

Article

City-Scale Digital Twins for Smart Urban Governance: Frameworks, Implementation Challenges, and Strategic Pathways

Sofia E. Larsen^{1, *}, Mei-Lin Huang², Kwame Adjei³

¹Department of Architecture, Design and Media Technology, Aalborg University, Aalborg, 9220, Denmark; sel@create.aau.dk

²School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 117566, Singapore; huang.meilin@nus.edu.sg

³Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, LG 25, Ghana; kadjai@ug.edu.gh

***Correspondence:** Sofia E. Larsen. Email: sel@create.aau.dk

Abstract

City-scale digital twins have emerged as transformative tools for smart urban governance, enabling real-time monitoring, simulation, and optimization of complex urban systems. However, the implementation of city-scale digital twins faces significant challenges including heterogeneous data integration, interoperability across multiple systems, and governance complexities. This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of city-scale digital twin frameworks, examining architectural models, implementation challenges, and strategic pathways for sustainable urban development. The analysis identifies four core components: data acquisition and integration, virtual modeling and simulation, analytics and decision support, and stakeholder engagement. Key challenges include data quality and standardization, system interoperability, social inclusion, digital infrastructure gaps, workforce capacity constraints, and financial sustainability. The findings indicate that successful implementation requires integrated governance frameworks combining technical innovation with institutional capacity building. The paper proposes strategic pathways including phased implementation approaches, public-private partnership models, and citizen engagement mechanisms. These pathways offer actionable guidance for policymakers and urban planners seeking to leverage digital twins for inclusive, resilient, and sustainable urban development.

Keywords: digital twin; smart city; urban governance; implementation challenges; strategic pathways

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: 20 May 2026; Accepted: 15 August 2026; Published: 15 September 2026

CITATION

Larsen SE, Huang ML, Adjei K. City-Scale Digital Twins for Smart Urban Governance: Frameworks, Implementation Challenges, and Strategic Pathways.

Global Intelligence Technology Horizons. 2026; 1(1): 4.

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2026 by author(s).

Published by Star Mountain International Publishing Group Pte. Ltd. in *Global Intelligence Technology Horizons*.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

1. Introduction

Urbanisation in the twenty-first century has brought problems that traditional governance models were never designed to handle. Cities grow faster than infrastructure can keep pace, and interdependencies among transport, energy, water, housing, and public health are tightly woven [1]. Against this backdrop, the appeal of digital twins is clear. If a city could be replicated virtually—with all its data streams flowing into a single integrated model—then urban governance could move from reactive problem-solving to something more anticipatory and strategic [2].

The basic idea is not new. Urban models have existed for decades. What distinguishes digital twins is the dynamic coupling between the virtual and the physical. A digital twin is not a static model; it is a living replica that ingests continuous data streams from sensors, satellites, social media, and administrative systems, and uses those streams to simulate, analyse, and influence the physical city [3]. This bidirectional relationship gives digital twins their transformative potential [4].

City Digital Twins (CDTs) are emerging as powerful tools for sustainable urban development [5]. Recent scholarship has identified four key functional characteristics: heterogeneous data integration, multi-system interaction, dynamic change prediction, and bi-direction interaction with physical operations [5].

Singapore has been the most visible pioneer. Its Virtual Singapore project integrates data from over 100 government sources into a national-scale digital twin used for urban planning, disaster simulation, and policy analysis [6]. Helsinki has taken a different route, emphasising openness and citizen engagement: its 3D city model is freely accessible, enabling residents to visualise proposed developments and participate in planning processes [7]. Shanghai has focused on infrastructure and operations, using its digital twin to monitor utilities, traffic, and environmental conditions in real time [8]. Dubai, Amsterdam, and several Chinese cities have launched similar initiatives [9].

Despite this heterogeneity, common challenges have crystallised. One persistent obstacle is data. Urban data are generated by different systems, stored in different formats, and subject to different quality standards. Integration is expensive; some estimates put data preparation at upwards of 80% of total project effort [10]. Interoperability is a related concern—most cities operate legacy systems never designed to communicate [11]. Social inclusion adds further complexity: digital twins risk entrenching inequalities by excluding those without digital access or skills [12]. Financial costs are substantial, requiring ongoing maintenance and staffing that many cities cannot sustain [13].

These are not merely technical problems. They are institutional, political, and human problems dressed in technical language. This paper argues that the success of city-scale digital twins depends less on technological sophistication than on governance quality.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Analytical Approach

The analysis draws on a systematic review of academic literature on digital twins and smart cities, supplemented by policy documents and technical reports from leading initiatives in Singapore, Helsinki, Shanghai, Dubai, and Amsterdam [14]. Case study cities were selected to represent different governance traditions, resource levels, and stages of digital twin maturity. The literature search covered Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using the terms "digital twin," "smart city," "urban governance," and "implementation challenges," with publications from 2015 through early 2026 [15].

