Google Maps as Cartographic Infrastructure:
From Participatory Mapmaking to Database Maintenance

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE PLANTIN[1]
London School of Economics and Political Science, UK

Google Maps has popularized a model of cartography as platform in which digital traces are collected through participation, crowdsourcing, and user-data harvesting, and used to constantly improve the mapping service. Based on this capacity, Google Maps has now attained a scale, reach, and social role similar to the existing infrastructures that typically organize cartographic knowledge in society. After describing Google Maps as a configuration relying on characteristics from both platforms and infrastructures, this article investigates what this hybrid configuration means for public participation in spatial knowledge in society. First, this turn to infrastructure for Google has consequences for the status of public participation in mapmaking, which switches from creating content to providing database maintenance activities. Second, if Google Maps opens up cartography to participation, it simultaneously recentralizes this participatory knowledge to serve its corporate interests. In this hybrid configuration, cartographic knowledge is therefore simultaneously more participatory and more enclosed.

Keywords: algorithms, API, crowdsourcing, digital cartography, Google Maps, knowledge infrastructure, maintenance, participation, platform, Web mapping

　　　　Cartographic information is traditionally organized by an ecosystem of actors who provide the technologies and expertise to create, maintain, and disseminate spatial knowledge in society. It comprises national geographic institutes (e.g., the UK Ordnance Survey and the French IGN), responsible for the authoritative representation of a national territory; geospatial imagery companies, which possess satellites to acquire images and software to analyze geographic data; technologies, such as geographic information systems (GIS), which act as standards for communicating and working on geographic information; and universities and education programs, responsible for teaching and disseminating cartographic knowledge,

Jean-Christophe Plantin: j.plantin1@lse.ac.uk

whether through the manipulation of specific software or more generally through spatial and cartographic literacy. Together these actors constitute for cartography what has been called a *knowledge infrastructure,* defined as "robust internetworks of people, artifacts, and institutions which generate, share, and maintain specific knowledge about the human and natural worlds" (Edwards et al., 2013, p. 23). Seen through this lens, cartography constitutes an essential service in society, aiming to provide exhaustive coverage of a specific territory[2] and wide accessibility of cartographic information to the public.[3] Reliability is another key property of knowledge infrastructure (Edwards, Jackson, Bowker, & Knobel, 2007), achieved through constant updating of maps and related to long-term sustainability of mapping by ensuring that maps are properly archived and available for future generations.

This infrastructure remains a structuring force for geographic knowledge in society. However, the rise of the Web has promoted an alternative configuration for mapping: cartography as platform, as illustrated by Google Maps and the project OpenStreetMap, both started in the mid-2000s. In these, cartography adopts properties from Web-based platforms, such as programmability and modularity (Helmond, 2015; Montfort & Bogost, 2009; van Dijck & Poell, 2013) and, most importantly, openness to multiple forms of participation from noncartographers and nongeographers (Goodchild, 2007; Haklay, Singleton, & Parker, 2008; Plantin, 2015; Sui, 2008). In this configuration, maps can be much more easily modified, reused, and remixed by users. It also means that the plurality of digital traces that users of mapping platforms leave—either as active contributions to a base map (e.g., by editing a street name or a road) or as indirect productions of data (e.g., by generating data on traffic by using a mapping service or GPS)—are used to create, update, and refine a geographic database.

By analyzing the genealogy and the current architecture of Google Maps, this article argues that this quintessential mapping platform has now attained a scale, reach, and social role similar to existing knowledge infrastructures. It does not mean that Google is replacing the existing infrastructure for cartography—in fact, it strongly relies on several of its components, such as standards and base maps— but that it constitutes a mapping platform that has reached a scale and social status that was previously attained only by knowledge infrastructures. What is specific to Google is that it reaches such status by leveraging properties of the two configurations (Plantin, Lagoze, Edwards, & Sandvig, 2016), thereby constituting a hybrid entity. On the one hand, Google Maps is a platform, inasmuch as it relies on the programmability of its content and on multiple forms of participation from users; on the other hand, by being the most widely used mapping service and by powering numerous everyday third-party applications, Google Maps provides a service without which contemporary societies could hardly function anymore, similar to infrastructures (Edwards, 2003).

Such hybrid configuration interrogates how infrastructures and platforms shape how knowledge is produced, disseminated, and accessed in a digital age. By combining the strengths of both private platforms and authoritative knowledge infrastructures, Google is in a de facto position of power to

---

[2] State security interests are a traditional limitation of this goal, as critical facilities and administration buildings are regularly removed from maps.

[3] This does not mean that accessing base maps from mapping institutions is free (in fact, it rarely is), but that access does not depend on the "users' identity or intended use" (Frischmann, 2012, p. 7).

