapidly to emergencies and future security challenges, significantly reducing their negative consequences and ensuring the safety and integrity of the population (Subsection 2.1). Creating a safe and resilient urban environment is considered a necessity to ensure the well-being of citizens and promote trust in digital and physical urban solutions (Subsection 6.4), while the safety of people is to be guaranteed by implementing a geographical location-based alert system which would send real-time notifications about extreme situations to residents' smartphones (Subsection 6.4), as well as virtual and augmented reality solutions designed to teach citizens how to behave in emergency situations (Subsection 6.4).

As is typical of smart city policy documents, the guidelines pay close attention to digital solutions and the Internet of Things, which are identified as essential to Riga's development because they enable the municipality to respond more quickly and effectively to the needs of its residents (Subsection 6.2). A broad and secure 5G network is also considered vital for improving citizens' access to public and private services, with plans to install public internet access points in strategically important locations (Subsection 6.3). Finally, smart solutions for communicating with residents are highlighted, such as virtual assistants powered by artificial intelligence that provide information and help patients navigate the healthcare system (Subsection 6.6).

People in Istanbul's smart city strategic plan

In December 2021, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality released the Istanbul Smart City Strategic Plan 2030 (*2030 İstanbul Akıllı Şehir Stratejik Planı*). It is the first smart city strategic plan prepared at the local government level in the country and, at the same time, the primary and most important smart city document in Turkey's largest city, which should contribute to the implementation of the concept and help it become a leading smart city in the world. The strategic plan defines a smart city as a sustainable city that aims to improve the quality of life of its residents and utilize resources efficiently and effectively, using the most advanced technological capabilities and data, integrating all stakeholders into urban management, and pursuing digital inclusivity (Chapter 1). It is emphasized that Istanbul's smart city vision is a fair, green, and creative city with happy Istanbulites, and its main mission is to provide accessible services to a 24-hour Istanbul, a city that produces, embraces all its values, and thrives culturally and socially, with a new generation approach to municipal administration; without forgetting to create an inclusive and strong urban economy in a safe and livable environment (Chapter 3).

The strategic plan clearly highlights the pursuit of participatory democracy and transparent government, where people actively engage in decision-making and governance processes. This approach is reflected in the smart city governance platform outlined in the document, which consists of an executive board, coordinators, and an advisory board (Chapter 5). The advisory board is composed of strategic independent stakeholders: the academic community, the public and private sectors, and civil society. It

provides consulting services related to project support in its field of activity and the evaluation of ongoing projects, and is also responsible for reviewing strategic plans and providing new perspectives aligned with global trends. The importance of people participating in smart city activities is explicitly emphasized throughout the document. The aim is to provide citizens with fast and reliable data, thereby ensuring their participation in decision-making processes (Chapter 4).

Furthermore, the strategic plan highlights the goal that innovative digital smart city solutions should encompass and serve all residents of Istanbul, taking into account the existing diversity of civilizations, social, economic, and geographical differences (Abstract section). It emphasizes the necessary efforts to include migrants and refugees in urban life and facilitate their integration (Chapter 3). This demonstrates that the smart city strategic plan pays close attention to Turkey's challenges related to immigration.

The role of people is evident across various dimensions of Istanbul's smart city strategy and is also highlighted as one of its priority areas. The smart city strategy includes ensuring high-quality, modern education, giving all Istanbul residents equal opportunities to participate in urban life (Chapter 4). It is also stated that the aim is to develop social skills and social inclusion through increasing digital literacy and information skills, as well as strengthening citizens' interaction with the city (Chapter 4). Another goal is to achieve people-oriented, integrated transportation, using technology to make transport convenient, safe, and environmentally friendly, providing coordinated and equal services for all (Chapter 4). Increasing the accessibility of services and ensuring a healthy, inclusive life for older adults and people with disabilities are also emphasized throughout the document (Chapters 3, 4, and 6).

Comparative analysis

A comparative analysis reveals that both Riga and Istanbul define a smart city in their urban planning documents in a similar way: a city with a high quality of life and sustainable development. This shared understanding of a smart city presumably implies a similar definition of people in the respective documents. Indeed, this is true. In the urban policy documents of Riga and Istanbul, people are identified as one of the central actors (stakeholders) in a smart city, but the content of this definition differs.

