

# Review of: "Skilling Up for Tomorrow's Cities: The Workforce of Smart Cities"

Kai Jakobs<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rheinisch Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses one important aspect (training) of a crucial yet frequently overlooked aspect of virtually any technical development: People. That's highly commendable.

That said, I do have some comments on the paper. Some relate not so much to the paper as such (see below for those), but to the things it does not address. The paper looks at smart city operation. This is important. But right now, smart cities are still in an early development stage. Notably, the underlying standards are still being developed. This is the stage where societal, environmental, ethical etc. aspects (as opposed to technical and economic ones) can be incorporated into the standards and thus into the ensuing technology. Once the standards have been set, the problems discussed in the paper will move to the fore. It would be great if the authors also considered that stage of smart city development (as opposed to just its operation).

Over to the paper proper now. Overall, I feel it falls a bit short as it adopts a largely technical perspective. It talks about highly relevant aspects like "transversal skills" and "inclusive participation", but largely fails to elaborate on these aspects (again, see below for more specific comments). Rather, it focuses on purely technical aspects (using the term a bit loosely to also include e.g. environmental issues). Little surprise, the outcome is quite 'technocratic', imho, of course.

Said more specific comments:

(editorial) P.1.: You identify four "categories of occupational profiles", not five.

P.2: Judging by your list in the first para, said profiles seem to focus a lot on truly technical (computer science-related) aspects (e.g., the "IoT). This should be expanded.

P.3: I fail to see why you seem to feel that "stakeholder engagement, and collaborative governance" are 'skills'. Please explain. I must admit that I also fail to see why "all city residents" should be able to "manage the ever-evolving technological landscape" and to "develop and implement digital solutions". Please discuss.

P.3: "This approach demands active and inclusive participation, enabling diverse voices to be heard and integrated into the decision-making process." I completely, utterly, and entirely agree with the idea of 'inclusive participation', but which approach exactly are you talking about? Please elaborate.

P.3 ff. The core competencies you identify are definitely helpful. But some more concrete examples of why exactly these

competencies are important and for what would be helpful here.

P.8: It is not quite clear to me why you need a, say, 'Smart Grid Engineer', but not e.g. a 'Smart Building Engineer', and why an "Autonomous Vehicle Operator/Technician" but no "ITS Engineer". Please discuss.

P.10: I wonder if each and every city actually needs the people with profiles listed here (except perhaps for the 'Local Energy Community Manager'). Please explain.

Talks about people and takes existing technology for granted. What about people to shape that technology in the first place, to make it more useful / avoid negative consequences ('Responsible Innovation') as opposed to just implement what others have developed?