

AI for Urban Infrastructure Systems

By Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD

www.ruduct.com/cv.pdf

Institut Bisnis dan Multimedia (IBM ASMI)

Academic Article

Abstract

Artificial intelligence is becoming an operational layer of modern urban infrastructure. Transport networks, energy grids, water utilities, waste systems, buildings, telecommunications, and public-service facilities increasingly generate continuous streams of data through sensors, smart meters, cameras, geographic information systems, supervisory control platforms, and digital twins. AI can transform these data into forecasts, diagnoses, optimization decisions, maintenance priorities, emergency warnings, and resource-allocation strategies. Yet urban infrastructure is not an ordinary digital application. It is a collection of long-lived, safety-critical, socially essential, and institutionally complex systems whose failures can cascade across an entire city. Consequently, the value of AI for urban infrastructure cannot be judged solely by predictive accuracy or computational sophistication. It must also be assessed through reliability, resilience, lifecycle performance, transparency, cybersecurity, fairness, public accountability, and the capacity of organizations to govern automated systems over decades.

This article develops a comprehensive framework for understanding AI for urban infrastructure systems. It examines machine learning, computer vision, reinforcement learning, generative AI, digital twins, predictive maintenance, asset management, demand forecasting, network optimization, structural health monitoring, traffic management, energy systems, urban water, waste engineering, buildings, communications, emergency management, and climate resilience. It also discusses data architecture, interoperability, model lifecycle management, cybersecurity, algorithmic risk, procurement, financing, institutional capacity, and ethical governance. Special attention is given to developing-country cities and the Indonesian context, where rapid urbanization, infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, and uneven digital capacity create both urgent needs and major opportunities. The central argument is that AI should be understood as a socio-technical capability embedded in urban institutions, not as a stand-alone technology. Cities gain the greatest public value when AI augments

professional judgment, strengthens anticipatory maintenance, improves cross-sector coordination, and supports more resilient, inclusive, and sustainable infrastructure systems.

Keywords

Artificial intelligence; urban infrastructure; smart cities; digital twins; predictive maintenance; infrastructure resilience; machine learning; AIoT; asset management; urban systems; cybersecurity; Indonesia

1. Introduction: AI as an Urban Infrastructure Capability

Urban infrastructure is the material and organizational foundation of urban life. Roads, bridges, railways, electricity networks, water-supply systems, drainage, wastewater treatment, solid-waste facilities, telecommunications, buildings, ports, hospitals, and emergency services allow cities to function continuously. Historically, these systems were designed as largely physical assets, supported by periodic inspections, fixed operating rules, and professional judgment. The digital transformation of cities is changing this model. Infrastructure is becoming increasingly observable through sensors and increasingly governable through data. Artificial intelligence adds a further layer: it allows urban organizations to infer patterns, predict future states, optimize competing objectives, and detect emerging problems before they become visible through conventional procedures.

The strategic importance of AI arises from the scale and complexity of cities. An urban transport authority may need to coordinate millions of daily trips, thousands of intersections, large vehicle fleets, and constantly changing demand. A water utility operates pumps, reservoirs, treatment plants, pressure zones, and buried pipes whose condition is imperfectly known. An electricity distributor must balance demand, distributed renewable generation, electric-vehicle charging, storage, and reliability under weather uncertainty. No human team can manually process all the data generated by such systems in real time. AI can therefore extend organizational cognition by converting high-volume and high-frequency data into operationally useful information.

Yet infrastructure AI differs fundamentally from consumer AI. A recommendation error on an entertainment platform is inconvenient; a false signal in bridge monitoring, flood forecasting, traffic control, or grid protection may affect safety and public welfare. Infrastructure assets also have long service lives. A bridge may operate for a century while the AI software associated with it may change every few months. Cities therefore face a lifecycle mismatch between physical infrastructure and rapidly evolving algorithms. The management question is not only how to deploy an AI model, but how to validate, update, monitor, govern, and eventually replace it while preserving continuity of service.

Recent reviews of urban digital twins and AI emphasize both their growing potential and the persistent gap between technological ambition and realized public value. Urban digital twins can support situational awareness, simulation, and decision support, while AI can add forecasting, pattern recognition, optimization, and generative capabilities. However, interoperability, data quality, institutional fragmentation, cybersecurity, and weak lifecycle governance remain major barriers. The practical implication is that AI for infrastructure should be treated as an institutional capability: a combination of data, models, standards, skills, governance, and operational routines.

2. What Counts as AI in Urban Infrastructure?

Artificial intelligence is an umbrella term covering several computational approaches. In urban infrastructure, supervised machine learning is commonly used when historical data contain known outcomes. Examples include predicting pipe failure, estimating pavement deterioration, classifying structural defects, forecasting electricity demand, or predicting bus arrival time. Unsupervised learning is useful when labels are limited; it can identify anomalies, clusters, or unusual equipment behavior. Deep learning is particularly effective for high-dimensional data such as images, video, sound, and complex sensor streams.

Computer vision enables automated interpretation of visual information. Infrastructure agencies can use cameras, drones, robots, or mobile phones to inspect bridges, roads, sewers, facades, railways, or construction sites. Algorithms can classify cracks, corrosion, potholes, illegal dumping, traffic incidents, and other conditions. This does not eliminate engineering inspection. Rather, it can prioritize locations that deserve professional attention and reduce the cost of screening large asset inventories.

Reinforcement learning is relevant where an agent must select actions repeatedly in a dynamic environment. Potential applications include adaptive traffic-signal control, energy management, pump scheduling, and building control. Because reinforcement-learning systems can behave unpredictably outside their training conditions, safety constraints and simulation-based testing are especially important before deployment in critical infrastructure.

Generative AI introduces a different capability. Large language models can assist engineers and managers with document analysis, maintenance knowledge retrieval, incident summaries, procurement drafting, scenario generation, and natural-language interfaces to infrastructure databases. Generative models can also synthesize images, data, or urban design scenarios. Their value lies partly in lowering the interface barrier between complex data systems and human users. At the same time, hallucination risk means that generative AI should not be allowed to invent engineering facts, asset states, or regulatory requirements without verification.

AI of Things, or AIoT, combines artificial intelligence with Internet of Things devices. Sensors collect data, communication networks transmit them, and AI models interpret or act on them. Edge AI processes some data near the source rather than sending everything to centralized cloud systems. This can reduce latency, bandwidth, and privacy risk, which is useful for traffic control, industrial facilities, water plants, or safety systems that must respond rapidly even when network connectivity is degraded.

3. Data Architecture: The Foundation Beneath the Algorithms

AI is only as useful as the data environment surrounding it. Urban infrastructure data are fragmented across agencies, vendors, formats, and historical periods. A road authority may maintain pavement records in one database, traffic sensors in another, construction contracts in document files, and complaints in a separate service platform. Water utilities may possess SCADA data, laboratory data, smart-meter data, geographic asset records, and maintenance logs that were never designed to interoperate. Before AI can provide reliable insight, cities need a data architecture that establishes identifiers, metadata, data quality rules, access permissions, and common semantics.