"produc[e] and certif[y] knowledge" (Gillespie, 2014): It can decide what needs to be included or excluded from the cartographic representation, who determines society's spatial representation, and what form and shape public participation will take. This article investigates the consequences of public participation in cartographic knowledge when Google Maps has such power. First, the status for the public participation to mapmaking changes in this hybrid configuration, from activities of content creation to those of maintenance. If the main outcome of the platformization of cartography in the mid-2000s has been to open up the map to multiple forms of participation, Google Maps combines this openness with needs that are specific to infrastructures. As Google Maps grows to the level of infrastructure, it is confronted with infrastructural problems, that is, guaranteeing the constant updating and accuracy of its map: It addresses these problems by channeling public participation to accomplish such tasks of maintenance. Participating in Google Maps no longer consists of simply adding content but also includes maintaining its geographic database. Second, the corporate nature of Google Maps results in an enclosure of the inputs coming from this participation. Google Maps combines a process of decentralization (by opening its base map to public participation) with a process of recentralization (around its market interests) typical of platforms (Helmond, 2015). The model of cartography promoted by Google Maps is therefore further expanding the role of public participation in mapmaking while concentrating the results of this participation to gain a leading position in the highly competitive sector of the geospatial Web. With projects such as Google Maps, cartographic knowledge is therefore more participatory, but simultaneously more enclosed.

To reach these two results, this article relies on a framework that grasps the complex nature of such hybrid configuration. It combines *infrastructure studies* with *platform studies* (Plantin et al., 2016), two fields of investigation traditionally separated (the first originating from science, technology, and society and information sciences, the second living mostly in media and communications and management studies). The first perspective reveals cartography as essential knowledge in society (Edwards, 2010) and highlights its relational nature (Star & Ruhleder, 1996), that is, the labor and maintenance (Bowker & Star, 1999; Downey, 2014) necessary to create and update Google Maps. The second perspective emphasizes the role Google Maps increasingly plays as a platform that shapes public discourse (Gillespie, 2010), engages in the datafication of social life (van Dijck, 2014), and shapes communication following an economic logic (Langlois & Elmer, 2013). Combined, these two frameworks highlight what is at stake for spatial knowledge in society when mapping platforms compete with existing knowledge infrastructures.

Google Maps: Between Platform and Infrastructure

In this first part, I describe Google Maps as more than just a mapping platform, as it is now actively producing geographic data and maps and not only connecting producers and users of geographic data. It is also almost a knowledge infrastructure, as it adopts such a scale, but does not take on such responsibilities in terms of accountability or accessibility.

Let us start by considering the evolution of cartographic data sources used by Google Maps since its release.

In 2005, Google launches its Google Maps website, which aggregates base maps from a multiplicity of public and private sources (e.g., TIGER data from the U.S. Census Bureau and mapping companies such as Teleatlas and Navteq).

In 2007, Google launches Google Street View and starts collecting panoramic views of streets mostly by using cars, first in the United States and then in multiple locations around the world;

In 2008, the Google project Ground Truth is launched at the mapping division of Google to aggregate maps from authoritative sources, social media reports, and most originally, image-processing algorithms that extract street names or traffic signs from Google Street View images to update the Google Maps database;

The same year, Google releases the project MapMaker, allowing users to suggest modification of roads, street names, points of interest, and so on using an edit mode popularized by the participatory mapping project OpenStreetMap;

In 2009, Google launches the project reCAPTCHA[4] to crowdsource the transcription of images from its various scanning projects, among them Google Street View;

In 2013, Google acquires Waze, a participatory GPS service accessing and displaying real-time information from users about traffic;

In 2014, Google acquires Skybox Imaging and now operates Earth observation satellite imagery.

This account of the ways Google creates its map is by no means exhaustive, and each of these complex processes would require more elaboration; additionally, the way Google envisions and builds its map is very much an evolving process. However, it is possible to extract two key elements from this chronology that characterize the current strategic role digital traces play in the Google Maps project. First, mapmaking, according to Google, results from the combination of human and computational processes, both at the level of data collection and of data processing: Google relies on map users' participation through their reporting of problems and mistakes or their transcription of relevant information into natural language (e.g., a house number from a Google Street View image); these data inputs are then processed by algorithms that compute large quantities of data. Second, Google is increasingly putting effort into building its own mapping capacities. Google creates and updates its mapping service by aggregating several existing public or private sources, but it now also combines several internal services owned by Google (e.g., images from Google Street View provide data to update Google Maps) and has been building its sovereign mapping capacities (technologies for spatial data processing and satellites for mapmaking).

---

[4] Originally developed at Carnegie Mellon University and later acquired by Google in 2009 (and renamed reCAPTCHA), the CAPTCHA technology is an automated Turing test that asks website visitors to show they are human by transcribing texts in natural language.

The combination of, on the one hand, this reliance on human and computational means with, on the other hand, an increasing move toward independence of its geographic data provision results in a hybrid mapping project: Google Maps relies on participatory processes that are typical of Web 2.0 and Web-based platforms, but it has also reached the technical capacities and the level of use typical of cartographic knowledge infrastructure. In this first part, I describe how Google leverages the properties of these two configurations, and later how this hybrid nature of maps has consequences for public participation and knowledge in society.

Making Cartography "Platform-Ready"

In June 2005, a few months after Google's February 2005 release of its Google Maps service, it released its Google Maps API (application programming interface), which offered a technical and legal framework allowing third parties to access, display, and customize a base map. This combination of bottom-up and top-down innovations introduced digital cartography into the world of Web-based platforms and triggered a trend of mash-ups (Sonvilla-Weiss, 2010) using a cartographic layer. Through Google Maps, mapping practices meet participatory culture (Jenkins, 2006). Various terms similarly emerged in the mid-2000s in geography to account for this new role of users, no longer constrained to reception and taking a more active role in creating maps: "Neogeography" (M. Graham, 2010; Turner, 2006), "volunteered geographic information" (Goodchild, 2007), "Web mapping 2.0" (Haklay et al., 2008), and the "wikification of the map" (Sui, 2008) are examples of such terms. Across media studies and geography, the emphasis on participation shows the deeper role users play in creating and using maps and the extension of mapmaking to nongeographers and nonexperts in cartography (Plantin, 2015). Creating and manipulating an online mapping application after Google has therefore less to do with traditional GIS properties (Turner, 2006) than with other digital media practices (Farman, 2010).

