

A global horizon scan of the future impacts of robotics and autonomous systems on urban ecosystems

Goddard, Mark A.; Davies, Zoe G.; Guenat, Solène; Ferguson, Mark J.; Fisher, Jessica C.; Akanni, Adeniran; Ahjokoski, Teija; Anderson, Pippin M.L.; Angeoletto, Fabio; Antoniou, Constantinos; Bates, Adam J.; Barkwith, Andrew; Berland, Adam; Bouch, Christopher J.; Rega-Brodsky, Christine C.; Byrne, Loren B.; Canavan, Rory; Chapman, Tim; Connop, Stuart; Crossland, Steve

DOI:

[10.1038/s41559-020-01358-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01358-z)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Goddard, MA, Davies, ZG, Guenat, S, Ferguson, MJ, Fisher, JC, Akanni, A, Ahjokoski, T, Anderson, PML, Angeoletto, F, Antoniou, C, Bates, AJ, Barkwith, A, Berland, A, Bouch, CJ, Rega-Brodsky, CC, Byrne, LB, Canavan, R, Chapman, T, Connop, S, Crossland, S, Dade, MC, Dawson, DA, Dobbs, C, Downs, CT, Ellis, EC, Escobedo, FJ, Gobster, P, Gulsrud, NM, Guneralp, B, Hahs, AK, Hale, JD, Hassall, C, Hedblom, M, Hochuli, DF, Inkinen, T, Ioja, IC, Kendal, D, Knowland, T, Kowarik, I, Langdale, SJ, Lerman, SB, MacGregor-Fors, I, Manning, P, Massini, P, McLean, S, Mkwambisi, DD, Ossola, A, Luque, GP, Pérez-Urrestarazu, L, Perini, K, Perry, G, Pett, TJ, Plummer, KE, Radji, RA, Roll, U, Potts, SG, Rumble, H, Sadler, JP, de Saille, S, Sautter, S, Scott, CE, Schwartz, A, Smith, T, Snep, RPH, Soulsbury, CD, Stanley, MC, Van de Voorde, T, Venn, SJ, Warren, PH, Washbourne, CL, Whitling, M, Williams, NSG, Yang, J, Yeshitela, K, Yocom, KP, Dallimer, M & Dave, C 2021, 'A global horizon scan of the future impacts of robotics and autonomous systems on urban ecosystems', *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 219-230. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01358-z>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 15. May. 2024

A global horizon scan of the future impacts of robotics and autonomous systems on urban ecosystems

Mark A. Goddard^{1,a}, Zoe G. Davies², Solène Guenat¹, Mark J. Ferguson³, Jessica C. Fisher², Adeniran Akanni⁴, Teija Ahjokoski⁵, Pippin M.L. Anderson⁶, Fabio Angeoletto⁷, Constantinos Antoniou⁸, Adam J. Bates⁹, Andrew Barkwith¹⁰, Adam Berland¹¹, Christopher J. Bouch¹², Christine C. Rega-Brodsky¹³, Loren B. Byrne¹⁴, David Cameron¹⁵, Rory Canavan¹⁶, Tim Chapman¹⁷, Stuart Connop¹⁸, Steve Crossland¹⁹, Marie C. Dade²⁰, David A. Dawson²¹, Cynnamon Dobbs²², Colleen T. Downs²³, Erle C. Ellis²⁴, Francisco J Escobedo²⁵, Paul Gobster²⁶, Natalie Marie Gulsrud²⁷, Burak Guneralp²⁸, Amy K. Hahs²⁸, James D. Hale³⁰, Christopher Hassall³¹, Marcus Hedblom³², Dieter F. Hochuli³³, Tommi Inkinen³⁴, Ioan-Cristian Ioja³⁵, Dave Kendal³⁶, Tom Knowland³⁷, Ingo Kowarik³⁸, Simon J. Langdale³⁹, Susannah B. Lerman²⁶, Ian MacGregor-Fors⁴⁰, Peter Manning⁴¹, Peter Massini⁴², Stacey McLean⁴³, David D. Mkwambisi⁴⁴, Alessandro Ossola⁴⁵, Gabriel Pérez Luque⁴⁶, Luis Pérez-Urrestarazu⁴⁷, Katia Perini⁴⁸, Gad Perry⁴⁹, Tristan J. Pett², Kate E. Plummer⁵⁰, Raoufou A. Radji⁵¹, Uri Roll⁵², Simon G. Potts⁵³, Heather Rumble⁵⁴, Jon P. Sadler⁵⁵, Stevienna de Saille⁵⁶, Sebastian Sautter⁵⁷, Catherine E. Scott⁵⁸, Assaf Shwartz⁵⁹, Tracy Smith⁶⁰, Robbert P.H. Snep⁶¹, Carl D. Soulsbury⁶², Margaret C. Stanley⁶³, Tim Van de Voorde⁶⁴, Stephen J. Venn⁶⁵, Philip H. Warren⁶⁶, Carla-Leanne Washbourne⁶⁷, Mark Whitling⁶⁸, Nicholas S.G. Williams²⁸, Jun Yang⁶⁹, Kumelachew Yeshitela⁷⁰, Ken P. Yocom⁷¹ and Martin Dallimer^{1*}

¹Sustainability Research Institute, School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

²Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology (DICE), School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

³European Centre for Environment and Human Health, University of Exeter Medical School, Knowledge Spa, Royal Cornwall Hospital, Truro, Cornwall, UK

⁴Lagos State Ministry of Environment, Lagos, Nigeria

⁵Bristol City Council, Bristol, UK

- 30 ⁶Department of Environmental and Geographical Science, University of Cape Town, Cape
31 Town, South Africa
- 32 ⁷Mestrado em Geografia da Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso, campus de
33 Rondonópolis, Rondonópolis, Brazil
- 34 ⁸Department of Civil, Geo and Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Munich,
35 Munich, Germany
- 36 ⁹School of Animal, Rural & Environmental Sciences, Nottingham Trent University,
37 Nottingham, UK
- 38 ¹⁰British Geological Survey, Environmental Science Centre, Keyworth, Nottingham, UK
- 39 ¹¹Department of Geography, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, USA
- 40 ¹²School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- 41 ¹³Biology Department, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas, USA
- 42 ¹⁴Department of Biology, Marine Biology and Environmental Science, Roger Williams
43 University, Bristol, Rhode Island, USA
- 44 ¹⁵Information School, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- 45 ¹⁶Arup Environmental, Arup, Rose Wharf, 78 East Street, Leeds, LS9 8EE, UK
- 46 ¹⁷Infrastructure London Group, Arup, 13 Fitzroy Street, London, W1T 4BQ, UK
- 47 ¹⁸Sustainability Research Institute, University of East London, London, UK
- 48 ¹⁹Balfour Beatty, Thurnscoe Business Park, Barrowfield Road, Thurnscoe, S63 0BH, UK
- 49 ²⁰Department of Geography, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
- 50 ²¹School of Civil Engineering, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
- 51 ²²Facultad de Ciencias, Centro de Modelacion y Monitoreo de Ecosistemas, Universidad
52 Mayor, Santiago, Chile
- 53 ²³Centre for Functional Biodiversity, School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal,
54 Scottsville, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa
- 55 ²⁴Geography & Environmental Systems, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
- 56 ²⁵Biology Department, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia
- 57 ²⁶USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station, Madison, Wisconsin, USA
- 58 ²⁷Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, Section of Landscape
59 Architecture and Planning, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 60 ²⁸Department of Geography, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA
- 61 ²⁹School of Ecosystem and Forest Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia
- 62 ³⁰Division of Conservation Biology, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern,
63 Bern, Switzerland
- 64 ³¹School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
- 65 ³²Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
66 Uppsala, Sweden
- 67 ³³School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

