Trustworthy Digital Systems for Planning, Environmental Governance, and Decision-Making: Implications for Smart Planning and Environmental Governance

Maryam Forghaniallahabadi

PhD Researcher, University of Dundee, Scotland, United Kingdom

Contact: 2547342@dundee.ac.uk

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/maryam-forghaniallahabadi

Profile: https://discovery.dundee.ac.uk/en/persons/maryam-forghaniallahabadi/

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and data-driven frameworks into environmental planning and governance represents a fundamental paradigm shift in how spatial and ecological decisions are made. Digital systems are no longer auxiliary tools; they have become the foundational infrastructure of governance itself. This paper examines the necessity of trustworthy digital systems in smart planning, environmental governance, and decision-making. Analysing the relationship between the opportunities these systems offer, such as real-time monitoring and predictive analytics, and the systemic risks they introduce, including algorithmic bias and the proliferation of structural misinformation, the paper argues that the legitimacy of scaled environmental decisions depends entirely on data quality, integrity, and robust oversight. It proposes a multi-scalar framework for trustworthy smart planning that connects local sensing, regional coordination, and national policy, and it highlights the growing importance of digital integrity in the stewardship of cultural and historic environments. The central conclusion is that digital efficiency without trustworthy governance creates systemic risk, and that robust digital infrastructures are therefore central to the future of evidence-based environmental decision-making.

1. Introduction

Environmental governance and urban planning are undergoing a profound digital transformation in which the traditional architectures of decision-making are shifting rapidly toward automated, data-driven frameworks powered by AI platforms and complex decision-support algorithms (Kitchin, 2014; Forghaniallahabadi, 2025b; Onyango, Forghaniallahabadi and Gazzola, 2025a). In contemporary practice, digital systems do not act just as operational tools; they increasingly constitute the new infrastructure of governance itself. This infrastructural role means that the algorithms, data pipelines, and analytical models deployed by institutions now directly shape environmental policies, spatial planning outcomes, and the allocation of scarce ecological and financial resources. As Kitchin (2014) observes, the rise of real-time data and algorithmic urbanism reconfigures not only the speed of decisions but also the very basis on which they are justified.

As the scale and speed of environmental decisions increase, the legitimacy of those decisions comes to depend completely on the foundational reliability of the information that underpins them. Trust in digital systems, however, requires more than technical accuracy; it demands transparency, accountability, and a sustained commitment to data quality and integrity (Floridi *et al.*, 2018; Hurlimann, Moosavi and Browne, 2021; Adhikari and Ramkumar, 2023). Where citizens, regulators, and planners cannot interrogate how a recommendation was produced, the resulting decisions become difficult to contest, audit, or correct, and errors can propagate silently through the policy cycle. This paper therefore examines the implications of trustworthy digital systems for smart planning and environmental governance, articulating the balance between technological opportunity and systemic risk and proposing a multi-scalar blueprint for implementation. It draws on a conceptual model in which AI systems, environmental monitoring, planning intelligence, and data-driven governance are bound together by a shared dependence on data quality and integrity, and it advances the argument that trustworthiness is not an optional ethical overlay but a structural precondition for legitimate environmental decision-making at scale.

2. The Core of Trustworthy Digital Governance

At the centre of trustworthy digital governance lies the intersection of AI systems, environmental monitoring, planning intelligence, and data-driven governance, and the element that unifies these domains is the quality and integrity of the data on which they depend. When environmental monitoring networks gather large volumes of sensor data, the value of that data is determined by its accuracy, completeness, and consistency over time. AI systems and planning-intelligence algorithms rely on this information to generate predictive models and decision-support metrics, with the consequence that flawed inputs inevitably produce flawed governance outputs, frequently amplifying initial errors as they are aggregated across regional and national scales (Zanon, 2013; Yigitcanlar *et al.*, 2020; Forghaniallahabadi, 2024). Data quality, in this sense, is not merely a technical prerequisite but a fundamental governance concern, and trustworthy digital governance accordingly requires institutional frameworks capable of validating data sources, auditing algorithmic processes, and rendering digital infrastructures resilient against both unintentional error and deliberate manipulation.