In Riga's smart city guidelines, people are defined primarily as residents whose basic needs include a high quality of life, safety, accessibility of services, and sustainability. Residents are seen as users of public services whose well-being depends on the effective functioning of the municipality and technological solutions. Although the document declares people's participation, they are more often presented as objects for whom policy measures are created rather than as active policymakers. However, it is mentioned that residents have the right to participate in the development of a smart city, but this opportunity is not described in more detail. Meanwhile, Istanbul's smart city strategic plan defines people more broadly – not only as residents, but also as active citizens who have the right and opportunity to participate in urban governance. The document emphasizes the diversity of the population, including social, economic, and cultural differences, with particular attention to migrants and refugees. In this context, people are framed as active and empowered participants who jointly contribute to the creation of city policy.

Furthermore, although people's participation is declared as an aspiration in the Riga urban planning document under analysis, it is not comprehensively enshrined at the institutional level. The role of residents is mainly limited to using smart city services and providing suggestions and information to governmental institutions. This suggests that, in the case of the Latvian capital, a more 'top-down' model of policy formation is more prominent. Meanwhile, in Istanbul's smart city strategic plan, the role of people in shaping smart city policies is better structured and institutionalized. Civil society, through the advisory board, becomes a direct participant in the policy-making process (although the influence of the advisory board is not clearly defined). This reflects a more participatory (horizontal) approach to political decision-making in Turkey's largest city, where people are treated as partners rather than mere recipients of policy.

Discussion

The results of the research revealed a certain discrepancy between initial expectations and the idea of people's participation reflected in the analyzed documents. Given that the nature of a political regime is linked to opportunities for citizen participation and the openness of the government (Hollyer, Rosendorff, and Vreeland, 2011; Norris, 2022), it was reasonable to expect that Riga's planning document, created in a more democratic political environment, would assign a more active role to people than that of Istanbul. However, the analysis did not confirm this assumption. While both city documents consider people as an important part of a smart city, their participation in Istanbul's smart city strategic plan is more fully defined and more firmly anchored in specific governance structures.

This suggests that the type of political regime at the national level does not necessarily translate directly into how people are perceived in municipal urban planning documents, and that this perception may also be shaped by other local or policy-related factors such as the scope and genre of the document itself or the way it was drafted. In the case of Riga, the prevailing view is that people are recipients of the city's services and solutions, whose needs must be identified and met. Meanwhile, the Istanbul document assigns a broader role to the individual, defining them not only as a recipient of services but also as a participant capable of contributing to city governance and policy-making. This indicates that the people-oriented smart city approach can be interpreted in different ways: in one case, primarily through quality of life and access to services; in another, additionally through more active participation and inclusion in decision-making.

Furthermore, the findings of this research contribute to the existing literature in two ways. First, previous studies have examined either specific practices of people's participation in smart cities (Przebylłowicz et al., 2020; Goodman et al., 2020; Landa Oregi et al., 2025), or measured indicators of smart and sustainable development (Tsonkov and Petrov, 2024; Tsonkov and Kostev, 2023). This research reveals that between practices and indicators there is another level of analysis – the understanding of people enshrined in policy documents, which reflects what forms of participation are formally envisaged and considered appropriate by city authorities. Second, the research showed that both cities define the smart city in a similar fashion – as a city that ensures a high quality of life and sustainable development – but they understand the role of people in it differently. This convergence of concepts may partly reflect the broader dissemination of international standards and guidelines (Estevez et al., 2021). Nevertheless, as the results of this study demonstrate, a common vision of a smart city (Choi and Song, 2023) does not, by itself, guarantee that its content will be consistent across all specific city plans.

However, these results should be interpreted with caution. The research analyzes urban planning documents, so the differences identified reflect officially declared policy provisions, rather than actual public participation. The fact that the Istanbul document provides for a more institutionalized system of participation does not, in itself, mean that, in practice, people have greater influence on decision-making than in Riga. Similarly, the fact that participation is defined less comprehensively in the Riga document does not mean that actual opportunities for participation in that city are fewer. Therefore, the results of this study primarily reveal differences between official smart city policy approaches, while further research could assess the extent to which the role of people as declared in the documents is reflected in actual urban governance practices.

