



HAL
open science

”Smart City” public policies : rethinking local governance to maximise public value creation

Pascal Frucquet, David Carassus, Didier Chabaud, Pierre Marin

► To cite this version:

Pascal Frucquet, David Carassus, Didier Chabaud, Pierre Marin. ”Smart City” public policies : rethinking local governance to maximise public value creation. IRSPM Conference 2023, IRSPM, Apr 2023, Budapest (Hungary)., Hungary. hal-04095700

HAL Id: hal-04095700

<https://univ-pau.hal.science/hal-04095700v1>

Submitted on 12 May 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



« Smart City » public policies :
rethinking local governance
to maximise public value creation



Pascal Frucquet – PhD Student in Management

*under the supervision of David Carassus (Prof. IAE Pau-Bayonne),
Didier Chabaud (Prof. IAE Paris-Sorbonne) and Pierre Marin (PhD)*




❑ Development of « Smart City » or « Smart Territory » projects by French local authorities :

- Around **200** in 2021 (Data Publica & KPMG 2021, p.17)
- Increase to be expected with the upcoming results of the second wave of the **call for projects « Territoires Intelligents et Durables »**
- A matter of concern for French authorities : Belot (2017), Oural & al. (2018)
- A growing **interest of French management academics**

❑ Emergence of a research stream over the last 10 years proposing to address **Smart Cities from the point of view of public value theory** :

- Rodríguez Bolívar (2019) : the challenge is « *to [know] **the conditions and drivers needed** for achieving success in improving public value through ICT implementations* »
- Grossi & al. (2020) : « *Our current academic understanding of the management and governance of smart cities falls short (...) **there is a need for a research-based understanding of the management and governance of smart cities.*** »

- ❑ In the conceptual linking between **Smart City** and **public value**, the question of **governance** appears as a fundamental one



Research Question :

To what extent the creation of public value by “Smart City” and “Smart Territory” policies is influenced by their governance modes ?

- ❑ 4 streams of the academic literature dealing with **Smart City**, **public value** and **governance**

Smart Urban Governance & Governance of Smart Cities

Meijer and Bolivar (2016),
Przeybilovicz and Cunha (2021),
(Frucquet and al. 2021)

Performance management in the public sector

Bouckaert and Halligan (2008),
Guenoun (2009), Favoreu and al.
(2015), Carassus (2020)


Business Models for Smart Cities

Walravens (2015), Díaz-Díaz and al.
(2017), Schiavone and al. (2019),
Timeus (2020)

Public value

Moore (1995), Cresswell and al.
(2006), Bannister et Connolly (2014),
Harrison and al (2012)

□ Proposal of a **research model** :



- ❑ A **longitudinal exploratory qualitative** study over the period 2021-2023 with a selection of **2 case studies** among French local authorities engaged in « Smart City » or « Smart Territory » policies
- ❑ More than **30 semi-structured interviews** that were **fully recorded** and then transcribed in **verbatim**s which were manually coded, using **thematic coding**.


Case A

- 150 000 inhabitants (main city)
- 300 000 inhabitants (EPCI)
- Project by the main city and the EPCI
- 2018-2032
- 20 semi-structured interviews


Case B

- 110 000 inhabitants (main city)
- 275 000 inhabitants (EPCI)
- Project only led by the main city
- 2014-2026
- 10 semi-structured interviews

□ **Result n°1 : Open governance offers greater potential for creating public value than proactive governance**



- ❑ **Result n°2** : There is a **phasing** between **proactive governance** and **open governance**, with consequences on the types of public value created



- ❑ An **empirical contribution** to the understanding of the role of local governance in the public value chain of « Smart » city policies :
 - In accordance with **Przebylovicz and Cunha (2021)** regarding the **managerial actions** to be carried out to conduct such policies
 - In accordance with **Chafield and al. (2019)** about **the technological and non-technological favorable and unfavorable factors** for the co-creation of public value in the context of Smart Cities

- ❑ A **managerial contribution** by allowing policymakers and managers to better understand the chain of public value creation of « Smart City » policies by :
 - Designing these projects as **public policies in their own right** and not as technological ones
 - Questioning the **objectives** of public creation in order to identify the **resources** to be mobilized, the **partners** to work with, and the **KPI**
 - Thinking out **open governance**, implementing it and providing it with appropriate resources, **from the very beginning of the projects**

- Our research presents **3 main limitations** which constitute **an invitation for further research**

Improve **in depth knowledge of the two cases** to increase the quality of the comparison between them

Identify **any correlations between the nature of actions and activities** making up the « Smart City » policies and the **types of public value**

Analyse the point of view of the **stakeholders**, thus following the original model by Harrison and al. (2012)

Further research to be conducted in 2023 with the will to **enlarge the actions and activities studied**

Interviews to be realized in 2023 with **stakeholders** and **inhabitants**



Thank you for your attention

Contact :

Pascal Frucquet

pfrucquet@univ-pau.fr

