Platform Urbanization and Citizenship
An Inquiry and Projection

Filippo Bignami & Naomi C. Hanakata

Globally operating platforms (such as social media, commercial, service, e-government, and e-management platforms) are increasingly critical means of communication, exchange, and daily life. Their growing ecosystem and locally specific variations also increase possibilities for data mining and addressing specific user profiles. For many office workers, it is difficult to imagine a work routine without service platforms for business such as Microsoft Power, Google Cloud, or the Apple iOS system. However, platforms are also increasingly forming a firm component within community services and urban development administration, whether that is for, e.g., submitting taxes, obtaining health services, profiling a political campaign, monitoring the use of utilities, or new employment opportunities (Hanakata/Bignami 2022: 1). Recently, numerous new platforms have become available to track the spread of the Covid-19 virus or to report one's health condition or vaccination status. Together, these various ways of communication, monitoring, and control are changing the way people interact, expanding the possibilities of what we can do, but they also highlight the limitations and the character of different political subjectivations of citizens. This shift is particularly perceivable with regard to the urban environment, which is increasingly immersed and governed through platforms. In a critical reflection on the implications of what we call *platform urbanization*, we, in this contribution, discuss structural and political corollaries of this development and the subsequent need to reconceptualize citizenship today. Furthermore, in an attempt to expand conceptually, we, in this article, want to go beyond dominant practices of the present and scan inherent capacities of platform urbanization for possible urban citizenship scenarios. Taking platform urbanization as an inescapable force in contemporary urbanization processes, and by drawing from a heterogeneous set of examples, we want to look at the aptitude of platform technologies to foster

an urban condition in which platforms form an immaterial but concrete political condition and explore what it takes to realize a space of inclusion that offers participation empowerment for all.

Outlining platform urbanization

The urban realm is defined by platform infrastructures that are shifting many modes of interaction and production – of urban governance and identity – to a virtual space (Hanakata/Bignami 2022). This fundamental change is more than an increase in technological opportunities, and it is more than a change in the way we live, as proposed in the concept of platform urbanism (Barns 2014). It transforms how people come together and urban space is produced. This multidimensional process affects our everyday lives and the way our urban environment is perceived, co-constructed, and governed, and it transforms the way we can express ourselves (through social media), how we perceive our urban environment (as a replica of an online experience), and how we plan, manage, or predict its future (through digital twins) (Hanakata/Bignami 2022: 2). The concept of platform urbanization attempts to understand both this process as a planetary phenomenon and its various dimensions, which affect each possible territory and individual. It looks at platforms as infrastructures of a global process that increasingly defines everyday life in a physical and spatial way as well as at the socio-economic and political aspects of the urban. It provokes a new relationship between people and their environment through introducing various kinds of digital interfaces that link the two, which calls for a reconceptualization of citizenship. In a process of dematerialization, abstraction, and disassociation, platform urbanization creates a new political arena where the individual becomes a site for data collection as well as a node of connection flows of information, knowledge, and expertise. These are no longer exclusive to the skill set of the individual but feed processes of algorithmic reorganization and augmentation of data aggregation, which also entails a form of exploitation of the individual value and, all in all, a loss of individual skills.

With regard to its territorial dimension, platform urbanization advances without a specific territorial anchorage, and furthermore with no linkages to nation-states, as many of its infrastructures extend seamlessly beyond any boundaries. In fact, they undermine any physically defined entity and propel and consolidate the networks of global flows, extending conveniences of com-

munication and mobility but also of the traces left. Platform urbanization coincides and enables what Slavoj Žižek (2010) calls, with reference to Rancière, the *post-political*. Within a post-political condition, political practice becomes a matter of managing and policing administrative procedures (Swyngedouw 2019). This development, however, is not determined by the technology itself but by those who create, deploy, and control its use. While platforms provide the structures that enable the connection of goods and services (Barns 2018; Leszczynski 2020), their application requires specific skills and access to resources. A certain liberalization of application development by using open sources has become a major trigger for platform innovation. The impact on and making of our urban environment, however, is a matter of scale which is only attainable through power, defined as a dispositional quality and resource concentration commonly in the hands of a relatively restricted and exclusive group of actors. These are increasingly intertwined with digital market actors and occupied with promoting processes of platformization, adopting a techno-driven language of *smart cities*.