Conclusions

The scientific concept of a smart city has gradually evolved from a technological definition toward a people-oriented approach, in which technology is understood not as an end in itself, but as a means to improve quality of life and involve the population in urban governance. This shift is reflected in academic literature, the documents of international organizations, and practical urban policy. This paper examined the urban planning documents for smart cities prepared by two different cities, Riga and Istanbul, for the period up to 2030, with particular attention to how the role of people is addressed in these documents.

In the documents of both cities, a smart city is defined similarly – as a city that ensures a high quality of life and sustainable development – and people are identified as one of the key stakeholders in a smart city. However, the substance of this definition differs. In Riga's guidelines, people are defined primarily in terms of needs: as residents who must be guaranteed a high quality of life, safety, access to services, and a sustainable environment. In Istanbul's strategic plan, people are defined more broadly – not only as residents but also as active citizens with the right and opportunity to participate in city governance; the diversity of the population, including migrants and refugees, is specifically emphasized.

The role assigned to people also differs. The Riga guidelines declare public participation but do not clearly institutionalize it: the role of residents is primarily framed through the use of smart city services and the provision of suggestions and information to institutions, while their direct participation in policy-making is not specified in detail. In the Istanbul plan, participation is structured and linked to a specific governance structure – an advisory board – through which civil society becomes a direct participant in the policy-making process, although its influence on final decisions is not clearly defined in the document.

A comparative analysis leads to the conclusion that the general concept of a smart city does not in itself imply a common approach to the role of people in it: the same people-oriented approach is expressed in one document through quality of life and access to services, while in another it also includes participation and inclusion in decision-making. The Riga guidelines feature a more pronounced top-down model of policy-making, while the Istanbul plan treats people as partners. This also indicates that a more democratic national context does not necessarily correspond to a more active role for people in municipal planning documents. Further research could examine the extent to which the role of people as declared in these documents corresponds to actual urban governance practices.

Data Availability Statement

The data used to support the findings of this research are available from the corresponding authors upon request.

References

1. Ayres, Lioness, Karen Kavanaugh, and Kathleen A. Knafl. 2003. "Within-Case and Across-Case Approaches to Qualitative Data Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 13 (6): 871–883. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732303013006008>
2. Barrett, Susan, and Colin Fudge. 1981. "Examining the Policy-Action Relationship." In *Policy and Actions: Essays on the Implementation of Public Policy*, edited by Susan Barrett and Colin Fudge, 3–32. London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003644729-2>
3. Capdevila, Ignasi, and Matias I. Zarlenga. 2015. "Smart City or Smart Citizens? The Barcelona Case." *Journal of Strategy and Management* 8 (3): 266–282. <https://doi.org/10.1108/J SMA-03-2015-0030>
4. Chen, Thomas M. 2010. "Smart Grids, Smart Cities Need Better Networks [Editor's Note]." *IEEE Network* 24 (2): 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MNET.2010.5430136>
5. Choi, Hee-Sun, and Seul-Ki Song. 2023. "Direction for a Transition toward Smart Sustainable Cities based on the Diagnosis of Smart City Plans." *Smart Cities* 6 (1): 156–178. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities6010009>
6. Economist Intelligence Unit. 2025. Democracy Index 2024. Accessed December 15, 2025. <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2024>
7. Estevez, Elsa, Karina Cenci, Pablo Fillottrani, and Tomasz Janowski. 2021. "Review of International Standards and Policy Guidelines for Smart Sustainable Cities." In *Smart Cities and Smart Governance*, edited by Elsa Estevez, Theresa A. Pardo, and Hans J. Scholl, 66–99. Public Administration and Information Technology, vol. 37. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61033-3_4
8. European Commission. 2025. "Smart Cities." Accessed December 15, 2025. https://commission.europa.eu/eu-regional-and-urban-development/topics/cities-and-urban-development/city-initiatives/smart-cities_en
9. European Cyber Security Organization. 2018. *Smart Cities and Smart Buildings Sector Report: Cybersecurity*