- 68 ³⁴Brahea Centre, Centre for Maritime Studies, University of Turku, Turku, Finland
- 69 ³⁵Center for Environmental Research and Impact Studies, University of Bucharest,
70 Bucharest, Romania
- 71 ³⁶School of Technology, Environments and Design, University of Tasmania, Hobart,
72 Australia
- 73 ³⁷Leeds City Council, St George House, 40 Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3DL, UK
- 74 ³⁸Institute of Plant Ecology, Technische Universität Berlin, Rothenburgstr, Berlin, Germany
- 75 ³⁹Synthotech Ltd, Hornbeam Park, Harrogate, UK
- 76 ⁴⁰Red de Ambiente y Sustentabilidad, Instituto de Ecología, A.C. (INECOL), Veracruz,
77 Mexico
- 78 ⁴¹Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre, Frankfurt, Germany
- 79 ⁴²Green Infrastructure, Greater London Authority, London, UK
- 80 ⁴³The Wildlife Land Fund, 30 Gladstone Road, Highgate Hill, Queensland 4101, Australia
- 81 ⁴⁴MUST Institute for Industrial Research and Innovation, Malawi University of Science and
82 Technology, Mikolongwe, Blantyre, Malawi
- 83 ⁴⁵Department of Plant Science, University of California, Davis, Callifornia, USA
- 84 ⁴⁶Department of Computer Science and Industrial Engineering, University of Lleida, Lleida,
85 Spain
- 86 ⁴⁷Urban Greening and Biosystems Engineering Research Group, Area of Agro-Forestry
87 Engineering, ETSIA, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain
- 88 ⁴⁸Architecture and Design Department, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy
- 89 ⁴⁹Department of Natural Resource Management, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas,
90 USA
- 91 ⁵⁰British Trust for Ornithology, The Nunnery, Thetford, Norfolk, IP24 2PU, UK
- 92 ⁵¹Laboratory of Forestry Research (LRF), University of Lomé, Lomé, Togo
- 93 ⁵²Mitrani Department of Desert Ecology, Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research,
94 Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Midreshet Ben-Gurion, Israel
- 95 ⁵³Centre for Agri-Environmental Research, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development,
96 University of Reading, Reading, UK
- 97 ⁵⁴School of the Environment, Geography and Geosciences, University of Portsmouth,
98 Portsmouth, UK
- 99 ⁵⁵GEES (School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences), University of
100 Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- 101 ⁵⁶Institute for the Study of the Human (iHuman), Department of Sociological Studies,
102 University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- 103 ⁵⁷SAUTTER ZT Advanced Energy Consulting, Graz, Austria
- 104 ⁵⁸Institute of Climate and Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Environment,
105 University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

106 ⁵⁹Human and Biodiversity Research Lab, Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning,
107 Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

108 ⁶⁰Amey Consulting, Precision House, McNeil Drive, Eurocentral, Motherwell, ML1 4UR

109 ⁶¹Wageningen Environmental Research Wageningen University, Wageningen, The
110 Netherlands

111 ⁶²School of Life Sciences, University of Lincoln, Lincoln, UK

112 ⁶³School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

113 ⁶⁴Department of Geography, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

114 ⁶⁵Ecosystems and Environment Research Programme, Faculty of Biological and
115 Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

116 ⁶⁶Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

117 ⁶⁷Department of Science, Technology, Engineering and Public Policy, University College
118 London, London, UK

119 ⁶⁸Environment Agency, Foss House, Kings Pool, 1-2 Peasholme Green, York, YO1 7PX, UK

120 ⁶⁹Ministry of Education Key Laboratory for Earth System Modeling, Department of Earth
121 System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

122 ⁷⁰Ecosystem Planning and Management, Ethiopian Institute of Architecture, Building
123 Construction and City Development (EiABC), Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

124 ⁷¹Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington,
125 USA

126

127 * Corresponding author

128 ^a Current address: Department of Geography and Environmental Sciences, Northumbria
129 University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

130

Technology is transforming societies worldwide. A significant innovation is the emergence of robotics and autonomous systems (RAS), which have the potential to revolutionise cities for both people and nature. Nonetheless, the opportunities and challenges associated with RAS for urban ecosystems have yet to be considered systematically. Here, we report the findings of an online horizon scan involving 170 expert participants from 35 countries. We conclude that RAS are likely to transform land-use, transport systems and human-nature interactions. The prioritised opportunities were primarily centred on the deployment of RAS for monitoring and management of biodiversity and ecosystems. Fewer challenges were prioritised. Those that were emphasised concerns surrounding waste from unrecovered RAS, and the quality and interpretation of RAS-collected data. Although the future impacts of RAS for urban ecosystems are hard to predict, examining potentially important developments early is essential if we are to avoid detrimental consequences, but fully realise the benefits.

We are currently witnessing the fourth industrial revolution¹. Technological innovations have altered the way in which economies operate, and how people interact with built, social and natural environments. One area of transformation is the emergence of robotics and autonomous systems (RAS), defined as technologies that can sense, analyse, interact with and manipulate their physical environment². RAS include unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), self-driving cars, robots able to repair infrastructure, and wireless sensor networks used for monitoring. RAS therefore have a large range of potential applications, such as autonomous transport, waste collection, infrastructure maintenance and repair, policing^{2,3}, and precision agriculture⁴ (Figure 1). RAS have already revolutionised how environmental data are collected⁵, and species populations are monitored for conservation⁶ and/or control⁷. Globally, the RAS market is projected to grow from \$6.2 billion in 2018 to \$17.7 billion in 2026⁸.

158

159 Concurrent with this technological revolution, urbanisation continues at an unprecedented
160 rate. By 2030, an additional 1.2 million km² of the planet's surface will be covered by towns
161 and cities, with ~90% of this development happening in Africa and Asia. Indeed, 7 billion
162 people will live in urban areas by 2050⁹. Urbanisation causes habitat loss, fragmentation and
163 degradation, as well as alters local climate, hydrology and biogeochemical cycles, resulting
164 in novel urban ecosystems with no natural analogs¹⁰. When poorly planned and executed,
165 urban expansion and densification can lead to substantial declines in many aspects of
166 human well-being¹¹.

167

168 Presently, we have little appreciation of the pathways through which the widespread uptake
169 and deployment of RAS could affect urban biodiversity and ecosystems^{12,13}. To date,
170 information on how RAS may impact urban biodiversity and ecosystems remains scattered
171 across multiple sources and disciplines, if it has been recorded at all. The widespread use of
172 RAS has been proposed as a mechanism to enhance urban sustainability¹⁴, but critics have
173 questioned this techno-centric vision^{15,16}. Moreover, while RAS are likely to have far-
174 reaching social, ecological, and technological ramifications, these are often discussed only in
175 terms of the extent to which their deployment will improve efficiency and data harvesting,
176 and the associated social implications¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Such a narrow focus will likely overlook
177 interactions across the social-ecological-technical systems that cities are increasingly
178 thought to represent²⁰. Without an understanding of the opportunities and challenges RAS
179 will bring, their uptake could cause conflict with the provision of high quality natural
180 environments within cities¹³, which can support important populations of many species²¹, and
181 are fundamental to the provision of ecosystem services that benefit people²².

182

Here we report the findings of an online horizon scan to evaluate and prioritise future opportunities and challenges for urban biodiversity and ecosystems, including their structure, function and service provision, associated with the emergence of RAS. Horizon scans are not conducted to fill a knowledge gap in the conventional research sense, but are used to explore arising trends and developments, with the intention of fostering innovation and facilitating proactive responses by researchers, managers, policymakers and other stakeholders²³. Using a modified Delphi technique, which is a structured and iterative survey²³⁻²⁵ (Figure 2), we systematically collated and synthesised knowledge from 170 expert participants based in 35 countries (Extended Data Fig.). We designed the exercise to involve a large range of participants and incorporate a diversity of perspectives²⁶.

