

Urban Digital Twin

By Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD

www.rudymt.com/cv.pdf

Institut Bisnis dan Multimedia (IBM ASMI)

Academic Article

Abstract

Urban Digital Twin (UDT) technology is emerging as a major architecture for data-driven planning, management, simulation, and governance of contemporary cities. Unlike static three-dimensional city models, an Urban Digital Twin is a dynamic computational representation of urban assets, processes, populations, and environmental conditions that is continuously or periodically synchronized with the physical city through data. It combines geographic information systems, building information modeling, Internet of Things sensors, remote sensing, cloud and edge computing, artificial intelligence, simulation, optimization, and visualization. The purpose is not merely to reproduce the appearance of the city, but to create a trusted environment in which decision makers can observe current conditions, test alternative futures, anticipate risks, coordinate infrastructure systems, and evaluate the consequences of policy before implementation.

This article presents a comprehensive narrative of Urban Digital Twins as socio-technical systems. It examines definitions, maturity levels, architecture, data integration, GIS-BIM convergence, IoT, artificial intelligence, generative AI, simulation, interoperability, cybersecurity, privacy, ethics, institutional governance, financing, organizational capability, public participation, and lifecycle management. Applications are discussed across land-use planning, transportation, energy, water, waste, buildings, climate adaptation, environmental monitoring, public safety, disaster resilience, health, logistics, and infrastructure asset management. Particular attention is given to the distinction between digital models, digital shadows, and true digital twins, and to the importance of bidirectional integration between physical and virtual systems.

The article argues that an Urban Digital Twin should be evaluated by the quality of decisions and public value it enables rather than by visual sophistication. For rapidly urbanizing countries such as Indonesia, UDTs can support metropolitan planning, flood management, transport integration, land-use control, infrastructure maintenance, climate resilience, and new-capital-city development. However, successful adoption requires interoperable standards, reliable base data, institutional coordination, cybersecurity, legal clarity, local

capability, and sustained funding. The Urban Digital Twin should therefore be understood not as a single software product but as a long-term urban knowledge infrastructure.

Keywords

Urban Digital Twin; digital twin; smart city; GIS; BIM; Internet of Things; artificial intelligence; urban planning; infrastructure management; simulation; digital governance; climate resilience; Indonesia

1. Introduction: The City as a Living Information System

Cities have always been information systems in addition to being physical settlements. Streets communicate accessibility, prices communicate scarcity, maps communicate location, and administrative records describe ownership and population. What has changed in the digital era is the speed, scale, granularity, and interconnectivity of urban information. Sensors can observe infrastructure continuously; satellites can measure land and environmental change; mobile devices reveal patterns of movement; building information models represent detailed assets; and artificial intelligence can identify relationships that are difficult for human analysts to detect manually.

The Urban Digital Twin emerges from this transformation. It seeks to connect the physical city and its digital representation so that urban conditions can be understood dynamically rather than through periodic snapshots. A traditional map may show the road network, but a digital twin can combine the map with current traffic, road works, public transport locations, weather conditions, accident reports, and predictive models. A conventional drainage map may show pipes and channels, while a digital twin can combine that network with rainfall forecasts, pump status, river levels, land subsidence, and flood simulation.

This distinction is critical. The value of an Urban Digital Twin does not lie mainly in visual realism. A beautiful three-dimensional model may be useful for communication, but it becomes a twin only when it is integrated with the changing state of the real urban system and used in a structured feedback process. Contemporary research emphasizes this shift from static models toward dynamic and operational representations that support planning and management.

Urban Digital Twins are important because cities are systems of systems. Transportation, energy, water, buildings, telecommunications, waste, health, public safety, and ecosystems interact. Problems that appear sectoral are often systemic. Flooding can interrupt roads, electricity, hospitals, and communications simultaneously. Electrification of transport affects the electricity grid. New housing increases water and waste demand. Extreme heat affects buildings, energy systems, health, and public space.

A Digital Twin offers a framework in which these interdependencies can be represented, monitored, and explored. However, such integration also creates institutional and ethical challenges. Data are distributed among government agencies, utilities, private companies, and citizens. Models contain assumptions and uncertainty. Some data are sensitive. Decisions based on digital systems can produce unequal outcomes. Therefore, the Urban Digital Twin is as much a governance innovation as a technological innovation.

2. What Is an Urban Digital Twin?

A digital twin is generally understood as a virtual representation of a physical object, process, or system that is connected to real-world data and can be used to understand, predict, or influence the physical counterpart. In an urban context, the physical counterpart is unusually complex. It may include buildings, infrastructure networks, land, environmental processes, economic activity, human mobility, and public services.

It is useful to distinguish three related concepts. A digital model is a virtual representation that does not automatically exchange data with the physical world. A digital shadow receives data from the physical system, so the digital representation changes in response to the real city, but the information flow is largely one-way. A more mature digital twin supports dynamic and potentially bidirectional interaction: real-world observations update the digital twin, while simulations, analytics, or control decisions generated in the twin can influence operations or planning in the physical world.

At city scale, complete bidirectional automation is neither technically necessary nor always desirable. Many important urban decisions should remain subject to professional judgment, political authority, public participation, and legal process. Therefore, an Urban Digital Twin can be highly valuable even when its feedback into the physical world occurs through human decision makers rather than direct automated control.

An Urban Digital Twin should also be distinguished from a three-dimensional city model. Three-dimensional geometry may be one of its components, especially for visualizing buildings, infrastructure, shadows, views, or spatial relationships. But a twin may also contain time series, networks, economic variables, environmental fields, demographic data, and simulation models that are not visually obvious. The twin is better understood as a federated knowledge and decision environment than as a single 3D scene.

This broader definition prevents technological reductionism. The objective is not to create a perfect digital replica of every detail in the city. Such an objective would be prohibitively expensive and conceptually unnecessary. The appropriate twin is purpose-driven. A flood twin needs different data and resolution from a mobility twin. A building-energy twin needs different temporal detail from a strategic land-use model. The design question is therefore: what representation is sufficiently accurate and current to support a particular class of decisions?

3. Evolution from CAD and GIS to Digital Twins

The Urban Digital Twin is the result of several technological traditions converging. Computer-aided design introduced precise digital representation of engineered objects. Geographic information systems developed the capability to manage spatially referenced data across large territories. Building information modeling added semantically rich digital representations of buildings and infrastructure components. Remote sensing provided repeated observations of land, vegetation, heat, water, and urban form. The Internet of Things added real-time or near-real-time sensing. Cloud computing enabled scalable storage and processing. Artificial intelligence added prediction and pattern recognition.

Each tradition contributed something different. CAD emphasized geometry and engineering design. GIS emphasized location, topology, spatial analysis, and territorial scale. BIM emphasized detailed asset information, lifecycle management, and object semantics. IoT emphasized current operational conditions. Simulation contributed causal and dynamic models. AI contributed data-driven inference. Digital twins bring these capabilities together.