- for the Smart Cities Sector (WG3, Sectoral Demand). <https://ecs-org.eu/ecso-uploads/2022/10/5fdb27182b472.pdf>
10. Freedom House. 2025. "Latvia." In Freedom in the World 2025. Accessed December 15, 2025. <https://freedom-house.org/country/latvia/freedom-world/2025>
 11. Freedom House. 2025. "Turkey." In Freedom in the World 2025. Accessed December 15, 2025. <https://freedom-house.org/country/turkey/freedom-world/2025>
 12. Goodman, Nicole, Araz Zwick, Zachary Spicer, and Nelly Carlsen. 2020. "Public Engagement in Smart City Development: Lessons from Communities in Canada's Smart City Challenge." *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien* 64 (3): 416-432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12607>
 13. Hall, Robert E. 2000. "The Vision of a Smart City." Paper presented at the 2nd International Life Extension Technology Workshop, Paris, France, September 28, 2000. <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/773961>
 14. Hernández-Muñoz, José M., Jesús Bernat Vercher, Luis Muñoz, José A. Galache, Mirko Presser, Luis A. Hernández Gómez, and Johan Pettersen. 2011. "Smart Cities at the Forefront of the Future Internet." In *The Future Internet: Future Internet Assembly 2011: Achievements and Technological Promises*, edited by John Domingue, Alex Galis, Anastasius Gavras, Theodore Zahariadis, Dave Lambert, Frances Cleary, Petros Daras, et al., 447-462. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20898-0_32
 15. Hollyer, James R., B. Peter Rosendorff, and James Raymond Vreeland. 2011. "Democracy and Transparency." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (4): 1191-1205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611000880>
 16. Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. 2026. Istanbul UP2030. Istanbul: Environmental Protection and Control Department. https://cevre.ibb.istanbul/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/UP2030_Kitapcik_2030_final_renkcalisma_dican.pdf
 17. İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, Bilgi İşlem Dairesi Başkanlığı, Akıllı Şehir Şube Müdürlüğü. 2021. 2030 İstanbul Akıllı Şehir Stratejik Planı. https://www.akillisehir.istanbul/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/2030_Istanbul_Akilli_Sehir_Stratejik_Planı.pdf
 18. Kang, Jian, Francesco Aletta, Efstathios Margaritis, and Mengyang Yang. 2018. "A Model for Implementing Sound-scape Maps in Smart Cities." *Noise Mapping* 5 (1): 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.1515/noise-2018-0004>
 19. Kvieskienė, Giedrė. 2018. "Sumanas Miesto ir Gyvenimo Kokybės Sąsaja Tyrimai." *Socialinis Ugdymas* 49 (2): 112-114. <https://doi.org/10.15823/su.2018.15>
 20. Landa Oregi, Irati, Saioa Urrea-Uriarte, Iker Gonzalez Ochoantesana, Marina Anaya Rodríguez, and Patricia Molina-Costa. 2025. "Enhancing Citizen Participation in Citizen-Centered Smart Cities: Insights from Two European Case Studies." *Urban Science* 9 (5): 140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci9050140>
 21. Mohanty, Saraju P., Uma Choppali, and Elias Kougiannos. 2016. "Everything You Wanted to Know About Smart Cities." *IEEE Consumer Electronics Magazine* 5 (3): 60-70. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCE.2016.2556879>
 22. Nam, Taewoo, and Theresa A. Pardo. 2011. "Smart City as Urban Innovation: Focusing on Management, Policy, and Context." In *ICEGOV 2011: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance*, edited by Elsa Estevez and Marijn Janssen, 185-194. Tallinn, Estonia: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2072069.2072100>
 23. Norris, Pippa. 2022. "Comparing Mass Political Participation in Democratic and Authoritarian Regimes." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Participation*, edited by Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso, 858-876. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhob/9780198861126.013.52>
 24. Odendaal, Nancy. 2003. "Information and Communication Technology and Local Governance: Understanding the Difference Between Cities in Developed and Emerging Economies." *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 27 (6): 585-607. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-9715\(03\)00016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-9715(03)00016-4)
 25. Przybilovicz, Erico, Maria Alexandra Cunha, Stan Geertman, Charles Leleux, Ank Michels, Zsuzsanna Tomor, C. William R. Webster, and Albert Meijer. 2020. "Citizen Participation in the Smart City: Findings from an International Comparative Study." *Local Government Studies* 48 (1): 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1851204>
 26. Riga City Council. 2014. Sustainable Development Strategy of Riga until 2030 and Development Programme of Riga for 2014-2020. Riga: Riga City Council. https://www.rdpad.lv/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ENG_STRATEGIJA.pdf
 27. Rīgas valstspilsētas pašvaldības Pilsētas attīstības departaments. 2025. Rīgas Viedās Pilsētas Pamatnostādnes 2025.-2030. Gadam (1. redakcija). https://www.rdpad.lv/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/VP_pamatnostadnes_11032025-2.pdf

