PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP AND NEW PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: THE STRATEGIES FOR SMART CITIES SUPPORTING TO REDUCE SOCIAL INEQUALITY

Akarawin Sasanapitak[1] Somsak Amornsiripong[2]

Abstract

This article aimed to explain the concept of smart city development which requires a special pattern that is smart city governance. The concept is related to the concept of the new public governance, which is a new paradigm of public administration since the traditional public governance may not be suitable for the development, causing a delay and inability to adapt to the development based on the globalization era. It could not provide a solution to the problems and needs of the people. The new public governance prioritizes network management and is not limited only to the public sector but also encourages the private sector and civil society sector to participate in the provision of public services. It gives importance to public services delivered to the general public effectively and inclusively through a public-private partnership model of governance cooperation, which is a form of promoting cooperation in public service provision between the public and private sectors in current public governance. It is expected to be a strategy that facilitates smart city governance by utilizing technology to facilitate the general public in accessing public services. This would reduce social inequality. In Thailand, the example of a public-private partnership in smart city development was the establishment of a city development company. Currently, city development companies have been established in 10 provinces all over Thailand.

Introduction

"Smart City" is a development model that utilizes technology to facilitate the provision of public services for the general public because of the massive increase of the urban population. To clarify, more than half of the world's population currently lives in urban areas (United Nations, 2011). Moreover, there is a tendency that people for would move to live in urban areas more. The United Nations predicted that 66 percent of the world's population would move to live in urban areas by 2050 (United Nations, 2015). Additionally, 80 percent of the world's population would move to live in urban areas by 2099 (Hardoy, J.E., Mitlin, D., Satterthwaite, D., 2013). About 90 percent of countries, especially developing countries, were driving urbanization policy. This took place, especially in South Asia, China, and Sub-Saharan Africa (James H. Spencer, 2015). It can be seen that prioritizing urbanization due to the increasing movement of people is so important for countries all over the world. Thanks to the context above, the concept of developing a city into a smart city becomes one of the concepts for urban development. In other words, when the population increases, public services or

---

[1] Assistant Professor Dr., Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, Phranakon Si Ayutthaya Rajabhat University, Phranakon Si Ayutthaya, Thailand. E-mail: akarawins@gmail.com, corresponding author

[2] Associate Professor Dr., Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Mahidol University. Bangkok, Thailand.
E-mail: somsak.amo@mahidol.ac.th

utilities would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the urban population, or the provision of public services would not meet the needs of the people in the area.

The concept of smart city development is consistent with the principles of sustainable development. Such a concept develops a city by relying on information technology to improve the quality of life of urban residents and the environment. Many scholars commented that "Cities cannot be truly smart without being sustainable" (Ahvenniemi, H., Huovila, A., Pinto-Seppä, I., Airaksinen, M., 2017; Yigitcanlar, T., Kamruzzaman, Md., Foth, M., Sabatini-Marques, J., Da Costa, E., Ioppolo, G., 2019). They also commented that a smart city development model would address the problems in cities (Bansal, Mukherjee, & Gairola, 2017) by utilizing technology to meet the spatial context to promote the efficient management of cities and the provision of public services for people (Akarawin Sasanapitak, 2022). Thus, it can be said that smart city development can be a key to improve the quality of life and livelihood of the urban population based on the principles of sustainable development.

In the academic issues, a smart city is an interweave between technology and urban governance (Meijer, A., Rodriguez Bolivar, MP, 2015). This is consistent with many academics who added that promoting a smart city inevitably required the adaptation of technology to promote a better quality of life for urban residents (Thuzar, 2010; Akarawin Sasanapitak, Somsak Amornsiripong, 2021). Thus, most people considered smart city governance as a science-related field, such as information technology, engineering, urban designs, etc. Smart city development was also related to social sciences as well. Moreover, Chorurabi et al. (2012) suggested that a smart city may require cooperation from other sectors, apart from public

sectors. Holland (2014) commented that being a smart city required cooperation between political groups and social groups rather than technology. This required multiple stakeholders. So, it is called "Smart City Governance."