Interoperability has both technical and institutional dimensions. Technical interoperability concerns formats, APIs, standards, time stamps, coordinate systems, and communication protocols. Semantic interoperability concerns meaning: two agencies may use the same word such as failure, service interruption, or asset condition differently. Institutional interoperability concerns permission and trust. Agencies may hesitate to share data because of legal restrictions, cybersecurity concerns, political incentives, or fear of losing control. AI projects often fail not because algorithms are weak but because the organizational environment cannot produce sufficiently coherent data.

Data quality should be assessed through completeness, accuracy, representativeness, timeliness, consistency, and lineage. Missing data are not random in many cities. Wealthier districts may have denser sensors and better asset records, while informal or peripheral areas remain poorly observed. An AI system trained on such data may systematically perform better for already well-served areas. Infrastructure analytics therefore require attention to spatial data inequality.

A mature data architecture also distinguishes operational technology from information technology. Operational technology directly controls physical processes such as pumps, traffic signals, substation equipment, or building systems. Information technology supports administrative and analytical functions. Connecting these environments creates value but also expands cyber risk. Critical systems need segmented networks, strict identity management, logging, secure interfaces, and carefully governed pathways through which AI recommendations can influence control actions.

4. Digital Twins and the Rise of Model-Centered Infrastructure Management

A digital twin is a dynamic digital representation of a physical asset, process, or system that is linked to real-world data. At infrastructure scale, digital twins can integrate geometric models, sensor measurements, operating states, maintenance history, simulations, and AI analytics. Urban digital twins extend the idea across districts or entire cities, linking multiple systems such as transport, buildings, energy, water, and environmental conditions. Recent literature shows rapid growth in this field, but also emphasizes that many so-called twins remain visualization platforms rather than fully integrated decision systems.

AI expands the analytical power of digital twins. Machine learning can estimate parameters that are difficult to measure directly, predict future conditions, detect anomalies, and calibrate simulations. Generative AI can help create synthetic scenarios, assist with model configuration, or provide natural-language interaction. A bridge digital twin, for example, might combine structural models, traffic loading, temperature data, strain measurements, inspection images, and maintenance records. AI could identify patterns suggesting abnormal behavior, while physics-based models test whether the signal is structurally plausible.

The strongest digital twins are hybrid rather than purely data-driven. Infrastructure obeys physical laws. Water pressure, traffic flow, structural mechanics, thermodynamics, and electrical networks have known constraints. Combining physics-based models with machine learning can improve robustness, particularly when data are sparse or future conditions differ from historical experience. This is important under climate change, when past patterns may no longer represent future extremes.

Urban digital twins also create governance questions. Who owns the twin? Which agency defines the authoritative representation of an asset? How are model updates approved? Can private vendors

lock cities into proprietary platforms? How are citizens represented in simulations? The socio-technical literature increasingly argues that digital twins should be understood as institutional arrangements as well as technological systems. Their public value depends on integration into planning and decision processes rather than visualization alone.

5. Predictive Maintenance and Asset Management

Predictive maintenance is one of the most mature applications of AI in infrastructure. Conventional maintenance is often either reactive, after failure occurs, or preventive, based on fixed time intervals. Both approaches can be inefficient. Reactive maintenance may create safety risks and service disruption, while time-based maintenance may replace components that still have useful life. Predictive maintenance uses condition data and statistical models to estimate failure risk so that intervention can be prioritized.

Infrastructure asset management is a broader decision process. Agencies must decide which roads to resurface, which pipes to replace, which bridges to inspect, which transformers to upgrade, and how to allocate limited budgets across thousands of assets. AI can rank assets by predicted deterioration, consequence of failure, or lifecycle cost. This transforms maintenance from a schedule into a risk-based portfolio problem.

The strongest systems combine probability of failure with consequence of failure. A small pipe with high failure probability may be less urgent than a major transmission main with moderate probability but catastrophic consequences. Likewise, a minor crack in an isolated structure may rank below a similar defect on a bridge carrying emergency traffic. AI should therefore support risk-informed asset management rather than merely predict technical condition.

Lifecycle management of AI itself becomes critical. Models degrade as equipment changes, operating practices shift, sensors age, and climate conditions evolve. Recent research in 2026 highlights the need to monitor infrastructure AI after deployment, including drift detection, update control, auditability, and retirement. A model that once performed well cannot be assumed to remain valid indefinitely. Infrastructure organizations need model registers, version histories, validation schedules, fallback procedures, and documented accountability.

6. AI for Transportation Infrastructure and Mobility Systems

Transportation produces some of the richest urban data and has therefore become a major AI application domain. Traffic cameras, connected vehicles, ticketing systems, GPS traces, mobile devices, road sensors, and transit operations generate continuous information. AI can estimate traffic states, forecast congestion, detect incidents, predict travel time, optimize transit schedules, and support dynamic routing.

Adaptive traffic-signal control is a prominent example. Traditional signals follow fixed timing plans or limited detector logic. AI-based control can respond to changing traffic flows and potentially optimize corridor or network performance. However, optimization objectives matter. A system designed only to minimize vehicle delay may worsen pedestrian safety, public-transport reliability, or emissions. Urban

mobility is a multi-objective public system; algorithms should reflect explicit policy priorities rather than treat traffic throughput as the only goal.

Public transport can benefit from demand forecasting, predictive maintenance, fleet assignment, driver scheduling, and passenger-information systems. Machine learning can predict bus bunching or delays, while computer vision can support station safety and crowd management. Ethical controls are needed when video analytics involve facial or behavioral inference. Infrastructure management should use the minimum personal data necessary and separate legitimate safety functions from intrusive surveillance.

Road and bridge maintenance can be improved through AI-assisted inspection. Images collected by survey vehicles or drones can identify pavement distress, potholes, markings, corrosion, or surface defects. Transportation digital twins can integrate these observations with traffic loads, climate exposure, construction history, and maintenance records. Reviews of AI and digital twins in transportation infrastructure emphasize substantial potential but also the need for clearer classification, validation, and future research.

7. AI for Urban Energy Infrastructure

Urban energy infrastructure is increasingly complex because electricity systems are becoming more distributed, renewable, electrified, and data-rich. AI can forecast demand, renewable generation, electricity prices, equipment condition, and electric-vehicle charging. It can optimize battery operation, building loads, district energy, and grid flexibility. In distribution networks, AI can assist fault localization, voltage management, and detection of abnormal consumption.

The importance of AI rises as variability increases. Solar and wind generation depend on weather; electric vehicles create flexible but potentially concentrated loads; batteries can charge or discharge; buildings can respond to grid signals. Coordinating these resources requires forecasts and optimization across multiple time scales. Urban digital twins can represent interactions among buildings, grids, storage, and markets, while AI provides adaptive control and scenario analysis.

Yet electrical infrastructure is safety-critical. Protection systems and grid controls must respect physical limits. AI recommendations should therefore be constrained by power-system engineering, and autonomous actions should be limited to domains where failure modes are understood. Human operators need clear situational awareness, including uncertainty estimates and reasons for major recommendations.