28. Rios, Patrice. 2012. "Creating 'The Smart City.'" PhD diss., University of Detroit Mercy. UDM Digital Commons. <http://hdl.handle.net/10429/393>.
29. Tsonkov, Nikolay Ivanov, and Kamen Dimitrov Petrov. 2024. "Model for Analysis and Evaluation of Sustainable Cities in Bulgaria in the Context of Local Public Policy Appliance." *Public Policy and Administration* 23 (3): 308-323. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.23.3.35309>
30. Tsonkov, Nikolay, Kamen Petrov, and Tzvetelina Berberova-Valcheva. 2022. "Adoption of Information Technologies for Black Sea Region Municipalities' Smart Development." *International Journal on Information Technologies and Security* 14 (1): 87-96. <https://ijits-bg.com/sites/default/files/archive/2022%28vol.14%29/No1/contents/2022-N1-08.pdf>
31. Tsonkov, Nikolay, and Radoslav Kostev. 2023. "GIS-Based Model for the Assessment of the Smart Sustainable Development of the Municipalities of Northeast Bulgaria." *International Journal on Information Technologies and Security* 15 (4): 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.59035/MBLY5833>
32. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). 2025. International Guidelines on People-Centred Smart Cities. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2025/02/international_guidelines_on_people_centred_smart_cities_10.02.25_shared.pdf
33. Vishnivetskaya, Anna, and Elena Alexandrova. 2019. "'Smart City' Concept. Implementation Practice." IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering 497: 012019. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/497/1/012019>
34. Washburn, Doug, and Usman Sindhu. 2010. Helping CIOs Understand "Smart City" Initiatives. Forrester Research. https://public.dhe.ibm.com/partnerworld/pub/smb/smarterplanet/forr_help_cios_und_smart_city_initiatives.pdf

Eugenijus Krikščiūnas

Į ŽMOGŲ ORIENTUOTA SUMANIOJO MIESTO POLITIKA RYGOS IR STAMBULO MIESTŲ PLANAVIMO DOKUMENTUOSE

Anotacija. Daugelis miestų visame pasaulyje siekia tapti sumaniais miestais. Laikui bėgant ši koncepcija neapsiribojo tik technologijomis, bet ėmė vis labiau orientuotis į žmones. Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjami dviejų miestų (Rygos ir Stambulo) planavimo dokumentai, skirti šių miestų, esančių skirtingų politinių režimų šalyse (Latvijoje ir Turkijoje), pertvarkymui į sumanius miestus. Dokumentų analizė ir jų palyginimas parodė, kad, priešingai nei iš pradžių buvo galima numanyti, ydingai demokratijai priskiriamos Latvijos sostinės Rygos dokumente išreiškta politika, kuria siekiama patenkinti žmonių poreikius, tačiau jie nėra aktyviai įtraukiami į sprendimų priėmimo procesus. Tuo tarpu hibridinio režimo Turkijos mieste Stambule žmonių veikla priimanč sumaniojo miesto sprendimus yra institucionalizuota ir įtvirtinta struktūrose; be to, jiems dokumente priskiriami konkretūs vaidmenys.

Eugenijus Krikščiūnas, PhD candidate at Klaipėda University in the Political Science programme.
E-mail: eugenijus.kriksciunas@ku.lt

Eugenijus Krikščiūnas, doktorantas, Klaipėdos universitetas, Politikos mokslų programa.
El. paštas: eugenijus.kriksciunas@ku.lt



This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).