Indeed, smart cities incorporate some of the material infrastructures implied in platform urbanization. These infrastructures have propelled the industry of smart technology producers, "pursuing a technological solutionism that often dismisses the multilayered implications" (Hanakata/Bignami 2022: 3) of platform urbanization. Smart cities and smart city technologies, however, reveal one key aspect of platform urbanization, which is the centralized mode of control and governance and the rapid development of algorithmic-driven management in urban environments that increased at the end of the second decade of the 21st century (Huws 2020). Many recent developments have been called out as new platform cities, including, for example, NEOM in Saudi Arabia by NEOM Company; Woven City in Susono, Japan, by Toyota; Toronto Tomorrow in Canada by Alphabet's Sidewalk Lab; Pungol Digital District in Singapore by JTC; and Dholera in India by a large conglomerate of public and private stakeholders. All rely on customized or all-in-one solutions offered by industry partners or big tech companies (Hanakata/Bignami 2022). All of them provide smart infrastructures that are promoted as neutral facilitators for more efficient living (Leszczynski 2020: 192), and focus on practical aspects of a stipulated techno-utopia. As such, they tend to ignore questions of citizenship, labor, mobility, and the overarching techno-political framework, which are all, however, an integral part of platform urbanization. The currently dominant developments of platform urbanization leverage the privacy and data of individuals and make compliance with (basic) personal in-

formation provision a requirement for participation and action to commodify human experience and urban life (Zuboff 2019).

Implications on citizenship – an inquiry

Based on the conceptualization of platform urbanization above, it appears that we are fully immersed in an open-ended techno-political framework (Calzada 2021). Further, it appears that we are within a consolidation of institutional, political, and technical systems through the exponential logics of computation on a planetary scale (Bratton 2015). Such logics of computation are both a technological apparatus and a model for a new techno-political architecture. In this article, we also consider how we might recognize and co-construct alternative scenarios and effects, which forces us to revisit and extend the concept of citizenship (Hanakata/Bignami 2021). The idea of a techno-political scenario is particularly appropriated in the context of the urban environment, where processes of platformization and technology constitute, substantiate, or enact political aims in a wider sense, positioning the city in a central role, which provokes a discussion about urban technopolitics (Foley/Miller 2020). In a techno-political scenario featuring platform and urban politics, we can uncover the aspects that are often hidden within complex arrangements of platform infrastructure and economic production. One of such aspects is, for example, a form of truly invasive platform capitalism (Srnicek 2017), including actors and organizations that shape this type of capitalism and are being shaped by it. Platforms are slowly but steadily eroding and replacing political and institutional spaces since the world wide web has become the real "global institution" (Mathiason 2008). As such, we can conclude that 'exercising' citizenship is not just a matter of participating in predefined institutional realms but a matter of creating new and different types of interaction collectivity and/or of transforming participation in urban politics, in community, and society, online and offline.

The making of the urban can be described as a political process. In effect the definition of platform urbanization, as outlined above, is based on a conception of the urban as both a material and immaterial place where the widespread use of platforms influences the modes of production of the urban. This requires a closer examination: platforms, within the urban, are becoming the new 'boundary condition' for citizenship and space (detached from the nation-state) within which the collectivity interacts in a context of