This convergence has not been seamless. GIS and BIM were developed around different data models, coordinate systems, scales, and professional practices. Operational technology in utilities often uses protocols that differ from information-technology platforms. Sensor data may lack stable identifiers linking measurements to physical assets. Historical records may be incomplete or inconsistent. Consequently, data integration is one of the most difficult tasks in Urban Digital Twin development.

The historical evolution also explains why digital twins should be built incrementally. Most cities already possess many digital systems: cadastral databases, GIS layers, traffic-control systems, utility asset records,

building permits, CCTV, weather stations, and financial systems. A UDT strategy should connect and improve these assets rather than discard them in favor of one monolithic new platform.

The mature Urban Digital Twin is therefore an architecture of integration. It builds on decades of digital investment and gradually increases synchronization, semantic consistency, analytical capability, and institutional coordination.

4. Core Architecture of an Urban Digital Twin

A useful Urban Digital Twin architecture can be understood as a series of interacting layers. The physical layer contains real-world assets and processes: roads, buildings, pipes, power lines, people, vehicles, rivers, vegetation, and environmental conditions. The sensing layer observes the physical city through IoT devices, remote sensing, administrative systems, crowdsourcing, and operational databases.

The communication layer transfers data through fiber, cellular networks, Wi-Fi, low-power networks, satellite links, or secure enterprise connections. Edge computing may process data close to the source when low latency, privacy, or resilience is important.

The data layer stores, organizes, validates, and integrates information. This layer includes geospatial databases, time-series databases, BIM repositories, asset registries, document stores, and metadata catalogs. Common identifiers and semantic models are essential because they allow different datasets to refer consistently to the same physical entities.

The modeling layer contains simulation, statistical models, optimization algorithms, machine learning, and domain-specific engineering calculations. These models transform observations into explanations, predictions, and scenarios.

The service layer provides functions to users: dashboards, alerts, planning tools, maintenance systems, scenario comparison, visualization, and APIs. Different users need different interfaces. A mayor may need strategic indicators, while a water engineer needs network pressure and pump status.

The governance layer cuts across all others. It defines data ownership, access, cybersecurity, privacy, quality assurance, model validation, procurement, accountability, and institutional responsibilities. Treating governance as an afterthought is one of the most common mistakes in digital-twin programs.

A robust architecture should be modular. Cities change technologies over time, and no single vendor will remain optimal indefinitely. Open interfaces and standards allow individual components to evolve without requiring complete system replacement.

5. GIS, BIM, and the Spatial Foundation

Spatial representation is fundamental because nearly every urban phenomenon has a location. Geographic information systems provide the spatial backbone of many Urban Digital Twins. GIS manages parcels, roads, networks, land use, administrative boundaries, topography, environmental zones, and demographic information.

Building information modeling provides a different type of detail. BIM represents building components, materials, systems, and relationships in ways that support design, construction, and facility management. When BIM is integrated with GIS, the city can connect detailed buildings and infrastructure to their broader urban context.

This integration is especially valuable for planning and asset management. A proposed building can be evaluated in relation to transport accessibility, flood risk, sunlight, views, infrastructure capacity, and surrounding land use. Underground utilities can be connected to road construction schedules. Emergency planners can understand building access, occupancy, and surrounding street conditions.

However, GIS-BIM integration is technically challenging. Differences in scale, geometry, semantics, level of detail, and coordinate reference systems must be managed. A building model may contain information far more detailed than necessary for citywide analysis. Efficient systems therefore simplify or transform data according to use.

CityGML, IFC, and related standards contribute to interoperability, but standards alone do not solve organizational problems. Agencies must agree on authoritative datasets, update responsibilities, identifiers, and quality requirements.

The spatial foundation should also incorporate uncertainty. Property boundaries, underground utilities, building heights, and demographic estimates may contain errors. A trustworthy digital twin should communicate confidence rather than create a false impression of precision.

6. Internet of Things and Real-Time Urban Sensing

IoT provides one of the mechanisms through which the digital representation is synchronized with the physical city. Sensors can measure traffic flow, public transport location, electricity use, water pressure, air quality, noise, temperature, rainfall, river levels, waste-bin fullness, structural vibration, and building occupancy.

Real-time data improve situational awareness. A traffic model can be updated with current congestion. A flood twin can incorporate rainfall and river observations. A building-energy twin can compare actual consumption with expected performance. A utility can identify abnormal pressure patterns.

Yet real-time data are not always necessary. Strategic land-use planning may use annual or monthly updates. Asset condition may be inspected periodically. Designing every component for real-time synchronization increases cost and complexity without necessarily improving decisions.

Sensor reliability is critical. Measurements may drift, fail, or become disconnected. Digital twins should therefore include data-quality monitoring, calibration records, redundancy where consequences are high, and mechanisms for detecting anomalies.

IoT also creates cybersecurity exposure. A compromised sensor can provide false information; a compromised actuator can produce physical consequences. Device identity, encryption, access control, secure firmware updates, and network segmentation are fundamental.

Urban Digital Twin architecture should therefore treat IoT as a managed infrastructure layer, not as a collection of inexpensive gadgets. The quality of the twin cannot exceed the quality of the observations on which it relies.

7. Data Integration, Semantics, and Interoperability

Urban data are heterogeneous. One agency records road segments using one identifier; another uses street names; a utility uses asset codes; a private mobility company uses GPS coordinates. Without semantic integration, datasets that refer to the same physical place or event cannot easily be combined.

Interoperability has technical, syntactic, semantic, and organizational dimensions. Technical interoperability concerns whether systems can communicate. Syntactic interoperability concerns whether data formats are compatible. Semantic interoperability concerns whether the same concepts have the same meaning. Organizational interoperability concerns whether institutions have procedures and authority to exchange and use the information.

Semantic models and knowledge graphs can help represent relationships among urban entities. A building is located on a parcel; the parcel is connected to a street; the building receives electricity through a feeder and water through a service connection; residents use nearby transit stops. Representing these relationships creates a richer digital environment.

Metadata are equally important. Users need to know when data were collected, by whom, at what accuracy, under what definition, and with what limitations. Data without metadata are difficult to trust.

Interoperability should be addressed during procurement. Proprietary platforms that cannot export data or provide documented APIs can trap cities in long-term vendor dependence. Open standards and modular architecture preserve flexibility.

The deeper goal is not merely data sharing. It is shared urban meaning. A Digital Twin becomes powerful when multiple disciplines can understand how their data and models relate.

8. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in the Urban Twin

Artificial intelligence expands the analytical capability of Urban Digital Twins. Machine learning can forecast traffic, energy demand, water consumption, pollution, equipment failure, or land-use change. Computer vision can identify vehicles, pedestrians, construction progress, road damage, or building features from imagery.

AI is particularly useful when relationships are complex and data-rich. A flood-risk model may combine rainfall, drainage, terrain, river conditions, soil moisture, and historical events. A mobility system may predict travel demand using weather, events, public transport, and road conditions.

Predictive maintenance is another major application. Sensor data from bridges, pumps, elevators, transformers, or HVAC systems can be analyzed to identify abnormal patterns. Maintenance can then be prioritized according to risk instead of fixed intervals.