Smart city governance is related to the local governance for effective development and actions. It is also related to a relationship with multiple stakeholders among interest groups, institutions, and public service providers for smart cities (Odendaal, 2003; Yigitcanlar, T., O'Connor, K., Westerman, C., 2008; Nam & Pardo, 2011;, Kourtit, K., Kijkamp, P., Arribas, D.,2012). Therefore, smart city governance is characterized by a network that makes the local sector a more important actor than the central government. Bolivar, M. P. R., & Meijer, A. J. (2016) said that creating a network for smart city governance may require three key components: (1) e-governance, (2) engagement by stakeholders, citizens, and communities, and (3) network-based relationships by building partnerships and collaboration.

Based on the literature review, a smart city is a city that full of information, news, and technology which are easily accessed by the general public. Therefore, legislation and policies are crucial for smart city development. So, smart city governance may require specific policies or legislation (Ruhlandt, R.W.S., 2018). In addition, Bolivar, M.P.R., Meijer, A.J. (2016) added that the policy that can manage smart cities must transform the abstract into the concrete. Therefore, this article aimed to explain the concept of the new public governance which is a new paradigm of the public administration that prioritizes the network organization that is limited to the public sector through a public-private partnership model of governance cooperation. It is expected to be a strategy that facilitates smart city governance by utilizing technology to facilitate the general public in accessing public services. This would reduce social inequality.

Smart City and Social Inequality Reduction

The Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (2018) defined inequality as the difference or inequality in the distribution of resources and the well-being of the population in the country or the situation that one person gets something that another person does not. The operational guideline to solve the problem needs to be conducted. Inequality and poverty are related to many dimensions in society, which can be divided into four areas as follows:

1) Economic inequality: It can be considered as inequality of distribution of the wealth, income, and property including land ownership.
2) Social inequality: It can be considered from the opportunity to access public services, the allocation, and distribution of public resources and services, such as education and public health.
3) Justice inequality: It can be considered from inequality of rights and access to the justice process of the general public.
4) Political inequality: It can be considered from the political bargaining power and participation in political decision-making and policy-making.

When inequality between urban and rural areas was compared, urban areas' inequality has always been higher than in rural areas. This was partly due to the diversity of jobs, incomes, and access to public services. It also portrayed the situation of inequality in Thailand for several reasons. One of the causes of social inequality was the lack of access to household infrastructure, especially for people in urban areas where social inequality is obvious. Thus, one way to reduce social inequality is to develop smart cities to promote access to public services and infrastructure through the utilization of information technology (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council, 2018).

Moreover, Akarawin Sasanapitak and Somsak Amornsiriphong (2021) found that smart city development played a role in reducing social inequality in 5 areas as follows:

1) Role in creating fairness in resource allocation: In other words, smart cities play a role in the development of urban infrastructure.
2) Role in urban development and transparent public administration: Smart cities will encourage the public sector to use technology to manage the city and public services efficiently as well as the ability to solve problems in the city.
3) Role in promoting careers and generating income: In the future, the world will encounter many changing environments. Smart city development is a tool to enhance the lives of people in cities in terms of economic and social dimensions.
4) Role in promoting communication and participation: In the future, the world will be entering an aging society, which may require inter-generation collaboration. Therefore, smart cities play a role in promoting good communication and understanding, especially between inter-generation.
5) . Role in promoting gender equality and social class: Technology in smart cities will facilitate the public transport system. Therefore, women can access transportation services that are easier, safer, and more worthy.

Therefore, it can be said that technology or innovation that develops the city plays an important role in helping people to receive equal

benefits and the same service or to receive the same information regardless of the barrier that prevented public services from being inclusive. If cities are developed into smart cities by utilizing technology appropriately, it will be one factor that helps reduce the social inequality that has occurred in urban areas as well.

New Public Governance Concept

The public administration in the era of globalization in the 21st century has changed in terms of economic, social, political, and environmental dimensions. Therefore, traditional bureaucratic systems that had too much emphasis on directing or adhering to rules made people feel bored and reduced their depersonalization (Akarawin Sasanapitak, Noppon Akahat, 2016). Public services may not meet the needs of the people and may not be able to directly solve the problems of the people. Therefore, the paradigm of public administration has now adapted to the changing social context. Another concept of public administration discussed today to promote the cooperation between sectors is the concept of the new public governance.

The concept of New Public Governance (NPG) is one of the paradigms of public administration. Osborne (2010), who was the former president of the International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPM), viewed that NPG can be divided into three groups:

1) Corporate governance is about the internal system process and the process of setting up direction, auditing, and responsibilities of the public sector.