the previously mentioned post-politicization (Swyngedouw 2019). Platforms have not only infused social, cultural, and economic life but resignified political life by creating interconnected relations among people, institutions, technology providers, and built environments. They have influenced almost every aspect of politics, and yet their presence in politics remains obscure. Exploring these new "urban techno-politics and how and whose politics are embedded in infrastructure not only make visible the social and the political, it can also create space for opening-up and engaging alternative sets of techno-politics generated by alternative sets of actors and organizations" (Foley/Miller 2020: 316). Such a techno-political scenario is characterized by disjunctions between formal notions of citizenship and the practical realities of how citizenship is grounded. Such disjunctions point to instances in which compromises must be acknowledged (e.g., less freedom and more security through tech surveillance), which often results in the offering of comfortable but partial forms of citizenship (limited to some groups, to some areas, to some behaviors, to some markets, and to some forms of participation). As a corollary, this process further increases already existing forms of differential inclusion (Mezzadra/Neilson 2012), which has a significant impact on the dimensions of (urban) citizenship: organizers and providers of this scenario are few in number and largely formed by oligopolist private (big tech) companies that leverage on restricted and technical know-how. Users and alleged digital citizens often ignore the logics that engineer such new techno-political scenarios. Platform urbanization's techno-political scenarios alter conventional politics and, furthermore, have created new politics without any obvious precedence (Hanakata/Bignami 2022). Platforms have supported the definition of new spaces and subjects of politics, confirming how historical assemblages of territory, authority, and rights linked to nation-states have been reshuffled and reorganized (Sassen 2005; 2016). Moreover, they have added further dimensions to the concept of citizenship.

By bringing these new dimensions of citizenship to the center of concern, we do away with a mere technology-driven understanding of platforms ensuing a conception of citizens as meek, passive data subjects. Instead, we attend to how political subjectivities are always performed in relation to techno-political arrangements and technological urban infrastructures. We also contend with positivist assertions of sovereign subjects corroborated by libertarian vision of platforms. We argue that, if we shift our analysis from how we are being 'controlled' to analyze how to trigger ongoing processes, social practices, and a political performance rather than a static category, we can identify

paths of subversive citizenship (Isin/Ruppert 2020). To reach this conclusion, we need to consider citizen subjects not in isolation (as platforms tend to do) but in relation to the actions and institutions they are a part of (as political subjectivation processes tend to do). This includes, for example, claims and performances of citizenship including a reorganization of digital-social rights for a new "cyberspace" environment (Tomasello forthcoming).

The 'outdated' role of nation-states

If the depicted conception of platform urbanization is based on the city as a dominant social and political scenario where platform providers and operators impose their operating logics on society (Hanakata/Bignami 2021), there are additional aspects to be considered. The actual process of so-called globalization is the basic context within which the circulation of technology, capital, people, information, services, and goods takes place. Today, globalization can be understood as an interdependence of technology, institutions, means of production and finance, goods, people, and economic flows, regardless of borders and polities. Due to the strengthening of transnational institutions and interdependencies, the sovereignty of nation-states, still formally and legally valid, is weakening its nomos. Here, we want to refer to Schmitt's (2003) binary differentiation between the physical and the virtual (Bratton 2015) and put it to use, breaking it apart somehow to highlight that the tension between the online and offline world is blurring. Consequently, national identity and membership are also diminishing or complemented with other forms of identity and membership that are coming to the fore, such as, for example, the urban. Gerard Delanty believes that the nation-state has lost its sovereignty due to a number of factors, including the strengthening of international law; the internationalization of political decision-making; hegemonic forces and international structures of safety; and the globalization of culture and global economy (Delanty 2009). Because of these international connections and interdependencies, the nation-state has become an additional category of supranational and subnational entities. Therefore, it can be argued that the conception of the nation-state, as it originated from a post-Westphalian order, is 'outdated' and does no longer play the unique and central role in international relations as it used to, but that other kinds of institutions and forms of governance appear as key actors. Ulrich Beck proposes the following triad: neoliberal state, supranational state, and cosmopolitan state. The latter appears more able to preserve the interests of its citizens