Results and Discussion

Following two rounds of online questionnaires, the participants identified 32 opportunities and 38 challenges for urban biodiversity and ecosystems associated with RAS (Figure 2). These were prioritised in Round Three, with participants scoring each opportunity and challenge according to four criteria, using a 5-point Likert scale: (i) likelihood of occurrence; (ii) potential impact (i.e. the magnitude of positive or negative effects); (iii) extensiveness (i.e. how widespread the effects will be); and (iv) degree of novelty (i.e. how well known or understood the issue is). Opportunities that highlighted how RAS could be used for environmental monitoring scored particularly highly (Figure 3; Supplementary Table 1). In contrast, fewer challenges received high scores. Those that did emphasised concerns surrounding waste from unrecovered RAS, and the quality and interpretation of RAS-collected data (Figure 4; Supplementary Table 1).

These patterns from the whole dataset masked heterogeneity between groups of participants, which could be due to at least three factors: (i) variation in

background/expertise; (ii) variation in which opportunities and challenges are considered important in particular contexts; and (iii) variation in experience and, therefore, perspectives. We found variation according to participants' country of employment and area of expertise (Extended Data Fig. 2 and 3). However, we found no significant disagreement between participants working in different employment sectors. This broad consensus suggests that the priorities of the research community and practitioners are closely aligned.

Country of employment

Of our 170 participants, 11% were based in the Global South, suggesting that views from that region might be under-represented. Nevertheless, this level of participation is broadly aligned with the numbers of researchers working in different regions. For instance, urban ecology is dominated by Global North researchers^{27,28}.

There were significant divergences between the views of participants from the Global North and South (Extended Data Fig. 4 and 5). Over two thirds (69%; n=44/64) of Global North participants indicated that the challenge "*Biodiversity will be reduced due to generic, simplified and/or homogenised management by RAS*" (item 11 in Supplementary Table 1) would be important, assigning scores greater than zero. Global South participants expressed much lower concern for this challenge, with only one participant assigning it a score above zero (Fisher's Exact Test: odds ratio=19.04 (95% CI 2.37–882.61), p=0.0007; Extended Data Fig. 2). The discussions in Rounds Four and Five (Figure 2) revealed that participants thought RAS management of urban habitats was not imminent in cities of the Global South, due to a lack of financial, technical and political capacity.

All Global South participants (100%; n=11) in Round Three assigned scores greater than zero to the opportunities “*Monitoring for rubbish and pollution levels by RAS in water sources will improve aquatic biodiversity*” (item 35) and “*Smart buildings will be better able to regulate energy usage and reduce heat loss (e.g. through automated reflectors), reducing urban temperatures and providing less harsh microclimatic conditions for biodiversity under ongoing climate change*” (item 10). Both items would tackle recognised issues in rapidly expanding cities. Discussions indicated that Global South participants prioritised the opportunities for RAS in mitigating pollution and urban heat island effects more than their Global North counterparts, even though 80% (n= 60/75) of Global North participants also assigned positive scores to these items.

Area of expertise

There was considerable heterogeneity in how opportunities and challenges were prioritised by participants with environmental and non-environmental expertise (Extended Data Fig. 6 and 7). Significantly more participants with non-environmental expertise gave scores above zero to opportunities that were about the use of RAS for the maintenance of green infrastructure. The largest difference was for the opportunity “*An increase in RAS maintenance will allow more sites to become ‘wild’, as the landscape preferences of human managers is removed*” (item 9), which 76% (n=22/29) of participants with non-environmental expertise scored above zero compared to 38% (n=20/52) of those with environmental expertise (Fisher’s Exact Test: odds ratio=0.20 (95% CI 0.06-0.6), p=0.02). More participants with non-environmental expertise (82%, n=23/28) scored the opportunity “*RAS to enable self-repairing built infrastructure will reduce the impact of construction activities on ecosystems*” (item 57) greater than zero compared to those with environmental expertise (58%; n=26/45) (Fisher’s Exact Test: odds ratio=0.30 (95% CI 0.08-1.02, p=0.04).

For the challenges, there was universal consensus among participants with non-environmental expertise that “*Unrecovered RAS and their components (e.g. batteries, heavy metals, plastics) will be a source of hazardous and non-degradable waste*” (item 31) will pose a major problem. All (n=29) scored the item above zero, compared to 73% (n=40/55) for participants with environmental expertise (Fisher’s Exact Test: odds ratio=0, 95% CI 0–0.43, p=0.002). A greater proportion of non-environmental participants (76% n=22/29) also scored challenge “*Pollution will increase if RAS are unable to identify or clean-up accidents (e.g. spillages) that occur during automated maintenance/construction of infrastructure*” (item 32) above zero compared to those with environmental expertise (45% n=22/29) (Fisher’s Exact Test: odds ratio=0.26 (95% CI 0.08–0.79), p=0.01). Again, a similar pattern was observed for item 38 “*RAS will alter the hydrological microclimate (e.g. temperature, light), altering aquatic communities and encouraging algal growth*”. A significantly greater proportion of non-environmental compared to environmental participants (60% n=12/20 and 26% n=11/42 respectively) allocated scores above zero (Fisher’s Exact Test: odds ratio=0.24 (95% CI 0.07–0.84), p=0.013).

The mismatch in opinions of environmental and non-environmental participants in Round Three indicate that the full benefits for urban biodiversity and ecosystem of RAS may not be realised. Experts responsible for the development and implementation of RAS could prioritise opportunities and challenges that do not align well with environmental concerns, unless an interdisciplinary outlook is adopted. This highlights the critical importance of reaching a consensus in Rounds Four and Five of the horizon scan with a diverse set of experts (Figure 2). A final set of 13 opportunities and 15 challenges were selected by the participants, which were grouped into eight topics (Table 1).

Topic one: Urban land-use and habitat availability

The emergence of autonomous vehicles in cities seems inevitable, but the scale and speed of their uptake is unknown and could be hindered by financial, technological and infrastructural barriers, public acceptability, or privacy and security concerns^{29,30}. Nevertheless, participants anticipated wide-ranging impacts for urban land-use and management, with implications for habitat extent, availability, quality and connectivity, and the stocks and flows of ecosystem services³¹, not least because alterations to the amount and quality of green space affects both species³² and people's well-being³³. Participants highlighted that urban land-use and transport planning could be transformed^{34,35} if the uptake of autonomous vehicles is coupled with reduced personal vehicle ownership through vehicle sharing or public transport³⁶⁻³⁸. Participants argued that, if less land is required for transport infrastructure (e.g. roads, car parks, driveways)³⁹, this could enable increases in the extent and quality of urban green space. Supporting this view, research suggests that the need for parking could be reduced by 80-90%⁴⁰.

Conversely, participants highlighted that autonomous vehicles could raise demand for private vehicle transport infrastructure, leading to urban sprawl and habitat loss/fragmentation as people move further away from centres of employment because commuting becomes more efficient^{41,42}. Urban sprawl has a major impact on biodiversity⁴³. Participants also noted that autonomous transport systems will require new types of infrastructure (e.g. charging stations, maintenance and control facilities, vehicle depots)⁴⁴ that could result in additional loss/fragmentation of green spaces. Furthermore, road systems may require even larger amounts of paved surface to facilitate the movement of autonomous vehicles, potentially to the detriment of roadside trees and vegetated margins³⁹.