A systematic literature review and thematic analysis approach was employed [16]. Two major themes were identified: (1) models, frameworks, and tools for digital twin development and (2) data management strategies for effective implementation [16]. The analysis categorises technological integrations including GIS, BIM, remote sensing, machine learning, and IoT.

2.2 Thematic Synthesis

Thematic synthesis identified recurring patterns, obstacles, and strategies [17]. The resulting framework is organised around four dimensions: technical architecture, institutional arrangements, financial models, and social-ethical considerations [18]. These dimensions provide a lens for comparing initiatives.

2.3 Case Study Selection

Three primary case studies were selected: Singapore's Virtual Singapore, Helsinki's 3D City Model, and Shanghai's digital twin initiative. These represent distinct governance traditions and varying degrees of citizen engagement. Singapore exemplifies a centralised approach; Helsinki represents an open, participatory model; Shanghai demonstrates an infrastructure-focused orientation.

3. Conceptual Framework

Based on the thematic synthesis of the literature and case study analysis of Singapore's Virtual Singapore, Helsinki's 3D City Model, and Shanghai's digital twin initiative, this section presents the conceptual framework of city-scale digital twins in two parts: (1) the four core architectural components of city-scale digital twins, and (2) the key implementation challenges confronting these initiatives.

3.1 Core Components of City-Scale Digital Twins

Despite variations across cities, a functional digital twin comprises four core components that collectively enable the transition from static urban models to dynamic, intelligent governance platforms.

3.1.1 Data Acquisition and Integration

The first component is data acquisition and integration—harmonising data from thousands of sources into a unified framework. This foundational layer is essential; without it, nothing else works [19]. Urban digital twins require integration of heterogeneous data streams from IoT sensors, administrative databases, satellite imagery, social media, and citizen reports. The absence of common data standards compounds the difficulty [20].

Standards-based approaches have emerged. The Open Geospatial Consortium's Urban Digital Twins Interoperability Pilot has demonstrated practical application of OGC APIs, establishing robust frameworks for scalable urban digital twins [21].

3.1.2 Virtual Modelling and Simulation

The second component is virtual modelling and simulation—building a three-dimensional, semantically rich representation incorporating both static features and dynamic data [5]. This layer transforms raw data into an intelligible representation of urban form and function. The evolution from smart cities to digital twin cities has been driven by virtual–real mapping, dynamic interaction, and intelligent simulation [22].

The modelling layer must balance accuracy with computational feasibility. High-fidelity models are expensive; overly simplified models may fail to capture emergent behaviours.

3.1.3 Analytics and Decision Support

The third component is analytics and decision support—applying AI, machine learning, and statistical methods to generate insights for planning and operations [23]. This layer transforms the virtual model from visualisation tool into analytical engine. Agentic digital twins represent the frontier, generating knowledge-augmented workflows through multi-step reasoning. However, current platforms remain primarily visualisation and data integration systems [24].

3.1.4 Stakeholder Engagement

The fourth component, often underemphasised, is stakeholder engagement—involving citizens, businesses, and civil society in design, governance, and use [25]. Digital twins neglecting this component may be technically impressive but institutionally fragile. Research has framed digital twins as socio-technical systems [26]. Surveys reveal that although digital twins inform (78%) and consult (82%) with communities, they rarely enable genuine participation. Full potential is realised only when data infrastructure advances alongside transparent governance and citizen empowerment [27].

3.2 Implementation Challenges

City-scale digital twins confront a range of implementation challenges that span technical, institutional, social, and financial dimensions.

3.2.1 Data and Interoperability Challenges

The most commonly cited challenge is data. Urban data are produced by different systems with different formats, standards, and update cycles. Integration is labour-intensive [20]. Studies show initiatives face problems of heavy physical precision but light social cognition and heavy scenario applications but light data systems. Mapping rate assessment models with three indicators—data resolution, freshness, and correlation—evaluate completeness and timeliness.

Interoperability is a related issue. Most cities operate legacy systems never designed to communicate; integration requires substantial investment in middleware and APIs [28]. Unifying multiple digital twins into a city-level federated twin requires sophisticated data exchange platforms [29]. The challenge extends to semantic interoperability—consistent interpretation of data across systems. Without common ontologies, integration remains fragmented.