from neoliberal hegemony. This is possible since losing autonomy from nation-states can mean pooling sovereignty. In turn, this pooling of sovereignty produces an increase in collective and shared sovereignty to a level capable of solving collective problems that are not national anymore (Beck 2006). Rainer Bauböck understands the concept of urban citizenship as completing, not replacing, national citizenship. He points out three different accounts of urban citizenship, namely: diminutive, which rests on treating urban municipalities as constructs of higher level governments whose borders and competencies are determined by them (optionally including immigrants in local demonstrations, for example); derivative, which gives additional weight to the urban level by regarding it as similar to citizenship in the constitutive polities of a federation (such as regions, cantons, autonomous territories, etc.); and post-national, which cuts the relation between city and state, highlighting the emancipation of urban areas from the nation-state (for example, through forging transnational city networks) (Bauböck/Orgad 2020). In such a multifarious perspective linking the urban and citizenship, the city appears as a crucial entity able to reshape citizenship, extending it both in the sense of political and social functions and in the spatial-organizational sense. The city (as a form of concentrated urbanization) appears as the dominant form, the economically most developed and politically most powerful societies in the world, the center of the above-mentioned flows (of platforms, technology, capital, people, information, services, and goods), a multicultural environment, and the point of meeting and creation of innovations, new identities, political participations, and memberships.

Platform urbanization scenario – a projection

If we take platform urbanization as a key driver of contemporary urbanization processes and as an increasingly defining force within our urban environment and look at its inherent capacity to define our everyday lives and the way we perceive and conceive our urban environment, how can we envision an urban citizenship scenario that flourishes through the intrinsic powers of platform technologies? The following section draws from some case studies as well as our own imaginaries and describes a selection of examples and ideas in an attempt to outline what could be possible if we leverage the capacities of platform urbanization in a way that is inclusive, equal, and politically constructive for all. It is not a matter of heralding non-profit platforms over those

for profit, nor to naively divide them into good and bad practices. Rather, it is about identifying ways of leveraging platform capacities that operate in the interest of a participatory and inclusive urban development.

Strengthening of the value and orientation toward commons

Commons are a collective good that increase their value through shared and collective use and consumption in the city. Therefore, they form an important component within the city as a space for encounter, connection, exchange, and difference. This may include open spaces, facilities as well as infrastructures, but also private spaces, such as certain commercial, residential, and industrial estates, and natural resources. Strengthening the value of and orientation toward commons may include leaving the management of commons not in the hands of a selected few digital platform market actors but in the hands of communities based on collectively established social practices and governance mechanisms. This implies a continuous, informal, and open-ended form of political and social co-construction enabling an increased awareness and responsibility. Such sharing and governance practices, however, require an elaborate political negotiation and participatory management system to be successful. Drawing from big data and capable of coordinating and consolidating multiple data sources (and therefore different interests and voices), platform technologies could be employed to facilitate such an open political scenario. This could also allow for a multifunctional and flexible use of spaces, increasing a city's adaptive capacity and a plurality of opportunities. An example of this is Fairbnb (http://www.fairbnb.coop), a cooperative organization and open-source platform that has adopted a responsible home sharing strategy, working with local authorities to verify hosts. Local representations ensure compliance with sustainability standards to protect the community from the side effects of unwanted tourism. Besides, Fairbnb practices solidarity by involving local communities to define the social projects that are a priority for their sustainable development, supporting them with resources generated by 50 % of the platform's revenues, which are used to fund local projects, while the remaining revenues are used by Fairbnb to maintain its network and operations. Another example is Katuma (http://katuma.org), a network that allows people to sell and buy local foods from farmers and participate in a sustainable model with socio-economic benefits for the community via free software and an app. Through this cooperative

approach, small-scale producers can agree on prices and define the network collectively.[1]