Energy AI also raises equity issues. Dynamic tariffs and automated demand response may benefit households with smart appliances and flexible loads while disadvantaging households that cannot shift consumption. Predictive investment models trained on revenue data may prioritize profitable neighborhoods over underserved areas. Infrastructure AI should therefore be evaluated not only for efficiency but for distributional effects.

8. AI for Urban Water Supply and Wastewater Systems

Water utilities operate hidden networks whose condition is often uncertain. Pipes are buried, leakage may be invisible, and failures can cause major economic and health consequences. AI can

support demand forecasting, leak detection, pressure management, pump optimization, water-quality monitoring, and asset replacement planning. Machine learning can combine pressure, flow, acoustic, smart-meter, and repair-history data to identify patterns associated with leakage or pipe failure.

Treatment plants can use AI for process optimization. Drinking-water and wastewater plants must respond to changing influent quality, weather, energy prices, and regulatory limits. Predictive models can estimate process conditions and support dosing, aeration, pumping, sludge management, or membrane operation. Because water quality directly affects public health, automated control should include conservative safety constraints and laboratory verification.

Sewer and drainage systems are another important application. AI can forecast rainfall-runoff response, predict sewer overflow, identify blockage risk, and support pump or gate control. When linked with weather radar and flood models, such systems can provide earlier warning for urban flooding. Climate change increases the value of anticipatory models because extreme rainfall patterns may exceed historical design assumptions.

Water data also illustrate the need for cybersecurity. SCADA systems and remote-controlled equipment can become attack surfaces if poorly protected. AI does not remove the need for conventional engineering reliability; it introduces additional software dependencies that must be secured and tested.

9. AI for Waste and Circular Urban Infrastructure

Urban waste systems involve collection, transfer, sorting, recycling, organics treatment, waste-to-energy, landfill management, and material recovery. AI can improve route planning, predict waste generation, detect contamination in recycling streams, automate sorting, forecast landfill gas, and optimize facility operation. Computer vision and robotics are especially important in materials-recovery facilities, where objects differ in size, shape, color, and composition.

Smart bins can communicate fill levels, allowing collection routes to respond to actual need rather than fixed schedules. This can reduce unnecessary vehicle kilometers, fuel use, and overflowing containers. However, the economics depend on sensor cost, network reliability, maintenance, and waste density. A technologically sophisticated collection system may not be justified in every neighborhood.

AI can also support circular-economy planning by mapping material flows and identifying potential industrial symbiosis. Construction waste, organics, plastics, metals, and electronic waste can be modeled as resource streams. The objective is not simply to make waste disposal smarter, but to reduce waste generation and increase recovery. AI should reinforce the waste hierarchy rather than optimize a fundamentally wasteful system.

10. AI for Buildings and Public Facilities

Buildings form a major part of urban infrastructure because they house economic activity, public services, education, healthcare, and residential life. AI-enabled building-management systems can forecast occupancy, optimize heating or cooling, detect equipment faults, manage lighting, and

coordinate distributed energy resources. In tropical cities, cooling optimization is particularly important because air-conditioning can create large electricity peaks.

Predictive maintenance can identify abnormal vibration, temperature, or power consumption in chillers, elevators, pumps, and ventilation equipment. Fault detection and diagnostics can reduce energy waste and prevent service interruption. Hospitals and laboratories require special caution because indoor environmental conditions may have clinical or scientific implications.

AI can also improve space utilization and facility planning by analyzing occupancy patterns. Universities, offices, and public buildings may discover that some spaces are consistently underused while others are congested. Better scheduling can reduce both capital demand and energy use. Yet occupancy analytics must respect privacy, and organizations should avoid collecting personally identifiable data when aggregate sensing is sufficient.

11. AI for Telecommunications and Digital Infrastructure

Modern cities depend on telecommunications as critical infrastructure in its own right and as the communication layer supporting other infrastructures. AI can optimize network capacity, predict equipment failure, detect cyber anomalies, and allocate radio resources. The expansion of 5G, edge computing, data centers, and IoT increases both capability and dependency.

Edge computing is strategically important because infrastructure systems often need low-latency decisions. Traffic control, industrial safety, autonomous inspection, and emergency response cannot always depend on distant cloud services. Edge AI can continue operating during connectivity disruptions and reduce the amount of sensitive data transmitted. However, distributed devices create a large patch-management and cybersecurity burden.

Data centers themselves interact with urban energy and water systems. Their electricity demand, backup power, cooling needs, and waste heat can affect local infrastructure. AI can optimize computing workloads and cooling, but cities should include data-center growth in infrastructure planning rather than treating digital capacity as immaterial.

12. Structural Health Monitoring and Civil Engineering

Structural health monitoring uses sensors and analysis to assess the condition of bridges, tunnels, dams, towers, buildings, and other structures. AI can recognize patterns in vibration, strain, displacement, acoustic emission, imagery, and environmental data. The promise is earlier detection of deterioration and more targeted inspection.

A central challenge is distinguishing damage from normal variability. Temperature, humidity, traffic, wind, and operational changes can affect structural response. Purely data-driven models may misinterpret such changes if training data do not represent the full range of conditions. Hybrid methods that combine structural mechanics with machine learning are therefore attractive. Physics provides constraints; data-driven models capture complex patterns.

Computer vision can augment manual inspection by identifying cracks, spalling, corrosion, and deformation from images. Drones reduce the need for inspectors to enter dangerous locations.

Nevertheless, image-based defect detection depends on lighting, resolution, camera angle, surface condition, and training data. AI should prioritize inspection rather than substitute unquestioningly for professional engineering judgment.

13. Climate Resilience, Disaster Risk, and Emergency Management

Climate change increases the frequency and severity of stresses facing urban infrastructure. Extreme heat affects electricity demand, pavements, rail systems, buildings, and public health. Intense rainfall overwhelms drainage. Sea-level rise threatens coastal assets. Drought affects water supply and hydropower. AI can combine weather forecasts, remote sensing, sensor data, and infrastructure models to improve early warning and scenario analysis.

Urban digital twins can simulate cascading impacts. A flood may disable a substation, which interrupts pumps, telecommunications, traffic signals, and hospital services. Conventional sector-by-sector planning may underestimate these dependencies. AI-assisted multi-infrastructure models can identify critical nodes whose protection yields large resilience benefits.

Emergency management can use AI to prioritize inspections, estimate damage from satellite images, optimize evacuation routes, and allocate response resources. Generative AI can assist with summarizing incident reports or translating public information, but emergency communication requires verified information. Hallucinated instructions during a disaster could be dangerous, so authoritative data and human approval are essential.

Resilience analytics should consider social vulnerability. The most technically exposed asset is not always the highest public priority. Failure of a small water facility serving a vulnerable community may have greater human consequences than a larger asset with alternative supply. AI-supported risk models should therefore combine hazard, asset criticality, service dependency, and social vulnerability.

14. From Prediction to Optimization and Automated Control

AI applications exist along a continuum from descriptive analytics to autonomous control. Descriptive systems explain what has happened. Predictive systems estimate what may happen. Prescriptive systems recommend what should be done. Automated control systems execute actions without waiting for human approval. The further a city moves along this continuum, the more important governance, validation, and fail-safe design become.