Data quality challenges are acute in heritage contexts [30]. The Digital City & River Twin framework in Florence highlights how data quality, consistency, and granularity are critical for resilience management and heritage conservation.

3.2.2 Social, Workforce, and Financial Challenges

Social inclusion is a less visible but equally important concern. Digital twins risk serving only those with digital skills and connectivity [31]. The digital divide could be reproduced within governance structures. Research emphasises digital-literacy programmes, privacy-by-design, and trust-building governance [27]. Aggregate data without local context leads to decisions incompatible with cultural and economic realities. This challenge is acute in the Global South.

Workforce capacity is another constraint. Digital twins require specialised skills in data science, urban modelling, and software engineering in short supply [32]. Implementation requires commitment over years [33]. The transition demands new competencies, roles, and ways of working.

Financial sustainability is a persistent obstacle. Costs are substantial and ongoing. Cities with constrained budgets struggle to sustain initiatives beyond pilot phases [34]. Economic challenges drive implementation risk; data privacy, security, computational limitations, lack of transparency, and high costs are secondary risks [35].

4. Discussion

4.1 Interpretation of Findings

The analysis reveals that city-scale digital twins represent a significant innovation in urban governance, but their success is contingent on governance quality rather than technological sophistication alone. The four core components identified—data acquisition and integration, virtual modelling and simulation, analytics and decision support, and stakeholder engagement—collectively define the functional architecture. However, the analysis demonstrates that technical capability alone is insufficient. Data quality, interoperability, inclusion, workforce capacity, and financial sustainability are not secondary considerations; they are the core of the challenge.

The implementation challenges identified are deeply interconnected. Poor data quality undermines modelling accuracy; lack of interoperability limits analytical capabilities; social exclusion erodes legitimacy; workforce shortages delay deployment; and financial constraints threaten sustainability. These interdependencies suggest that piecemeal approaches to digital twin implementation are unlikely to succeed. A systemic perspective is required—one that addresses technical, institutional, social, and financial dimensions simultaneously.

4.2 Governance Models and Strategic Pathways

Three governance models emerge from the analysis, each with distinct implications.

In the centralised model, a single agency takes overall responsibility—offering coordination but potentially slow and inflexible. Singapore exemplifies this approach [36]. The model enables consistent standards and clear accountability but may concentrate power and limit innovation.

In the federated model, multiple agencies contribute and share—offering flexibility but demanding coordination. Several European cities have adopted variations [37]. The model preserves departmental autonomy but requires robust governance mechanisms to manage interdependence.

In the networked model, government, industry, and civil society collaborate loosely [38]. This aligns with digital twins as civic digital commons, with co-creation and data-governance arrangements giving citizens real influence. The networked model offers greatest potential for engagement but poses challenges for coordination and accountability.

Each model has strengths and weaknesses. Choice reflects assumptions about government's role, public participation, and control versus adaptability. Governance perspectives—hierarchical, network, polycentric, and adaptive—help explain risks and opportunities [39]. Trade-offs include flexibility versus accountability, integration versus complexity, and transparency versus vendor dependence.

Cities that have made progress have followed similar strategic pathways. Phased implementation—starting small, demonstrating value, then expanding—reduces risk and builds momentum. Public-private partnerships help with financing and expertise but require careful structuring to avoid vendor lock-in [40]. Citizen engagement and co-creation have helped build trust and legitimacy. Institutional capacity building—investing in training, recruitment, and university partnerships—has been essential. Ethical and regulatory frameworks ensure digital twins serve public purposes, addressing data privacy, algorithmic transparency, fairness, and citizen redress.

4.3 Comparison with Existing Literature

The findings align with prior systematic analyses of digital twin implementation. Previous work has identified data integration and interoperability as persistent challenges, consistent with the findings here [10,11]. Studies evaluating governance models have similarly found that institutional arrangements are as critical as technical infrastructure [36,37]. The emergence of socio-technical perspectives on digital twins, framing them as governance tools rather than merely technical systems, resonates with this analysis [26].

The strategic pathways identified build on and extend prior work on smart city governance. The emphasis on citizen engagement and co-creation reflects a growing recognition that digital twins must be governed as civic assets rather than administrative tools [40]. The findings also highlight the importance of context: what works in Singapore—a city-state with concentrated authority—may not translate to Helsinki or to cities in the Global South with different institutional capacities and resource constraints.

4.4 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The analysis focuses on three case study cities and may not capture the full diversity of digital twin initiatives globally. The rapidly evolving nature of both technology and governance means that some findings may become outdated quickly. The analysis does not quantify the economic costs and benefits of different governance approaches.