2) Good Governance is a normative model of good public administration related to social, political, and administrative dimensions by international organizations, and

3) Public governance is the scope of the public administration, which consists of

1. Socio-political governance is about organizational relations within a society in a holistic view. The public sector is not granted authority for policy formulation, but it requires actors as well.

2. Public policy governance prioritizes elites and network groups that play a key role in policymaking.

3. Administrative governance prioritizes the use of effective public administration tools to solve the public sector's complicated problems.

4. Contract governance prioritizes the processing of contracts in the management of public services. Therefore, the public sector plays an insignificant role in the control over public services, and

5. Network governance is the concept based on the concept of a self-organizing inter-organizational network (Rhode, 1997), which prioritizes the network-based process to implement a public policy.

The ultimate goal of NPG is to establish a plural state, which means a state with dependent actors, leading to the relationship in the organization that produces effectiveness and outcome that respond to the implementation of policies and complex public administration with a network and institutional theories as to the foundation with a focus on negotiation (Prakorn Siriprakob, 2016; Uthai Laohawichian, 2015). In other words, this is the process or structure of public policy formulation and administration that unite all levels of public sectors, private sectors, and civil society organizations to jointly set public goals and achieve them. This allows some of the

powers and duties of the public sector to mingle with the private sector or civil society through public-private partnerships.

In Thailand, the example of cooperation among sectors to develop smart cities has been carried out as the establishment of "The City Development Company", which is a collaboration of the private sector in large provinces. This focused on the infrastructure and public services, such as the small electric train in Khon Kaen, the development of the transport bus in Phuket, known as "Phuket transit", etc. At present, there is a city development company in 10 provinces in the country.

Public-Private Partnership

At present, one of the smart city developments is to promote cooperation in the development of public, private, and social sectors. It is found that Thailand has two crucial urban development laws. The first one is the City Plan ACT 2019, which emphasizes a policy city map, public participation, and the decentralization of city planning to local administrative organizations. In addition, the law divides city planning based on an area's policy into 5 types, consisting of (1) country policy city plan, (2) regional policy city plan, (3) provincial policy city plan, (4) principle city plan, and (5) special city plan. Additionally, another law that is greatly recognized now is the Public and Private Partnership ACT 2019, which is a law directly related to Public-Private Partnership (PPP).

The author would like to explain to build the understanding of the meaning of PPP, which has been variously defined by others. For example, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2007) defines the arrangements whereby the private sector provides infrastructure assets and services that traditionally have been provided by the government, such as hospitals, schools, prisons,

roads, bridges, tunnels, railways, and water, and sanitation plants. This is consistent with the definition of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which highlighted that PPP must assign the private sector to be both a supplier and an investor in public services, and the risk must be transferred from the public sector to the private sector. Standard and Poor's (S&P) explained that PPP is a medium- and long-term relationship between the public and private sectors, related to risk and reward management. The European Commission (EC) (2003) defined PPP as a partnership between the public sector and private sectors to deliver a project or a service traditionally provided by the public sector. To sum up, PPP refers to the concession for the private sector instead of government action. This includes commercial activities and social affairs.

For Thailand, the first PPP regulation appeared in 1992 which is the Private Participation in State Undertaking Act 1992 (PPSU Act 1992). During the activation, the problem arose that the extent of cooperation between the public and private sectors was unclear as well as causing confusion among the private sectors in enforcing this law. Later, Thailand revised the law by issuing the Private Investments in State Undertaking Act 2013 (PISU Act 2013). However, the problem of defining investment extent remained unresolved (Natcha Khiangprakhong, 2016).

Later, on March 6, 2019, the Thai government announced implementing of the Public and Private Partnership Act (2019) to improve the PPP process to be clearer. The essence of the law set the objectives of the co-investment between the public and private sectors by focusing on using the expertise and innovation of the private sector. The Public and Private Partnership Policy Committee (PPPPC) was established to monitor the PPP policy as well as to set up the Public and Private Partnership

Supporting Funds to promote the PPP activities in Thailand. Most importantly, the public policies must be clearly implemented in the provision of infrastructure and public services which are related to the following infrastructure (section 7).