Optimization is rarely neutral because it requires an objective function. A traffic algorithm may minimize delay, emissions, crashes, or transit unreliability. An energy algorithm may minimize cost, carbon, or outage risk. A water utility may optimize energy use while maintaining pressure and water-quality constraints. Policy choices must therefore be encoded explicitly. If engineers optimize what is easy to measure rather than what society values, AI can make the wrong objective more efficient.

Autonomous control should be bounded by safety envelopes. A building system might automatically adjust temperature set points within approved ranges. A pump-control algorithm may optimize schedules while respecting minimum pressure and reservoir constraints. Critical protection systems may require deterministic logic rather than experimental AI. The principle is proportionality:

the greater the potential consequence of error, the stronger the requirement for validation, redundancy, and human authority.

15. Explainability, Uncertainty, and Human Oversight

Infrastructure professionals need more than a prediction; they often need to understand why a model reached a conclusion and how uncertain it is. Explainability can identify the features contributing to a prediction, compare similar historical cases, or show sensitivity to assumptions. This supports professional judgment and can reveal spurious correlations.

Uncertainty should be communicated quantitatively where possible. A model that predicts a 70 percent probability of pipe failure provides different information from a binary failure/no-failure label. Decision thresholds can then reflect consequence. High-consequence assets may justify intervention at lower predicted probabilities than low-consequence assets.

Human oversight does not mean that every AI output requires manual approval. It means that roles and escalation paths are defined. Routine low-risk actions may be automated, while unusual conditions trigger human review. Operators must be able to override systems, understand current system state, and return to safe manual operation if AI services fail.

Automation can create skill erosion if personnel stop practicing diagnosis and control. Infrastructure organizations should therefore maintain competency through training, simulation, drills, and rotation. A resilient organization is able to function when digital systems are unavailable.

16. Cybersecurity and the Expanding Attack Surface

Connecting physical infrastructure to digital platforms expands the attack surface. Sensors can be spoofed, credentials stolen, models manipulated, data corrupted, and control systems disrupted. AI itself can be attacked through adversarial inputs, data poisoning, model extraction, or malicious prompts in generative systems. Infrastructure cybersecurity therefore requires defense in depth.

Basic controls remain essential: network segmentation, least-privilege access, multifactor authentication, patch management, secure backups, logging, encryption, vendor-risk management, and incident response. AI-specific controls add model provenance, secure training pipelines, monitoring for abnormal outputs, and strict separation between generative interfaces and control systems.

Cyber resilience should be designed around service continuity. The question is not only whether an attack can be prevented, but how infrastructure behaves when digital functions are compromised. Pumps, traffic signals, substations, and buildings should have safe fallback modes. Critical manual procedures should be documented and periodically tested.

17. Ethics, Privacy, and Algorithmic Fairness

Urban infrastructure affects everyone, but data and algorithms can distribute benefits unevenly. Predictive policing is not an infrastructure function, yet similar concerns arise when urban analytics use mobility, video, payment, or location data. Cities should distinguish legitimate infrastructure sensing

from surveillance and apply data minimization. A system should not collect identifiable information merely because technology makes it possible.

Algorithmic fairness is relevant when AI influences investment priorities, service quality, pricing, inspections, or access. Historical data may encode previous inequalities. If road maintenance was historically concentrated in wealthier districts, a model trained on maintenance records may learn to prioritize those areas again. Fairness audits should examine performance and outcomes across neighborhoods and social groups.

Transparency is also institutional. Citizens do not need source code for every model, but they should know when consequential decisions are materially influenced by AI, what objectives are being pursued, what data categories are used, and how decisions can be challenged. Public agencies should preserve a clear chain of accountability. Responsibility cannot be delegated to a vendor or algorithm.

18. Procurement, Vendors, and the Risk of Technological Lock-In

Many cities acquire AI through vendors rather than developing systems internally. Procurement therefore shapes long-term capability. Contracts should address data ownership, model ownership, portability, interoperability, cybersecurity obligations, update rights, service levels, audit access, and exit provisions. A cheap initial system may become expensive if the city cannot export its data or change providers.

Outcome-based procurement can be useful when objectives are clear. Instead of purchasing an AI label, a utility might procure a verified reduction in non-revenue water or unplanned outages. However, contracts must avoid incentives that encourage gaming of metrics. Independent measurement and verification are essential.

Cities should also avoid dependence on a single large platform for all urban functions. Modularity and open interfaces can preserve competition and reduce systemic risk. Critical infrastructure should not become impossible to operate because a proprietary cloud service, vendor, or licensing arrangement changes.

19. Financing and Economic Evaluation

AI projects often promise efficiency savings, but their economics are more complex than software acquisition cost. Total cost of ownership includes sensors, communications, data integration, cloud or edge computing, cybersecurity, model development, retraining, staff, vendor support, and eventual replacement. Many projects underestimate the cost of maintaining data quality over time.

Economic evaluation should compare AI with alternative interventions. If a utility can reduce leakage through better basic maintenance, AI may not be the first priority. If an agency lacks an accurate asset registry, building a sophisticated predictive model may be premature. Digital maturity should therefore guide sequencing.

Benefits can include avoided failures, reduced downtime, longer asset life, lower energy use, better labor productivity, improved safety, faster emergency response, and deferred capital investment. Some benefits are probabilistic. Resilience investments may appear expensive until the avoided cost of rare

but catastrophic failure is considered. Decision makers should therefore use lifecycle and risk-adjusted evaluation rather than short-term return alone.

20. Governance and Institutional Design

AI for urban infrastructure crosses organizational boundaries. A flood model may require meteorological, drainage, road, power, and emergency data. Electric-vehicle planning requires transport and grid coordination. Urban digital twins may integrate planning, cadastre, utilities, and environmental systems. Traditional administrative silos are therefore a major barrier.

A practical governance structure can include an executive steering body, a technical architecture group, a data-governance function, a cybersecurity authority, domain-specific engineering owners, and an independent assurance mechanism for high-risk models. Responsibility should remain with the infrastructure agency that owns the service, even when models are supplied externally.

Model governance should include registration, purpose definition, risk classification, validation evidence, approved data sources, performance thresholds, change control, monitoring, incident reporting, and retirement. High-risk models deserve stronger review than low-risk analytical tools. This risk-tiered approach allows innovation without treating every model as equally dangerous.

Institutional learning is equally important. Post-incident reviews should examine not only whether a model was wrong, but whether operators interpreted it correctly, whether interfaces created confusion, whether incentives encouraged overreliance, and whether escalation procedures worked. AI safety is an organizational property as much as a model property.

21. Workforce Transformation and Professional Competence

AI changes the work of engineers, planners, operators, technicians, and managers. It can automate repetitive analysis but increases the importance of problem formulation, data interpretation, systems thinking, and cross-disciplinary communication. Infrastructure professionals need enough AI literacy to understand model limitations without necessarily becoming data scientists.