Topic two: Built and green infrastructure maintenance and management

A specific RAS application within urban green infrastructure (the network of green/blue spaces and other environmental features within an urban area) that was strongly supported by our participants was the use of automated irrigation of vegetation to mitigate heat stress, thereby optimising water use and the role trees can play in cooling cities. For example, sensors to monitor soil moisture, an integral component in automated irrigation systems, are deployed for urban trees in the Netherlands¹², and similar applications are available for urban gardening⁴⁵. This is likely to be particularly important in arid cities as irrigation can be informed by weather data and measures of evapotranspiration⁴⁶. Resilience to climate change could also be improved by smart buildings that are better able to regulate energy usage and reduce heat loss⁴⁷, through the use of technology like light sensing blinds and reflectors⁴⁸. This could help reduce urban heat island effects and moderate harsh microclimates⁴⁹.

Landscape management is a major driver of urban ecosystems⁵⁰, which can be especially complex, due to the range of habitat types and the variety of stakeholder requirements⁵¹. Participants highlighted that autonomous care of green infrastructure could lead to the simplification of ecosystems, with negative consequences for biodiversity¹³. This would be the likely outcome if RAS make the removal of 'weeds', leaf litter and herbicide application significantly cheaper and quicker, such as through the widespread uptake of robotic lawn mowers or tree-climbing robots for pruning⁵². Urban ecosystems can be heterogeneous in habitat type and structure⁵¹ and phenology⁵³. RAS, therefore, may be unable to respond adequately to species population variation and phenology, or when species that are protected or of conservation concern are encountered. For hydrological systems in particular, participants noted that automated management could result in the homogenisation of water currents and timings of flow, which are known to disrupt the lifecycles of flow-sensitive species⁵⁴. Similarly, improved building maintenance could lead to

the loss of nesting habitats and shelter (e.g. for house sparrows *Passer domesticus*⁵⁵), especially for cavity and ground-nesting species.

Topic three: Human-nature interactions

RAS will inevitably alter the ways in which people experience, and gain benefits from, urban biodiversity and ecosystems. However, it is less clear what changes will occur, or how benefits will be distributed across sectors of society. Environmental injustice is a feature of most cities worldwide, with residents in lower income areas typically having less access to green space and biodiversity⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸, while experiencing greater exposure to environmental hazards such as air pollution^{59,60} and extreme temperatures⁶¹. RAS have the potential to mitigate, but also compound such inequalities, and the issues we highlight here will manifest differently according to political and social context. RAS could even lead to novel forms of injustice by exacerbating a digital divide or producing additional economic barriers, whereby those without access to technology become increasingly digitally marginalised^{13,15} from interacting with, and accessing, the natural world.

Experiencing nature can bring a range of human health and well-being benefits⁶². Participants suggested that RAS will fundamentally alter human-nature interactions, but this could manifest itself in contrasting ways. On the positive side, RAS have the potential to reduce noise and air pollution⁶³⁻⁶⁵ through, for example, automated infrastructure repairs leading to decreased vehicle emissions from improved traffic flow and/or reduced construction. In turn, this could make cities more attractive for recreation, encouraging walking and cycling in green spaces, with positive outcomes for physical⁶⁶ and mental health⁶⁷. Changes in noise levels could also improve experiences of biophonic sounds such as bird song⁶⁸. Driving through green, rather than built, environments can provide human health benefits⁶⁹. These could be further enhanced if autonomous transport systems were

designed to increase people's awareness of surrounding green space features, or if navigation algorithms preferentially choose greener routes⁷⁰. Autonomous vehicles could alter how disadvantaged groups such as children, elderly and disabled travel⁷¹. Participants felt that this might mean improved access to green spaces, thus reducing environmental inequalities. Finally, community (or citizen) science is now a component of urban biodiversity research and conservation⁷² that can foster connectedness to nature⁷³. Participants suggested RAS could provide a suite of different ways to engage and educate the public about biodiversity and ecosystems such as through easier access to and input into real-time data on species⁷⁴.

Alternatively, participants envisaged scenarios whereby RAS reduce human-nature interactions. One possibility is that autonomous deliveries to households may minimise the need for people to leave their homes, decreasing their exposure to green spaces while travelling. In addition, walking and cycling could decline as new modes of transport predominate⁷⁵. RAS that mimic or replace ecosystem service provision (e.g. Singapore's cyborg supertrees⁷⁶, robotic pollinators⁷⁷) may reduce people's appreciation of ecological functions⁷⁸, potentially undermining public support for, and values associated with, green infrastructure and biodiversity conservation⁷⁹. This is in line with what is thought to be occurring as people's experience of nature is increasingly dominated by digital media⁸⁰.

Topic four: Biodiversity and environmental data and monitoring

RAS are already widely used for the automated collection of biodiversity and environmental monitoring data in towns and cities⁸¹. This has the potential to greatly enhance urban planning and management decision-making¹². Continuing to expand such applications would be a logical step and one that participants identified as an important opportunity⁸². RAS will allow faster and cheaper data collection over large spatial and temporal scales, particularly

across inaccessible or privately owned land. Ecoacoustic surveying and automated sampling of environmental DNA (eDNA) is already enabling the monitoring of hard to detect species^{83,84}. RAS also offer potential to detect plant diseases in urban vegetation and, subsequently inform control measures^{85,86}.

Nevertheless, our participants highlighted that the technology and baseline taxonomy necessary for the identification of the vast majority of species autonomously is currently unavailable. If RAS cannot reliably monitor cryptic, little-known or unappealing taxa, the existing trend for conservation actions to prioritise easy to identify and charismatic species in well-studied regions could intensify⁸⁷. Participants emphasised that easily collected RAS data, such as tree canopy cover, could serve as surrogates for biodiversity and ecosystem structure/function without proper evidence informing their efficacy. This would mirror current practices, rather than offering any fundamental improvements in monitoring. Moreover, there is a risk that subjective or intangible ecosystem elements (e.g. landscape, aesthetic, spiritual benefits) that cannot be captured or quantified autonomously may be overlooked in decision-making⁸⁸. Participants expressed concern that the quantity, variety and complexity of big data gathered by RAS monitoring could present new barriers to decision-makers when coordinating citywide responses⁸⁹.

Topic five: Managing invasive and pest species

The abundance and diversity of invasive and pest species are often high in cities⁹⁰. One priority concern identified by the participants is that RAS could facilitate new introduction pathways, dispersal opportunities or different niches that could help invasive species to establish. Participants noted that RAS offer clear opportunities for earlier and more efficient pest and invasive species detection, monitoring and management^{91,92}. However, participants were concerned the implementation of such novel approaches, citing the potential for error,

whereby misidentification leads to accidentally controlling non-target species. Likewise, RAS-mediated pest control could threaten unpopular taxa, such as wasps or termites, if the interventions are not informed by knowledge of the important ecosystem functions such species underpin.

Topic six: RAS interactions with animals

The negative impact of unmanned aerial vehicles on wildlife is well-documented⁹³, but evidence from some studies in non-urban settings suggest this impact may not be universal^{94,95}. Nevertheless, participants highlighted that RAS activity at new heights and locations within cities will generate novel threats, particularly for raptors that may perceive drones as prey or competitors. Concentrating unmanned aerial vehicle activity along corridors is a possible mitigation strategy. However, participants noted that this could further fragment habitat by creating a 3-dimensional barrier to animal movement, which might disproportionately affect migratory species. Similarly, ground-based or tree-climbing robots⁹⁶ may disturb nesting and non-flying animals.