AI also supports anomaly detection. A digital twin can compare observed conditions with expected behavior. Unexpected water flows may suggest leakage; unusual energy use may indicate equipment malfunction; unexpected traffic patterns may signal an incident.

However, AI models can fail. Historical data may contain bias. Conditions may change. Rare extreme events may not be represented in training data. Model outputs should therefore include validation, uncertainty assessment, and human oversight.

In public administration, explainability is important. If an algorithm recommends infrastructure investment or enforcement actions, decision makers should understand the basis and limitations of the recommendation.

9. Generative AI and the New Frontier of Urban Digital Twins

Generative artificial intelligence is beginning to influence Urban Digital Twin development in new ways. Recent research has examined the use of generative models to create synthetic urban data, alternative

scenarios, design options, textual interfaces, and even components of three-dimensional urban models. This development can reduce the cost of scenario creation and make digital-twin systems more accessible to non-specialists.

One promising application is conversational interaction. Instead of requiring users to navigate complex GIS interfaces, a planner may ask, in natural language, which neighborhoods have the greatest combined exposure to heat, traffic pollution, and low green-space access. A generative AI interface could translate the question into queries, retrieve relevant layers, summarize results, and suggest further analysis.

Generative AI can also assist scenario design. Planners can explore alternative street layouts, building configurations, transit options, or development patterns. However, generated designs should be treated as hypotheses rather than authoritative solutions.

Synthetic data may help when real data are sparse or privacy-sensitive. Yet synthetic data can reproduce hidden biases or create unrealistic distributions. Validation against real-world knowledge remains essential.

Generative AI also introduces risks of hallucination. A language model can produce plausible but incorrect statements about urban assets or regulations. Therefore, critical outputs should be grounded in verified data from the twin and linked to traceable sources.

The most useful role of generative AI may be as an interface and augmentation layer that helps humans navigate complex urban information while leaving validated models and authoritative databases responsible for factual and engineering integrity.

10. Simulation: Testing the Future Before Building It

One of the most important functions of an Urban Digital Twin is simulation. Cities routinely make decisions with long-term consequences: new roads, transit lines, zoning changes, housing developments, flood defenses, energy networks, and public facilities. Simulation allows alternative decisions to be tested before capital is committed.

Transport simulation can estimate congestion, travel times, emissions, and public transport performance. Energy models can estimate building demand and grid impacts. Hydrological models can test flood scenarios. Microclimate models can evaluate heat, shade, and wind. Agent-based models can represent the behavior of households, travelers, or firms.

The digital twin provides a common context in which these models can share data. A land-use scenario can alter travel demand; transport accessibility can affect land value; new development can affect energy and water demand; urban form can affect heat exposure.

Simulation does not eliminate uncertainty. Model outputs depend on assumptions, calibration, and scenario definitions. Digital twins should therefore support sensitivity analysis and comparison rather than present one forecast as certain.

The ability to test policies before implementation is especially valuable for public communication. Citizens can see potential consequences of development alternatives. However, visual simulation should not manipulate participation by presenting uncertain futures as predetermined outcomes.

A mature Urban Digital Twin should distinguish observed data, modeled estimates, forecasts, and normative scenarios so users understand what kind of information they are seeing.

11. Urban Planning and Land-Use Management

Urban planning is one of the natural application areas for Digital Twins. Planners must coordinate land use, transportation, housing, public facilities, environmental protection, and infrastructure capacity over long periods.

A UDT can integrate cadastral data, zoning, building permits, transport accessibility, demographic projections, infrastructure networks, environmental risk, and real estate development. Proposed plans can be evaluated for multiple outcomes.

Three-dimensional visualization is especially useful for urban design. Building height, shadow, views, street enclosure, heritage context, and public space can be examined. But planning value goes beyond visualization. The same development can be tested for traffic generation, water demand, energy consumption, school capacity, flood exposure, and access to green space.

Digital twins can also improve development control. Permit applications can be checked against zoning rules or infrastructure constraints. Construction progress can be compared with approved designs using imagery or scans.

However, planning decisions involve values. Optimization cannot decide by itself how to balance economic growth, heritage, affordability, environmental protection, and social equity. The twin should inform deliberation rather than replace democratic planning.

12. Mobility and Transportation Digital Twins

Transportation systems are highly dynamic and well suited to digital-twin methods. Roads, public transport, pedestrians, bicycles, freight, parking, and traffic signals generate continuous data.

A mobility twin can integrate traffic sensors, GPS from buses or fleets, ticketing data, road incidents, weather, events, and infrastructure condition. It can support real-time operations and strategic planning.

Traffic management can use the twin to evaluate signal timing, diversions, or incident response. Public transport agencies can monitor reliability and simulate schedule changes. Planners can test new bus lanes, rail lines, cycling networks, or congestion-management policies.

Electric vehicle adoption adds a new dimension because mobility and electricity systems become coupled. A digital twin can estimate where charging demand will emerge and how it will affect distribution networks.

Freight twins can improve logistics by analyzing delivery patterns, loading zones, ports, and distribution centers. This can reduce congestion and emissions.

Privacy is a major issue because mobility data can reveal personal routines. Aggregation, anonymization, minimization, and access controls should be built into architecture.

13. Energy and Building Digital Twins

Buildings are among the most mature domains for digital twins because BIM provides detailed asset models and building-management systems provide operational data. A building digital twin can combine geometry, materials, equipment, occupancy, weather, and energy consumption.

At district scale, multiple building twins can be integrated with electricity networks, solar generation, batteries, district cooling, and electric vehicle charging. This creates an urban energy twin.

Energy twins can support efficiency by comparing actual performance with expected benchmarks. They can identify abnormal consumption, optimize HVAC systems, and test retrofit options.

They can also support grid interaction. Buildings with flexible loads can respond to electricity prices or grid constraints. Batteries can be scheduled according to solar production and peak demand.

For urban planning, building-energy simulations can estimate future demand under different development scenarios or climate conditions.

Embodied carbon can also be incorporated by linking buildings to material inventories. As operational energy becomes cleaner, lifecycle material impacts become more important.

A key challenge is data access. Building owners, utilities, tenants, and municipalities may control different information. Governance must define appropriate sharing while protecting commercial and personal data.

14. Water, Wastewater, and Flood Digital Twins

Urban water systems are spatially extensive, partly underground, and affected by changing demand and environmental conditions. Digital twins can provide operators with a more coherent view of networks that are otherwise difficult to observe.

A water-supply twin can integrate pipe maps, pressure sensors, flow meters, smart meters, pumps, reservoirs, water-quality data, and hydraulic models. Operators can identify leakage, simulate valve changes, and evaluate network expansion.

Wastewater twins can model sewer flows, treatment plants, and overflow risk. Sensors can identify rising levels and pump problems.

Flood twins are particularly important for climate-resilient cities. They can combine terrain, land cover, drainage networks, rainfall radar, river levels, tides, pumps, and weather forecasts. Scenario simulation can estimate which streets, buildings, and critical facilities are at risk.