Organizations should develop blended teams. Domain engineers understand physical processes and safety constraints; data scientists understand statistical modeling; cybersecurity specialists understand digital risk; operators understand practical system behavior; managers connect technology with budgets, regulation, and public value. No single profession can manage urban infrastructure AI alone.

Training should include data quality, basic machine learning concepts, uncertainty, model validation, human factors, cybersecurity, ethics, and procurement. Simulation exercises can help operators practice situations in which AI recommendations conflict with physical intuition or other evidence. The goal is calibrated trust: neither blind acceptance nor reflexive rejection.

22. AI and Infrastructure Interdependency

One of the most important frontiers is cross-sector infrastructure analysis. Cities are systems of systems. Electricity powers pumps, traffic signals, telecommunications, railways, hospitals, and data

centers. Telecommunications support grid and water control. Roads provide access for repair crews. Water is needed for cooling and firefighting. Failures can therefore cascade.

AI and digital twins can help represent these interdependencies by combining network models and real-time data. A city can simulate how a substation outage affects water pressure, mobile networks, traffic, and emergency services. Such analysis helps identify assets that are critical because of their network position rather than their replacement value.

Interdependency models also improve investment prioritization. Strengthening a seemingly modest asset may produce large resilience benefits if many services depend on it. This moves infrastructure planning from sector optimization toward urban-system optimization.

23. Generative AI for Infrastructure Knowledge and Decision Support

Generative AI can make complex infrastructure information easier to access. Large agencies possess thousands of manuals, inspection reports, work orders, drawings, regulations, and contracts. Retrieval-augmented generation can allow staff to ask questions in natural language and receive answers grounded in approved documents. This can reduce search time and support knowledge transfer from experienced personnel.

Generative AI can also assist with drafting maintenance plans, summarizing incidents, comparing procurement documents, preparing meeting briefs, and translating technical language for public communication. In planning, it can generate alternative scenarios or explain model outputs to non-specialists.

The critical design principle is grounding. A language model should retrieve authoritative records rather than rely on general model memory for asset-specific facts. Answers should cite sources, display uncertainty, and distinguish verified information from generated suggestions. For high-consequence decisions, generative AI should remain an interface and reasoning aid rather than an autonomous authority.

24. Developing-Country Cities and the Indonesian Context

Developing-country cities face a distinctive combination of rapid growth, infrastructure deficits, informality, constrained finance, and uneven data quality. AI can help allocate scarce resources, but it can also amplify existing inequalities if digital investment is concentrated only where data and revenue are already strong. The appropriate strategy is therefore selective and problem-led rather than technology-led.

Indonesia offers major opportunities. Large metropolitan regions such as Jakarta, Surabaya, Bandung, Medan, Makassar, and rapidly growing secondary cities face congestion, flooding, waste-management challenges, energy growth, water stress, land subsidence in some areas, and increasing climate exposure. AI can support flood forecasting, traffic management, public-transport planning, grid forecasting, water leakage reduction, waste logistics, and infrastructure maintenance. The strongest use cases are those linked to clearly measurable service outcomes.

Jakarta illustrates the importance of infrastructure interdependency. Flooding interacts with drainage, pumping, roads, electricity, telecommunications, and emergency response. A digital twin integrating rainfall, river levels, land subsidence, pumps, drainage capacity, traffic, and vulnerable populations could support better situational awareness. AI could improve short-term prediction, but effective flood management still depends on physical infrastructure, spatial planning, watershed management, and social preparedness.

Indonesia should also consider local institutional capacity. Many municipalities have limited data-engineering resources. National platforms, shared standards, cloud infrastructure, university partnerships, and open-source tools can reduce duplication. However, centralization should not erase local knowledge. Cities need the ability to interpret and adapt systems to local conditions.

The archipelagic geography of Indonesia makes resilience and connectivity particularly important. Remote or island communities may benefit from edge AI, satellite data, microgrids, and decentralized monitoring where continuous high-bandwidth connectivity is unavailable. Infrastructure AI should be designed for intermittent communication rather than assuming ideal urban networks everywhere.

Universities and institutes of management can contribute by developing cross-disciplinary programs that connect engineering, data science, management, and public policy. The Indonesian challenge is not simply to import smart-city technologies, but to build domestic capability to govern them throughout their lifecycle.

25. Strategic Management Framework for AI-Enabled Infrastructure

A practical strategic framework begins with public value. City leaders should define the infrastructure problem before selecting the technology. Is the objective to reduce water loss, improve bridge safety, lower outage duration, reduce congestion, optimize energy use, or improve flood warning? Clear outcomes prevent AI from becoming a prestige project.

The second step is digital and organizational readiness. Agencies should assess asset records, sensor coverage, data quality, staff capability, cybersecurity, and business processes. Low maturity may justify investment in basic data foundations before advanced AI.

The third step is risk classification. Applications that merely summarize documents are lower risk than systems that control traffic signals or pumps. Risk classification determines validation, oversight, and cybersecurity requirements.

The fourth step is controlled experimentation. Pilots should be designed with baseline performance, test periods, comparison groups where feasible, and clear stopping rules. Technical accuracy alone is insufficient; pilots should measure operational adoption, staff workload, false alarms, maintenance impact, and equity.

The fifth step is integration into operations. AI becomes valuable when recommendations fit work orders, control rooms, budgets, and professional workflows. Separate dashboards that operators rarely use create little value. Integration should include escalation procedures and accountability.

The sixth step is lifecycle governance. Models require monitoring, retraining, periodic revalidation, cybersecurity updates, and eventual retirement. This should be budgeted from the beginning. Cities should avoid treating deployment as the end of the project.

The seventh step is learning and scale. Successful applications can be extended across assets or agencies, but scaling should preserve context. A model trained on one city or district may not transfer directly to another. Revalidation is necessary when populations, climates, materials, or operating practices differ.

26. Performance Measurement and Evaluation

Performance should be measured at several levels. Model metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, calibration, and prediction error are necessary but not sufficient. Operational metrics include reduced downtime, earlier warning, lower maintenance cost, fewer false alarms, faster repairs, energy savings, water savings, or travel-time reliability. Strategic metrics include resilience, asset-life extension, emissions reduction, affordability, and public trust.

Evaluation should compare outcomes against a baseline. If a predictive-maintenance model is deployed, the question is not whether it achieves 90 percent classification accuracy, but whether it reduces unplanned failures or improves maintenance productivity. A traffic system should be evaluated for pedestrian, transit, safety, and emissions outcomes as well as vehicle delay.

Fairness metrics should examine geographic and social differences. If a complaint-classification system works better in areas with formal addresses and high digital participation, underserved communities may receive poorer service. Infrastructure performance dashboards should therefore be disaggregated spatially where appropriate.

Finally, evaluation should include resilience to model failure. Cities should test what happens when sensors are unavailable, communication is lost, data distributions shift, or AI services are withdrawn. A system that performs brilliantly under normal conditions but fails dangerously during disruption is not robust infrastructure.