Enhancing the interlinkage and transfer of knowledge and skills

Similar to commons, the sharing of immaterial capacities within the urban realm forms an important component of the urban identity and the urban as a space for collectivity and exchange. Platform urbanization is already advancing based on increasing the capacity for individualized influence (Leszczynski 2020: 193). This capacity, however, is often quickly co-opted by digital platform market actors and individual voices subsequently commodified and/or rendered by dispossession and antagonistic subjectivation (Cuppini/Frapporti/Pirone 2015). Therefore, platforms should be leveraged to enhance the interlinkage and transfer of knowledge and skills, which may include the support of individual citizens to find a voice and connect to match interests and demands while strengthening a community of knowledge, experience, and skill sharing rather than just increasing the abstracted data capacity of digital platform market actors. This may also include cross-generational assistance in care and other services, from help with daily errands to child care, but it may also include the repurposing of existing expertise to new demands. An example of this was initiated during the lockdown in Germany and is called Corona School (https://www.lern-fair.de/). This online platform connects pupils from all grades and various subjects with university students as tutors and is dedicated to supporting learning opportunities for all regardless of their social,

1 Both examples are case studies of the European Horizon 2020 project PLUS, which is funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation program "Platform Labour in Urban Spaces: Fairness, Welfare, Development" (PLUS n.d.), Grant Agreement No. 822638. The project scrutinizes the main features of the platform economy's impact on work, welfare, and social protection in a trans-urban approach. The platform economy is, indeed, emerging as a strategic sector in terms of the application of digital technologies, business investments, and new jobs, both gig- and employment-driven. The project aims at sketching a picture of such transformations, proposing an innovative approach that identifies urban dimension as a fundamental stage for evaluating the political, social, and economic impact of these platforms and for building more inclusive policies. Within the project consortium, there are partners that are themselves platforms that make businesses but are inspired by and managed with a participatory and citizenship-driven approach.

cultural, and financial backgrounds. Similarly, other platforms such as Rentagrandma.com, GrandmaTutors.com, or VolunteerGrandparents.ca also leverage the intergenerational exchange of knowledge and experience. They offer assistance in childcare and domestic chores and aim to create and strengthen an experience that enriches all involved.

Supporting sustainable urban development

Sustainable urban development is one of the key challenges of our time. Efforts to facilitate such practices have long been at the forefront of exploring the possibilities of big data as a means to optimize transport infrastructures, urban microclimates, public amenities, or other urban services. Supporting sustainable urban development in its social, environmental, cultural, and economic dimension is a complex and essential endeavor that is in the interest of all. Participatory design, for example, which deploys technological artifacts, is often heralded as furthering the democratization of urban decision-making. However, participatory design practices often struggle with carrying the voices of all involved actors throughout the process and reflecting them in the enacted result. Making urban data mining not just a technical exercise to varnish city stats and create impressive visualizations but to substantiate complex urban development as inclusive processes is therefore key. An example that provides meaningful insights in this direction can be found in the latest extension of the HafenCity in Hamburg, Germany. The competition requirements for the project already included a digital platform that would allow a comparative evaluation of future microclimates, cost calculations, and energy demand and supply scenarios (HafenCity Hamburg GmbH 2019). It will, however, take some time before its compatibility with social indicators and its capacity to adapt – once the area is developed and populated with residents – can be verified. A further example of sustainable and cooperative urban development can be found in the initiative Bringthefood (https://bringfood.org), which is a non-profit web application to avoid food waste and deliver it to deprivileged people using criteria of proximity. It is adopted by various food banks, operators, and volunteer networks to manage surpluses from restaurants, small and large retailers, and producer organizations.

All these examples present seeds for an urban citizenship scenario that facilitates an open and expanded understanding of citizenship by advancing on the complex network structures and capacities of platform urbanization. They still present the exception but need to set the stage for a new default

in how we leverage the continuously diffusing impact of platform urbanization to increase the conditions for a sustainable and inclusive urban condition while avoiding an elitist city narrative.

What would it take to realize this?

In order to realize such an urban citizenship scenario, platforms need to be considered as enablers of individual skills rather than a deprivation of skills. Evidence from a research project on platform labor in urban spaces (PLUS[2]: see PLUS n.d.) indicates that there are some skill areas that can strengthen the awareness and capacity to create and interact more responsibly within platform environments. These skills are developed by and evolved through interrelations between individuals. The political construction of platform spaces not only shapes the understanding and use of platform opportunities but also determines the conception of users (workers, professionals, clients, policy makers, etc.) and their skills within these spaces.

To corroborate the need to improve the skills necessary to participate in platform environments, PLUS provides some helpful insights. Within the project's activities, seven city training workshops were carried out in Bologna, Paris, London, Berlin, Tallinn, Barcelona, and Lisbon. They were mainly carried out online due to Covid-19-related travel restrictions and involved platform workers and key urban actors to better understand which skills needed to be developed to access and participate in platform-mediated communities and spaces. Since there was a focus on platform workers, resulting insights cannot be applied to the average platform user. A generally valid insight, however, is that improving skills that allow citizens to exercise self-determination as digital citizens strengthens the participatory dimension of platforms and creates a more even landscape of platform urbanization. Further project results include the following insights:

2 University of Applied Sciences of Southern Switzerland – SUPSI, Labour, Urbanscape, and Citizenship – LUCI Research area, is partner of this project, coordinated by Alma Mater University of Bologna. SUPSI coordinates a work package dedicated to set up a MOOC for platform economy and reflect upon the meaning of skills in this environment through a specific report.

- Technological skills should be developed not only to improve technological literacy *per se* but also to inform about the data that platforms retain about their users and how to access it. The objective of acquiring technological skills is to educate informed platform users who can demand transparency, information, and fairness in data management;
- A better understanding of how platform algorithms work is necessary among users to balance platform power asymmetry;
- A better recognition and transparent transferability of knowledge are necessary to value professional experience (for example, navigating with maps and within city spaces, communication with clients/users, etc.), which, so far, is often contested by practices that replace individual experiences with big volumes of data (big data);
- An awareness of the collective dimension of platform users is important to improve cooperation with others, share experiences, and promote demands through legal actions, protests, strikes, and other forms of unionism. Platform workers need to be able to improve their capacity to engage in and exploit activism to support political demands for training and recognition of skills, whether at the individual level (for legal purposes and advice) or the collective level (coordinated actions, formulating demands, claiming rights, and creating a social network);
- The capacity to interact with platforms knowing their functioning. This can improve the understanding on, for example, how workers' allotments for different time slots work or how task assignments and the mechanisms of salary calculations are chosen, in order to allow workers to make effective and informed time planning;
- Developing further employable skills through platform infrastructures is key to facilitate the transition to sectors outside the platform economy. This includes the capacity to transfer skills acquired in the field.

Deeply affected by platform urbanization, citizens need to be aware of their rights and duties and find ways to participate in a social and political redefinition of their roles. This allows them to understand and critically deploy platform infrastructures and to gain political, economic, or social capital (Ignatow/Robinson 2017). To do so, citizens need to have the capacities to participate in and contribute to communities of shared interests while critically navigating through the discursive contexts of platform urbanization.

To improve and develop the above listed skills, it is also necessary to alleviate the condition of individuals as passive data subjects and act within

platform environments in order to recognize their political power within a ubiquitous techno-political environment.

Literature regarding the definition and analysis of the concept of skill (as well as of competence, knowledge, and attitude) is vast. However, discussions around this concept tend to focus on its technical and professional dimensions and the knowledge associated with the techniques of the working procedures, developed via training and/or experience and assessed and certified by formal or institutional actors. In the context of platform urbanization and the extended conception of (urban) citizenship, we consider skills as a co-constructed and cooperative approach. Evaluating, identifying, and developing skills should not solely be seen as objective top-down processes but as the result of an active social and political practice. Adopting this perspective on skills opens up a path on which citizens are not just data producers and consumers but active agents in the 'construction' of an extended condition of citizenship within the condition of platform urbanization. The trajectory of platform urbanization offers a powerful scenario to co-construct and politically deploy the concept of skills, addressing the fact that most of the skills exploited in this condition are neither defined nor formalized, recognized, trained, or certified.

Platforms are reshaping the urban and the modes of its production. To grasp this requires an extended understanding of (urban) citizenship. The aim is to clarify and improve awareness of such a changed nexus between individuals and collectivity, and correctly identify the connection between the technical and political characteristics of such a link. A pivotal role is played by the individual as the leading enabler of this nexus, which needs to be defined at an urban level to become concrete and widely understandable, since such a nexus needs to find a practical ground to come to fruition (Soares Carvalho/Bignami 2021). Citizenship grounded in the urban improves the uniformity of rights and responsibilities linked with political involvement and, therefore, might potentially mitigate the political impacts of social inequalities (Nyers/Rygiel 2012) that platforms are generating in the urban realm. As such, it seems essential to go for an extended notion of citizenship that is able to crisscross the uncharted trajectory of such a techno-political framework, which embraces online and offline lives in a flurry of unbalanced and unequal (but attractive to the users) scenarios. As a corollary, a new political participatory sphere (see example above) can emerge and allow citizens to participate in and understand new dimensions of citizenship by working, negotiating, and cooperating together. The sheer diversity of actors and positions within

this sphere offers opportunities to develop an extended understanding of citizenship that could allow people (of course, in given conditions) to see beyond their own immediate perceptions or individual techno-optimism. It supports a greater awareness of both individual and collective benefits. Interaction in this new political participatory sphere can help transform dispositions among citizens, instilling greater respect and enhancing their propensity to go beyond the surface of platforms and commitment to respond. Yet, part of that depends on the openness and capacity of the urban institutional actors. In other words, we are in a post-political scenario (as depicted above) where entrenched inequalities contribute to the muting of dissenting voices and where little willingness or capacity exists to redress these inequalities and address the specific concerns of the new framework. This is when other spaces outside the classical political and capitalist arena become critical. Actual political spaces, in the context of platform urbanization, are both material and immaterial 'sites' on which to gain confidence and consolidate positions, and from which to act on the urban environment through unedited forms of political (or, better, techno-political) co-constructed action.

The inquiries and projections of this contribution do not stand alone but form part of a growing field of critical inquiry regarding the techno-political framework in which our urban environments are evolving. They shall be understood as signposts of much-needed, proactive thinking in alternative scenarios that critically confront as well as leverage the capacities inherent in platform urbanization. We believe that we are only at the beginning of fully understanding what it might mean to speak of an augmented urban experience, digital citizenship, or platform urbanization, and what these terms might entail for an extended discussions of cities and citizenship alike – also beyond debates about the role of smart cities, around which much current literature on platformization and the urban still pivots.

References

Baker, Mona/Blaagaard, Boletta B. (2016): Reconceptualizing Citizen Media: A Preliminary Charting of a Complex Domain, in: Baker, Mona/Blaagaard, Boletta B. (eds.): *Citizen Media and Public Spaces: Diverse Expressions of Citizenship and Dissent*, London: Routledge: 22-26.

Barns, Sarah (2014): Platform Urbanism: The Emerging Politics of Open Data for Urban Management. American Association of Geographers Annual

Conference, 2014. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327621979_Platform_urbanism_the_emerging_politics_of_open_data_for_urban_management_American_Association_of_Geographers_Annual_Conference_2014 [27.05.2021].

Barns, Sarah (2018): Platform Urbanism Rejoinder: Why Now? What Now?, in: *Mediapolis. A journal of cities and culture* 3(4). https://www.mediapolisjournal.com/2018/11/platform-urbanism-why-now-what-now [02.01.2022].