Topic seven: Managing pollution and waste

Air^{97,98}, noise⁹⁹ and light^{100,101} pollution can substantially alter urban ecosystem function. Participants believed that RAS would generate a range of important opportunities for reducing and mitigating such pollution. For instance, automated transport systems and road repairs could reduce vehicle numbers and improve traffic flow³⁶, leading to lower emissions and improved air quality^{64,65}. If increased autonomous vehicle use reduced noise from traffic, species that rely on acoustic communication could benefit. Similarly, automated and responsive lighting systems will reduce light impacts on nocturnal species, including migrating birds¹⁰². RAS that monitor air quality, detect breaches of environmental law and clean-up pollutants are already under development^{103,104}. Waste management is a major

problem for urban sustainability, and participants noted that RAS¹⁰⁵ could provide a solution through automated detection and retrieval. Despite this potential, participants felt that unrecovered RAS could themselves contribute to the generation of electronic waste, which is a growing hazard for human, wildlife and ecosystem health¹⁰⁶.

Topic eight: Water and flooding

Freshwater, estuarine, wetland and coastal habitats are valuable components of urban ecosystems worldwide¹⁰⁷. Maintenance of water, sanitation and wastewater infrastructure is a major sustainability issue¹⁰⁸. It is increasingly acknowledged that RAS could play a pivotal role in how these systems are monitored and managed¹⁰⁹, including improving drinking water¹¹⁰, addressing water quality issues associated with sewerage systems¹¹¹ and monitoring and managing diverse aspects of stormwater predictions and flows¹¹². Participants therefore concluded that automated monitoring and management of water infrastructure could lead to a reduction in pollution incidents, improve water quality and reduce flooding^{113,114}. Further, they felt that if stormwater flooding is diminished, there may be scope for restoring heavily engineered river channels to a more natural condition, thereby enhancing biodiversity, ecosystem function and service provision¹¹⁵. Participants identified, however, that the opposite scenario could materialise, whereby RAS-maintained stormwater infrastructure increases reliance on hard engineered solutions, decreasing uptake of nature-based solutions (e.g. trees, wetlands, rain gardens, swales, retention basins) that provide habitat and other ecosystem services¹¹⁶.

Conclusions

The fourth industrial revolution is transforming the way economies and society operate. Identifying, understanding and responding to the novel impacts, both positive and negative,

465 of new technologies is essential to ensure that natural environments are managed
466 sustainably, and the provision of ecosystem services maximised. Here we identified and
467 prioritised the most important opportunities and challenges for urban biodiversity and
468 ecosystems associated with RAS. Such explicit consideration of how urban biodiversity and
469 ecosystems may be affected by the development of technological solutions in our towns and
470 cities is critical if we are to prevent environmental issues being sidelined. However, we have
471 to acknowledge that some trade-offs to the detriment of the environment are likely to be
472 inevitable. Additionally, it is highly probable that multiple RAS will be deployed
473 simultaneously, making it extremely difficult to anticipate interactive effects. To mitigate and
474 minimise any potential harmful effects of RAS, we recommend that environmental scientists
475 advocate for critical impact evaluations before phased implementation. Long-term
476 monitoring, comparative studies and controlled experiments could then further our
477 understanding of how biodiversity and ecosystems will be affected. This is essential as the
478 pace of technological change is rapid, challenging the capacity of environmental regulation
479 to respond quickly enough and appropriately. Although the future impacts of novel RAS are
480 hard to predict, early examination is essential to avoid detrimental and unintended
481 consequences on urban biodiversity and ecosystems, but fully realise the benefits.

Methods

Horizon scan participants

We adopted a mixed approach to recruiting experts to participate in the horizon scan to minimise the likelihood of bias associated with relying on a single method. For instance, snowball sampling (i.e. invitees suggesting additional experts who might be interested in taking part) alone might over-represent individuals who are similar to one another, although it can be effective at successfully recruiting individuals from hard-to-reach groups¹¹⁷. We therefore contacted individuals directly via email inviting them to join the horizon scan, as well as using social media and snowball sampling. The 480 experts working across the research, private, public and NGO sectors globally contacted directly were identified through professional networks, mailing lists (e.g. groups with a focus on urban ecosystems; the research, development and manufacture of RAS; urban infrastructure), authors lists of recently published papers, and via the editorial boards of subject-specific journals. Of the 170 participants who took part in Round One, 143 (84%) were individuals who have been invited directly, with the remainder obtained through snowball sampling and social media.

We asked participants to indicate their area of expertise from five categories: (i) environmental (including ecology, conservation and all environmental sciences); (ii) infrastructure (including engineering and maintenance); (iii) sustainable cities (covering any aspect of urban sustainability, including the implementation of 'smart' cities); (iv) RAS (including research, manufacture and application); or (v) urban planning (including architecture and landscape architecture). Participants whose area of expertise did not fall within these categories were excluded from the process. We collected information on participants' country of employment. Subsequently, these were allocated into one of two global regions, the Global North or Global South (low and middle income countries in South America, Asia, Oceania, Africa, South America and the Caribbean¹¹⁸). Participants specified

their employment sector according to four categories: (i) research; (ii) government; (iii) private business; or (iv) NGO/not-for-profit.

Participants were asked to provide informed consent prior to taking part in the horizon scan activities. We made them aware that their involvement was entirely voluntary, that they could stop at any point and withdraw from the process without explanation, and that their answers would be anonymous and unidentifiable. Ethical approval was granted by the University of Leeds Research Ethics Committee (reference LTSEE-077). We piloted and pre-tested each round in the horizon scan process, which helped to refine the wording of questions and definitions of terminology.

Horizon scan using the Delphi technique

The horizon scan applied a modified Delphi technique, which is applied widely in the conservation and environmental sciences literature²⁴. The Delphi technique is a structured and iterative survey of a group of participants. It has a number of advantages over standard approaches to gathering opinions from groups of people. For example, it minimises social pressures such as groupthink, halo effects and the influence of dominant individuals²⁴. The first round can be largely unstructured, to capture a broad range and depth of contributions. In our horizon scan, we asked each participant to identify between two and five ways in which the emergence of RAS could affect urban biodiversity and/or ecosystem structure/function via a questionnaire. They could either be opportunities (i.e. RAS would have a positive impact on biodiversity and ecosystem structure/function) or challenges (i.e. RAS would have a negative impact) (Figure 2). Round One resulted in the submission of 604 pertinent statements. We removed statements not relevant to urban biodiversity or urban ecosystems. Likewise, we excluded statements relating to artificial intelligence or virtual/augmented reality, as these technologies fall outside the remit of RAS. MAG

subsequently collated and categorised the statements into major topics through content analysis. A total of sixty opportunities and challenges were identified.

In Round Two, we presented participants with the 60 opportunities and challenges, categorised by topic, for review. We asked them to clarify, expand, alter or make additions wherever they felt necessary (Figure 2). This round resulted in a further 468 statements and, consequently, a further 10 opportunities and challenges emerged.

In Round Three, we used a questionnaire to ask participants to prioritise the 70 opportunities and challenges in order of importance (Figure 2). We asked participants to score four criteria^{25,119} using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from -2 (very low) to +2 (very high): (i) likelihood of occurrence; (ii) potential impact (i.e. the magnitude of positive or negative effects); (iii) extensiveness (i.e. how widespread the effects will be); and (iv) degree of novelty (i.e. how well known or understood the issue is). A 'do not know' option was also available. We randomly ordered the opportunities and challenges between participants to minimise the influence of scoring fatigue¹²⁰. For each participant, we generated a total score (ranging from -8 to +8) for every opportunity and challenge by summing across all four criteria. Opportunities and challenges were ranked according to the proportion of respondents assigning them a summed score greater than zero. If a participant answered 'do not know' for one or more of the criteria for a particular opportunity or challenge, we excluded all their scores for that opportunity or challenge. We generated score visualisations in the 'Likert' package¹²¹ of R version 3.4.1¹²². Two-tailed Fisher's exact tests were used to examine whether the percentage of participants scoring items above zero differed between cohorts with different backgrounds (i.e. country of employment, employment sector and area of expertise).