27. Research and Education Agenda

Research should move beyond model accuracy toward long-term field evidence. Many studies demonstrate promising algorithms on historical datasets, but fewer document performance over years of operation. Infrastructure requires research on drift, maintenance, retraining, operator interaction, cybersecurity, and organizational adoption.

Hybrid physics-AI models deserve continued attention because they can combine engineering knowledge with data-driven flexibility. Explainable and uncertainty-aware methods are especially valuable for safety-critical decisions. Research should also examine cross-infrastructure cascading failure, where urban-system benefits may exceed sector-specific optimization.

Urban AI research needs stronger representation of developing-country conditions. Data scarcity, informal infrastructure, tropical climates, rapid urbanization, and constrained municipal budgets differ from the conditions in many benchmark datasets. Locally collected data and context-sensitive models are essential.

Management education should treat AI-enabled infrastructure as a strategic transformation problem. Students can analyze cases involving vendor lock-in, lifecycle costs, human oversight, public

accountability, and competing objectives. Such cases are valuable because they show that AI decisions are never purely technical.

Universities can also function as living laboratories. Campuses contain roads, buildings, energy systems, water, waste, security, and digital networks. AI pilots can be tested at manageable scale while generating research and student learning. Strong governance is still necessary, particularly for privacy and safety.

28. Urban Infrastructure AI Maturity Model

Cities differ greatly in their capacity to use AI responsibly. A useful maturity model begins at Level 1, where infrastructure management is predominantly reactive and records are fragmented. At this level, the priority is not sophisticated AI but basic asset inventories, maintenance discipline, data standards, and staff capability. Organizations that skip these foundations may produce impressive demonstrations that cannot be sustained operationally.

Level 2 is digitally enabled infrastructure. Assets are increasingly mapped in geographic information systems, work orders are digitized, sensors are installed on selected critical systems, and operational data can be retrieved consistently. Analytics remain mostly descriptive. The strategic objective is to create trustworthy data pipelines and clear ownership. This stage often yields immediate benefits even before machine learning is introduced because managers gain visibility into asset condition, maintenance backlog, and service performance.

Level 3 is predictive infrastructure management. Agencies deploy models for demand forecasting, anomaly detection, deterioration prediction, or failure risk. AI begins to influence inspection and maintenance priorities. At this stage, model validation, performance monitoring, and integration with work-management processes become essential. A prediction that does not generate an operational response has little value. Staff must understand how the model changes priorities and how to challenge questionable outputs.

Level 4 is integrated and prescriptive infrastructure. Multiple domains are connected through shared data architecture and digital twins. Models do not only predict failure but recommend actions under budget, safety, and service constraints. Transport, energy, water, buildings, and emergency systems may exchange selected data. Human decision makers use AI-supported scenario analysis to evaluate trade-offs. Institutional governance becomes more complex because the same data or model may affect several agencies.

Level 5 is adaptive infrastructure, where bounded autonomous control is used in selected applications and the city continuously learns from operational outcomes. Adaptive signals, grid resources, pumps, building systems, or maintenance schedules may respond automatically within approved safety limits. Continuous assurance is required because model updates, sensor changes, or new urban behavior can alter system performance. At this maturity level, resilience includes the capacity to operate safely when AI functions are unavailable.

The maturity model is not a race toward maximum automation. Different infrastructure functions may appropriately remain at different levels. A city may use advanced AI for energy forecasting while keeping dam safety decisions under conservative engineering procedures. Maturity means matching

technology with risk, data readiness, organizational competence, and public purpose. The most mature city is therefore not the one with the most algorithms, but the one that knows where AI creates value, where it does not, and how to govern both situations.

29. Implementation Architecture: From Sensors to Executive Decisions

AI-enabled infrastructure can be understood as a layered architecture. The physical layer contains roads, pipes, bridges, transformers, buildings, pumps, vehicles, treatment plants, and other assets. The sensing layer includes meters, cameras, weather stations, vibration sensors, water-quality probes, GPS devices, and inspection observations. The communication layer moves data through fiber, cellular networks, radio, low-power wide-area networks, satellite links, or local industrial networks. Each layer has different reliability and cybersecurity characteristics.

Above these layers sits the data platform. Raw observations must be time-stamped, validated, associated with asset identifiers, and stored with sufficient metadata. Streaming data may support real-time operations, while historical data support training and planning. Data lakes can store large volumes, but unmanaged accumulation creates a data swamp. Cities need curated datasets, retention policies, quality metrics, and responsible access rather than indiscriminate collection.

The model layer contains engineering simulations, statistical models, machine learning, computer vision, and generative systems. A robust architecture allows several models to coexist. A physics model may estimate water pressure, a machine-learning model may predict pipe failure, and an optimization model may schedule replacement. The models should not be forced into one monolithic AI. Modular design supports validation and allows components to be replaced as better methods become available.

The application layer connects models with operational workflows. Predictions appear in maintenance systems, control-room displays, mobile inspection applications, planning dashboards, or emergency platforms. This layer is where human factors become crucial. Interfaces should present uncertainty, avoid alarm overload, and show recommended actions in a form consistent with professional practice. Poor interface design can neutralize technically excellent models.

Finally, the governance layer establishes authority. It defines which datasets are authoritative, which models are approved, which decisions can be automated, who receives alerts, how incidents are recorded, and when models must be revalidated. Executive dashboards should summarize outcomes rather than overwhelm leaders with technical detail. Senior management needs to know whether service reliability, risk, cost, and resilience are improving, not merely how many AI models have been deployed.

This layered architecture clarifies an important point: an AI initiative is only one component of a larger information-to-action chain. Failure can occur at any layer. A sensor may drift, communication may fail, asset identifiers may be wrong, a model may be biased, an interface may confuse users, or governance may permit inappropriate automation. Infrastructure assurance must therefore test the complete chain rather than model accuracy alone.

30. Extended Case Narrative: An AI-Enabled Metropolitan Corridor

Consider a hypothetical metropolitan corridor called Nusantara Metro Corridor. It contains a commuter railway, bus rapid transit, arterial roads, flood-control channels, distribution substations, water mains, hospitals, schools, commercial centers, and dense residential neighborhoods. Historically, each infrastructure agency operates its own control room and databases. During heavy rain, road flooding causes congestion, buses become unreliable, a substation is threatened, and emergency vehicles struggle to reach a hospital. Each agency sees only part of the problem.

The metropolitan government creates an integrated infrastructure operations program. Rain gauges, river sensors, pump status, traffic speeds, railway conditions, substation alarms, and emergency-service data are connected through governed interfaces. An urban digital twin represents the corridor's major networks. Machine-learning models forecast localized flooding thirty to ninety minutes ahead, while hydraulic models verify plausible water movement. Traffic models estimate how road closures will redistribute vehicles. The electricity utility identifies substations at risk and prepares switching plans.

The system does not automatically control every asset. Instead, it uses graded authority. Low-risk traffic-message signs are updated automatically. Pump scheduling operates automatically within approved hydraulic limits. Major road closures require traffic-management approval. Electrical switching remains under utility operators. Hospital alerts are generated when predicted access time crosses a threshold. This design reflects consequence rather than technological enthusiasm.

Over time, predictive maintenance is added. Computer vision analyzes road-survey images, railway cameras identify track anomalies, acoustic sensors help locate water leakage, and transformer models estimate failure risk. The metropolitan asset-management board uses a common risk framework to compare interventions. A replacement project receives higher priority not merely because an asset is old, but because its failure would disrupt several dependent services.

The city initially encounters problems. Different agencies use incompatible location codes. Sensor maintenance is underfunded. An early flood model performs poorly in a rapidly urbanizing catchment because new construction altered runoff. Operators ignore some alerts because false positives are too frequent. These problems force the city to improve data governance, model monitoring, and feedback from frontline staff. The experience shows that operational maturity emerges through learning, not through a single procurement.

Public accountability is built into the program. The city publishes service-level indicators and explains which decisions use AI. Personal mobility data are aggregated and retention is limited. An independent technical panel reviews high-risk models annually. Universities participate in model validation and workforce training. The program's success is measured through reduced outage duration, faster flood response, improved transit reliability, lower water losses, and better maintenance productivity rather than the number of sensors or dashboards.

This case illustrates the deeper meaning of AI-enabled infrastructure. The primary innovation is not a particular algorithm. It is the creation of an institutional architecture capable of seeing interdependencies, anticipating failure, coordinating agencies, and learning from outcomes. AI becomes valuable because it is embedded within professional engineering, governance, and public-service objectives.

31. Policy Roadmap for Responsible Urban Infrastructure AI

A national or metropolitan policy roadmap can organize AI adoption into a series of practical priorities. First, governments should classify critical infrastructure AI by consequence. Low-risk tools such as document summarization require basic controls, while systems affecting physical operations require formal validation and assurance. Risk classification prevents both under-regulation and excessive bureaucracy.

Second, public-sector data standards should establish common asset identifiers, geospatial references, metadata, and cybersecurity requirements. Standardization reduces duplicated integration work and makes it easier for smaller municipalities to adopt proven tools. Procurement policies should require exportable data and documented APIs so that public infrastructure is not trapped in closed vendor ecosystems.

Third, governments should invest in shared capability. National research centers, universities, utilities, and professional associations can provide validation methods, reference architectures, training, and model repositories. Smaller cities may not be able to maintain specialized AI teams, but they can benefit from shared services while retaining responsibility for local decisions.

Fourth, AI investment should be connected to physical infrastructure budgets. Sensors without maintenance funding deteriorate; analytics without repair budgets cannot improve service; digital twins without current asset data become inaccurate. Digital and physical investment plans should therefore be reviewed together.

Fifth, governments should require lifecycle reporting for high-risk AI. Agencies should document model purpose, training data, performance, limitations, responsible owner, version history, incidents, and retirement decisions. This creates institutional memory and reduces dependence on individual staff or vendors.

Sixth, public participation should be proportional to social impact. Communities should be consulted when AI affects service priorities, public-space monitoring, tariffs, or major planning decisions. Participation is not only an ethical requirement; it can reveal local conditions that data systems miss.

Finally, policy should encourage experimentation while preserving reversibility. Sandboxes, pilots, and living laboratories allow innovation under controlled conditions. Cities should preserve the ability to return to conventional operation when systems fail. Responsible innovation is not slow innovation; it is innovation designed so that mistakes can be detected, contained, and corrected before they become infrastructure crises.

32. Public Value, Trust, and Social License

Urban infrastructure is ultimately a public-service system, and the legitimacy of AI depends on whether residents experience better services rather than merely more technology. Public value includes reliability, safety, accessibility, affordability, environmental performance, and responsiveness. A city may possess advanced predictive analytics and still fail if road conditions deteriorate, water service remains unreliable, or flood warnings do not reach vulnerable communities. AI strategy should therefore begin with service outcomes that citizens can recognize.

Trust is built through demonstrated competence and transparent governance. Infrastructure agencies should communicate the role of AI in plain language, especially when it influences high-impact decisions. People should know whether an algorithm is helping prioritize repairs, manage traffic, or forecast floods, and they should understand which human institution remains accountable. This does not require disclosure of every line of code. It requires clarity about purpose, responsibility, data use, and avenues for review.

Social license is particularly important for sensing technologies. Cameras, mobility traces, smart meters, and mobile applications can generate useful infrastructure intelligence but may also create perceptions of surveillance. Data minimization, aggregation, clear retention limits, and independent oversight can reduce this tension. Cities should collect only the data needed for legitimate infrastructure functions and avoid function creep, in which information collected for one purpose is quietly reused for another.

Trust also depends on equitable outcomes. If affluent districts receive smart services while peripheral communities remain poorly connected, AI can become a symbol of exclusion. Equity should therefore be incorporated into infrastructure investment criteria, sensor deployment, model evaluation, and public dashboards. The strongest social license emerges when residents see that technology is being used to close service gaps, not merely to create prestigious smart-city districts.

33. Final Strategic Lessons for Urban Leaders

Several strategic lessons follow from the analysis in this article. First, infrastructure AI should be problem-driven. The city should define the service failure, operational bottleneck, or risk before choosing the algorithm. This sounds simple, but many digital projects begin with available technology rather than a clearly specified urban problem. Problem-driven design improves both accountability and economic evaluation.

Second, data foundations often create more value than sophisticated models. Accurate asset registers, reliable sensors, consistent maintenance records, and interoperable systems are prerequisites for trustworthy AI. Leaders should be willing to invest in these less visible foundations even when they attract less publicity than digital twins or generative AI.

Third, the most important infrastructure decisions are multi-objective. Cost, reliability, safety, resilience, carbon emissions, equity, and public acceptance may point in different directions. AI can make trade-offs more explicit, but it cannot decide social values on behalf of society. Policy makers must define acceptable priorities and constraints.

Fourth, institutional capability determines whether technical potential becomes durable value. A city needs engineers who understand data, data specialists who respect physical constraints, managers who understand lifecycle economics, cybersecurity professionals who understand operational technology, and leaders who can coordinate across agencies. Workforce development is therefore infrastructure investment.

Fifth, urban leaders should design for failure. Sensors will fail, data will be missing, models will drift, vendors will change, cyber incidents will occur, and extreme events will exceed expectations. Safe

fallback modes, redundancy, manual competence, and incident learning should be part of system design from the beginning.

Finally, cities should treat AI as an evolving capability rather than a finished product. Urban systems change continuously as populations, climate, technology, land use, and economic activity evolve. Models and governance arrangements must evolve with them. The strategic objective is not technological permanence but institutional adaptability: the ability to learn, revise, and improve while maintaining dependable public services.

34. Key Performance Indicators for AI-Enabled Infrastructure

A disciplined AI program requires indicators that connect technical performance with infrastructure outcomes. At the model level, agencies can monitor prediction error, calibration, false-positive and false-negative rates, drift, and data completeness. These measures indicate whether the analytical engine remains statistically trustworthy. However, they should always be connected to operational indicators.