Future research should conduct longitudinal studies of digital twin implementation outcomes across diverse urban contexts, examine the effectiveness of different citizen engagement mechanisms, and develop comparative frameworks for evaluating the social and economic impacts of city-scale digital twins. The integration of digital twins with emerging technologies—including AI, IoT, and blockchain—also merits further investigation. The governance of digital twins in developing country contexts, where resources are constrained and institutional capacity is limited, represents a particularly important area for future research.

4.5 Policy Implications

For policymakers, the analysis suggests several priorities. First, investment in data infrastructure and interoperability standards is essential to address foundational technical challenges. Second, regulatory frameworks must be developed to address data privacy, algorithmic accountability, and citizen rights. Third, capacity building—in both technical skills and governance capabilities—should be prioritised to address workforce constraints. Fourth, citizen engagement mechanisms should be embedded in digital twin governance from the outset, not added as an afterthought. Fifth, international coordination and knowledge sharing can help cities learn from each other's experiences and avoid common pitfalls.

5. Conclusion

City-scale digital twins represent a significant innovation in urban governance, but they are not a panacea. Their potential to improve planning, operations, and sustainability is real, but it is contingent on the quality of governance that surrounds them. Data quality, interoperability, inclusion, workforce capacity, and financial sustainability are not secondary considerations; they are the core of the challenge.

The analysis has identified four core functional components—data acquisition and integration, virtual modelling and simulation, analytics and decision support, and stakeholder engagement—and examined the implementation challenges confronting each. Three governance models—centralised, federated, and networked—offer different pathways for institutional coordination and citizen participation. Strategic pathways including phased implementation, public-private partnerships, citizen engagement, institutional capacity building, and ethical frameworks provide actionable guidance for cities at different stages of digital twin development.

The cities that have made the most progress—Singapore, Helsinki, Shanghai—have invested as much in institutions and people as in technology. For other cities, the lesson is to start small, build capacity, engage citizens, and treat digital twins as governance projects, not IT projects. Digital twins can either deepen existing inequalities or help build more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable cities. The difference lies not in the technology but in the governance that surrounds it. As more cities embark on digital twin initiatives, the imperative is not simply to build better models but to build better governance.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, S.E.L.; methodology, S.E.L. and M.L.H.; validation, M.L.H.; formal

analysis, S.E.L.; investigation, K.A.; writing—original draft preparation, S.E.L.; writing—review and editing, all authors. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Ethics Approval

Not applicable

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the cities of Singapore, Helsinki, and Shanghai for their publicly available policy documents reports. AI language tools were used to assist with language polishing. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the open access policies of their respective institutions.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest to report regarding the present study.

References

1. Bibri SE, Krogstie J. Smart sustainable cities of the future: an extensive interdisciplinary literature review. *Sustain Cities Soc.* 2017;31:183-212.
2. Harrison C, Eckman B, Hamilton R, Hartswick P, Kalagnanam J, Paraszczak J, et al. Foundations for smarter cities. *IBM J Res Dev.* 2010;54(4):1-16.
3. Batty M. Digital twins. *Environ Plan B Urban Anal City Sci.* 2018;45(5):817-820.

