1. View the disruption created by deindustrialisation, austerity and the coronavirus pandemic as an opportunity to challenge both the public and private paradigms as they currently exist.

2. Focus on rethinking cities and their infrastructure beyond the public and private conceptually, but also practically and concretely.

3. Reformat cities by offering a diverse range of more horizontal, collaborative and commons-oriented alternatives to those galleries, libraries, archives and museums (GLAM) that are provided by the state and corporate realms.

4. Create and maintain these bespoke cultural institutions by selecting from the hardware, software, tools, resources and collections made available by proponents of open access, open GLAM, free and open-source software, p2p filesharing, copyleft, 'piracy' and the anti-privatized knowledge commons.

5. Remember there is no need to mimic those cultural institutions that have traditionally gone to make up a city - municipal libraries, museums, galleries and the like. New and very different kinds of institutions that function online or off (as well as hybrid combinations thereof) can also be designed.

6. Recall, too, that not every detail of a city needs to be planned and designed. Some things can be left to chance.

7. Keep in mind that the cities we are working to create do not exist: there is no blueprint for them. Yet neither are they a conspiracy theory or illusion. They are missing cities; cities that need to be called forth in different ways, times and places. Artistically, practically, theoretically. They thus require a certain aporetic openness, both to that which can be named and identified in advance and that which cannot.

8. Also bear in mind that we are not trying to produce an equivalent to the Smart City. Without the ‘stupid’ - including the marginalized, the disadvantaged, the disempowered and the disaffected - cities are boring and antiseptic. It is therefore important cities remain hospitable to the useless and unproductive, as well as to the strange, the surprising, the weird and the monstrous. This includes the notion that nonhuman species – animals, insects, plants – and other actors and elements may actively participate in the creation of culture and of cities.

9. Strive to make it possible for multiplicities of actors, beyond the usual suspects of professional politicians, political parties, leaders, councilors, think-tanks and retired middle class professionals, to be able to participate in the (re)making of cities according to the specific needs and requirements of the situation.

10. Recognise such multiplicities do not already exist: say, as civic populations or publics. Rather a context needs to be invented in which they too can be called forth. These missing communities can then participate in the re-commoning of cities by copying the above-mentioned tools and resources as they are, or by developing, modifying and repurposing some elements and discarding the rest.

11. Appreciate cities are messy. It is therefore to be expected that the appropriate combination and mixture of principles and protocols, tools and infrastructure, tactics and strategies, priorities and resources will differ from location to location, and will be highly situated and site specific: temporally, materially, ecologically, politically.

12. Recognise that each city contains a pluriverse of cities. Within any ‘one’ city there will be a plurality of resources, priorities, communities, groups, movements and organisations.

13. Ensure that the building of bespoke cultural institutions is carried out in a non-rivalrous, non-competitive - although not necessarily non-antagonistic - fashion, in order to collaboratively proliferate experiments with reimagining the city.

14. Be aware that the practice of re-commoning cities is not concerned with growth or expansion. Nor are the results to be organised hierarchically in terms of an inside/outside, centre/periphery model, be the latter the countryside or the suburbs. Instead, it proceeds through the establishment of relations of co-creation and custodianship with a variety of widely distributed initiatives. It can thus add to the repertoire of alternatives that are already being explored in places such as Preston, Birmingham and North Ayrshire in the UK, New York and San Francisco in the US, Barcelona and Madrid in Spain and Amsterdam in the Netherlands: platform cooperativism, mutual care networks, community land trusts, the solidarity economy, the maker movement and so on.

15. Make sure to feed the results back into either an informal, flexible, latent commons or a more formal distributed union or federation of open city infrastructure. In this way they can be made available to be critically and creatively reused, misused and abused by others in turn.