In addition to participation, programmability and modularity are the other two defining properties of platforms applied here to Web-based maps. Programmability means that content is made accessible in a structured format that allows users to develop applications from third parties (Helmond, 2015; Montfort & Bogost, 2009; van Dijck & Poell, 2013). Modularity characterizes the architecture that allows such programmability. It defines the articulation between the three components that constitute a platform: a core component with low variability, complementary components with high variability, and interfaces for modularity between core and complementary components (Baldwin & Woodward, 2008). In the case of maps, it means that Google Maps makes cartographic information programmable by organizing the modularity between a core component (a base map) and complementary components (e.g., online mash-ups or mobile applications created by third parties) through an API.

By adopting the participation, programmability, and modularity of digital platforms and applying them to digital cartography, Google Maps has made maps "platform-ready" (Helmond, 2015): The strategic use of APIs reconfigured map manipulation and spatial data input to fit with existing Web-based practices. However, I show below how this configuration is increasingly combined with properties traditionally associated with infrastructures.

Web Maps as Knowledge Infrastructure

Google certainly relies massively on the existing cartographic knowledge infrastructure to create its own mapping service. For example, Google uses existing base maps from public institutions to feed its maps; it relies on technologies and standards (from satellites to GPS) to collect geographic data; it hires engineers who acquired their expertise in universities. In that sense, Google Maps would clearly not have been possible without the existing knowledge infrastructure that provides the basis to start its mapping project.

However, the Google Maps project taken as a whole (i.e., encompassing all data sources Google mobilized to create and update its maps, mentioned earlier) has recently been adopting properties that have long been associated with infrastructures. This configuration meets an increasing interest in describing digital media through the lens of their infrastructural properties (Parks & Starosielski, 2015), either to emphasize the materiality of communication over content—for example, by showing how Internet cable networks (Starosielski, 2015) or data centers (Hu, 2015) organize computer-mediated communication—or to highlight the values embedded in infrastructure when they organize the circulation of information and knowledge in society (Peters, 2016). This perspective is useful to investigate the increasingly infrastructural nature of Google Maps and how it relates to and differs from existing institutions dedicated to cartography.

What makes Google Maps closer to a knowledge infrastructure? Google Maps is free to use and accessible to anyone with a mobile phone or a Web browser. Its use is part of a learned membership. It has reached a global scale, as it goes beyond the traditional national mandates of mapping institutions, with 1 billion active users of the Google Maps website worldwide (Harding, 2016). The Google Maps API is used to power so many applications that it constitutes a de facto standard for online maps. It is reliable and mostly invisible, yet a breakdown of Google Maps would disrupt all the services that depend on it—including business, government, work, and everyday commuting.

Google is therefore a specific actor in the existing spatial knowledge infrastructure, as it posits maps as a combined process of platforms and infrastructures (Plantin et al., 2016): On the one hand, the Google Maps project transformed the map into a Web-based platform by relying on crowdsourcing to keep the maps updated and on APIs to guarantee massive reuse of those maps in browsers or mobile applications, but on the other hand, Google Maps is also increasingly infrastructuralized, as it is now reaching the scale and social utility that is typical of knowledge infrastructures. However, it still differs from what is traditionally defined as infrastructure, as it remains profit driven and is not subject oversight to maintain public interest; its standardization is also unilaterally imposed and does not result from regulation.

Digital Platforms and Splintering Infrastructures

The rise of such a mapping project results not only from the computing power of Google. More specifically, it emerges from two changes in the landscape of geospatial information: first, the rise of digital cartography, started already with GIS technologies, which shed light on traditionally opaque cartographic processes; and second, the splintering of dedicated cartographic institutions, leaving room

for other actors to rise and take up a stronger role in mapmaking.

Critical literature in cartography has highlighted how cartography is intrinsically embedded within power relations: Power "traverses" the way maps are made and used (Harley, 1989). They are intrinsically related to the rise of nation states (Wood, 2010); in their digital form, they derive their power from the assumptions of objectivity they create (Pickles, 1995). For all these reasons, the creation and the circulation of cartographic knowledge are matters of control over who is mapping, who is mapped, and who can access the map. Affirming that the rise of computer-based cartography, appearing as early as the late 1960s (Coppock & Rhind, 1991), or of Web-based mapping, as early as 1993 (Haklay et al., 2008), automatically renegotiates this plurality of forms of power would be far too easy. However, what is different with digital cartography is that the steps of production for a map are less easy to conceal or to forget: Users are constantly reminded of the materiality of all the elements and processes that are aggregated to create the final product of the map:

> If you could easily forget the masses of institutions, skills, conventions and instruments that went into the making of a beautifully printed atlas, it is much more difficult to do so now that we are constantly reminded of the number of satellites presiding over our GPS, of the sudden disappearance of network coverage, of the variations in data quality, of the irruption of censorship, of the inputs of final users in sending data back, etc. (November, Camacho-Hübner, & Latour, 2010, p. 5)