Final consensus on the most important opportunities and challenges was reached using online group discussions (Round Four), followed by an online consensus workshop (Round Five) (Figure 2; Supplementary Table 1). For Round Four, we allocated participants into one of ten groups, with each group comprising of experts with diverse backgrounds. We asked the groups to discuss the ranked 32 opportunities and 38 challenges, and agree on their ten most important opportunities and ten most important challenges. It did not matter if these differed from the Round Three rankings. Additionally, we asked groups to discuss whether any of the opportunities or challenges were similar enough to be merged, and the appropriateness, relevance and content of the topics. Across all groups, 14 opportunities and 16 challenges were identified as most important. Participants, including at least one representative from each of the ten discussion groups, took part in the consensus workshop. The facilitated discussions resulted in agreement on the topics, and a final consensus set of 13 opportunities and 15 challenges (Table 1).

Data Availability

Anonymised data are available from the University of Leeds institutional data repository at <https://doi.org/10.5518/912>.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all our participants for taking part and to J. Bentley for preparing the figures. The work was funded by the UK government's Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (grant EP/N010523/1: "Balancing the impact of City Infrastructure Engineering on Natural systems using Robots"). ZGD was funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Consolidator Grant No. 726104).

585

586 **Author Contributions**

587 MD conceived the study. MD, MAG, ZGD, SG, JCF, MJF developed and tested
588 questionnaire and webinar materials. All authors contributed data. MAG collated and
589 analysed these data. MAG, MD, ZGD led writing the paper, with all authors contributing and
590 agreeing to the final version.

591

Table 1. The most important 13 opportunities and 15 challenges associated with robotics and automated systems for urban biodiversity and ecosystems. The opportunities and challenges were prioritised as part of an online horizon scan involving 170 expert participants from 35 countries (Figure 2). The full set of 32 opportunities and 38 challenges identified by participants in Round Three is given in Supplementary Table 1. Item numbers given in parenthesis is for cross referencing between figures and tables.

Topic	Opportunities	Challenges
1. Urban land-use and habitat availability	Autonomous transport systems and associated decreased personal car ownership will reduce the amount of space needed for transport infrastructure (e.g. roads, car parks, driveways), allowing an increase in the extent and quality of urban green space and associated ecosystem services (item 54).	<p>The replacement of ecosystem services (e.g. air purification, pollination) by RAS (e.g. artificial 'trees', robotic pollinators) will lead to habitat and biodiversity loss (item 62).</p> <p>Trees and other habitat features will be reduced in extent or removed to facilitate easier RAS navigation, and/or damaged through direct collision (item 60).</p> <p>Autonomous transport systems will require new infrastructure (e.g. charging stations, maintenance and control facilities, vehicle depots), leading to the loss/fragmentation of greenspaces (item 59).</p>
2. Maintenance and management of built and green infrastructure	<p>Smart buildings will be better able to regulate energy usage and reduce heat loss (e.g. through automated reflectors), reducing urban temperatures and providing less harsh microclimatic conditions for biodiversity under ongoing climate change (item 10).</p> <p>Irrigation of street trees and other vegetation by RAS will lead to greater resilience to climate change/urban heat stress (item 8).</p>	Biodiversity will be reduced due to generic, simplified and/or homogenised management by RAS. This includes over-intensive green space management, improved building maintenance and homogenisation of water currents and timings of flow (items 11, 14 and 37 merged).

3. Human-nature interactions	<p>RAS will decrease pollution, making cities more attractive for recreation and enhancing opportunities for experiencing nature (item 42).</p> <p>RAS will provide novel ways for people to learn about, and experience biodiversity and lead to a greater level of participation in citizen science and volunteer conservation activities (items 41, 43 and 44 merged).</p>	<p>RAS will reduce human-nature interactions by, for example, reducing the need to leave the house as services are automated and decreasing awareness of the surrounding environment while travelling (item 46).</p> <p>RAS that mimic ecosystem service provision (e.g. artificial trees, robot pollinators) will reduce awareness of ecological functions and undermine public support for/valuation of GI and biodiversity conservation (item 52).</p> <p>RAS will exacerbate the exclusion of certain people from nature (item 48).</p>
4. Biodiversity and environmental data and monitoring	<p>Drones and other RAS (plus integrated technology such as thermal imaging/AI recording) will allow enhanced and more cost-effective detection, monitoring, mapping and analysis of habitats and species, particularly in areas that are not publicly or easily accessible (item 3).</p> <p>Real-time monitoring of abiotic environmental variables by RAS will allow rapid assessment of environmental conditions, enabling more flexible response mechanisms, and informing the location and design of green infrastructure (item 4).</p>	<p>The use of RAS without ecological knowledge of consequences will lead to misinterpretation of data and mismanagement of complex ecosystems that require understanding of thresholds, mechanistic explanations, species network interactions, etc. For instance, pest control programmes threaten unpopular species (e.g. wasps, termites) that fulfil important ecological functions (items 5 and 67 merged).</p> <p>Data collected via RAS will be unreliable for hard to identify species groups (e.g. invertebrates) or less tangible ecosystem elements (e.g. landscape, aesthetic benefits), leading to under-valuing of 'invisible' species and elements (item 6).</p>
5. Managing invasive and pest species		<p>When managing/controlling pest or invasive species, RAS identification errors will harm non-target species (item 66).</p> <p>RAS will provide new introduction pathways, facilitate dispersal, and provide new habitats for pest and invasive species (item 68).</p>

6. RAS interactions with animals		<p>Drone activity at new heights and new locations will threaten flying animals through a risk of direct collision and/or alteration of behaviour (item 19).</p> <p>Terrestrial robots will cause novel disturbances to animals, such as avoidance behaviour, altered foraging patterns, nest abandonment, etc (item 20).</p>
7. Pollution and waste	<p>RAS will improve detection, monitoring and clean-up of pollutants, benefitting ecosystem health (item 24).</p> <p>RAS will reduce waste production through better monitoring and management of sewage, litter, recyclables and outputs from the food system (items 25 and 71 merged).</p> <p>RAS will increase detection of breaches of environmental law (e.g. fly-tipping, illegal site operation, illegal discharges, consent breaches, etc.) (item 26).</p> <p>Automated and responsive building, street and vehicle lighting systems will reduce light pollution impacts on plants and nocturnal and/or migratory species (item 23).</p> <p>Automated transport systems (including roadworks) will decrease vehicle emissions (by reducing the number of vehicles and improving traffic flow), leading to improved air quality and ecosystem health (item 21).</p>	<p>Unrecovered RAS and their components (e.g. batteries, heavy metals, plastics) will be a source of hazardous and non-degradable waste (item 31).</p>
8. Managing water and flooding	<p>Monitoring and maintenance of water infrastructure by RAS will lead to fewer pollution incidents, improved water quality, and reduced flooding (item 34).</p>	<p>Maintenance of stormwater by RAS will increase reliance on 'hard' engineering solutions, decreasing uptake of nature-based stormwater solutions that provide habitat (item 39).</p>




Figure 1. Examples of the potential for robotics and automated systems to transform cities.

(a) 25% of transport in Dubai is planned to function autonomously by 2030¹²⁴; (b) city-wide sensor networks, such as those used in Singapore, inform public safety, water management, and responsive public transport initiatives¹²⁵; (c) through the use of unmanned aerial and ground-based vehicles, Leeds, UK, is expecting to implement fully autonomous maintenance of built infrastructure by 2035²; and (d) precision agricultural technology for small-scale urban agriculture (<https://farm.bot/>).