4. Grieves M, Vickers J. Digital twin: mitigating unpredictable, undesirable emergent behavior in complex systems. In: Kahlen FJ, Flumerfelt S, Alves A, editors. *Transdisciplinary perspectives on complex systems*. Cham: Springer; 2017. p. 85-113.
5. Wang QC. Reflecting city digital twins (CDTs) for sustainable urban development: roles, challenges and directions. *Digit Eng*. 2025;5:100035.
6. Yu J, Li S, Chen Y, Wang H, Zhang X, Liu Z, et al. From GIS to digital twins: the evolution of urban spatial intelligence. *Geo-Spatial Inf Sci*. 2025;28(2):189-206.
7. Forum Virium Helsinki. Helsinki city digital twin: citizen engagement and open data. *Urban Inform*. 2024;3(1):1-15.
8. Chen L, Wang Y. Shanghai's digital twin initiative: infrastructure management and operational efficiency. *J Urban Technol*. 2025;32(2):89-106.
9. Alam F, Alharbi N, Alqahtani S. Digital twin technology for smart cities: a comprehensive review and future directions. *Energy Rep*. 2025;14:5539-5557.
10. Alsamhi M, Al-Azzawi S, Al-Khalidi M, Al-Ani M, Al-Raweshidy H. Data interoperability in city-scale digital twins: challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Access*. 2025;13:1-18.
11. Park J, Kim S, Lee H. Integrating legacy systems with digital twins: a reference architecture. *J Inf Syst*. 2024;38(3):45-62.
12. Robinson L, Schulz J, Dutton WH. Digital divides and digital twins: social inclusion in smart cities. *Urban Geogr*. 2025;46(3):312-329.
13. Jones M, Smith A. Financing city-scale digital twins: challenges and opportunities. *Public Money Manag*. 2025;45(2):123-138.
14. Martinez F, Lee S, Gupta R, Wong T. Digital twin implementation in smart cities: a comparative analysis. *Cities*. 2024;146:104789.
15. Williams D, Brown E, Chen Y. Lessons learned from city-scale digital twin implementation. *J Urban Technol*. 2024;31(2):45-67.
16. Aina YA, Hassan AM, Al-Masri A, Al-Ali A, Al-Banna S. Exploring the Methodologies for Developing City Digital Twin for Sustainable Smart Cities: A Thematic Analysis. *ISPRS Ann Photogramm Remote Sens Spat Inf Sci*. 2025;X-5/W2-2025:235.
17. Chen J, Wang Y, Liu H. Thematic synthesis in urban governance research: methods and applications. *Urban Stud*. 2025;62(3):489-506.
18. Zhang X, Li Y, Wang H, Liu S. A framework for evaluating city-scale digital twin initiatives. *Comput Environ Urban Syst*. 2025;107:102045.
19. Wang L, Chen R, Kim J, Singh P. Data acquisition and integration for city-scale digital twins. *IEEE Internet Things J*. 2025;12(5):1234-1245.
20. Li H, Zhang W, Liu X, Chen T. Data quality challenges in city-scale digital twin development. *Data Sci Eng*. 2024;9(3):234-251.

21. Jones C, Miller R, Davis A. An OGC API–Based Framework for Scalable and Interoperable Urban Digital Twin Ecosystems. *ISPRS Arch.* 2025.
22. Yang F, Zhao J, Li M. From smart cities to digital twin cities: a GIS-driven review of urban refined governance models and paradigm transformation. *Geogr Rev B.* 2026;5:3-35.
23. Kim S, Lee J, Chen Y, Park J. AI and machine learning for city-scale digital twin analytics. *Artif Intell Rev.* 2025;58(2):123-145.
24. Brown T, Wilson A, Taylor S. Towards fully automated city operations: Integrating agentic AI with urban digital twins. 2026.
25. Anderson L, Cohen M, Davis R. Citizen engagement in city-scale digital twin governance. *J Urban Aff.* 2025;47(3):456-478.
26. Thompson S, Roberts A. Digital twins for cities – The rise of the socio-technical system. *Environ Plan B.* 2026.
27. Shahriari M, Rafieian M, Hosseini A. A socio-technical framework for urban digital twins: Tehran in a global comparison. *Sustain Cities Soc.* 2025;134:106905.
28. Nakamura Y, Tanaka K, Sato M. Interoperability frameworks for city-scale digital twins. *Comput Ind.* 2025;156:104067.
29. Liu Q, Zhang H, Wang C. NEXUS for Data Exchange in a Federated Smart City Digital Twin. 2025.
30. Rossi E, Bianchi M, Conti L. Data Quality in Urban Digital Twins: Challenges in the Virtualization of Florence's Historic Heritage. *ISPRS Arch.* 2025.
31. Kim Y, Jones M, Singh P. Social inclusion and urban digital twins: a critical analysis. *Urban Geogr.* 2024;45(4):567-589.
32. Singh R, Patel N, Chen Y. Workforce capacity building for city-scale digital twins. *Cities.* 2024;151:105234.
33. Williams J, Taylor M. Developing and implementing urban digital twins: not easy at all! [Internet]. Taylor & Francis. 2024.
34. Lee H, Kim S, Park J. Financial sustainability of city-scale digital twins. *Urban Gov.* 2025;5(2):234-251.
35. Garcia M, Sanchez R. Understanding risk dynamics in digital twin integration: A causal analysis for smart infrastructure projects. 2025.
36. Martin L, White C, Davis R. Governance models for city-scale digital twins. *J Urban Plan.* 2024;150(3):04024012.
37. Peters BG, Pierre J. Institutional arrangements for smart city governance. *Public Adm Rev.* 2025;85(2):345-362.
38. Hodge GA, Greve C. Public-private partnerships for digital twin implementation. *Public Policy Adm.* 2024;39(4):567-589.

39. Marsden G, Docherty I. Urban mobility digital twins in transport policy: governance challenges and policy trade-offs. *Transp Policy*. 2026;185:104204.
40. Smith G, Richards RC. Citizen engagement in urban digital governance. *Urban Stud*. 2025;62(5):789-806.