If it has always been possible to see surveyors in the field, OpenStreetMap has pushed this visibility over the cartographic process the furthest: It made salient the steps of mapmaking from data collection to editing to online publication. It does not mean that everyone can become a cartographer without the necessary skills, but rather that cartography appears less like an opaque process only known by credentialed cartographers. What digital maps and Web-based participatory modes of cartography have therefore brought on is a depunctualization (Callon, 1984; Gehl, 2016) of mapmaking: All the actors, technologies, and processes that are necessary to create a map are made visible (or at least, are less concealed) and revealed through larger participation in mapmaking. This visibility gained over the multiple steps of mapmaking makes it easier for new actors who are not typically related to cartography (but who possess the necessary expertise and technical resources) to produce maps.

The depunctualization of maps that comes with digitization needs to be considered in coordination with a second factor: Multiple mapping platforms can more easily emerge at a time of the "splintering" of existing infrastructures. S. Graham and S. Marvin (2001) use that term to describe the state of urban infrastructures as increasingly retrofitted and replaced by "networked premium spaces" that guarantee benefit of access to selected users, as opposed to the "modern infrastructure ideal" that bears the promise (albeit always unequally realized) of general service and accessibility for all. Applied to cartographic institutions, the rise of the geoweb, with Web-mapping platforms at the forefront, takes place in this context of splintered cartographic institutions. The geoweb increases a "roll back" of the state from its traditional role as authoritative source, which is followed by a "roll out" (Leszczynski, 2012) of various mapping actors, not for profit and for profit, that all have more freedom to develop their own mapping capacities.

This movement between roll back and roll out does not mean that private mapping platforms such as Google Maps are simply replacing dedicated cartographic institutions. Rather, online platforms appearing alongside national mapping institutes is one possible configuration of multiple sources of cartographic data. As Leszczynski (2012) puts it:

> In the West (the USA and UK in particular), rather, the state's role is changing from that of sole purveyor of geographic information and arbiter of cartographic truth to that of one of many producers and facilitator or institutional body of oversight. (p. 78)

Cartographic knowledge infrastructures are therefore not disappearing; they simply are not the only points for creating, validating, and disseminating maps. The rise of new material forms for creating and publishing mapping data, based on participation and openness, accompany the end of the "modernist era of mapping" (Goodchild, 2009) characterized by the state as the central authority for creating and disseminating maps as official knowledge. What results is a map that has lost its "ontological security" (Kitchin & Dodge, 2007), as there is more than one legitimate way of mapmaking that is backed by technical expertise and political power.

I have so far characterized Google Maps as a twofold entity: As a platform, this service opens up cartography by expanding the categories of actors that can create and use maps while wresting control over maps from the monopoly of traditional cartographic institutes, but it has now reached a scale that makes it compete with the knowledge infrastructures that traditionally organize cartographic knowledge in society. Combining the participation, programmability, and modularity of platforms with the scale, reliability, and essential nature of infrastructures, Google therefore plays an important part in "producing and certifying knowledge" (Gillespie, 2014) by deciding what and who is included or excluded from cartographic representation. This move from authoritative knowledge infrastructures to privatized platforms is reshaping the politics of knowledge itself, and it asks the fundamental questions of who participates in a society's spatial representation and how.

At this point, I move from using infrastructures and platforms as objects to using them as concepts. Each of these objects has been at the center of dedicated fields of inquiry—respectively and chronologically, infrastructure studies and platform studies—that I describe below. More precisely, I select from these two large bodies of scholarship authors that have specifically operated critical investigations of how infrastructures or platforms shape knowledge in society. These two perspectives, typically separated, are put here into a dialogue that allows us to interrogate the role Google Maps takes in the creation and dissemination of an essential knowledge in society.

Participating in Google Maps: From Content Creation to Maintenance

One of the defining traits of cartography (in digital or nondigital form) is that the effort needed to update the base map never ends, as the territory that the map represents is constantly changing, for example, in borders, toponyms, or occupations of space (buildings, roads, etc.). As Google Maps entered the geospatial sector by following the logic of platforms, it relied almost exclusively on other mapping services to display cartographic content, and it could therefore rely on them to make sure the accuracy

and updating of maps was guaranteed. However, now that it is moving toward creating its own mapping capacities, it needs to find for itself the means to tackle this problem of accuracy and updating. As it is a hybrid of properties from two configurations, it does not have to rely on ways of maintaining maps that are typical of mapping infrastructures (e.g., surveyors in the field): Instead, Google Maps applies the characteristics of digital platforms to perform this task, particularly by channeling users' participation.

Aggregating Multiple Data Sources to Update Maps

What are the forms that participation takes in Google Maps? First, it allows users to suggest modifications to the map through the edit mode of the Google Maps website or mobile application. These edits are then moderated by hired Google operators and included if relevant (Kelion, 2012). It is the form of participation that is closest to the "Web mapping 2.0" (Haklay et al., 2008) ethos in which users can contribute directly to the map.

Second, this type of participation is complemented by an automatic collection of digital traces generated by users of the Google Maps mobile application. Such reliance on users equates transforming every user's mobile into a sensor that provides real-time information on the state of traffic but also usable data to update its map (Stenovec, 2015). For example, simply by driving, Google Maps users provide navigational data that confirm to Google that this road actually exists or that the map displays the accurate directions for driving.

Third, the Google mapping division relies on crowdsourcing to organize the modularity of spatial data between Google Street View and Google Maps. In addition to providing many images, Google Street View also provides a great quantity of data relevant to updating its maps: traffic signs, intersections, names of shops and streets, a sense of direction for driving, the presence of a new building. Once collected by the Google cars and other devices, such real world information is extracted from Google Street View images and then compared with Google Maps to verify that the same information is accurate and updated on Google Maps. Through the constant provision of real-world data, the imagery service therefore provides Google Maps with a ground truth to verify the accuracy of its map. This work is achieved through what the Google engineers call "algorithms and elbow grease." The algorithmic part consists of a process similar to optical character recognition to delineate and extract information on the images collected (e.g., street names) that are of interests to update the map (Madrigal, 2012).

However, and this is crucial to understanding the role of users' participation in Google Maps, the passage of data between Google Street View and Google Maps is not automatic, and it does not occur without glitches. The large-scale digitization and processing of real-world images relies on dedicated work that aims to adjust and compensate for the limitations of algorithms. This is where the elbow grease comes in: Dedicated people are tasked with deciphering images and transcribing them and therefore making them reusable in another context.

Necessary Protocol Work Between Data Sources

The presence of such activities to make infrastructures work touches a central theme of the sociological investigation of information systems. Combining work in the sociology of science on the largely essential yet unacknowledged role of technicians in scientific production (Shapin, 1989), the field of infrastructure studies has investigated information systems through the human activities on which they depend (Star & Ruhleder, 1996): It has led to the study of dedicated workers in charge of operations of maintenance, classification, and processing for objects as diverse as urban transportation networks (Denis & Pontille, 2015) and ecological (Millerand, 2011) and biomedical (Dagiral & Peerbaye, 2012) databases. These various sites of investigation highlight the precarity, invisibility, and unrewarding nature of such positions (Bowker & Star, 1999; Ensmenger, 2014). To summarize, this field of study asks, what activity is needed to make infrastructures work, who provides it, and under which status?

Adopting such a perspective allows us to see the crucial role of human activity in updating the Google Maps database. It consists of "protocol labor" (Downey, 2014), comprising activities by dedicated workers such as coding, delivering, or processing, to allow information and data to "jump contexts" by being put into circulation. Considering failure and breakdown as intrinsically present in infrastructures (Jackson, 2014) and not just epiphenomena renders this human activity essential:

> No matter what automated protocols are in place at any given moment, they will be imperfect and incomplete; disparate information networks can only work together through the efforts of specific workers who maintain the links, transform the content, and police the boundaries between those networks. (Downey, 2001, p. 225)

What is the protocol labor present in Google Maps? The use of the term "elbow grease" by Google engineers is already an acknowledgment of the necessity of such adjustment through human labor, and it takes different forms depending on the type of digital traces to process. For participatory data such as suggestions of edits, a specific category of workers called "Ground Truth operators" is responsible for curating and verifying the accuracy of the edits suggested by users, by double-checking if the suggested edits correspond to real-world changes. Concerning the modularity of data between Google Street View and Google Maps, this task can come from dedicated operators hired by Google. In this case, dedicated staff has to review and curate images and detect relevant information following this simple question: "'Am I looking at an address or not?' Click. Yes. Click. Yes. Click. No" (McMillan, 2014, para. 1). But such a task can also be completed by relying on crowdsourcing, through the reCAPTCHA application. Since Google acquired this technology in 2009, it has been using it to crowdsource the transcription of images from its various scanning projects, such as Google Books and Google Street View. A user will, for example, transcribe a house number through a reCAPTCHA—that is, manually process data from Street View, which can eventually be used to update Google Maps. A third way is the reliance on algorithms: "For other maintenance projects—say, updating speed limits throughout a state or town—we can use information that is going to be automatically detected through Street View technology and algorithms" (Bosker, 2013, para. 9).

Maps are thus updated through a configuration that relies on a combination of hired operators, crowdsourcing, and algorithms.

What we saw in this section is that as platforms grow to the level of infrastructures, the status of participation changes: Google Maps engineers have less and less need for participation as content creation, but more and more for participation as correction and verification of existing data, that is, the maintenance and correction of an existing database. This evolution has consequences for the nature and the status of participation: First, participation goes beyond the simple inputting of data to also provide protocol work to organize the modularity between data sources, here from Google Street View to Google Maps. Second, participation is increasingly mediated by algorithms, as it is channeled to make sure that algorithms work properly. Finally, participation is used only as long as it is the most efficient way of accomplishing a task, and it is but one way (along with hired operators or algorithms) to conduct it.

The Recentralization of Knowledge by Mapping Platforms

We saw that the field of infrastructure studies provides a detailed account of the labor Google Maps relies on to update its geographic database. Specifically, it highlights the diversification of tasks assigned to public participation, thus not only providing content but also performing maintenance tasks. What are the larger consequences of this transformation of public participation in creating, using, and maintaining spatial knowledge? Critical perspectives on digital platforms ask such questions through the prism of the dynamics between openness and enclosure of knowledge in society. Relying on this perspective shows how Google Maps benefits from the decentralization of cartographic knowledge production, through multiple forms of participation to feed its maps; however, it also shows that this openness simultaneously comes with new forms of recentralization. Google Maps operates in the very competitive environment of mapping platforms, and the goal is to provide the best map possible—the one that others will use for their mapping needs, similar to what an infrastructure would do. Participation is therefore channeled toward the goal of possessing the most accurate and updated maps to gain a comparative advantage among mapping services.