For Indonesia, these applications are highly relevant because intense rainfall, coastal flooding, land subsidence in some metropolitan areas, drainage constraints, and rapid urbanization create complex water risks.

Digital twins can improve warning and planning, but they depend on accurate drainage maps and reliable field data. In many cities, underground network records are incomplete. Building the twin therefore often begins with improving basic asset information.

15. Waste and Circular Economy Digital Twins

Waste management can also benefit from digital twins. Collection routes, bins, transfer stations, recycling facilities, composting, waste-to-energy plants, and landfills form a logistics and processing network.

A waste twin can combine generation estimates, collection data, fleet location, facility capacity, material flows, and environmental monitoring. Route optimization can reduce fuel use. Facility simulation can identify bottlenecks.

Material-flow analysis can extend the twin toward circular economy management. The city can estimate where construction materials, plastics, organics, electronics, or other resources enter and leave the urban system.

Construction digital twins can support deconstruction and material reuse by maintaining information about building components. Digital material passports could eventually help recover resources when buildings are renovated or demolished.

Landfill monitoring can integrate methane, leachate, settlement, and environmental data.

The strategic objective should remain waste prevention and circularity, not merely efficient disposal. Digital twins can help identify where materials are lost and where recovery systems can create value.

16. Environmental and Climate Digital Twins

Environmental conditions are dynamic and spatially uneven. Urban Digital Twins can integrate air quality, temperature, vegetation, noise, water quality, soil conditions, biodiversity, and climate risk.

Heat is an increasingly important urban challenge. A climate twin can combine satellite thermal imagery, local weather sensors, building form, vegetation, and surface materials to identify heat islands. Planners can simulate tree planting, shading, cool roofs, or changes in urban form.

Air-quality twins can combine sensors, traffic, weather, and dispersion models. This supports both monitoring and policy evaluation.

Green infrastructure can be represented as functional infrastructure. Parks, trees, wetlands, and permeable surfaces can provide cooling, stormwater retention, biodiversity, and recreation. Digital twins can help quantify these multiple benefits.

Climate-change scenarios should be integrated into long-term planning. Infrastructure designed for historical conditions may not be sufficient in future climates.

Environmental twins should also communicate uncertainty. Climate projections and ecological processes are not perfectly predictable. Decision makers need ranges and scenarios rather than false precision.

17. Disaster Risk Reduction and Urban Resilience

Digital twins can strengthen resilience by supporting preparedness, response, and recovery. Before disasters, cities can model exposure and vulnerability. During events, real-time data can update situational awareness. After events, imagery and sensors can support damage assessment.

Earthquake twins may combine hazard models with building inventories and structural information. Flood twins can identify evacuation routes. Wildfire twins can support peri-urban risk monitoring. Extreme-heat twins can identify vulnerable populations and critical cooling needs.

Critical infrastructure interdependency is especially important. A hospital may remain structurally intact but become unusable if electricity, water, telecommunications, or road access fail. A resilience twin should represent these dependencies.

Scenario exercises can be conducted in the digital environment. Emergency agencies can test alternative response strategies and identify bottlenecks.

Resilience also requires the digital twin itself to survive disruption. Cloud dependence, network failure, cyberattack, or power outage can reduce availability. Critical applications need backup power, redundant communications, offline capability, and secure recovery procedures.

18. Infrastructure Asset Management and Predictive Maintenance

Cities own or regulate vast portfolios of infrastructure: roads, bridges, tunnels, pipes, pumps, streetlights, public buildings, drainage systems, and public spaces. Asset management requires information about location, condition, risk, cost, and maintenance history.

A digital twin can connect each asset to inspection records, sensor data, work orders, documents, and risk models. This creates a lifecycle information environment.

Predictive maintenance uses data to estimate when failure is becoming more likely. Instead of replacing equipment on a fixed schedule or waiting for failure, maintenance can be prioritized according to condition and consequence.

For bridges, sensors may monitor vibration, strain, displacement, or temperature. For pumps and rotating machinery, vibration and power use may reveal degradation. Road condition can be monitored using vehicle-mounted cameras or mobile mapping.

Asset management should consider criticality. Not every asset needs dense sensing. Resources should focus on assets whose failure would have high consequences or whose condition is difficult to observe otherwise.

Digital twins can also support capital planning by combining deterioration models with budget scenarios. Managers can compare the long-term consequences of preventive maintenance versus deferred investment.

19. Public Health and Social Infrastructure

Urban Digital Twins can support public health by linking environmental exposure, mobility, accessibility, and service capacity. Heat, air pollution, noise, sanitation, and transport all affect health.

A health-oriented twin might map hospitals, clinics, emergency response, population density, heat vulnerability, and transport accessibility. During disasters, this can support resource allocation.

Urban accessibility analysis can identify neighborhoods with poor access to schools, parks, markets, health services, or public transport. The twin can test alternative facility locations.

However, health and demographic data are highly sensitive. Privacy protection should be stronger than for ordinary infrastructure data. Individual-level information should be minimized unless there is a legitimate and lawful need.

Digital twins should not create a surveillance approach to public health. Their purpose should be environmental prevention, service planning, and resilience rather than excessive monitoring of individuals.

20. Citizen Participation and Collaborative Planning

Urban planning is not only a technical process. Citizens possess local knowledge about flooding, safety, accessibility, cultural value, and daily experience that may not appear in administrative databases.

Digital twins can support participatory planning by making complex proposals easier to understand. Residents can visualize development scenarios, compare alternatives, and provide geographically specific feedback.

Virtual reality and web-based three-dimensional environments can support engagement, although accessibility should be considered. Not all citizens have high-speed devices or digital literacy.

Crowdsourced data can complement official information. Residents can report potholes, flooding, or inaccessible sidewalks. However, crowdsourced data may be socially biased toward groups with greater digital access.

Participation should occur early enough to influence decisions. A digital twin should not be used merely to persuade the public after decisions are already made.

Trust requires transparency about model assumptions. If a simulation is used to justify policy, citizens should be able to understand its purpose, limitations, and responsible institution.

21. Cybersecurity of Urban Digital Twins

An Urban Digital Twin can become a high-value target because it integrates information about critical infrastructure and operational conditions. Cybersecurity must therefore be a foundational design requirement.

Threats include unauthorized access, ransomware, manipulation of sensor data, disruption of communication, theft of sensitive infrastructure maps, and compromise of connected actuators. Supply-chain vulnerabilities can enter through third-party software or devices.

Zero-trust architecture, strong identity management, encryption, segmentation, continuous monitoring, secure development, and vulnerability management are important controls.

Digital twins should distinguish between public data and restricted operational data. Publishing detailed information about critical infrastructure may create security risks.

Model integrity also matters. Attackers may attempt to alter simulation parameters or data to influence decisions. Version control, audit logs, cryptographic integrity, and independent validation can reduce risk.

Cybersecurity exercises should include the Digital Twin. Cities need procedures for continuing essential operations if the twin becomes unavailable or untrusted.

22. Privacy, Ethics, and Algorithmic Accountability

The Urban Digital Twin can combine mobility, building occupancy, environmental observations, transactions, and administrative data. Such integration creates powerful analytical capability but also raises privacy risks.

Privacy-by-design requires data minimization, purpose limitation, appropriate anonymization, retention limits, and access control. The twin should not collect data simply because technology makes collection possible.

Ethical questions also arise from unequal sensing. Wealthier neighborhoods may be better represented because they have more connected infrastructure. Informal settlements may be underrepresented. Models trained on uneven data can reinforce inequality.

Algorithmic accountability requires documentation of model purpose, training data, assumptions, validation, and limitations. Decisions that materially affect rights or access to services should not be delegated to opaque algorithms without oversight.

The concept of a digital twin can create a misleading sense that the virtual city is complete and objective. In reality, every representation includes and excludes information. Ethical governance requires awareness of what is missing and whose experience may not be captured.

23. Data Governance and Institutional Ownership

Urban Digital Twins span institutional boundaries. Transport agencies, utilities, planning departments, emergency services, property registries, private operators, and citizens all generate data.

Data governance defines who is responsible for each dataset, who may access it, how quality is maintained, how changes are documented, and how disputes are resolved.

Authoritative sources should be identified. When two datasets disagree about a road, building, or utility asset, there should be a process for deciding which source governs and how corrections are made.

Data-sharing agreements are essential when private companies contribute mobility, telecommunications, or building data. Commercial confidentiality and public value must be balanced.

A metropolitan Digital Twin may require governance across multiple municipalities. Regional institutions or shared standards can help coordinate.

Institutional ownership should be durable. A twin should not depend entirely on a temporary project team or vendor. Public institutions need internal capability to govern architecture, data, and long-term evolution.

24. Model Governance, Validation, and Uncertainty

A digital twin contains models as well as data. These models may influence major investments, emergency decisions, or public policy. Model governance is therefore essential.

Every important model should have a documented purpose, responsible owner, assumptions, calibration process, validation history, version, and limitations. Changes should be controlled.

Validation compares model outputs with observed reality. A traffic model should reproduce known travel patterns within acceptable limits. A flood model should be tested against historical events where possible.

Uncertainty should be explicit. Forecasts should often be expressed as ranges or scenarios. A visually precise map can conceal substantial uncertainty.

Models should also be periodically reviewed because cities change. Travel behavior, climate, technology, and land use may shift, causing models to become outdated.

Independent review can be valuable for high-stakes applications. Transparency improves trust and reduces the risk of institutional overconfidence.

25. Financing and Economic Evaluation

Urban Digital Twins require sustained investment in data, platforms, connectivity, cybersecurity, modeling, staff, and maintenance. The cost is not limited to software licenses.

Economic evaluation should identify specific benefits: reduced congestion, avoided flood damage, improved maintenance, energy savings, faster permitting, better capital allocation, or reduced service disruption.

Some benefits are difficult to monetize. Improved coordination, transparency, and resilience may produce large public value without direct revenue.

A phased approach can improve financial sustainability. Cities can begin with high-value use cases that demonstrate measurable benefit, then expand shared architecture.

Public-private partnerships may be appropriate for some components, but data governance and long-term dependence should be carefully managed.

Total cost of ownership should include migration and exit. Cheap proprietary systems can become expensive if future integration is difficult.

The economic case should therefore be based on lifecycle public value rather than technological prestige.

26. Organizational Capability and Workforce Development

A Digital Twin is only as effective as the organization that uses it. Cities need professionals who understand urban systems, data, modeling, cybersecurity, procurement, and public policy.

Domain expertise remains indispensable. A data scientist cannot replace a transport engineer, planner, hydrologist, or utility operator. The challenge is interdisciplinary collaboration.

New roles may include urban data architects, digital-twin managers, geospatial data engineers, model validators, cybersecurity specialists, and data stewards.

Change management is important because digital twins alter workflows. Staff may resist systems that appear to monitor performance or threaten established expertise. Participation in design and clear communication can improve adoption.

Training should focus not only on software operation but on systems thinking and model interpretation. Users need to understand uncertainty and avoid overconfidence in digital outputs.

Universities can support this capability through interdisciplinary programs, applied research, and living laboratories.

27. Procurement and Avoiding Vendor Lock-In

Urban Digital Twins are often procured through large technology contracts. This creates a risk that one vendor controls the platform, data formats, visualization, and integration interfaces.

Cities should define architecture and standards before procurement. Contracts should require data portability, documented APIs, cybersecurity support, and transition assistance.

Modular procurement can separate data infrastructure, visualization, analytics, and domain applications. This increases management complexity but preserves flexibility.

Open-source components may reduce dependence but still require professional support. The important principle is not whether software is proprietary or open source, but whether the city retains control over data and strategic architecture.

Service-level agreements should define availability, performance, support, patching, and incident response.

Procurement should also evaluate vendor capacity for long-term maintenance rather than focusing only on demonstration features.

28. Lifecycle Management of the Digital Twin

A UDT is never finished. Buildings are constructed and demolished, roads change, sensors fail, software evolves, and data definitions are revised.

Lifecycle management should include update processes, data-quality monitoring, model recalibration, cybersecurity patching, documentation, and staff continuity.

Version control is important because decisions may need to be reconstructed later. Users should know which data and model version supported a particular analysis.

The twin may also need historical states. A temporal database can allow users to understand how the city changed over time.

Decommissioning should be planned for obsolete components. Data must be migrated securely, credentials revoked, and hardware responsibly recycled.

The long-term nature of urban infrastructure means the Digital Twin should outlive individual technology products. Architecture should therefore emphasize continuity and evolution.

29. International Examples and Lessons

Cities around the world have developed digital-twin initiatives with different objectives. Some focus on urban planning and three-dimensional representation; others emphasize transport, infrastructure operations, climate analysis, or citizen engagement.

The Herrenberg case in Germany has been widely discussed because it combined urban modeling with citizen-oriented applications. Singapore's Virtual Singapore initiative illustrates the value of a national-city scale three-dimensional digital environment. Helsinki has developed detailed 3D city models linked to energy and planning applications. Various UK and European initiatives emphasize national digital-twin principles and information management.

These examples show that there is no single Urban Digital Twin architecture. Each city begins from different data, institutions, and priorities.

A common lesson is that strong base data and governance matter as much as visualization. Another is that use cases should guide development. Digital twins become sustainable when they are integrated into routine planning and operations rather than maintained as demonstration projects.

International examples should therefore inspire principles rather than be copied mechanically. Local legal frameworks, budgets, geography, institutional capacity, and public expectations differ.

30. Indonesia: Strategic Opportunities for Urban Digital Twins

Indonesia has strong reasons to explore Urban Digital Twins. Rapid urbanization, metropolitan complexity, disaster exposure, infrastructure investment, and growing digital capability create both need and opportunity.

Flood management is a particularly important application. Digital twins could integrate topography, drainage, rainfall, rivers, tides, land subsidence, pumps, roads, buildings, and population exposure. This could improve both long-term investment and real-time response.

Metropolitan mobility is another priority. Jakarta and other major urban regions require coordination across roads, rail, buses, private vehicles, motorcycles, freight, and land use. A mobility twin could support integrated corridor planning and evaluate the interaction between transport investments and development.

Urban expansion requires better coordination of land, housing, utilities, and public facilities. Digital twins can help identify where growth exceeds infrastructure capacity.

The development of Nusantara as Indonesia's new capital also creates an opportunity to embed digital-twin principles from the beginning, although technological ambition should remain connected to governance, maintainability, cybersecurity, and public value.

Secondary cities should not be excluded. They may adopt lighter, modular twins focused on particular problems such as flood risk, waste, water, or land-use control.

National standards could support interoperability across cities, while local governments retain control over context-specific applications. Universities can provide independent research, model validation, and workforce development.

31. Urban Digital Twin Maturity Model

Cities can understand their progress through a maturity model.

At Level 1, the city has fragmented digital models and datasets. GIS, BIM, and operational systems exist but are weakly connected.

At Level 2, the city creates integrated spatial models and dashboards. Data sharing improves, but synchronization is limited.

At Level 3, selected systems become dynamic digital shadows. IoT and operational data update models regularly.

At Level 4, predictive analytics, simulation, and cross-domain integration support planning and operations.

At Level 5, the Digital Twin becomes an institutionalized urban decision environment with mature governance, cybersecurity, interoperability, lifecycle management, and public participation. Some systems may support controlled bidirectional interaction with physical infrastructure.

Maturity should not be defined by technology alone. A city with advanced visualization but weak governance may be less mature than a city with simpler tools that are well integrated into decision processes.

Progress should therefore be assessed across data, technology, organization, governance, skills, security, and public value.

32. Key Performance Indicators for Urban Digital Twins

Performance measurement should focus on decision value. Useful indicators include data completeness, update frequency, sensor uptime, model accuracy, interoperability, platform availability, cybersecurity incidents, and user adoption.

Operational outcomes should also be measured. A flood twin may be evaluated by warning lead time and avoided disruption. A transport twin by travel-time reliability or planning efficiency. An asset twin by reduced failure and maintenance cost.

Planning outcomes may include faster scenario evaluation, reduced permitting time, or improved coordination across agencies.

Governance indicators can include documented data ownership, privacy compliance, model validation, and auditability.

Equity indicators are important. The twin should represent all neighborhoods adequately and should not direct benefits only toward areas with better digital infrastructure.

A small set of meaningful KPIs is preferable to an extensive dashboard that does not influence decisions.

33. Implementation Roadmap

A practical implementation roadmap begins with strategic objectives rather than platform procurement. The city should identify several high-value problems where integrated data and modeling can improve decisions.

The next step is an inventory of existing data, models, systems, standards, contracts, and institutional responsibilities. This often reveals that many components already exist.

Architecture should then be defined: common identifiers, spatial reference, APIs, cybersecurity, metadata, identity management, data governance, and model governance.

Pilot use cases can test the architecture. A flood district, transport corridor, or public-building portfolio can provide a manageable starting scale.

Evaluation should examine operational benefit, data quality, user adoption, lifecycle cost, cybersecurity, and integration difficulty.

Successful elements can then be scaled. Standardization and reusable components reduce marginal cost.

Long-term governance should be institutionalized through budgets, roles, policies, training, and periodic strategic review.

The roadmap should remain adaptive. Technology will evolve, but the city's core information architecture and governance principles should provide continuity.

34. Research and Education Agenda

Urban Digital Twins create an interdisciplinary research agenda connecting engineering, computer science, geography, architecture, planning, management, economics, law, and social science.

Technical research is needed on scalable simulation, interoperability, semantic models, edge computing, AI, uncertainty, and cybersecurity.

Urban research should examine whether digital twins actually improve planning outcomes and whether benefits justify costs. Comparative studies across cities are important.

Management research can examine organizational capability, procurement, governance, leadership, and institutional change. These dimensions often determine whether technology becomes embedded in practice.

Ethics research should examine surveillance, algorithmic power, representation, and data inequality.

In tropical developing cities, more work is needed on flood twins, informal urban development, incomplete infrastructure data, low-cost sensing, and institutional adaptation.

Universities can create campus digital twins as living laboratories. Buildings, energy, mobility, water, and public space can be represented and studied.

For management education, Urban Digital Twins provide a powerful case in strategic decision making under complexity. Students can learn how technology, institutions, finance, public values, and uncertainty interact.

35. Future Directions: From Digital Twins to Urban Intelligence

Urban Digital Twins will become more dynamic as sensing, AI, generative models, and computing improve. However, the most important evolution may be organizational rather than technological.

Federated twins may connect multiple domain twins rather than create one gigantic centralized model. This can improve resilience and institutional ownership.

Real-time edge intelligence may allow more local processing. Generative AI may make complex systems easier to query. Knowledge graphs may improve semantic integration. Immersive interfaces may support planning and training.

Digital twins may increasingly support autonomous optimization in limited domains such as building controls or energy systems. High-stakes urban decisions, however, should remain accountable to human institutions.

National and regional digital-twin ecosystems may emerge, allowing cities to share standards and models while retaining local control.

Sustainability will become a greater concern because digital infrastructure itself consumes energy and materials. The value of computational sophistication should be weighed against environmental and financial cost.

The future Urban Digital Twin will therefore be judged less by how perfectly it mirrors reality and more by how effectively it improves collective intelligence.

36. Conclusion: The Digital Twin as Urban Knowledge Infrastructure

The Urban Digital Twin represents a significant evolution in the way cities can be understood and managed. It combines spatial models, real-time data, simulation, artificial intelligence, and institutional knowledge into a dynamic environment for decision support.

Its significance lies not in creating a visually perfect virtual city but in reducing the distance between observation, understanding, prediction, and action. It can help planners test alternatives, utilities manage assets, emergency agencies anticipate disruption, and citizens understand proposals.

Yet the technology also creates risks. Poor data can produce false confidence. Proprietary systems can create lock-in. Surveillance can undermine trust. Cyberattack can threaten critical systems. Models can reproduce social bias. These risks require governance equal in sophistication to the technology.

The most successful Urban Digital Twins will be purpose-driven, modular, interoperable, secure, ethically governed, and institutionally embedded. They will combine quantitative intelligence with professional judgment and democratic deliberation.

For Indonesia, Urban Digital Twins can support more integrated management of rapidly growing metropolitan regions, strengthen resilience to floods and other hazards, improve infrastructure investment, and support sustainable urban development. The opportunity is substantial, but implementation should begin with strong data foundations, clear governance, realistic use cases, local capability, and lifecycle financing.

Ultimately, the Urban Digital Twin should be understood as a form of urban knowledge infrastructure. Like roads or water networks, it requires long-term stewardship. Its purpose is to help cities learn about themselves, anticipate change, coordinate complex systems, and make better decisions for the people who live in them.

37. The Urban Digital Twin as a Policy Laboratory

An important strategic interpretation of the Urban Digital Twin is to see it as a policy laboratory. Traditional urban policy often relies on retrospective statistics and relatively slow planning cycles. A digital twin can shorten the learning cycle by allowing alternative policies to be explored before implementation and then compared with real outcomes after implementation. This creates a more experimental form of governance, provided that experimentation remains transparent and accountable.

Consider a policy to reduce congestion in a central business district. A city might evaluate several combinations: congestion charging, parking reform, bus priority, cycling infrastructure, remote-work incentives, and changes in traffic-signal operation. A mobility twin can estimate how travel patterns may respond, while an emissions model can estimate air-quality implications and an economic model can examine distributional effects. The purpose is not to identify a mathematically perfect policy, but to reveal trade-offs before irreversible decisions are made.

The same approach applies to land-use policy. Increasing allowable building density near transit stations may improve public transport viability and housing supply, but it can also increase demand for water, schools, electricity, drainage, and public space. A cross-domain digital twin can expose these interactions. Planning thus becomes less dependent on isolated sectoral forecasts.

Policy experimentation also requires careful treatment of behavioral response. People are not mechanical components. Travelers adapt routes, developers change investment strategies, households respond to prices, and businesses relocate. Agent-based models and empirical behavioral models can improve realism, but they still contain assumptions. Policy makers should therefore compare multiple behavioral scenarios rather than depend on a single prediction.

The greatest advantage of a policy laboratory may be institutional learning. After a policy is implemented, observed data can be compared with predicted outcomes. Differences reveal where models or assumptions were wrong. This feedback can improve future decisions. In this sense, the twin becomes part of a continuous policy-learning system.

However, digital experimentation must not bypass democratic processes. Simulation results should inform public debate rather than convert political choices into apparently technical necessities. Urban policy involves values—who pays, who benefits, which risks are acceptable, and which forms of development are desirable. A Digital Twin can clarify consequences, but society must still choose among alternatives.

38. Metropolitan and Regional Digital Twins

Many urban problems extend beyond municipal boundaries. Commuting regions, watersheds, electricity networks, air pollution, freight corridors, housing markets, and ecological systems operate at metropolitan or regional scale. A Digital Twin confined to one municipality may therefore provide an incomplete representation of the forces shaping urban outcomes.

Metropolitan digital twins require institutional interoperability as well as technical interoperability. Neighboring municipalities may use different GIS standards, asset identifiers, procurement systems, and data-access rules. Utilities may serve several jurisdictions. Transport services may cross administrative boundaries. Regional coordination is therefore a governance challenge.

A federated architecture can allow each municipality or agency to maintain its own authoritative systems while exchanging standardized data relevant to metropolitan analysis. This may be more realistic than constructing one centralized database. Common reference systems, shared metadata, and APIs can support integration without eliminating institutional autonomy.

Regional twins are especially valuable for transport. Residents often live in one municipality and work in another. Decisions about housing density in peripheral areas affect traffic and infrastructure in central cities. A metropolitan twin can evaluate these relationships more accurately.

Watersheds provide another example. Flood risk in one city may be influenced by upstream land-use change in another jurisdiction. Digital twins that follow hydrological boundaries rather than administrative boundaries can improve understanding and coordination.

For Indonesia, metropolitan-scale twins could be particularly valuable in regions such as Jabodetabek, Bandung Raya, Gerbangkertosusila, and other urban agglomerations where governance is distributed across multiple local governments. The strategic objective should be shared situational awareness and coordinated planning rather than centralized technological control.

39. Equity, Representation, and the Risk of a Digitally Unequal City

Urban Digital Twins promise evidence-based decision making, but the evidence itself may be socially uneven. Formal neighborhoods often have better cadastral records, more sensors, more connected buildings, and stronger administrative data. Informal or rapidly changing settlements may be poorly represented. If policy increasingly depends on the digital twin, underrepresented communities risk becoming invisible to decision systems.

This problem can be described as representational inequality. A place may exist physically but appear only partially in the digital city. Roads may be unmapped, addresses incomplete, household conditions unknown, and service needs estimated poorly. Investments guided by digital completeness could unintentionally favor areas where data are already strong.

Equity therefore requires active strategies to improve representation. Participatory mapping, community surveys, satellite imagery, mobile data collection, and collaboration with local organizations can fill gaps. Yet

data collection should not become intrusive. Communities should understand why data are collected and how they will be used.

Model outputs should be disaggregated. A policy that improves average travel time may worsen access for low-income neighborhoods. A flood investment may protect high-value property while leaving vulnerable populations exposed. The twin should support distributional analysis, not only aggregate optimization.

Accessibility is also relevant to participation. Sophisticated virtual-reality environments may impress experts but exclude citizens with limited devices, bandwidth, or digital literacy. Public communication should use multiple formats, including simple maps, printed materials, meetings, and accessible web interfaces.

The ethical principle is straightforward: the digital city should not become more legible to government while some citizens become less visible in policy. A mature Urban Digital Twin should improve recognition of diverse urban realities and support more equitable allocation of attention and resources.

40. Governance Architecture: From Project Office to Permanent Urban Capability

Many digital-twin initiatives begin as innovation projects funded through special programs. This is useful for experimentation but creates a sustainability problem. When project funding ends, staff disperse, vendor contracts expire, and data stop being updated. The twin gradually becomes obsolete. Long-term success therefore requires transition from project governance to permanent institutional capability.

A durable governance architecture needs several functions. First, there must be strategic ownership: an authority responsible for ensuring that the twin supports city priorities. Second, there must be technical architecture governance to maintain standards, interfaces, cybersecurity, and interoperability. Third, data stewardship must be distributed among agencies responsible for authoritative datasets. Fourth, model governance must ensure that analytical tools are validated and documented. Fifth, there must be service management for user support, platform reliability, and incident response.

These functions do not necessarily require one large central department. A hub-and-spoke structure can work well. A small central digital-twin office establishes standards and shared infrastructure, while transport, water, planning, environment, and other agencies retain domain responsibility. This protects subject-matter expertise and reduces the risk that a technology office becomes disconnected from operations.

Executive leadership remains important because cross-agency integration often encounters organizational resistance. Departments may hesitate to share data, change processes, or accept common standards. Leadership can align incentives and resolve institutional conflict.

Governance also requires budgeting discipline. Data maintenance, cybersecurity, cloud services, software support, model updates, training, and equipment replacement should be included in recurrent budgets. Treating them as one-time innovation expenses is unrealistic.

Finally, governance should include external accountability. Universities, professional associations, civil society, and independent auditors can contribute technical review and public scrutiny. A Digital Twin used for important public decisions should not operate as an opaque internal system.

41. A Strategic Framework for Executives and Urban Leaders

For senior leaders, the technical complexity of Urban Digital Twins can be overwhelming. A practical strategic framework can simplify decision making around five questions: purpose, representation, integration, governance, and value.