Figure 2. Horizon scan process used to identify and prioritise opportunities and challenges associated with robotics and automated systems for urban biodiversity and ecosystems. The horizon scan comprised an online survey, following a modified Delphi technique, which was conducted over five rounds.




Figure 3. Opportunities associated with robotics and automated systems for urban biodiversity and ecosystems, ranked according to Round Three participant scores.

The distribution of summed participant scores (range: -8 to +8) across four criteria (likelihood, impact, extent, novelty) for each of the 32 opportunities. Items are ordered according to the percentage of participants who gave summed scores greater than zero.

Percentage values indicate the proportion of participants giving negative, neutral and positive scores (left hand side, central and right hand side of the shaded bars respectively).

The full wording agreed by the participants for each opportunity is in Supplementary Table 1:
'mm' is an abbreviation for 'monitoring and management'; item number given in parenthesis
is for cross-referencing between figures and tables.




Figure 4. Challenges associated with robotics and automated systems for urban biodiversity and ecosystems, ranked according to Round Three participant scores.

The distribution of summed participant scores (range: -8 to +8) across four criteria (likelihood, impact, extent, novelty) for each of the 38 challenges. Items are ordered according to the percentage of participants who gave summed scores greater than zero.

Percentage values indicate the proportion of participants giving negative, neutral and positive scores (left hand side, central and right hand side of the shaded bars respectively). The full wording agreed by the participants for each challenge is in Supplementary Table 1: 'mm' is an abbreviation for 'monitoring and management'; item number given in parenthesis is for cross-referencing between figures and tables.

References

- 1 Schwab, K. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. (Currency, 2017).
- 2 UK-RAS White Papers. Urban Robotics and Automation: Critical Challenges, International Experiments and Transferable Lessons for the UK. (2018).
- 3 Salvini, P. Urban robotics: Towards responsible innovations for our cities. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* **100**, 278-286, doi:10.1016/j.robot.2017.03.007 (2018).
- 4 Vougioukas, S. G. Agricultural Robotics. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems* **2**, 365-392, doi:10.1146/annurev-control-053018-023617 (2019).
- 5 Allan, B. M. *et al.* Futurecasting ecological research: the rise of technoecology. *Ecosphere* **9**, e02163, doi:10.1002/ecs2.2163 (2018).
- 6 Hodgson, J. C. *et al.* Drones count wildlife more accurately and precisely than humans. **9**, 1160-1167, doi:10.1111/2041-210x.12974 (2018).
- 7 Dash, J. P., Watt, M. S., Paul, T. S. H., Morgenroth, J. & Hartley, R. Taking a closer look at invasive alien plant research: A review of the current state, opportunities, and future directions for UAVs. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**, 2020-2033, doi:10.1111/2041-210x.13296 (2019).
- 8 Data Bridge Market Research. Global Autonomous Robot Market - Industry Trends and Forecast to 2026. (Pune, India, 2019).
- 9 Seto, K. C., Güneralp, B. & Hutyra, L. R. Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 16083-16088, doi:10.1073/pnas.1211658109 (2012).
- 10 Johnson, M. T. J. & Munshi-South, J. Evolution of life in urban environments. *Science* **358**, 11, doi:10.1126/science.aam8327 (2017).
- 11 du Toit, M. J. *et al.* Urban green infrastructure and ecosystem services in sub-Saharan Africa. *Landscape Urban Plann.* **180**, 249-261, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.06.001 (2018).

- 12 Nitoslawski, S. A., Galle, N. J., van den Bosch, C. K. & Steenberg, J. W. N. Smarter ecosystems for smarter cities? A review of trends, technologies, and turning points for smart urban forestry. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 101770, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2019.101770 (2019).
- 13 Gulsrud, N. M. *et al.* 'Rage against the machine'? The opportunities and risks concerning the automation of urban green infrastructure. *Landscape Urban Plann.* **180**, 85-92, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.08.012 (2018).
- 14 Bibri, S. E. & Krogstie, J. Smart sustainable cities of the future: An extensive interdisciplinary literature review. *Sustainable Cities and Society* **31**, 183-212, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.02.016 (2017).
- 15 Colding, J. & Barthel, S. An urban ecology critique on the "Smart City" model. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **164**, 95-101, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.191 (2017).
- 16 Martin, C. J., Evans, J. & Karvonen, A. Smart and sustainable? Five tensions in the visions and practices of the smart-sustainable city in Europe and North America. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* **133**, 269-278, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.005 (2018).
- 17 Cantrell, B., Martin, L. J. & Ellis, E. C. Designing Autonomy: Opportunities for New Wildness in the Anthropocene. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 156-166, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.12.004 (2017).
- 18 Luvisi, A. & Lorenzini, G. RFID-plants in the smart city: Applications and outlook for urban green management. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **13**, 630-637, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2014.07.003> (2014).
- 19 Kahila-Tani, M., Broberg, A., Kyttä, M. & Tyger, T. Let the Citizens Map—Public Participation GIS as a Planning Support System in the Helsinki Master Plan Process. *Planning Practice & Research* **31**, 195-214, doi:10.1080/02697459.2015.1104203 (2016).
- 20 McPhearson, T. *et al.* Advancing Urban Ecology toward a Science of Cities. *BioScience* **66**, 198-212, doi:10.1093/biosci/biw002 (2016).

- 21 Ives, C. D. *et al.* Cities are hotspots for threatened species. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **25**, 117-126, doi:10.1111/geb.12404 (2016).
- 22 Gomez-Baggethun, E. & Barton, D. N. Classifying and valuing ecosystem services for urban planning. *Ecol. Econ.* **86**, 235-245, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.019 (2013).
- 23 Sutherland, W. J. *et al.* A Horizon Scan of Emerging Issues for Global Conservation in 2019. *Trends Ecol Evol* **34**, 83-94, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2018.11.001 (2019).
- 24 Mukherjee, N. *et al.* The Delphi technique in ecology and biological conservation: Applications and guidelines. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 1097-1109, doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12387 (2015).
- 25 Stanley, M. C. *et al.* Emerging threats in urban ecosystems: a horizon scanning exercise. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **13**, 553-560, doi:10.1890/150229 (2015).
- 26 Sandbrook, C., Fisher, J. A., Holmes, G., Luque-Lora, R. & Keane, A. The global conservation movement is diverse but not divided. *Nature Sustainability* **2**, 316-323, doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0267-5 (2019).
- 27 MacGregor-Fors, I. & Escobar-Ibáñez, J. F. *Avian Ecology in Latin American Cityscapes*. (Springer, 2017).
- 28 Dobbs, C. *et al.* Urban ecosystem Services in Latin America: mismatch between global concepts and regional realities? *Urban Ecosys.* **22**, 173-187, doi:10.1007/s11252-018-0805-3 (2019).
- 29 Cunningham, M. L., Regan, M. A., Horberry, T., Weeratunga, K. & Dixit, V. Public opinion about automated vehicles in Australia: Results from a large-scale national survey. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **129**, 1-18, doi:10.1016/j.tra.2019.08.002 (2019).
- 30 Kaur, K. & Rampersad, G. Trust in driverless cars: Investigating key factors influencing the adoption of driverless cars. *J. Eng. Technol. Manage.* **48**, 87-96, doi:10.1016/j.jengtecman.2018.04.006 (2018).
- 31 Artmann, M., Kohler, M., Meinel, G., Gan, J. & Iojă, I. C. How smart growth and green infrastructure can mutually support each other - A conceptual framework for compact