Decentralization with Recentralization

Langlois and Elmer (2013) highlight how economic logic shapes affordances of platforms and therefore participation. What they call "double articulation" highlights how the communicative mediation of social media platforms is "folded" within an economic logic. Similarly, van Dijck and Poell (2013) analyze how platforms create and extract values from participation through processes of datafication (in which every interaction on a platform can be transformed into data) and commodification (in which these data can be monetized). This body of critical research therefore goes beyond a vision of platforms as simply connecting people to analyze instead the circulation of data, value, and labor. It complements the focus from infrastructure studies scholars on human activity and its status by highlighting the dynamics combining decentralization of participation and recentralization of data and information (Helmond, 2015): How is the decentralization and recentralization of knowledge operated through platforms, and who benefits from it?

As we saw in the previous section, Google Maps clearly operates by decentralization of its data collection. Adopting the properties of platforms, it has a great interest in having its mapping product freely accessible (i.e., free to use) and having its base map customizable for third-party applications: Both are

ways of occupying the sector of geospatial data provision and of collecting the widest data from direct participation and usage traces.

This decentralization simultaneously comes with the recentralization of data flows to feed the interests of Google Maps. After entering the geospatial sector in 2005, Google needed complete control over the provision of cartographic data used for its geographic database. This was the main rationale behind creating the project Ground Truth in 2008: It aimed, according to Brian McClendon, then vice president of engineering for Google Maps, "to build [Google's] own maps from scratch" (cited by Kelion, 2012, para. 12). As he further describes: "We would start with licensed data and we would find whatever we could where we could get full rights to the data and improve it from there" (cited by Kelion, 2012, para. 12). The Google Truth engineers similarly presented the goal of this project as changing Google Maps from a "video rental" model—that is, renting base maps from other data providers and simply displaying them—to a "movie production studio" model—producing its own mapping data (Weiss-Malik & Lookingbill, 2013). This strategy aims to lower the dependency of Google on other sources of data (e.g., geospatial images from private companies, as mentioned) by developing its own data provision strategy. The diversification of roles for participatory data fits exactly within this goal.

In this context, participation in mapmaking is channeled and used in conjunction with other inputs to provide a map whose quality is recognized as the best and that is available for others to develop third-party applications—a service that an infrastructure would provide. However, such programmability ultimately serves the goal of Google: More users means more data, which eventually reinforces the position of Google Maps as the obligatory passage point for mapping provision.

More Participation, More Enclosure

This dual logic of decentralization of public participation and recentralization around a single entity has consequences for cartographic knowledge production in society. As we saw earlier, the platformization of cartography that occurred in the mid-2000s resulted in an opening of the map, in which several actors contested the traditional monopolies of agencies and satellite companies through multiple mapping initiatives (Plantin, 2014). In this context, participation was both a factor for and a result of this opening of mapmaking: Multiple forms of participation in maps were designed that in turn triggered new innovative communication practices based on maps. Cartographic information was decentralized, and participation was key in this process.

More than 10 years later, what we are seeing is that some of these projects, such as Google Maps, have evolved to adopt infrastructural properties. However, this has not resulted in the public provision originally associated with infrastructure. Instead, mapping capacities are channeled toward a corporate agenda: being recognized as the best map so others will use it. Google is leveraging the openness of the map while channeling the multiple forms of participation it allows to reach a competitive advantage over rivals and eventually recentralizing the map around its own private interests. Whereas traditional mapping institutes were meant to serve cartographic public needs, Google Maps provides the same service, but ultimately to serve Google's needs.

We therefore arrive at the paradox that defines current digital cartography. On one side, maps have never been so accurate and accessible: They cover a wide territory and are updated in almost real time; they are interactive and customizable, adapting to users' needs; people can contribute to them, and they are free to use. On the other side, maps increasingly serve private rather than public interests, similar to the monopoly of political elites and private patrons that characterized mapmaking for centuries before public institutes stepped in and administered mapping efforts with society in mind. The more participatory maps have become, the more enclosed they have become.

Conclusion

This article advances two main arguments. It first shows the evolving status of participation in Google Maps, changing from content creation to activities of maintenance as the project moves from platform to infrastructure. As maps behave like knowledge infrastructures, the maintenance of existing databases, beyond content input, is what is needed. The evolution of the roles assigned to participation in Google Maps illustrates this change. Second, this article shows the fragmentation of cartographic knowledge that results from the rise of Google Maps as an infrastructure. In this configuration, Google Maps aggregates digital traces to obtain a constantly updated map, but does not abide by mandates of accessibility and dissemination of knowledge that traditionally correspond to the social role of knowledge infrastructure. Whereas the platformization of the map in the mid-2000s consisted of a decentralization of mapping capacities through both the contestation of existing actors (mapping institutes) and the rise of new actors (OpenStreetMap, Google Maps), the infrastructuralization of maps through Google Maps operates a recentralization around private interests. The goal for Google is to reach a virtuous circle, where being recognized as the most accurate map increases the number of users, who then generate more digital traces, which are aggregated to constantly update geographic databases, therefore making Google Maps effectively the most accurate map.