Operational indicators may include unplanned outage duration, emergency repair frequency, mean time to detect faults, mean time to restore service, maintenance backlog, asset-life extension, energy consumption, water losses, transit punctuality, or avoided inspection hours. For digital twins, indicators should measure how often the twin supports real decisions, not merely whether the platform is technically available.

Governance indicators are equally important. Agencies can track the share of high-risk models with current validation, cybersecurity review, named accountable owners, documented fallback procedures, and complete version histories. Workforce indicators may include staff trained in AI assurance and the frequency of simulation exercises. Equity indicators can compare service improvements across neighborhoods. Together these measures transform responsible AI from a broad principle into a manageable performance system.

35. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence is becoming part of the operating logic of urban infrastructure. Its greatest potential lies not in replacing engineers or city managers, but in increasing the capacity of organizations to observe complex systems, anticipate failure, evaluate alternatives, and coordinate action. Predictive maintenance can extend asset life. Digital twins can improve situational awareness. AI can optimize energy, water, transport, and building operations. Computer vision can expand inspection capacity. Generative AI can make infrastructure knowledge more accessible.

The risks are equally significant. Poor data can produce misleading predictions. Algorithms can reproduce spatial and social inequality. Cyberattacks can exploit connected systems. Proprietary platforms can lock cities into vendors. Models can drift after deployment. Automation can weaken professional skills. Generative systems can hallucinate. These risks are not reasons to reject AI; they are reasons to govern it as critical infrastructure technology.

The central management principle is proportionality. Low-risk analytical tools can be deployed with relatively light controls. High-consequence systems require stronger validation, redundancy,

transparency, human oversight, and lifecycle assurance. Infrastructure agencies should maintain clear accountability even when models are developed by vendors.

For Indonesia and other rapidly urbanizing countries, AI can help cities leapfrog some limitations of conventional infrastructure management, but only when digital investment is connected to physical infrastructure, institutional capability, and public value. The objective should not be to create cities that appear technologically advanced. It should be to create cities whose infrastructure is safer, more reliable, more resilient, more efficient, more sustainable, and more inclusive because intelligence has been integrated responsibly into engineering and management.

Glossary

AIoT: The integration of artificial intelligence with Internet of Things devices and sensor networks.

Algorithmic fairness: The principle that model performance and resulting decisions should not systematically disadvantage particular groups or locations.

Asset management: Coordinated lifecycle planning, operation, maintenance, renewal, and disposal of infrastructure assets.

Computer vision: AI methods that interpret images and video for tasks such as inspection, classification, and detection.

Cyber-physical system: A system in which digital computation and communication are tightly connected to physical processes.

Data drift: Change in the statistical characteristics of input data after a model has been deployed.

Digital twin: A dynamic digital representation of a physical asset or system linked to real-world data.

Edge AI: AI processing performed near the data source rather than exclusively in centralized cloud infrastructure.

Explainable AI: Methods that make model outputs or influencing factors more understandable to users.

Generative AI: AI capable of generating text, images, data, code, scenarios, or other content.

Human-in-the-loop: A system design in which humans retain a defined role in reviewing or approving AI outputs.

Infrastructure interdependency: Dependence of one infrastructure system on another, such as water pumping depending on electricity.

Machine learning: Computational methods that learn patterns from data to make predictions, classifications, or decisions.

Model drift: Degradation in model performance as conditions change after deployment.

Predictive maintenance: Maintenance planning based on predicted condition or failure risk rather than fixed intervals alone.

Reinforcement learning: Machine learning in which an agent learns actions through rewards and interaction with an environment.

SCADA: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition systems used to monitor and control industrial and infrastructure processes.

Smart city: An urban development approach using digital technology and data to improve services, sustainability, and governance.

Structural health monitoring: Continuous or periodic measurement used to assess the condition and performance of structures.

Urban digital twin: A digital twin representing multiple assets or systems at district or city scale.

Zero-trust security: A cybersecurity approach that continuously verifies users, devices, and access rather than assuming internal trust.

References

- Xu, H., Omitaomu, F., Sabri, S., Zlatanova, S., Li, X., et al. (2024). Leveraging generative AI for urban digital twins: A scoping review on the autonomous generation of urban data, scenarios, designs, and 3D city models for smart city advancement. *Urban Informatics*, 3, 29.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s44212-024-00060-w>
- Alahi, A. N., et al. (2024). The synergistic interplay of artificial intelligence and digital twin in environmentally planning sustainable smart cities: A comprehensive systematic review. *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology*, 20, 100433.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esse.2024.100433>
- Wu, T. G., & Guan, C. (2025). Advancing intra and inter-city urban digital twins: An updated review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 45(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X241260887>
- Shahat, E., Hyun, C. T., & Yeom, C. (2021). City digital twin potentials: A review and research agenda. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3386. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063386>
- Dembski, F., Wössner, U., Letzgus, M., Ruddat, M., & Yamu, C. (2020). Urban digital twins for smart cities and citizens: The case study of Herrenberg, Germany. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2307.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12062307>
- Mohammadi, N., & Taylor, J. E. (2017). Smart city digital twins. 2017 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SSCI.2017.8285439>
- Batty, M. (2018). Digital twins. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 45(5), 817-820. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808318796416>
- Boje, C., Guerriero, A., Kubicki, S., & Rezgui, Y. (2020). Towards a semantic construction digital twin: Directions for future research. *Automation in Construction*, 114, 103179.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2020.103179>
- Fuller, A., Fan, Z., Day, C., & Barlow, C. (2020). Digital twin: Enabling technologies, challenges and open research. *IEEE Access*, 8, 108952-108971. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2998358>
- Zhu, M., & Jin, J. (2025). Data-driven urban digital twins and critical infrastructure under climate change: A review of frameworks and applications. *Urban Planning*, 10, 10109.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/up.10109>

- Sahal, R., Alsamhi, S. H., Breslin, J. G., & Brown, K. N. (2021). Blockchain-based digital twins collaboration for smart pandemic alerting: Decentralized COVID-19 pandemic alerting use case. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2021, 8851361. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8851361>
- Tao, F., Zhang, H., Liu, A., & Nee, A. Y. C. (2019). Digital twin in industry: State-of-the-art. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 15(4), 2405-2415. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2018.2873186>
- Glaessgen, E., & Stargel, D. (2012). The digital twin paradigm for future NASA and U.S. Air Force vehicles. 53rd AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics and Materials Conference. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2012-1818>
- Zhang, J., et al. (2022). Digital twins and artificial intelligence in transportation infrastructure: Classification, application, and future research directions. *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, 101, 107983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2022.107983>
- Morales, J., et al. (2025). What have urban digital twins contributed to urban planning and decision making? From a systematic literature review toward a socio-technical research and development agenda. *Smart Cities*, 8(1), 32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities8010032>
- El-Agamy, R. F., Sayed, H. A., Al Akhatatneh, A. M., Aljohani, M., et al. (2024). Comprehensive analysis of digital twins in smart cities: A 4200-paper bibliometric study. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57, 154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10781-8>
- International Organization for Standardization. (2018). ISO 55000: Asset management - Overview, principles and terminology. ISO.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). NIST. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>