Four interdependent properties define trustworthiness in this setting. *Reliability* requires that data and models perform consistently across contexts and over time rather than degrading silently as conditions change. *Transparency* requires that the assumptions, provenance, and limitations of a model remain legible to those affected by its outputs. *Accountability* requires clear lines of responsibility connecting a digital recommendation to the human institutions that adopt and act upon it. *Contestability* requires that stakeholders retain meaningful avenues to question, challenge, and revise decisions derived from digital systems (Diakopoulos, 2016; Jacobs *et al.*, 2020; De Bem Machado *et al.*, 2023). Where any one of these elements is absent, the appearance of objectivity that quantification confers can mask deep structural weaknesses, lending unwarranted authority to outputs that may in fact be biased, incomplete, or simply incorrect. Trustworthy digital governance therefore depends less on the sophistication of any individual algorithm than on the institutional arrangements that surround it and hold it to account.

3. Opportunities and Risks of Digital Systems

The deployment of digital systems in environmental planning presents a clear duality of opportunity and risk that warrants careful systemic diagnosis. On the side of opportunity, the integration of advanced digital systems offers capabilities that were until recently unattainable. Real-time environmental monitoring through sensor networks and connected devices enables the continuous tracking of ecological indicators, air and water quality, and urban microclimates, allowing institutions to respond immediately to emerging stressors (Silva *et al.*, 2018; Moreno-Bernal *et al.*, 2022; Onyango *et al.*, 2025; Onyango, Forghaniallahabadi and Gazzola, 2025b). Accelerated predictive analysis allows large and heterogeneous datasets to be processed at speed, supporting the forecasting of environmental trends, climate impacts, and patterns of urban growth (Bibri, 2018, 2020). Shared digital platforms enhance communication across government departments, private stakeholders, and the public, dissolving the institutional silos that have long fragmented environmental management, while advanced predictive analytics equip decision-makers with robust, data-backed evidence from which to formulate proactive rather than merely reactive policy.

These same systems, however, introduce profound risks when adopted uncritically. Flawed data pipelines or deliberate interference can embed structural misinformation into the core of decision-making systems, so that misguided conclusions acquire the authority of data (Koop and van Leeuwen, 2017; Ulpiani and Zinzi, 2021; Weil *et al.*, 2023; Forghaniallahabadi, 2025a). The rapid pace of technological deployment frequently outstrips the development of corresponding regulatory and validation frameworks, leaving systems exposed to unchecked error. Algorithms trained on historical data may inherit and reproduce existing biases, generating inequitable planning outcomes and marginalising communities or environmental priorities (Eubanks, 2018). When such decisions lack transparency or result in visible failure, public confidence in both the technology and the governing institutions can erode severely and become difficult to rebuild. The critical conclusion that emerges from this diagnosis is that digital efficiency without trustworthy governance creates systemic risk, and that efficiency must therefore never be prioritised over integrity, accountability, and public trust. These risks are moreover cumulative, since a small distortion introduced at the point of data capture can be amplified through successive layers of aggregation, modelling, and policy translation until it manifests as a large and consequential error at the scale of regional or national governance. Because such errors are embedded in infrastructure rather than in any single decision, they are difficult to detect and even harder to reverse once policies and investments have been committed on their basis.

4. A Strategic Blueprint for Trustworthy Smart Planning

To harness these opportunities while mitigating the attendant risks, environmental governance requires a structured, multi-scalar approach to trustworthy smart planning that integrates action across local, regional, and national levels. At the local scale, smart planning rests on the dynamic capture of micro-data and the generation of localised environmental metrics through sensors and site monitoring. Trust at this foundational level is established through the rigorous calibration of instruments, transparent collection methodologies, and the active involvement of local communities in monitoring, since the integrity of localised data conditions the reliability of every analytical pipeline that draws upon it.

At the regional scale, governance involves infrastructure modelling and the management of cross-municipal analytical pipelines. Trustworthiness here demands interoperability between heterogeneous digital systems and the establishment of standardised validation protocols, so that data aggregated from diverse local sources retains its contextual integrity and is analysed without the introduction of systemic bias. At the national scale, governance frameworks employ decision-making models to formulate strategic policy, and trustworthy systems at this level require comprehensive regulatory oversight, clear ethical guidelines for the deployment of AI, and robust mechanisms of public accountability. National policy must mandate the transparency of algorithms used in public-sector decision-making and establish legal frameworks capable of addressing the consequences of algorithmic failure (Cash *et al.*, 2006; Resnick *et al.*, 2017; Floridi *et al.*, 2018).

Crucially, trust must be engineered across these scales rather than at each one in isolation. The value of a national strategic model is ultimately constrained by the integrity of the local sensor readings that feed it, while local communities prove far more willing to participate in data collection when they can see how their contributions inform regional and national outcomes. A trustworthy system therefore requires vertical traceability, understood as the capacity to follow a single piece of information from its point of capture through every transformation to its final use in policy, so that responsibility and validation are preserved rather than diluted at each transition. This traceability also supports environmental impact assessment directly, furnishing assessors and the public with auditable evidence chains that strengthen the credibility and defensibility of assessment findings (Glasson, Therivel and Chadwick, 2019).

5. Expanding the Scope: Cultural Heritage and Historic Environments

Although the discourse on smart planning frequently centres on ecological and urban infrastructure, trustworthy digital systems are becoming equally vital to the long-term management of cultural and historic environments, where the preservation of irreplaceable assets in a rapidly changing world increasingly depends on robust digital intervention. Digital documentation now allows high-fidelity records and three-dimensional models of historic sites to be created for conservation and analysis, while continuous heritage monitoring uses sensors to track structural integrity and environmental influences such as humidity and vibration. Decision-support algorithms can predict patterns of deterioration and help to optimise the timing and nature of conservation interventions, and interactive governance platforms can engage the public in heritage stewardship through accessible digital interfaces (UNESCO, 2021).

In this domain the integrity of the underlying data is once again paramount, since secure, accurate, and immutable digital records are essential if the historical record is to be faithfully preserved. A loss of data quality in heritage monitoring could result in irreversible physical damage to historic assets, which underscores the broader argument of this paper i.e., trustworthy digital systems are as crucial to the safeguarding of cultural heritage as they are to environmental sustainability, and the principles of reliability, transparency, accountability, and contestability apply with equal force across both domains.

6. Conclusion

As planning and environmental architectures become inextricably linked with automated, data-driven frameworks, the nature of governance itself is being reshaped, and trustworthy digital infrastructures are set to play a central role in the future of smart planning, environmental governance, and evidence-based decision-making. Institutions must recognise that digital systems are not neutral instruments but powerful infrastructures that demand rigorous oversight, ethical design, and an unwavering commitment to data integrity. By confronting the serious risks of algorithmic bias, structural misinformation, and the fragmentation of public trust, policymakers and planners can deliberately design systems that prioritise trustworthiness over mere efficiency. Through a coordinated, multi-scalar approach that connects local sensing to national policy and that embraces both natural and cultural environments, it becomes possible to build a resilient framework of digital governance equal to the complex environmental challenges of the twenty-first century.

References

Adhikari, N. and Ramkumar, M. (2023) "IoT and Blockchain Integration: Applications, Opportunities, and Challenges," *Network*, 3(1), pp. 115–141. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/network3010006

De Bem Machado, A. *et al.* (2023) "Digital transformation: Management of smart cities," *Smart Cities and Digital Transformation: Empowering Communities, Limitless Innovation, Sustainable Development and the Next Generation*. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd., pp. 59–83. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80455-994-920231004

Bibri, S.E. (2018) "The IoT for smart sustainable cities of the future: An analytical framework for sensor-based big data applications for environmental sustainability," *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 38, pp. 230–253. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.12.034

Bibri, S.E. (2020) "The eco-city and its core environmental dimension of sustainability: green energy technologies and their integration with data-driven smart solutions," *Energy Informatics*, 3(1). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s42162-020-00107-7

Cash, D W *et al.* (2006) "Scale and Cross-Scale Dynamics: Governance and Information in a Multilevel World," *Ecology and Society, Published online: Aug 30, 2006 | doi:10.5751/ES-01759-110208*, 11(2). Available at: https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-01759-110208

Diakopoulos, N. (2016) "Accountability in algorithmic decision making," *Communications of the ACM*, 59(2), pp. 56–62. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1145/2844110

Floridi, L. *et al.* (2018) "AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations," *Minds and Machines 2018 28:4*, 28(4), pp. 689–707. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/S11023-018-9482-5

Forghaniallahabadi, M. (2024) "A Framework for Scalability and Intelligent Integration in Multi-Level Smart Spatial Planning." Available at: https://doi.org/10.20933/100001474

Forghaniallahabadi, M. (2025a) "Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Environmental Assessment (EA): A Systematic Literature Review." Available at: https://doi.org/10.20933/100001470

Forghaniallahabadi, M. (2025b) "Clustering Smart Retrofit Typologies through Building's Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Data: A K-Means Approach to Scalable Smart Spatial Planning, A Case of Cumbria, UK." Available at: https://doi.org/10.20933/100001471

Hurlimann, A., Moosavi, S. and Browne, G.R. (2021) "Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation actions," *Land Use Policy*, 101, p. 105188. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2020.105188

Jacobs, N. *et al.* (2020) "Who trusts in the smart city? Transparency, governance, and the Internet of Things," *Data & Policy*, 2(7), p. e11. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/DAP.2020.11

Kitchin, R. (2014) "Big Data, new epistemologies and paradigm shifts," *Big Data and Society*, 1(1). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951714528481

Koop, S.H.A. and van Leeuwen, C.J. (2017) "The challenges of water, waste and climate change in cities," *Volume 19, Issue 2, Pages 385 - 418*, 19(2), pp. 385–418. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-016-9760-4

Moreno-Bernal, P. *et al.* (2022) "Open-Source Big Data Platform for Real-Time Geolocation in Smart Cities," *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 1555, pp. 207–222. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96753-6_15

Onyango, V. *et al.* (2025) "Sectoral Interconnectedness: insights from five sectors in 'smart' urban planning (Energy, Transport, Waste Management, Buildings, and Cities)," *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 21(13), pp. 23–23. Available at: https://doi.org/10.19044/ESJ.2025.V21N13P23

Onyango, V., Forghaniallahabadi, M. and Gazzola, P. (2025a) "Singing from the Same Hymn Sheet? A Semantic and Convergence Analysis of the Extent to Which 'Smart' is Similarly Understood and Applied Across Energy, Transport, and Waste Management Sectors of Urban Planning," *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 21(8), pp. 120–120. Available at: https://doi.org/10.19044/ESJ.2025.V21N8P120

Resnick, I. *et al.* (2017) "Using Relational Reasoning to Learn About Scientific Phenomena at Unfamiliar Scales," *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(1), pp. 11–25. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/S10648-016-9371-5/FIGURES/6

Silva, B.N. *et al.* (2018) "Urban planning and smart city decision management empowered by real-time data processing using big data analytics," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 18(9). Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/s18092994

Ulpiani, G. and Zinzi, M. (2021) "Introducing the Built Environment in a Changing Climate: Interactions, Challenges, and Perspectives," *Climate 2021, Vol. 9, Page 104*, 9(7), p. 104. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/CLI9070104

Weil, C. *et al.* (2023) "Urban Digital Twin Challenges: A Systematic Review and Perspectives for Sustainable Smart Cities," *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 99, p. 104862. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCS.2023.104862

Yigitcanlar, T. *et al.* (2020) "Contributions and Risks of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Building Smarter Cities: Insights from a Systematic Review of the Literature," *Energies 2020, Vol. 13, Page 1473*, 13(6), p. 1473. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/EN13061473

Zanon, B. (2013) "Scaling-down and scaling-up processes of territorial governance: cities and regions facing institutional reform and planning challenges," *Urban Research and Practice*, 6(1), pp. 19–39. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2012.762209