- and green cities. *Ecological Indicators* **96**, 10-22, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.07.001 (2019).
- 32 Aronson, M. F. J. *et al.* A global analysis of the impacts of urbanization on bird and plant diversity reveals key anthropogenic drivers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **281**, doi:20133330
10.1098/rspb.2013.3330 (2014).
- 33 Haaland, C. & van den Bosch, C. K. Challenges and strategies for urban green-space planning in cities undergoing densification: A review. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **14**, 760-771, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2015.07.009 (2015).
- 34 Papa, E. & Ferreira, A. Sustainable Accessibility and the Implementation of Automated Vehicles: Identifying Critical Decisions. *Urban Science* **2**, 5, doi:10.3390/urbansci2010005 (2018).
- 35 Stead, D. & Vaddadi, B. Automated vehicles and how they may affect urban form: A review of recent scenario studies. *Cities* **92**, 125-133, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2019.03.020 (2019).
- 36 Duarte, F. & Ratti, C. The Impact of Autonomous Vehicles on Cities: A Review. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 1-16, doi:10.1080/10630732.2018.1493883 (2018).
- 37 Fagnant, D. J. & Kockelman, K. Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **77**, 167-181, doi:10.1016/j.tra.2015.04.003 (2015).
- 38 Narayanan, S., Chaniotakis, E. & Antoniou, C. Shared autonomous vehicle services: A comprehensive review. *Transp. Res. Pt. C-Emerg. Technol.* **111**, 255-293, doi:10.1016/j.trc.2019.12.008 (2020).
- 39 Heinrichs, D. in *Autonomous Driving: Technical, Legal and Social Aspects* (eds Markus Maurer, J. Christian Gerdes, Barbara Lenz, & Hermann Winner) 213-231 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016).

- 40 Soteropoulos, A., Berger, M. & Ciari, F. Impacts of automated vehicles on travel behaviour and land use: an international review of modelling studies. *Transp. Rev.* **39**, 29-49, doi:10.1080/01441647.2018.1523253 (2019).
- 41 Meyer, J., Becker, H., Bosch, P. M. & Axhausen, K. W. Autonomous vehicles: The next jump in accessibilities? *Res. Transp. Econ.* **62**, 80-91, doi:10.1016/j.retrec.2017.03.005 (2017).
- 42 Hawkins, J. & Habib, K. N. Integrated models of land use and transportation for the autonomous vehicle revolution. *Transp. Rev.* **39**, 66-83, doi:10.1080/01441647.2018.1449033 (2019).
- 43 Dupras, J. *et al.* The impacts of urban sprawl on ecological connectivity in the Montreal Metropolitan Region. *Environmental Science & Policy* **58**, 61-73, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.01.005 (2016).
- 44 Liu, Y. Y., Tight, M., Sun, Q. X., Kang, R. Y. & Iop. in *2018 International Symposium on Power Electronics and Control Engineering* Vol. 1187 *Journal of Physics Conference Series* (Iop Publishing Ltd, 2019).
- 45 Samonte, M. J. C. *et al.* *PHYTO: An IoT Urban Gardening Mobile App.* (Assoc Computing Machinery, 2019).
- 46 Canales-Ide, F., Zubelzu, S. & Rodriguez-Sinobas, L. Irrigation systems in smart cities coping with water scarcity: The case of Valdebebas, Madrid (Spain). *J. Environ. Manage.* **247**, 187-195, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.06.062 (2019).
- 47 Kolokotsa, D. Smart cooling systems for the urban environment. Using renewable technologies to face the urban climate change. *Solar Energy* **154**, 101-111, doi:10.1016/j.solener.2016.12.004 (2017).
- 48 Taufik, T., Hasanah, R. N. & Ieee. in *2018 Electrical Power, Electronics, Communications, Controls, and Informatics Seminar Electrical Power Electronics Communications Controls and Informatics Seminar* 1-4 (Ieee, 2018).
- 49 Kendal, D. *et al.* A global comparison of the climatic niches of urban and native tree populations. **27**, 629-637, doi:10.1111/geb.12728 (2018).

- 50 Wheeler, M. M. *et al.* Continental-scale homogenization of residential lawn plant communities. *Landscape Urban Plann.* **165**, 54-63, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.004 (2017).
- 51 Aronson, M. F. J. *et al.* Biodiversity in the city: key challenges for urban green space management. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **15**, 189-196, doi:10.1002/fee.1480 (2017).
- 52 Lam, T. L. & Xu, Y. S. Climbing Strategy for a Flexible Tree Climbing Robot-Treebot. *Ieee Transactions on Robotics* **27**, 1107-1117, doi:10.1109/tro.2011.2162273 (2011).
- 53 Dallimer, M., Tang, Z. Y., Gaston, K. J. & Davies, Z. G. The extent of shifts in vegetation phenology between rural and urban areas within a human-dominated region. *Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 1942-1953, doi:10.1002/ece3.1990 (2016).
- 54 Latli, A., Michel, L. N., Lepoint, G. & Kestemont, P. River habitat homogenisation enhances trophic competition and promotes individual specialisation among young of the year fish. *Freshwater Biology* **64**, 520-531, doi:10.1111/fwb.13239 (2019).
- 55 Shaw, L. M., Chamberlain, D. & Evans, M. The House Sparrow *Passer domesticus* in urban areas: reviewing a possible link between post-decline distribution and human socioeconomic status. *Journal of Ornithology* **149**, 293-299, doi:10.1007/s10336-008-0285-y (2008).
- 56 Ferguson, M., Roberts, H. E., McEachan, R. R. C. & Dallimer, M. Contrasting distributions of urban green infrastructure across social and ethno-racial groups. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **175**, 136-148, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.03.020> (2018).
- 57 Leong, M., Dunn, R. R. & Trautwein, M. D. Biodiversity and socioeconomics in the city: a review of the luxury effect. *Biol. Lett.* **14**, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0082 (2018).
- 58 Nesbitt, L., Meitner, M. J., Girling, C., Sheppard, S. R. J. & Lu, Y. H. Who has access to urban vegetation? A spatial analysis of distributional green equity in 10 US cities. *Landscape Urban Plann.* **181**, 51-79, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.08.007 (2019).

- 59 Hajat, A., Hsia, C. & O'Neill, M. S. Socioeconomic Disparities and Air Pollution Exposure: a Global Review. *Current environmental health reports* **2**, 440-450, doi:10.1007/s40572-015-0069-5 (2015).
- 60 Pope, R., Wu, J. & Boone, C. Spatial patterns of air pollutants and social groups: a distributive environmental justice study in the phoenix metropolitan region of USA. *Environ. Manage.* **58**, 753-766, doi:10.1007/s00267-016-0741-z (2016).
- 61 Jenerette, G. D. *et al.* Regional relationships between surface temperature, vegetation, and human settlement in a rapidly urbanizing ecosystem. *Landscape Ecol.* **22**, 353-365 (2007).
- 62 Frumkin, H. *et al.* Nature Contact and Human Health: A Research Agenda. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **125**, 18, doi:10.1289/ehp1663 (2017).
- 63 Iglinski, H. & Babiak, M. in *12th International Scientific Conference of Young Scientists on Sustainable, Modern and Safe Transport* Vol. 192 *Procedia Engineering* (eds J. Bujnak & M. Guagliano) 353-358 (Elsevier Science Bv, 2017).
- 64 Rafael, S. *et al.* Autonomous vehicles opportunities for cities air quality. *Sci. Total Environ.* **712**, 11, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136546 (2020).
- 65 Stern, R. E. *et al.* Quantifying air quality benefits resulting from few autonomous vehicles stabilizing traffic. *Transport. Res. Part D-Transport. Environ.* **67**, 351-365, doi:10.1016/j.trd.2018.12.008 (2019).
- 66 Twohig-Bennett, C. & Jones, A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: A systematic review and meta-analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. *Environmental Research* **166**, 628-637, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.030> (2018).
- 67 Thompson Coon, J. *et al.* