RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT OF TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS
e-ISSN: 2773-5044

RMTB

Vol. 7 No. 1 (2026) 324-336
https://publisher.uthm.edu.my/periodicals/index.php/rmtb

Leveraging Integrated Systems for Urban Infrastructure Management

Syahirah Abdullah[1], Mohd Azwarie Mat Dzahir[1]*

[1] *Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Built Environment and Surveying, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Johor, 81310, MALAYSIA*

*Corresponding Author: mohdazwarie@utm.my
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30880/rmtb.2026.07.01.030

Article Info

Received: 31 Mac 2026
Accepted: 31 Mei 2026
Available online: 30 June 2026

Keywords

Urban infrastructure, Integrated system, asset management and monitoring

Abstract

Urban infrastructure is the backbone of modern cities, ensuring the seamless provision of essential services such as transportation, water supply, energy distribution, and waste management. However, the increasing complexity of urban environments, combined with aging infrastructure and growing population demands, presents significant challenges for asset management and monitoring. This research introduces an integrated framework for urban infrastructure asset management and monitoring, aimed at enhancing operational efficiency, sustainability, and resilience. By leveraging Internet of Things (IoT) technologies, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and Artificial Intelligence (AI), the framework enables real-time data acquisition, automated condition assessment, and intelligent decision-making. Central to this approach is the use of Building Information Modelling (BIM) standards to structure and categorize triggers and consequences across interdependent infrastructure assets. The framework incorporates predictive analytics and data-driven decision support mechanisms to facilitate proactive maintenance strategies, reduce service disruptions, and optimize resource allocation. The research contributes to the advancement of infrastructure governance by demonstrating how digital transformation can improve lifecycle performance and support adaptive, scalable solutions for sustainable urban development.

1. Introduction

Urban infrastructure is all the service structures provided for the people which include roads, railways, and even underground services like water, electricity, and gas. It forms the supporting structure for all activities of modern society by enabling the carrying out of daily functions (Du, *et al*., 2023). Infrastructure facilitates the lives of people by ensuring the availability of essential resources and contributes to the overall health, safety and well-being of society.

Today, the world is moving towards urbanization and is experiencing a phenomenon of rapid city growth which triggers even more focus on urban infrastructure. The urbanization phenomena making urban infrastructure more critical to ensuring the functioning of modern society (Clarke *et al*., 2017). There has been a growing demand for development and improvement of sufficient infrastructure to meet the increasing population needs. Economic growth, environmental concerns, public health, and the living standards of the urban residents are all interconnected and heavily rely on the quality of these infrastructure systems. Service interruptions, safety hazards, and other issues stem from neglected out-of-date infrastructure and mismanagement. Poorly managed and outdated infrastructure can result in service disruptions, safety hazards and inefficiencies, all of which impede economic growth and deteriorate the standard of living (Wei, *et al.*, 2020).

Nevertheless, many urban infrastructure systems around the world are aging. This has created substantial difficulties for municipalities. Inadequate maintenance, lack of funding and outdated technology have led to worsening situation, resulting in service disruptions and higher operating costs (Lafioune, *et al*., 2023). In addition, the pressures of urbanization, climate change and technological advancements require municipalities to not only maintain but also continuously upgrade their infrastructure to remain resilient to face the evolving challenges.

Moreover, it is obvious that many infrastructure components are interrelated. Even if the infrastructure systems are chained together for operational functionality, they are often separately created, controlled, and maintained by different parties (Almeida *et al.,* 2022). Fulfilling the demands of various parties is one of the greatest concerns. Due to lack of sufficient data and considerable experience, stakeholders can ignore the interrelation of elements of the infrastructure which can lead to undesirable social, economic, and environmental consequences.

Hence, an integrated system is needed to manage and monitor the relationships between urban infrastructure assets. By viewing different infrastructure assets (such as roads, land and cables), triggers (such as pipe leaks) and impacts (such as traffic disruptions) as integrated systems, each subdomain can be represented and encompasses the dependencies between them. The system can aid in decision making by supporting the collection and integration of information and showing the possible results of different triggers, aiding in determining if more information is needed, along with suggesting how to get that information.

2. Urban Infrastructure Asset Management

Urban infrastructure asset management is a measure of maintaining the asset's level of service (e.g., water supply, roads, bridges, rail, etc.) for current and future customers in accordance with the most economically efficient management (IPWEA, 2015). It comprises methods and procedures for a favorable macroeconomic impact of the infrastructure such as maintenance prioritization and implementation steps. Surveys of condition are also taken to gather more data on the infrastructure. Inventory, condition, and measure data are typically the ones that are housed in these databases.

Urban infrastructure consists of physical assets and services that support urban life. It includes a system of systems providing essential services to residents, businesses and public institutions. It is a series of activities in communications, transport, energy supply, water supply, and waste treatment (Bertolini et al., 2020). Urban infrastructure goes beyond physical. It significantly enhances the standard of life of residents, promotes economic activity, and encourages environmental sustainability (Muller et al., 2020). Urban infrastructure can classify into two forms, "hard" and "soft." Hard infrastructure is the tangible or physical services such as roads and bridges, and soft infrastructure are the processes and systems in place to support the physical infrastructures such as policies, regulations and management systems. An integrated approach of infrastructure management considers both the aspects to deliver urban services in the right manner.

Urban infrastructure is essential for the economic development of society. Effective infrastructure networks are important for the smooth operation of markets, trade in goods, and movement of people. Well-built infrastructure stimulates economic growth by raising productivity, lowering costs, and supporting investment. The quality of urban life is directly related to infrastructure. Availability of efficient water, power, transport, and communication infrastructure improves public health, amenity quality, and safety (Sundararajan et al., 2018). Sustainable infrastructure networks help to mitigate environmental degradation. Green buildings, efficient waste management networks, and sustainable transportation networks, for example, minimize carbon footprint while maximizing the utilization of resources (Gao et al., 2021). Urban infrastructure has a big impact on reducing social inequality. It does this by giving fair access to key services for vulnerable groups (Güney & Kara 2021). Urban infrastructure is key to how modern cities work. It allows economic, social, and environmental activities to happen. Every type of infrastructure plays a crucial role in keeping urban cities running. As cities grow and change, they'll need more well-kept, unified, and long-lasting infrastructure.

This chapter focuses on the management of urban infrastructure assets, emphasizing its vital role in promoting sustainability, efficiency, and resilience within urban environments. It addresses various challenges encountered when managing these assets, including aged infrastructure, urbanization, limited resources, and increased complexity in interdependent systems. The chapter points out the difference between the traditional and modern approach of managing assets. The traditional methods often stand alone and without coordination meanwhile the modern methods use technology, data analysis, and real-time tracking. This chapter also stresses the need for integrated systems to manage infrastructure assets, which can help cities optimize resources, enhance decision-making, and improve the overall delivery of urban services. By exploring both the limitations and advancements in management practices, this chapter highlights the necessity of embracing integrated systems to better, more proactively, and more sustainably manage urban infrastructure.

2.1 Challenges in Managing Urban Infrastructure

Urban infrastructure asset management plays a crucial role in ensuring the sustainability, efficiency, and resilience of cities. However, managing infrastructure assets presents numerous challenges. Studies have shown that infrastructure asset management poses a considerable challenge as presented in Table 1.

Table 1 *Challenges in Urban Infrastructure Asset Management*

Challenges	Albanwan et al., 2023	Sabato et al., 2023	Bhamidipati, 2015	Almeida et al., 2021	Lafioune et al., 2024	Okwori et al., 2024	Abdelkhalek et al., 2023	Weightage
Lack of financial	X				X	X		3
Lack of human resources	X				X	X		3
Deterioration of infrastructure		X	X	X	X		X	5
Lack of reliable data	X		X	X	X	X		5
Technological Gaps					X	X		2
Environmental factor		X	X		X		X	4
Political factor			X		X		X	3

One of the most critical challenges in urban infrastructure asset management is the lack of financial (Okwori *et al*., 2024; Albanwan *et al*., 2023; Lafioune *et al.,* 2024). Urban areas, particularly in developing regions where limited budgets hinder its facility maintenance, repairs, and infrastructure upgrades. Many municipalities face severe funding constraints, often diverting financial resources toward immediate concerns while neglecting long-term strategic asset management, leading to significant infrastructure deterioration over time. As a result, deferred maintenance contributes to assets remaining in poor conditions, reducing their lifespan, and increasing costs for emergency repairs or full replacements (Marlow *et al.,* 2015).

Besides, as urban infrastructure becomes more complex, the demand for skilled professionals continues to rise, often exceeding the local workforce's capacity (Okwori *et al.,* 2024; Albanwan *et al.,* 2023; Lafioune *et al.,* 2024). Rapid urban expansion makes it difficult for municipalities to attract and retain experts with the necessary technical knowledge to manage and maintain evolving infrastructure systems. This shortage hinders efficient asset management, making it harder to keep infrastructure functional and safe for public use (Lafioune *et al.,* 2024). Moreover, the lack of specialised expertise leads to maintenance delays and inefficiencies, accelerating the deterioration of aging urban assets and increasing associated risks.

Furthermore, the deterioration of urban infrastructure presents a major challenge, particularly as aging systems require immediate attention (Lafioune *et al.,* 2024; Sabato *et al.,* 2023; Abdelkhalek *et al.,* 2023; Almeida *et al.,* 2021; Bhamidipati, 2015). Many essential assets, including roads, bridges, water supply networks, and power grids, were built decades ago and have often exceeded their intended lifespan. As these structures continue to weaken, significant investment is needed for extensive repairs or full replacements to maintain functionality and ensure public safety (Capacci *et al.,* 2022). This issue affects both developed and developing nations, with many struggling to secure the financial and technical resources necessary for timely upgrades. A strategic, long-term asset management approach is crucial, integrating technology to monitor infrastructure conditions and detect potential problems early.

In addition, effective urban infrastructure management relies heavily on precise and accurate data, which is crucial for long-term planning and decision-making (Chohan *et al.,* 2023). However, many urban areas suffer from data gaps, inconsistent collection methods, and poor data quality (Albanwan *et al*., 2023; Lafioune *et al.,* 2024; Almeida *et al.,* 2021; Bhamidipati, 2015). Information is often gathered through manual surveys and isolated databases, leading to fragmented and complex analysis. The lack of reliable data complicates efforts to develop cohesive infrastructure strategies and implement necessary improvements (Okwori *et al.,* 2024). As a result, municipal planners and stakeholders struggle to make data-driven decisions that ensure sustainable urban growth.

Technological limitations also create significant obstacles in managing urban infrastructure assets, reducing efficiency, hindering data integration, and weakening predictive maintenance capabilities (Lafioune *et al.,* 2024). Many cities still rely on outdated systems that lack interoperability, making real-time monitoring difficult. Separate databases for different assets prevent seamless coordination, leading to inefficiencies in planning. The slow adoption of advanced technologies like GIS, BIM, and IoT results in reactive maintenance, increasing costs and service disruptions (Okwori *et al.,* 2024). Without bridging technological disparities, urbanisation pressures will exacerbate inefficiencies and compromise long-term sustainability.

Beyond technological advancements, urban infrastructure must also withstand environmental challenges exacerbated by climate change (Sabato *et al.,* 2023; Lafioune *et al*., 2024). Extreme weather events such as floods, storms, and temperature fluctuations increasingly strain existing systems, accelerating deterioration of roads, bridges, and drainage networks (Bhamidipati, 2015). For example, cities prone to flooding must implement advanced stormwater management solutions to mitigate damage and maintain resilience (Abdelkhalek *et al.*, 2023). Without proper adaptation measures, infrastructure may fail under environmental pressure, causing disruptions and safety risks. Adapting infrastructure to environmental pressures is crucial to maintaining long-term resilience and minimising disruptions caused by climate change.

Besides, political and governance challenges complicate urban infrastructure management, especially when multiple agencies oversee different assets. Inefficient governance policy led to communication breakdowns, project delays, and operational inefficiencies (Lafioune *et al.,* 2024; Bhamidipati, 2015). Poor coordination among government bodies, private sector stakeholders, and community groups hinders system integration and limits effective data sharing in managing urban infrastructure assets. Strengthening collaboration and streamlining governance frameworks, such as standardization of building codes, improving permit approval processes, and enforcing transparent procurement regulations, can optimize resource distribution and infrastructure development (Okwori *et al.,* 2024). Without cohesive leadership, urban infrastructure projects risk underfunding, mismanagement, and delays.

2.2 Urban Infrastructure Management Approaches

Urban infrastructure management has evolved significantly over recent decades, driven by rapid technological advancements and a stronger focus on sustainability and efficiency. Traditional approaches relied on reactive maintenance and manual inspections, which often led to costly emergency repairs and service disruptions (Shao *et al.,* 2024). According to Lafioune *et al.* (2024), digital transformation is reshaping asset management by enabling proactive planning, real-time monitoring, and enhanced collaboration across sectors. These improvements help cities optimise resources, reduce operational costs, and improve service delivery. Historically, infrastructure was maintained through a reactive model where repairs were performed only after failures occurred, leading to inefficiencies and high expenditures. Manual inspections and periodic assessments provided limited predictive insights, making it difficult to prevent asset deterioration (Mohammadi, A. & El-Diraby, 2021). Additionally, siloed governance structures resulted in fragmented decision-making, as different agencies independently managed transportation, utilities, and energy (Wei *et al.,* 2020). This lack of coordination hindered timely upgrades and created inefficiencies in infrastructure planning.

Modern infrastructure management incorporates predictive maintenance, using real-time data, IoT sensors, and analytics to anticipate potential failures. This approach minimises downtime, optimises asset performance, and ensures timely interventions to extend infrastructure lifespan (Lawal *et al.,* 2025). Smart technologies improve urban resilience by enabling adaptive management strategies that align with growing urban demands. For example, real-time traffic systems dynamically adjust signal timing to reduce congestion and enhance mobility (Nyokum & Tamut, 2024). Advanced tools like City Information Modelling (CIM) and Digital Twins (DT) provide a holistic view of asset conditions, improving data-driven decision-making. These technologies integrate geospatial analytics, predictive modelling, and AI-driven insights to support infrastructure planning and resource optimization (Lawal *et al.,* 2025). DT models facilitate real-time collaboration among stakeholders, ensuring infrastructure projects align with community needs and regulatory standards. Leveraging such innovations allows cities to strengthen their infrastructure's adaptability and long-term sustainability.

Traditional infrastructure management methods, while effective in the past, are no longer sufficient to address the complexities of modern urban environments. Shifting toward data-driven, integrated, and predictive strategies enhances efficiency, resilience, and environmental sustainability. Embracing smart technologies and collaborative governance enables cities to extend asset lifespan, reduce costs, and support sustainable urban growth (Piri, 2024). As urbanisation and climate challenges intensify, municipalities must adopt forward-thinking solutions to maintain well-connected, resilient infrastructure systems.

Table 2 *Difference between traditional and modern approaches*

Items	Traditional Approach	Modern Approach
Maintenance Strategy	Reactive - repairs occur after failures, leading to high costs and service disruptions	Predictive - data-driven models anticipate issues, reducing downtime and optimising performance (Lawal *et al.*, 2025).
Data collection and Monitoring	Manual inspections and ground surveys, relying on outdated information (Ye *et al.*, 2024).	IoT sensors, real-time analytics, and AI-driven diagnostics improve infrastructure tracking (Nyokum & Tamut, 2024).
Decision Making	Siloed agencies manage assets separately, leading to inefficiencies (Wei *et al.*, 2020).	Integrated decision-making with collaboration among government, private sector, and communities (Piri, 2024).
Technology Adoption	Limited use of digital tools; reliance on paper-based records	Smart city technologies, GIS, BIM, and urban digital twins enable better resource utilization (Ye *et al.*, 2024).
Urban Resilience	Vulnerable to environmental risks; minimal adaptation strategies (Bhamidipati, 2015).	Climate-responsive planning, advanced

In summary, the shift from traditional to modern urban infrastructure management highlights the increasing complexity of urbanisation and the need for innovative, sustainable solutions. Conventional methods focused on large-scale, rigid projects with minimal stakeholder engagement, often leading to inefficiencies in long-term urban planning. In contrast, modern approaches emphasise technological integration, environmental sustainability, and participatory governance, ensuring infrastructure systems remain adaptable to urban demands (Lafioune *et al.*, 2024). Combining traditional engineering principles with data-driven decision-making enables cities to optimise asset performance and service delivery. Moving forward, integrating collaborative and technology-driven frameworks will equip urban areas to navigate future challenges and promote long-term resilience (Chang *et al.*, 2023).

2.3 The Need for Integrated System in Urban Infrastructure Management

Integrated systems for urban infrastructure management offer powerful solutions to the inefficiencies and limitations of traditional fragmented approaches. The integration of infrastructure assets enables better coordination, improved decision-making, and more efficient use of resources. In the context of integrating urban infrastructure systems, extensive research has been conducted to develop various decision support systems (DSSs) for proactive urban infrastructure between different sectors. These studies typically focus on integrating systems to improve efficiency, sustainability, and overall performance in urban environments. The following table showed some of the key findings from previous research on integrating urban systems using different research contexts.

Table 3 *Previous Research*

No	Title	Author and Year	Key Description	Research Context
1	An Integrated System Framework of Building Information Modelling and Geographical Information System for Utility Tunnel Maintenance Management	Lee *et al.*, 2018	Define BIM-3DGIS system to improve utility tunnel maintenance management by enhancing visualization and data integration	Utility tunnel
2	Simulation Framework for Asset Management in Climate-Change Adaptation of Transportation	Bhamidipati, 2015	Define a simulation framework to assess long-term and short-term climate change impact	Transport infrastructure
3	Decision Support System for Water Distribution Systems Based on Neural Networks and Graphs Theory for Leakage Detection	Arsene *et al.*, 2012	Define decision support system to detect pipe leakage by using GFMMNN based on neural networks	Water system
4	A Resilience Assessment Framework for Critical Infrastructure Networks' Interdependencies	Imani *et al.*, 2020	Define a resilience framework by focusing on interdependency-induced vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure networks	Critical infrastructure network (water, energy, and transport)
5	Integration Of TLS-Derived	Mohamma	Define BrIM as a bridge	Bridge

Bridge Information Modeling (BrIM) With A Decision Support System (DSS) For Digital Twinning and Asset Management of Bridge Infrastructures	di, *et al.,* 2023	management tool with integrated data, priority ranking, visual reports, and budget-based remedial strategies.	Infrastructure

3. Statement of Issues

This section describes critical issues related to the need for an integrated infrastructure asset management system, drawing insights from the recent scholarly literature.

Rapid growth in metropolitan areas worldwide is driving an increasing demand for infrastructure systems supporting basic services including transportation, water supply, waste management, energy and communications. However, many municipalities find difficulty in navigating the complexity of linked systems, their aging infrastructure and insufficient financing (Lafioune *et al*., 2023). Becoming unsuitable in solving these problems are the traditional isolated-silo operations of infrastructure management (Du, *et al.,* 2023). In this context, the need for integrated urban infrastructure asset management is a priority.

A key issue with the current state of urban infrastructure management is its fragmented nature (Lafioune *et al*., 2023). Different stakeholders of infrastructure such as road maintenance, water utilities, and electrical grids fall under the purview of several departments and agencies. This lack of coordination leads to higher operating expenditure, delayed maintenance, and inefficiencies (Gadsby *et al.,* 2024). Moreover, urban infrastructure systems are increasingly interconnected and might have cascading effects on others. For example, road closures from water supply system malfunctions can affect public health, interrupt traffic systems, and overwhelm sewage systems (Bhamidipati, 2015). As a result, there is an immediate need to coordinate infrastructure management across several fields to guarantee that urban systems function cohesively and effectively.

Traditional systems of monitoring and maintaining infrastructure also depend mainly on periodic inspections and reactive maintenance approaches, which are consuming resources and usually fail to hinder failures before they happen (Sabato *et al*., 2023). This strategy is becoming unworkable given the expanding scale and sophistication of urban systems. For example, the Jalan Masjid India sinkhole, was an 8-metre (26 ft) deep sinkhole that formed on Jalan Masjid India in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on 23 August 2024, possibly caused by a burst sewage pipe and other geological faults. Municipalities fail to prevent failures of the system and have caused one victim to disappear for more than a week. Similarly, in April 2025, a gas pipeline explosion in Putra Heights, Subang Jaya, ignited a massive fire that injured over 150 individuals, damaged hundreds of homes and vehicles, and disrupted electricity and gas supply across multiple districts (Camoens*, et al*., 2025). These events underscore how localized infrastructure failures, whether underground pipe collapses or utility leaks, can propagate across systems, affecting public safety, emergency response, and economic activity.

Furthermore, urban areas also have growing demands to tackle climate change, population expansion, and budget constraints, which call for more effective and data-driven strategies of infrastructure management (Almeida *et al*., 2021). By permitting stakeholders to find weaknesses, forecast breakdowns, and maximize resources before issues arise, integrated systems that employ real-time monitoring, predictive analytics, and team decision making can go a great way toward solving these problems. Its capability to increase operational efficiency, cut maintenance costs, improve service delivery, and underpin sustainable urban development makes integrated urban infrastructure asset management necessary (Meydani et al., 2024). Advanced technology such the Internet of Things (IoT), cloud computing, and big data analysis should be included in integrated urban infrastructure asset management systems to meet the challenges. These technologies support data-driven decision-making, allow real-time monitoring, and give practical intelligence. Such integration lets cities transition from reactive to proactive management, therefore protecting infrastructure assets, lowering operational hazards, and boosting urban system resiliency (Ye *et al*., 2024).

Despite these challenges, infrastructure interdependencies also present opportunities to strengthen urban resilience and optimize resource allocation across sectors (Grafius *et al.,* 2020; Carhart & Rosenberg, 2016). Interdependency-based opportunities can facilitate more dynamic and coordinated information exchange across agencies, enabling proactive responses to evolving asset conditions and service disruptions. Spatial location of infrastructure systems such as utilities, roads, and drainage creates opportunities for shared inspection, maintenance scheduling, and joint investment planning. Such geographic efficiencies contribute to reduced operational costs and minimize service downtimes during interventions. Furthermore, synergies between systems can be strategically leveraged to enhance overall functionality. Addressing the challenges while harnessing these opportunities requires detailed modelling of infrastructure interdependence to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration. Ultimately, the intentional exploitation of interconnectivity among infrastructure systems supports a more adaptive, resilient, and sustainable urban management paradigm.

Although infrastructure interdependencies are documented in literature, actual management practices remain predominantly fragmented. Governmental agencies, municipal departments, and private-sector entities often operate in isolation, leading to suboptimal coordination and restricted information access (Wei *et al.,* 2020; Araya & Vasquez, 2022). This lack of coordination leads to inefficiencies and potential hazards, such as accidental damage to buried utilities during excavation projects (Varol & Şanlıoğlu, 2017). The comprehensive data on infrastructure locations, conditions, and interdependencies are essential for improving planning, maintenance, and risk mitigation in urban settings. However, the vast complexity of infrastructure data necessitates advanced models to enable seamless integration, analysis, and reasoning for better understanding and management.

Building upon the issues and opportunities outlined above, it is evident that a more sophisticated approach to urban infrastructure management is urgently required. The fragmented nature of current practices, combined with the increasing frequency of disruptive events such as sinkholes and pipeline explosions, reveals a critical gap in how interdependencies are understood, modeled, and managed. While literature acknowledges these interconnections, existing frameworks often fall short in operationalizing them for decision support, particularly in contexts where stakeholder coordination is limited and data environments remain siloed. To address these gaps, this research proposes the development of an integrated framework for urban infrastructure asset management and monitoring. By capturing infrastructure interdependencies, contextual variables such as ground conditions and weather, and rule-based reasoning, the framework aims to improve predictive capabilities and facilitate cross-sector collaboration.

4. Research Significance

This research addresses a critical gap in urban infrastructure management by advocating for the adoption of integrated systems capable of navigating the increasing complexity and interdependence of urban environments. As cities expand and infrastructure demands intensify, traditional siloed management approaches prove insufficient. The study underscores the transformative potential of integrated frameworks that enable real-time data exchange, cross-domain coordination, and holistic asset oversight, ultimately fostering operational efficiency, resource optimization, and long-term urban sustainability. By incorporating advanced technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), big data analytics, and Building Information Modeling (BIM), the research highlights a paradigm shift in how municipalities monitor, maintain, and respond to infrastructure conditions. These technologies facilitate continuous performance tracking, predictive maintenance, and data-driven decision-making, enhancing public safety while minimizing service disruptions and operational costs.

A key contribution of the study lies in its development of modular domain ontologies that conceptualize urban infrastructure as a network of interrelated subsystems. These ontologies capture granular insights into assets, triggers, consequences, and investigative techniques, forming the basis for a rule-based reasoning engine. This engine simulates deterioration scenarios and recommends timely interventions, even in data-scarce environments, thereby enabling proactive infrastructure management. The research also tackles the persistent issue of data fragmentation across spatial and administrative boundaries. By consolidating heterogeneous datasets into a unified BIM-based schema, the framework ensures semantic interoperability, standardized classification, and precise location-based data retrieval. This integration enhances stakeholder access to real-time asset intelligence and supports coordinated infrastructure responses.

Furthermore, the study introduces a qualitative reasoning model to address uncertainty stemming from incomplete or ambiguous data. Through likelihood-based estimations and targeted diagnostic recommendations, the framework remains adaptable to diverse urban contexts and data environments. This capability is especially valuable in guiding investigative efforts and refining data accuracy in complex field conditions.

In essence, the research offers a comprehensive, scalable, and adaptive decision support framework that empowers urban planners, policymakers, and infrastructure managers to implement intelligent, resilient, and sustainable infrastructure strategies. It lays the groundwork for future regulatory and operational innovations that align with the evolving demands of technologically advanced and environmentally conscious urban development.

5. Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to explore the complexities of urban infrastructure asset management and monitoring. The approach is designed to capture expert insights, contextual nuances, and systemic interdependencies that are often overlooked in quantitative frameworks. The methodology is structured into sequential stages to ensure a comprehensive and systematic investigation of the research problem.

Research in Management of Technology and Business Vol. 7 No. 1 (2026) p. 324-336

The study integrates both secondary and primary data collection methods. An extensive literature review was conducted using peer-reviewed academic journals sourced from electronic databases, complemented by authoritative texts accessed through university library archives. This phase established the theoretical foundation of the study, synthesizing existing knowledge on infrastructure management, domain ontologies, and emerging technologies such as BIM, IoT, and rule-based reasoning. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with domain experts. Based on the semi-structured interviews conducted, the expected outcome is a comprehensive categorization of triggers and their associated consequences within urban infrastructure systems. The interview process is expected to elicit expert knowledge concerning the causal factors, both direct and indirect that influence the performance and deterioration of urban assets such as roads, underground pipes, and ground layers. These insights will not only identify asset-specific triggers but also uncover inter-asset cascading effects, such as subsidence of road structures due to pipe failure or joint misalignment.

The qualitative data collected will be systematically translated into BIM-compatible classifications using recognized ontological and information frameworks. This transformation will facilitate the semantic encoding of asset attributes, performance history, and defect typologies. Each reported trigger and consequence will be categorized with relevant parameters. Furthermore, the outcome will inform the development of an ontology-driven schema that captures relationships across infrastructure subsystems by defining properties like *hasTrigger, resultsInConsequence, affectsAsset,* and *requiresMitigationAction*. This structured output will contribute to an interoperable knowledge base capable of supporting rule-based reasoning engines and predictive analytics, ultimately enhancing proactive monitoring and cross-disciplinary decision support in infrastructure asset management.

6. Conclusion

The implementation of integrated systems in urban infrastructure management marks a pivotal advancement in how cities respond to the growing complexity, interdependence, and operational demands of their built environments. As urban populations expand and infrastructure networks age, the limitations of traditional, fragmented management approaches become increasingly evident. This study underscores the transformative potential of integrated frameworks that unify diverse infrastructure assets such as roads, water supply systems, and underground utilities into a cohesive digital ecosystem. By doing so, municipalities and stakeholders are empowered to optimize resource allocation, streamline operations, and enhance service delivery across sectors.

Central to this transformation is the adoption of cutting-edge technologies, including cloud computing, artificial intelligence (AI), the Internet of Things (IoT), and Building Information Modeling (BIM). These technologies enable real-time monitoring, predictive maintenance, and data-driven decision-making, allowing infrastructure managers to detect anomalies, anticipate failures, and implement timely interventions. The convergence of these tools within an integrated system not only improves operational efficiency but also strengthens urban resilience against unforeseen disruptions such as natural disasters, system failures, or rapid urbanization pressures. Moreover, the consolidation of spatial and administrative datasets into a unified BIM-compatible schema further addresses the persistent challenge of data fragmentation. Through standardized classification and semantic interoperability, stakeholders gain access to precise, location-specific asset intelligence, fostering cross-disciplinary collaboration and informed policymaking.

Ultimately, this research contributes a comprehensive framework for integrated urban infrastructure management that aligns technological innovation with sustainability and governance objectives. It provides a strategic roadmap for cities seeking to evolve into intelligent, adaptive, and environmentally conscious urban systems. By leveraging integrated systems, municipalities can not only enhance the quality of life for their citizens but also build infrastructure environments that are resilient, future-proof, and capable of thriving amid the dynamic challenges of the 21st century.

Acknowledgement

This research study was supported by Sarawak Premier Seat Grant Scheme RJ130000.7352.1RO21 and RJ130000.7352.1R034, Universiti Technology Malaysia (UTM).

Conflict of Interest

Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of the paper.

Author Contribution

The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: ***study conception and design:*** *Syahirah Abdullah and Mohd Azwarie Mat Dzahir;* ***draft manuscript preparation:*** *Syahirah Abdullah and Mohd Azwarie Mat Dzahir. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.*

References

Abdelkhalek, S., & Zayed, T. (2023). A multi-tier deterioration assessment models for sewer and stormwater pipelines in Hong Kong. Journal of Environmental Management, 345(118913), 118913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.118913

Aivaliotis, P., Georgoulias, K., Arkouli, Z., & Makris, S. (2019). Methodology for enabling Digital Twin using advanced physics-based modelling in predictive maintenance. Procedia CIRP, 81, 417–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2019.03.072

AlBanwan, A., AlFoudari, A., & AlBehbehani, R. (2023). Infrastructure asset management and the role of structural health monitoring. In Life-Cycle of Structures and Infrastructure Systems (pp. 3404–3411). CRC Press.

Almeida, N., Trindade, M., Komljenovic, D., & Finger, M. (2022). A conceptual construct on value for infrastructure asset management. Utilities Policy, 75(101354), 101354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2022.101354

Araya, F., & Vasquez, S. (2022). Challenges, drivers, and benefits to integrated infrastructure management of water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation systems. Sustainable Cities and Society, 82(103913), 103913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.103913

Armstrong, J., Helm, P., Preston, J., & Loveridge, F. (2024). Economics of geotechnical asset deterioration, maintenance and renewal. Transportation Geotechnics, 45(101185), 101185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trgeo.2024.101185

Arsene, C. T. C., Gabrys, B., & Al-Dabass, D. (2012). Decision support system for water distribution systems based on neural networks and graphs theory for leakage detection. Expert Systems with Applications, 39(18), 13214–13224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.05.080

Azhar, S. (2011). Building Information Modeling (BIM): Trends, benefits, risks, and challenges for the AEC industry. Leadership and Management in Engineering, 11(3), 241–252.

Bhamidipati, S. (2015). Simulation framework for asset management in climate-change adaptation of transportation infrastructure. Transportation Research Procedia, 8, 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2015.06.038

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices. Createspace Independent Publishing Platform.

Bittner, T., Donnelly, M., & Winter, S. (2005). Ontology and Semantic Interoperability. In Large-scale 3D Data Integration (pp. 139–160). CRC Press.

Borghetti, F., Beretta, G., Bongiorno, N., & De Padova, M. (2024). Road infrastructure maintenance: Operative method for interventions' ranking. Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 25(101100), 101100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2024.101100

Boyarchikov, Y., & Martinec, T. (2024). Road pavement monitoring and analysis approaches using gyroscope and accelerometer data. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 58(9), 138–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2024.07.385

Buldyrev, S. V., Parshani, R., Paul, G., Stanley, H. E., & Havlin, S. (2010). Catastrophic cascade of failures in interdependent networks. Nature, 464, 1025–1028.

Capacci, L., Biondini, F., & Frangopol, D. M. (2022). Resilience of aging structures and infrastructure systems with emphasis on seismic resilience of bridges and road networks: Review. Resilient Cities and Structures, 1(2), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcns.2022.05.001

Carhart, N., & Rosenberg, G. (2016). A framework for characterising infrastructure interdependencies. International Journal of Complexity in Applied Science and Technology, 1(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijcast.2016.081294

Chang, C. M., Salinas, G. T., Gamero, T. S., Schroeder, S., Vélez Canchanya, M. A., & Mahnaz, S. L. (2023). An infrastructure management humanistic approach for smart cities development, evolution, and sustainability. Infrastructures, 8(9), 127. https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures8090127

Chang, J. Y., Garcia, J. M., Xie, X., Moretti, N., & Parlikad, A. (2022). Information Quality for Effective Asset Management: A literature review. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 55(19), 235–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2022.09.213

Chohan, I. M., Ahmad, A., Sallih, N., Bheel, N., Ali, M., & Deifalla, A. F. (2023). A review on life cycle assessment of different pipeline materials. Results in Engineering, 19(101325), 101325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2023.101325

Clarke, B. G., Derek, Magee, V., Dimitrova, A. G., Cohn, H., Quratul-Ain Mahesar, A. M., Sadeghioon, C. D. F., & David Enwisle, H. R. R. C. R. S. (2017). A decision support system to proactively manage subsurface utilities. International Symposia for Next Generation Infrastructure.

Costello, S. B., Chapman, D. N., Rogers, C. D. F., & Metje, N. (2007). Underground asset location and condition assessment technologies. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 22(5–6), 524–542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2007.06.001

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods.

Dave, B., Buda, A., Nurminen, A., & Främling, K. (2018). A framework for integrating BIM and IoT through open standards. Automation in Construction, 95, 35–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2018.07.022

Dragan A. Savic, Josef Bicik, Mark S. Morley, Andrew Duncan, Zoran Kapelan, Slobodan Djordjevic and Edward C. Keedwell. (2013). Intelligent Urban Water Infrastructure Management. Journal of the Indian Institute of Science, 93:2.

Du, H., Wei, L., Dimitrova, V., Magee, D., Clarke, B., Collins, R., Entwisle, D., Eskandari Torbaghan, M., Curioni, G., Stirling, R., Reeves, H., & Cohn, A. G. (2023). City infrastructure ontologies. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 104(101991), 101991. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2023.101991

Dyer, M., Dyer, R., Weng, M.-H., Wu, S., Grey, T., Gleeson, R., & Ferrari, T. G. (2019). Framework for soft and hard city infrastructures. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers. Urban Design and Planning, 172(6), 219–227. https://doi.org/10.1680/jurdp.19.00021

Eastman, C., Teicholz, P., Sacks, R., & Liston, K. (2011). BIM Handbook: A Guide to Building Information Modeling for Owners, Designers, Engineers, Contractors, and Facility Managers. Wiley.

Erdelean, I., Schaub, A., Stefan, C., Vanžura, M., Praendl-Zika, V., & Hula, A. (2023). Assessment of physical road infrastructure to support automated vehicles in an urban environment. Transportation Research Procedia, 72, 2385–2392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.11.731

Gadsby, A., Knezevich, R., Yu, P. L., Tsai, Y. J., & Harvey, J. (2024). A national survey and roadmap on complete streets infrastructure asset management policy. Transport Policy, 157, 86–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2024.08.005

Gavrikova, E., Volkova, I., & Burda, Y. (2020). Strategic aspects of asset management: An overview of current research. Sustainability, 12(15), 5955. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155955

Goforth, E., Yosri, A., El-Dakhakhni, W., & Wiebe, L. (2022). Infrastructure asset management system optimized configuration: A genetic algorithm–complex network theoretic metamanagement approach. Journal of Infrastructure Systems, 28(4). https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)is.1943-555x.0000712

Gonzva, M., Barroca, B., Gautier, P.-E., & Diab, Y. (2016). Analysis of disruptions cascade effect within and between urban sociotechnical systems in a context of risks. E3S Web of Conferences, 7, 07008. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20160707008

Grafius, D. R., Varga, L., & Jude, S. (2020). Infrastructure interdependencies: Opportunities from complexity. Journal of Infrastructure Systems, 26(4), 04020036. https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)is.1943-555x.0000575

Gruber, T. R. (1993). A translation approach to portable ontology specifications. Knowledge Acquisition, 5(2), 199–220. https://doi.org/10.1006/knac.1993.1008

Hadzilacosa T, D. Kallesa, N. Prestonb, P. Melbourneb, L. Camarinopoulosc, M. Eimermacherd, V. Kallidromitise, S. Frondistou-Yannasf, S. Saegrov. (2000). UtilNets: a water mains rehabilitation decision support system. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems 24 (2000) 215-232.

Heckerman, D. E., & Shortliffe, E. H. (1992). From certainty factors to belief networks. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, 4(1), 35–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/0933-3657(92)90036-o

Hitzler, P. (2021). A review of the semantic web field. Communications of the ACM, 64(2), 76–83. https://doi.org/10.1145/3397512

Imani, M., & Hajializadeh, D. (2020). A resilience assessment framework for critical infrastructure networks' interdependencies. Water Science and Technology: A Journal of the International Association on Water Pollution Research, 81(7), 1420–1431. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2019.367

Industry Foundation Classes (IFC) for Data Sharing in the Construction Industry. (2015). BuildingSMART International.

ISO 19650: Organization and Digitization of Information About Buildings and Civil Engineering Works, Including Building Information Modelling (BIM) - Information Management Using Building Information Modelling. (2018).

Javed, A. R., Shahzad, F., Rehman, S. ur, Zikria, Y. B., Razzak, I., Jalil, Z., & Xu, G. (2022). Future smart cities: requirements, emerging technologies, applications, challenges, and future aspects. Cities (London, England), 129(103794), 103794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103794

Jayasinghe, P. A., Derrible, S., & Kattan, L. (Eds.). (2023). Interdependencies between Urban Transport, Water, and Solid Waste Infrastructure Systems. Infrastructures, 8, 76. https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures8040076.

Karan, E. P., & Irizarry, J. (2015). Extending BIM interoperability to preconstruction operations using geospatial analyses and semantic web services. Automation in Construction, 53, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2015.02.012

Koch, C., Vonthron, A., & König, M. (2017). A tunnel information modelling framework to support management, simulations and visualisations in mechanised tunnelling projects. Automation in Construction, 83, 78–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2017.07.006
Lafioune, N., Poirier, E. A., & St-Jacques, M. (2024). Managing urban infrastructure assets in the digital era: challenges of municipal digital transformation. Digital Transformation and Society, 3(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/dts-02-2023-0010
Latif, J., Shakir, M. Z., Edwards, N., Jaszczykowski, M., Ramzan, N., & Edwards, V. (2022). Review on condition monitoring techniques for water pipelines. Measurement: Journal of the International Measurement Confederation, 193(110895), 110895. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2022.110895
Lawal, O. O., Nawari, N. O., & Lawal, O. (2025). AI-enabled cognitive predictive maintenance of urban assets using city Information Modeling—systematic review. Buildings, 15(5), 690. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15050690
Lee, G., Issa, R. R. A., & Jarkas, A. (2018). Construction delay: Understanding its causes and effects. International Journal of Project Management, 26(6), 669–676.
Lee, J., & Yoon, Y. (2021). Indicators development to support intelligent road infrastructure in urban cities. Transport Policy, 114, 252–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.10.009
Liu, L., Zeng, N., Liu, Y., Han, D., & König, M. (2024). Multi-domain data integration and management for enhancing service-oriented digital twin for infrastructure operation and maintenance. Developments in the Built Environment, 18(100475), 100475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dibe.2024.100475
Ma, Y., Wang, S., Xin, G., Li, B., Fang, H., Lei, J., Du, X., Wang, N., & Di, D. (2025). A state-of-the-art-review of underground concrete sewage pipelines detection technologies. Measurement: Journal of the International Measurement Confederation, 242(116268), 116268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2024.116268
Malmir, B., Amini, M., & Chang, S. I. (2017). A medical decision support system for disease diagnosis under uncertainty. Expert Systems with Applications, 88, 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2017.06.031
Marlow, D., Gould, S., & Lane, B. (2015). An expert system for assessing the technical and economic risk of pipe rehabilitation options. Expert Systems with Applications, 42(22), 8658–8668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.07.020
Meydani, R., & Leander, J. (2024). Deciding how to decide: A conceptual model for consensually fostering urban infrastructure maintenance. Cities (London, England), 154(105361), 105361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.105361
Moazami, D., Behbahani, H., & Muniandy, R. (2011). Pavement rehabilitation and maintenance prioritization of urban roads using fuzzy logic. Expert Systems with Applications, 38(10), 12869–12879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.04.079
Mohammadi, A., & El-Diraby, T. (2021). Toward user-oriented asset management for urban railway systems. Sustainable Cities and Society, 70(102903), 102903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.102903
Mohammadi, M., Rashidi, M., Yu, Y., & Samali, B. (2023). Integration of TLS-derived Bridge Information Modeling (BrIM) with a Decision Support System (DSS) for digital twinning and asset management of bridge infrastructures. Computers in Industry, 147(103881), 103881. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2023.103881
Moradi, P., Asadi, M. J., Ebrahimzadeh, N., & Yarahmadi, B. (2021). Ilam tunnels inspection, maintenance, and rehabilitation: A case study. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 110(103814), 103814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2021.103814
Motulsky, S. L. (2021). Is member checking the gold standard of quality in qualitative research? Qualitative Psychology (Washington, D.C.), 8(3), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000215
National Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016–2021. (2016). HM Treasury.
Nethra Betgeri, S., Reddy Vadyala, S., Matthews, J. C., Madadi, M., & Vladeanu, G. (2023). Wastewater pipe condition rating model using K- Nearest Neighbors. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 132(104921), 104921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2022.104921
Nyokum, T., & Tamut, Y. (2024). Sustainable urban infrastructure development: Integrating smart technologies for resilient and green cities. SSRG International Journal of Civil Engineering, 12(4), 18–36. https://doi.org/10.14445/23488352/ijce-v12i4p103
Okwori, E., Viklander, M., & Hedström, A. (2024). Data integration in asset management of municipal pipe networks in Sweden: Challenges, gaps, and potential drivers. Utilities Policy, 86(101689), 101689. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2023.101689
Omrany, H., Ghaffarianhoseini, A., Ghaffarianhoseini, A., & Clements-Croome, D. J. (2023). The uptake of City Information Modelling (CIM): a comprehensive review of current implementations, challenges and future outlook. Smart and Sustainable Built Environment, 12(5), 1090–1116. https://doi.org/10.1108/sasbe-06-2022-0116
Ouyang, M. (2014). Review on modeling and simulation of interdependent critical infrastructure systems. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 121, 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2013.06.040