Bauböck, Rainer/Orgad, Liav (eds.) (2020): *Cities vs States: Should Urban Citizenship be Emancipated from Nationality?*, San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute.

Beck, Ulrich (2006): *The cosmopolitan vision*, Cambridge: Polity press.

Bratton, Benjamin H. (2015): *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Calzada, Igor (2021): *Smart City Citizenship*, Cambridge, MA: Elsevier Science Publishing.

Cuppini, Niccolò/Frapporti, Mattia/Pirone, Maurilio (2015): Logistics Struggles in the Po Valley Region, in: *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114(1): 119-34.

Delanty, Gerard (2009): *Cosmopolitan imagination*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Foley, Rider/Miller, Thaddeus (2020): Urban Techno-Politics: An Introduction, in: *Science as Culture* 29(3): 309-18.

HafenCity Hamburg GmbH (2019): Grasbrook. Wettbewerblicher Dialog Stadtteil Grasbrook. https://www.grasbrook.de/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Upload__Grasbrook_Auslobungsbroschuere.pdf [14.04.2022].

Hanakata, Naomi C./Bignami, Filippo (2021): Platform Urbanization and the Impact on Urban Transformation and Citizenship, in: *South Atlantic Quarterly* 120(4): 763-76.

Hanakata, Naomi C./Bignami, Filippo (2022): Platform Urbanization, its Recent Acceleration, and Implications on Citizenship. The Case of Singapore, in: *Citizenship Studies*: 1-21. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2022.2077568.

Huws, Ursula (2020): The algorithm and the city: platform labour and the urban environment, in: *Work Organisation, Labour & Globalisation* 14(1): 7-14.

Ignatow, Gabe/Robinson, Laura (2017): Pierre Bourdieu: Theorizing the digital, in: *Information, Communication & Society* 20(7): 950-66.

Isin, Engin F. (2017): Performative Citizenship, in: Shachar, Ayelet/Bauböck, Rainer/Bloemraad, Irene/Vink, Maarten (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 500-23.

Isin, Engin F./Ruppert, Evelyn (2020): *Being Digital Citizens*, London/New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Leszczynski, Agnieszka (2020): Glitchy Vignettes of Platform Urbanism, in: *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 38(2): 189-208.

Mathiason, John (2008): *Internet Governance. The New Frontier of Global Institutions*, London: Routledge.

Mezzadra, Sandro/Neilson, Brett (2012): Between Inclusion and Exclusion: On the Topology of Global Space and Borders, in: *Theory, Culture & Society* 29(4-5): 58-75.

Nyers, Peter/Rygiel, Kim (eds.) (2012): *Citizenship, Migrant Activism, and the Politics of Movement*, New York: Routledge.

Platform Labour in Urban Spaces (PLUS) (n.d.): https://project-plus.eu/ [08.04.2022].

Sassen, Saskia (2005): The Repositioning of Citizenship and Alienage: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics, in: *Globalizations* 2(1): 79-94.

Sassen, Saskia (2016): Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy, in: *Trajectories* 27(3): 62-84.

Schmitt, Carl (2003): *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum*, New York: Telos Press.

Soares Carvalho, Ana Paula/Bignami, Filippo (2021): Social development through (global) citizenship education: the Brazilian case, in: *Intercultural Education* 32(4): 464-75.

Srnicek, Nick (2017): *Platform capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Swyngedouw, Erik (2019): The Perverse Lure of Autocratic Postdemocracy, in: *South Atlantic Quarterly* 118(2): 267-86.

Tomasello, Federico (forthcoming): From industrial to digital citizenship: rethinking social rights in cyberspace, in: *Theory and society* (submitted).

Žižek, Slavoj (2010): *Living in the End Times*, London/New York: Verso.

Zuboff, Shoshana (2019): Surveillance Capitalism and the Challenge of Collective Action, in: *New Labor Forum* 28(1): 10-29.