The first question is purpose: which decisions should improve because the Digital Twin exists? Clear use cases prevent technology-driven procurement. Examples might include flood investment, metropolitan transport planning, infrastructure maintenance, development control, or emergency response.

The second question is representation: what must the twin know to support those decisions? This determines necessary spatial resolution, update frequency, historical depth, and model complexity. Not every asset needs real-time sensing, and not every building needs detailed BIM.

The third question is integration: which agencies, systems, and datasets must interact? Leaders should identify institutional dependencies early. Technical interfaces can be designed only after responsibilities and authoritative sources are understood.

The fourth question is governance: who owns the data, validates models, approves access, manages cybersecurity, finances operations, and is accountable for decisions? A sophisticated platform with unclear governance is a strategic liability.

The fifth question is value: how will success be demonstrated? Performance should be linked to measurable improvements such as reduced downtime, faster planning, avoided flood losses, improved public participation, lower maintenance cost, or greater infrastructure reliability.

Executives should also maintain a distinction between demonstration and institutionalization. A successful pilot proves that something can work. Institutionalization proves that the organization can operate, finance, govern, and improve it for many years. The latter is the true measure of smart-city maturity.

The leadership philosophy should therefore be selective ambition: ambitious about public outcomes and integration, but selective about technology. Urban Digital Twins should be expanded where they create demonstrable value and kept simple where complexity adds little. This discipline protects public resources and keeps the technology subordinate to urban purpose.

42. Integrating Urban Digital Twins with Sustainable Development Goals

Urban Digital Twins can contribute to sustainable development when their analytical capabilities are explicitly connected to environmental, social, and economic objectives. Their relevance extends beyond the narrow category of smart-city technology. They can support sustainable transport, energy efficiency, water security, resilient infrastructure, climate adaptation, disaster-risk reduction, environmental protection, and inclusive access to public services.

A sustainability-oriented twin should therefore include indicators that represent resource use and social outcomes rather than only operational efficiency. Building models can estimate energy and carbon. Mobility models can evaluate emissions and accessibility. Water models can examine losses and flood risk. Green-space models can evaluate heat mitigation and ecosystem services.

Lifecycle thinking is important because digital technology itself has an environmental footprint. Sensors, servers, networks, storage, and AI consume energy and materials. High-resolution models can require significant computing resources. The environmental benefit of additional computational complexity should therefore be evaluated.

Digital twins can also support circular economy strategies. Information about buildings and infrastructure can improve maintenance, extend asset life, and support reuse of materials. Waste and material-flow models can identify recovery opportunities.

Social sustainability requires attention to accessibility, affordability, health, safety, and equity. A city should not become technologically optimized while remaining socially fragmented. The twin can help reveal unequal exposure to pollution, heat, flooding, or poor transport access.

Connecting the Digital Twin to sustainability objectives creates an important discipline: technology must demonstrate how it contributes to better urban outcomes. The ultimate purpose is not a digital mirror of the city, but a better physical and social city.

Glossary

Application Programming Interface (API): A defined interface that enables software systems to exchange data or functions.

Artificial Intelligence (AI): Computational methods that perform tasks such as prediction, classification, optimization, perception, or language processing.

Building Information Modeling (BIM): A structured digital representation of physical and functional characteristics of buildings or infrastructure.

CityGML: An open data model and exchange format for semantic three-dimensional city models.

Cyber-physical system: A system in which digital computation and communication interact closely with physical processes.

Data governance: Rules, responsibilities, and processes for managing data quality, access, ownership, security, and use.

Digital model: A virtual representation without automatic data exchange with its physical counterpart.

Digital shadow: A digital representation that is automatically updated from the physical system, typically through one-way data flow.

Digital twin: A dynamic virtual representation linked to a physical asset or system through data and used for analysis, prediction, or control.

Edge computing: Processing data near the source rather than relying entirely on centralized cloud infrastructure.

Geographic Information System (GIS): A system for managing, analyzing, and visualizing spatially referenced information.

Generative AI: AI models that can create new text, images, data, code, designs, or scenarios based on learned patterns.

Interoperability: The ability of different systems, datasets, models, or organizations to exchange and meaningfully use information.

Internet of Things (IoT): Networks of physical devices equipped with sensing, processing, and communication capabilities.

Knowledge graph: A structured representation of entities and their semantic relationships.

Model governance: Processes for controlling model ownership, assumptions, versions, validation, risk, and accountability.

Predictive maintenance: Maintenance informed by data and models that estimate equipment condition and failure risk.

Remote sensing: Observation of the Earth or objects from satellites, aircraft, drones, or other non-contact platforms.

Scenario analysis: Systematic exploration of alternative plausible futures or policy choices.

Semantic interoperability: The ability of systems to exchange information with consistent meaning.

Urban Digital Twin (UDT): A dynamic digital representation of urban assets, processes, and conditions integrated with data and models to support urban decision making.

References

- Batty, M. (2024). Digital twins in city planning. *Nature Computational Science*, 4, 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-024-00606-7>
- 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>
- Mazzetto, S. (2024). A review of Urban Digital Twins integration, challenges, and future directions in smart city development. *Sustainability*, 16(19), 8337. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198337>
- 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>
- Shahzad, M., Shafiq, M. T., Douglas, D., & Kassem, M. (2022). Digital twins in built environments: An investigation of the characteristics, applications, and challenges. *Buildings*, 12(2), 120. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12020120>
- Xu, H., Omिताomu, 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>
- Urban Digital Twin Challenges: A systematic review and perspectives for sustainable smart cities. (2023). *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 99, 104862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104862>
- Navigating urban complexity: The transformative role of digital twins in smart city development. (2024). *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 111, 105583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2024.105583>
- 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>
- Barricelli, B. R., Casiraghi, E., & Fogli, D. (2019). A survey on digital twin: Definitions, characteristics, applications, and design implications. *IEEE Access*, 7, 167653–167671. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2953499>
- 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>

- Kritzing, W., Karner, M., Traar, G., Henjes, J., & Sihn, W. (2018). Digital Twin in manufacturing: A categorical literature review and classification. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(11), 1016–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.08.474>
- Biljecki, F., Stoter, J., Ledoux, H., Zlatanova, S., & Çöltekin, A. (2015). Applications of 3D city models: State of the art review. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 4(4), 2842–2889. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi4042842>
- Zanella, A., Bui, N., Castellani, A., Vangelista, L., & Zorzi, M. (2014). Internet of Things for smart cities. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 1(1), 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2014.2306328>
- Kitchin, R. (2014). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal*, 79, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-013-9516-8>
- Batty, M., Axhausen, K. W., Giannotti, F., Pozdnoukhov, A., Bazzani, A., Wachowicz, M., Ouzounis, G., & Portugali, Y. (2012). Smart cities of the future. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 214, 481–518. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2012-01703-3>

Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD | Institut Bisnis dan Multimedia (IBM ASMI) | www.rudycr.com/cv.pdf