Piri, S. (2024). Smart infrastructure integration for enhanced urban resilience: A transdisciplinary approach. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4811269
Quintero, A., Konaré, D., & Pierre, S. (2005). Prototyping an intelligent decision support system for improving urban infrastructures management. European Journal of Operational Research, 162(3), 654–672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2003.10.019
Radzi, A. R., Azmi, N. F., Kamaruzzaman, S. N., Rahman, R. A., & Papadonikolaki, E. (2024). Relationship between digital twin and building information modeling: a systematic review and future directions. Construction Innovation, 24(3), 811–829. https://doi.org/10.1108/ci-07-2022-0183
Rasol, M., Pais, J. C., Pérez-Gracia, V., Solla, M., Fernandes, F. M., Fontul, S., Ayala-Cabrera, D., Schmidt, F., & Assadollahi, H. (2022). GPR monitoring for road transport infrastructure: A systematic review and machine learning insights. Construction and Building Materials, 324(126686), 126686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2022.126686
Rinaldi, S. M., Peerenboom, J. P., & Kelly, T. K. (2001). Identifying, understanding, and analyzing critical infrastructure interdependencies. IEEE Control Systems Magazine, 21(6), 11–25.
Rogers, C. D. F., Hao, T., Costello, S. B., Burrow, M. P. N., Metje, N., Chapman, D. N., Parker, J., Armitage, R. J., Anspach, J. H., Muggleton, J. M., Foo, K. Y., Wang, P., Pennock, S. R., Atkins, P. R., Swingler, S. G., Cohn, A. G., Goddard, K., Lewin, P. L., Orlando, G., … Saul, A. J. (2012). Condition assessment of the surface and buried infrastructure – A proposal for integration. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 28, 202–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2011.10.01
Sabato, E., D'Amico, F., Tripodi, A., & Tiberi, P. (2023). BIM & Road safety – Applications of digitals models from in-built safety evaluations to asset management. Transportation Research Procedia, 69, 815–822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.02.240
Sattar, S., Li, S., & Chapman, M. (2021). Developing a near real-time road surface anomaly detection approach for road surface monitoring. Measurement: Journal of the International Measurement Confederation, 185(109990), 109990. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2021.10999
Shao, X., Cai, B., Ahmed, S., Zhou, X., Hu, Z., Sui, Z., & Liu, X. (2024). Towards proactive corrosion management: A predictive modeling approach in pipeline industrial applications. Process Safety and Environmental Protection : Transactions of the Institution of Chemical Engineers, Part B, 190, 1471–1480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2024.08.021
Shortliffe, E. H., & Buchanan, B. G. (1975). A model of inexact reasoning in medicine. Mathematical Biosciences, 23(3–4), 351–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(75)90047-4
Shtayat, A., Moridpour, S., Best, B., Shroff, A., & Raol, D. (2020). A review of monitoring systems of pavement condition in paved and unpaved roads. Journal of Traffic and Transportation Engineering (English Edition), 7(5), 629–638. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtte.2020.03.004
Smith, A., & Brown, J. (2018). Legal challenges in the application of Building Information Modeling. Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction, 10(2)
Staab, S., & Studer, R. (Eds.). (2016). Handbook on Ontologies. Springer.
Su, Y., Wang, J., Wang, X., Yao, Y., & Shou, W. (2023). 3D reconstruction in underground utilities. Automation in Construction, 156(105100), 105100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2023.105100
Succar, B. (2009). Building information modelling framework: A research and delivery foundation for industry stakeholders. Automation in Construction, 18(3), 357–375.
Sun, L., Zhu, J., Tan, J., Li, X., Li, R., Deng, H., Zhang, X., Liu, B., & Zhu, X. (2023). Deep learning-assisted automated sewage pipe defect detection for urban water environment management. The Science of the Total Environment, 882(163562), 163562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.163562
Tan, X., Fan, L., Huang, Y., & Bao, Y. (2021). Detection, visualization, quantification, and warning of pipe corrosion using distributed fiber optic sensors. Automation in Construction, 132(103953), 103953. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2021.103953
Tang, L., Chen, C., Li, H., & Mak, D. Y. Y. (2022). Developing a BIM GIS–integrated method for urban underground piping management in China: A case study. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 148(9). https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)co.1943-7862.0002323
Tang, Y., Piao, J., Wang, H., Rajib, S., & Li, Y. (2025). Predicting cascade failures in interdependent urban infrastructure networks. In arXiv [cs.SI]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.0289
Teng, S., Chen, X., Chen, G., & Cheng, L. (2023). Structural damage detection based on transfer learning strategy using digital twins of bridges. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing, 191(110160), 110160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymssp.2023.110160
Varol, M. B., & Şanlıoğlu, İ. (2017). Open geospatial consortium web map and feature services and free/open source server/client softwares. International Journal of Engineering and Geosciences, 2(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.26833/ijeg.286691
Volk, R., Stengel, J., & Schultmann, F. (2014). Building Information Modeling (BIM) for existing buildings - Literature review and future needs. Automation in Construction, 38, 109–127.

Walport, M., & Wilson, A. (2016). Future of Cities: an overview of the evidence. Government Office for Science.
Wang, M. (2021). Ontology-based modelling of lifecycle underground utility information to support operation and maintenance. Automation in Construction, 132(103933), 103933. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2021.10393
Wang, Z., Zhu, J., & Ma, T. (2024). Review on monitoring of pavement subgrade settlement: Influencing factor, measurement and advancement. Measurement: Journal of the International Measurement Confederation, 237(115225), 115225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.measurement.2024.115225
Wei, L., Du, H., Mahesar, Q.-A., Al Ammari, K., Magee, D. R., Clarke, B., Dimitrova, V., Gunn, D., Entwisle, D., Reeves, H., & Cohn, A. G. (2020). A decision support system for urban infrastructure inter-asset management employing domain ontologies and qualitative uncertainty-based reasoning. Expert Systems with Applications, 158(113461), 113461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113461
Wu, Q. (2024). Application of BIM+GIS integration technology in the Construction of urban intelligent water informatization. Journal of Electrical Systems, 20(6s), 2352–2362. https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3215
Xia, M., Shao, H., Williams, D., Lu, S., Shu, L., & de Silva, C. W. (2021). Intelligent fault diagnosis of machinery using digital twin-assisted deep transfer learning. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 215(107938), 107938. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2021.107938
Xie, Y., Liu, C., Chang, S., & Jiang, B. (2022). Urban sustainability: Integrating socioeconomic and environmental data for multi-objective assessment. Sustainability, 14(15), 9142. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159142
Ye, Z., Wei, Y., Yang, S., Li, P., Yang, F., Yang, B., & Wang, L. (2024). IoT-enhanced smart road infrastructure systems for comprehensive real-time monitoring. Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems, 4, 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2024.01.002
Yu, W., Li, B., Fang, H., Du, X., Zhai, K., Wang, N., Di, D., & Du, M. (2024). Mechanical characteristics of concrete pipes under the coupled effects of the pressure, seepage, and flow fields. Structures, 61(106053), 106053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2024.106053
Zamanian, S., & Shafieezadeh, A. (2023). Age-dependent failure probabilities of corroding concrete sewer pipes under traffic loads. Structures, 52, 524–535. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2023.03.132
Zhou, Y., & Lai, W. W. L. (2024). Characterization of leakage signatures in buried water pipes by ground penetrating radar(GPR) and instantaneous frequency analysis. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 153(105984), 105984. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2024.105984