1) roads, highways, expressways, or transport by road;

2) railways, mass transit or transport by rail;

3) airports or transport by air;

4) ports or transport by water;

5) water management, irrigation, waterworks, or water treatment;

6) energies;

7) telecommunications or communications;

8) hospitals or public health;

9) schools or education;

10) residences or facilities for low-income or middle-income people, the elderly, underprivileged people, or people with disabilities;

11) exhibition centres and conference centres;

It can be noticed that the activities that the Thai government has promoted to create PPP were not only economic or value-added productivity but also social enterprises or underprivileged people or people of disabilities. The implementation of the PPP project in Thailand is carried out in 4 ways as follows:

1) Regarding Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) or Build-Transfer-Operate (BTO), the private sector invest in developing and implementing the projects and took risks from performance. The ownership of the project asset must be transferred to the public sector when the BTO is ready or at the end of the contract (BOT). The government may give away special privileges to allure the private sector, such as the right of service provision. Currently, there are 8 projects under BOT contracts,

such as the project of investment and operation in Laem Chabang Port, the Tollway Concession project, and the project to use the right to manage and operate a material management center, etc. As for BTO, there are 20 projects, such as the Cargo project at Suwannabhumi Airport, etc.

2) Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) is a form of concession that the government that granted the private sector the right to finance, design, construction, and service operation within a specified period. The ownership of the asset will be transferred back to the government at the end of the specified period. Currently, there are 2 ongoing projects, namely (1) the contract of instruction and operation in infrastructure development in the Mor-chit bus terminal and (2) the project of concession on tap water production and distributions.

3) Regarding Build-Lease–Operate-Transfer (BLOT), the private sector design and finds a source of funds to build on the land leased from the public sector. The private sector can operate during the period leased from the public sector. Eventually, the ownership will be transferred back to the public sector. At present, there is 1 project which is the concession contract on exploitation in the Phahonyothin area.

4) Regarding Build-Rent-Own-Transfer (BROT), the private sector can operate to lease assets from the public sector after the assets are transferred to the public sector. Currently, there are 2 projects under contract, namely (1) the concession contract on exploitation in building to operate hotel business, and (2) the concession contract on exploitation in Patumwan commercial area.

Discussion

It can be said that smart city development prioritizes technology and information systems. However, a smart city also requires cooperation from various sectors in society according to the New Public Governance which focuses on the implementation of public affairs that encourage the private sector to do so in the case of administration and development which are not limited to public affairs. Instead, it promotes cooperation built by the public sector, the private sector, and the general public, so it can be developed into smart city governance. Therefore, digital and information systems will be used as a tool to build smart city governance, which will help promote the distribution of information as well as facilitate the general public to effectively access public services, and information can be useful in the policy decision-making process.

The research by Akarawin Sasanapitak (2020) found that smart city development at the local level required cooperation from five relevant sectors which have different roles and cooperation in developing cities with the following details:

1) The Public Sector as Facilitator, acting as an intermediary for coordinating policy-making related to urban development with a concrete and clear policy.
2) The Private Sector as Technological Leader with high flexibility and not relying on regulations as well as adapting to changes in the globalized society as a key part of urban development and a technological leader. So, this part will provide a beneficial innovation to support the development in the urban.
3) The Academic Sector as Academic Service Provider, that is to say, is the sector that management of the knowledge to support smart city development and support the policy decision-making process to be more efficient and clearer.
4) The Civil Society Organization as Informal Examiner, playing a role in managing the needs and problems of the general public in a city, supporting urban management system, capacity building to the community as well as participating in informal auditing, and
5) The International Organization as Technology and Innovation Supporter, The International Organization will be the sector that supports the knowledge and innovation. The most important of the international organization is the standardization of smart city development which led to a comparison between the cities.

This demonstrates that smart city development may no longer be a monopoly on public sector development, but it requires other sectors. One factor that promotes smart city governance is the presence of an efficient and timely legal system. Laws that promote smart cities may need to be flexible and consistent with the technology systems in smart cities. Akarawin Sasanapitak (2020) stated that urban administrative regulations are a government-owned administrative mechanism for developing an efficient smart city. If the rules are not conducive to proactive urban development, it will be considered a major problem in smart city development. Additionally, smart city governance is an application of the concept of the new public governance because both of them prioritize network management and encourage the private sector and civil society to participate in the provision of public services with a focus on the quality of public services delivered to the general public effectively and inclusively.