I arrived at these results by operationalizing a selection of authors from fields of infrastructure studies and of platform studies who have developed critical accounts of how each configuration organizes access to and participation in knowledge in society. Critical infrastructure studies scholars call for the investigation of the labor and maintenance needed to make each configuration work, and platform studies scholars investigate how the circulation of knowledge can be reorganized to serve specific corporate actors. The rationale behind mixing infrastructure studies and platform studies, traditionally separated by disciplinary lines, is to reflect the hybrid entities that populate the Web, such as Facebook and Google, that use networked and data-driven communication capacities and that mix properties of platforms with those of infrastructures (Plantin et al., 2016).

Based on the case study of this article, what inferences can we make concerning the evolution of the role of participation in mapmaking? We saw that the form it takes is highly dependent on contingent needs of a specific mapping project. We also saw that participation is competing with other forms to complete the same tasks (hired operators and algorithms). The status of participation therefore seems precarious at best, and it may disappear altogether if another way of updating maps is found to be more efficient.

Looking at the current evolution of the geospatial Web, there are also reasons to think that cartographic knowledge will be more and more fragmented through the multiplication of private platforms adopting an infrastructural scale. Motivated by the business opportunities of mobile applications and autonomous cars, multiple companies would like to lower their dependency on Google Maps and are currently investing heavily on developing their own mapping capacities. Following the model of Google Maps, this independence of mapping capacities is achieved either through using drivers as sensors to obtain geographic data (Perkins, 2015), creating a personal fleet of cars to take pictures and other measurements (McClendon, 2016), or even acquiring existing geographic databases (Associated Press, 2015). Such large investments in mapping capacities could result in the multiplication of mapping projects that, like Google Maps, reach spectacular exhaustivity and quality, but that use this data to serve their own purposes exclusively.

References

Associated Press. (2015, August 3). Audi, BMW and Daimler to buy Nokia's Here map business. *Mashable.* Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2015/08/03/audi-bmw-and-daimler-buy-nokia-here/

Baldwin, C. Y., & Woodard, C. J. (2008). *The architecture of platforms: A unified view*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School. Retrieved from http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/6025.html

Bosker, B. (2013, January 21). Life as a Google Maps editor: Screening thousands of corrections and making maps by hand. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/21/google-maps-editor-ground-truth-team_n_2516924.html

Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Callon, M. (1984). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay. *Sociological Review, 32*, 196–233.

Coppock, J. T., & Rhind, D. W. (1991). The history of GIS. In D. J. Maguire, M. F. Goodchild, & D. W. Rhind (Eds.), *Geographical information systems: Principles and applications* (Vol. 1, pp. 21–43). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Dagiral, E., & Peerbaye, A. (2012). Les mains dans les bases de données: Connaître et faire reconnaître le travail invisible [Hands-on with databases: Knowing and showing invisible work]. *Revue d'Anthropologie des Connaissances, 6*(1), 191–216.

Denis, J., & Pontille, D. (2015). Material ordering and the care of things. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 40*(3), 338–367.

Dijck, J. van. (2014). Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society, 12*(2), 197–208.

Dijck, J. van, & Poell, T. (2013). Understanding social media logic. *Media and Communication, 1*(1), 2–14.

Downey, G. (2001). Virtual webs, physical technologies, and hidden workers: The spaces of labor in information internetworks. *Technology and Culture, 42*(2), 209–235.

Downey, G. (2014). Making media work: Time, space, identity, and labor in the analysis of information and communication infrastructures. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 143–165). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, P. N. (2003). Infrastructure and modernity: Force, time and social organization in the history of sociotechnical systems. In T. J. Misa, P. Brey, & A. Feenberg (Eds.), *Modernity and technology* (pp. 185–226). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, P. N. (2010). *A vast machine: Computer models, climate data, and the politics of global warming*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, P. N., Jackson, S., Bowker, G. C., & Knobel, C. (2007, January). *Understanding infrastructure: Dynamics, tensions and design*. Report of the workshop History and Theory of Infrastructure: Lessons for New Scientific Cyberinfrastructures, University of Michigan School of Information, Ann Arbor, MI.

Edwards, P. N., Jackson, S., Chalmers, M., Bowker, G. C., Borgman, C. L., Ribes, D., & Calvert, S. (2013). *Knowledge infrastructures: Intellectual frameworks and research challenges*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan School of Information. Retrieved from http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/97552

Ensmenger, N. (2014, October 2–4). When good software goes bad: The surprising durability of an ephemeral technology. Paper presented at MICE (Mistakes, Ignorance, Contingency, and Error) Conference, Munich, Germany. Retrieved from http://homes.soic.indiana.edu/nensmeng/files/ensmenger-mice.pdf

Farman, J. (2010). Mapping the digital empire: Google Earth and the process of postmodern cartography. *New Media & Society*, *12*(6), 869–888.

Frischmann, B. M. (2012). *Infrastructure: The social value of shared resources*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gehl, R. W. (2016). The politics of punctualization and depunctualization in the digital advertising alliance. *Communication Review, 19*(1), 35–54.

Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of "platforms." *New Media & Society, 12*(3), 347–364.

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167–194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Goodchild, M. F. (2007). Citizens as sensors: The world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal*, *69*(4), 211–221.

Goodchild, M. F. (2009, March 22–27). Citizens as censors: The world of volunteered geography. Plenary lecture presented at the 2009 AAG Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, NV.

Graham, M. (2010). Neogeography and the palimpsests of place: Web 2.0 and the construction of a virtual earth. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 101*(4), 422–436.

Graham, S., & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering urbanism: Networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haklay, M., Singleton, A., & Parker, C. (2008). Web mapping 2.0: The neogeography of the geoweb. *Geography Compass, 2*(6), 2011–2039.

Harding, Z. (2016, February 1). Google has 7 products with 1 billion users. *Popular Science*. Retrieved from http://www.popsci.com/google-has-7-products-with-1-billion-users

Harley, J. B. (1989). Deconstructing the map. *Cartographica, 26*(2), 1–20.

Helmond, A. (2015). The platformization of the Web: Making Web data platform ready. *Social Media + Society, 1*(2). Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/doi/abs/10.1177/2056305115603080

Hu, T. H. (2015). *A prehistory of the cloud*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackson, S. (2014). Rethinking repair. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society*. (pp. 221–240). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture. Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Kelion, L. (2012, October 9). Google Maps uses Ground Truth project to battle Apple. *BBC Technology*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-19536269

Kitchin, R., & Dodge, M. (2007). Rethinking maps. *Progress in Human Geography, 31*(3), 331–344.

Langlois, G., & Elmer, G. (2013). The research politics of social media platforms. *Culture Machine, 14*.
        Retrieved from http://www.culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/505

Leszczynski, A. (2012). Situating the geoweb in political economy. *Progress in Human Geography, 36*(1),
        72–89.

Madrigal, A. C. (2012, September 6). How Google builds its maps—and what it means for the future of
        everything. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from
        https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/09/how-google-builds-its-maps-and-what-
        it-means-for-the-future-of-everything/261913/

McClendon, B. (2016, July 27). Mapping Uber's future [Web log post]. Uber Newsroom. Retrieved from
        https://newsroom.uber.com/mapping-ubers-future/

McMillan, R. (2014, July 16). Inside the artificial brain that's remaking the Google empire. *Wired*.
        Retrieved from http://www.wired.com/2014/07/google_brain/

Millerand, F. (2011). Le partage des données scientifiques à l'ère de l'e-science: L'instrumentation des
        pratiques au sein d'un collectif multidisciplinaire [Data sharing in the e-science era:
        Instrumentation of practices within a multidisciplinary collective]. *Terrains & Travaux, 18*(1),
        215–237.

Montfort, N., & Bogost, I. (2009). *Racing the beam: The Atari video computer system*. Cambridge, MA:
        MIT Press.

November, V., Camacho-Hübner, E., & Latour, B. (2010). Entering a risky territory: Space in the age of
        digital navigation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 28*(4), 581–599.

Parks, L., & Starosielski, N. (2015). *Signal traffic: Critical studies of media infrastructures*. Champaign, IL:
        University of Illinois Press.

Perkins, C. (2015, October 14). Tesla is mapping the Earth, 'cause your GPS won't cut it for self-driving
        cars. *Mashable*. Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2015/10/14/tesla-high-precision-digital-
        maps/

Peters, J. D. (2016). *The marvelous clouds: Toward a philosophy of elemental media*. Chicago, IL:
        University of Chicago Press.

Pickles, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Ground truth: The social implications of geographic information systems*. New
        York, NY: Guilford Press.

Plantin, J.-C. (2014). *Participatory mapping: New data, new cartography*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Plantin, J.-C. (2015). The politics of mapping platforms: Participatory radiation mapping after the Fukushima Daiichi disaster. *Media, Culture & Society, 37*(6), 904–921.

Plantin, J.-C., Lagoze, C., Edwards, P. N., & Sandvig, C. (2016, August). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society,* Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1461444816661553

Shapin, S. (1989). The invisible technician. *American Scientist, 77*(6), 554–563.

Sonvilla-Weiss, S. (2010). Mashups, remix practices and the recombination of existing digital content. In S. Sonvilla-Weiss (Ed.), *Mashup Cultures* (pp. 8–23). New York, NY: Springer.

Star, S. L., & Ruhleder, K. (1996). Steps toward an ecology of infrastructure: Design and access for large information spaces. *Information Systems Research, 7*, 111–134.

Starosielski, N. (2015). *The undersea network*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Stenovec, T. (2015, November 25). The 2 simple reasons why Google Maps is better than everything else. *Business Insider UK*. Retrieved from http://uk.businessinsider.com/the-reason-google-maps-is-the-best-traffic-app-2015-11?r=US&IR=T

Sui, D. Z. (2008). The wikification of GIS and its consequences: Or Angelina Jolie's new tattoo and the future of GIS. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 32*(1), 1–5.

Turner, A. J. (2006). *Introduction to neogeography*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.

Weiss-Malik, M., & Lookingbill, A. (2013). Project Ground Truth: Accurate maps via algorithms and elbow grease. *Google I/O 2013*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FsbLEtS0uls

Wood, D. (2010). *Rethinking the power of maps*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.