Public-private partnerships are one of the strategies that may lead to effective smart city governance and smart city development.

In the case of Thailand, the Public and Private Partnership Act 2019 has been issued to promote the Public and Private Partnership policy to promote smart city governance and lead to smart city development. This is consistent with Thailand's Smart City Supporting Plan. The potential of the public sector to govern at the city level may lack inclusion. In addition, the bureaucratic system strictly adheres to the rules. This made the operation of urban development lack flexibility. Therefore, if analyzing the benefits of PPP in Thailand, there are many advantages for the public sector, the private sector, and the general public. In the public sector, PPP helps to promote public operations and create financial value because the administration of the private sector can be managed more economically as well as managing risks from the public sector. In the private sector, PPP will benefit in increasing business opportunities in providing public services apart from traditional business. In the general public, public services in the form of PPP may allow the clients to receive public services at an affordable price and quality. As projects from PPP will be carried out with the expertise of the public and private sectors, people receive cheaper and quality public services (Thailand Parliament Report, 2017).

A good example of how the PPP concept can help drive smart cities is the establishment of a City Development Company. At the present, city development companies have already been established in 10 provinces, namely Khon Kaen, Phuket, Samut Sakhon, Rayong, Bangkok, Saraburi, Phitsanulok, Chiang Mai, Chonburi, and Sukhothai (Thansettakij, 2017). This kind of company plays a key role in the development of cities in Thailand. Since there are support groups from the private sector and local politicians in the province, the coordination for the development within the province is well managed. However, it is also found that smart city development still has legal issues. For example, in the case of Khon Kaen city development company, despite receiving good support from local government organizations, public sectors, private sector, and civil society sectors to build a small electric train (Jureeporn Wanmontri and Supawatanakorn Wongthanavasu, 2020), at present, there is still a problem in asking for permission to use the public area in the province as well as other legal problems. Therefore, the construction has temporarily ceased under the process of finding a solution.

Conclusion

A smart city is one of the crucial means of urban development that can reduce social inequality. One of the causes of social inequality is the inability to access public services inclusively and efficiently, especially in urban areas that the population is constantly increasing and are facing insufficiency of public services and utilities. Therefore, it is necessary to utilize technology from the smart city to aid in the administration and provision of public services to provide public services to the general public inclusively and efficiently. However, regarding smart city development, the traditional public governance may not be suitable for the development, causing a delay and inability to adapt to the development, and it could not provide a solution to the problems and needs of the people. In addition, the traditional public administration does not give importance to network management. Therefore, appropriate smart city governance must focus on other sectors involved apart from the public sector. This is called "Smart City Governance."

To sum up, smart city governance is an implementation of the concept of the new public governance, which wants to reduce some limitations of the traditional public governance that hinder smart city development. Both concepts shared common features in terms of encouraging the private sector and other sectors to play a role in the provision of public services and a focus on the quality of public services through public- private partnerships, which promote cooperation in the provision of public services between the public and private sectors.

References

Ahvenniemi, H. , Huovila, A. , Pinto- Seppä, I. , Airaksinen, M. (2017) . What are the differences between sustainable and smart cities ?. *Cities, 60* (1), 234 - 245.

Akarawin Sasanapitak, Noppon Akahat. (2016) . Governance: Concept and Development to Local Government) . *ARU Research Journal, 3* (3), 63-70. [In Thai]

Akarawin Sasanapitak. (2020). *The Development of Local Smart City Model to Reduce Social Inequality.* Dissertation of Doctor of Public Administration, Program in Public Policy and Public Management, Mahidol University, Nakornpathom.

Akarawin Sasanapitak, Somsak Amornsiripong. (2021). The Synthesis of Smart City Roles Affecting to Reduce Social Inequality: The Meta - Synthesis. *Political Science and Public Administration Journal. 12* (Suppl. 1), 7-28. [In Thai].

Akarawin Sasanapitak. (2022). Smart City: The Synthesis of Meaning. *School of Administrative Studies Journal. 5*(1), p.126-141. [In Thai].

Bansal, N., Mukherjee, M., & Gairola, A. (2017). From poverty, inequality to Smart City. *Springer Transactions in Civil & Environmental Engineering*, 109 - 122.

Bolivar, M. P. R. , & Meijer, A. J. (2016) . Smart governance: Using a literature review and empirical analysis to build a research model. *Social Science Computer Review, 34* (6), 673 - 695.

Chourabi et al,. (2012) . Understanding smart cities: An integrative framework. *Proceeding of HICSS 45ᵗʰ Hawaii International conference on System Science*, IEEE, 2289 - 2297.

European Commission. (2003). Guidelines for Successful Public - Private Partnerships. Retrieved 25 July 2021. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/ppp_en.pdf.

Hardoy, J. E. , Mitlin, D. , Satterthwaite, D. (2013) . *Environmental Problems in an Urbanizing World.* Routledge: New York.

Hollands, R. G. (2014). Critical intervention into the cooperate smart city. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society,* January 27, 2015.

James H. Spencer. (2015) . *Globalization and urbanization: the global urban ecosystem.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jureeporn Wanmontri & Supawatanakorn Wongthanavasu. (2020). Key Actors in Collaborating with the Development of Khon Kaen's Smart City. *Governance Journal, 9*(1), p.262-303. [In Thai].

Kourtit, K., Kijkamp, P., Arribas, D. (2012). Smart cities in perspective - A comparative European study by mean of self- organizing maps. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 25*(2), 229 – 246.

Meijer, A. , Bolivar, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city: a review of the literature on smart urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 82* (2), 392 - 408.

Nam T, Pardo T.A. (2011). Conceptualizing smart city with dimensions of technology, people, and institutions. *Proceeding of 12th Conference on Digital Government Research*, College Park, MD, June 12–15 2011.

Natcha Khiangprakhong. (2016). Legal Problems on the investment in State Undertaking under the Private Investment in State Undertaking Act B.E. 2556. *Thammasat Business Law Journal*, Vol.6, 2016, [In Thai].

Odendaal, N. (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.

Osborne P. S, (2010). Introduction the (New) Public Governance: a suitable case for treatment?. In S. P. Osborne. (Eds.). *The New Public Governance: Emerging Perspective on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. London and New York: Routledge.

Prakorn Siriprakob. (2016). *3 Paradigms of Public Administration: Concept, theories, and Practices*. 2nd Ed. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997).*Understanding Governance, Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Thailand Parliamentary Budget Report. (2017). *The Analysis of Public and Private Partnership.* Bangkok: The Secretariat parliament of Thailand. [In Thai]

Thansettakij Newspaper. (2017). *City Development Company were established in 10 Provinces..*, No. 37 (3,315), 19 - 22 November 2017. [In Thai].

The Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. (2018). *Poverty and Inequality Analysis Report in Thailand 2017*. Bangkok: The Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. [In Thai].

The Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. (2018). The facts about the situation of inequality in Thailand. Retrieved 7 Nov. 2019. https://www.nesdb.go.th/ewt_news.php?nid=8490. [In Thai].

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2007). *PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (PPP).* Retrieved 27 Dec. 2019. https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=2096.

Thuzar, M. (2011). *Urbanization in South East Asia: Developing Smart Cities for the Future?.* Regional Outlook. 96-100.

United Nations. (2011). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2011 Revision.* New York: Department of Economic and Social Affair. Retrieved 24 Jan.2020. http://un.org/en/development/desa/ publications/ world- urbanization- prospects-the-2011-revision.html.

United Nations (2015). *World Urbanization prospects. The 2014 revision.* New York: Department of Economic and Social Affair.

Uthai Laohawichian. (2015). Public Administration in Thailand: Changes in subject characteristics and Trends. *Public Administration in Thailand: Change, Development, and Trends. School of Public Administration.* The National of Institute of Development Administration. Bangkok: Sukumvit Media. 51-84. [In Thai].

Yingitcanlar, T. , O' Connor, K. , Westerman, C. (2008). The Making of Knowledge Cities: Melbourne' s Knowledge- based Urban Development Experience. *Cities, 25*(2), 63 - 72.

Yingitcanlar, T., Sabatini-Marques, J., Costa, E. M., Kamruzzaman , M. , Ioppolo, G. (2017). Stimulation technological innovation through incentives: Perceptions of Australian and Brazilian firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.

Yigitcanlar, T. , Kamruzzaman, Md. , Foth, M. , Sabatini-Marques, J., Da Costa, E., Ioppolo, G., (2019). Can cities become smart without being sustainable? A systematic review of the literature. *Sustainable Cities and Society*. *45*, 348-365.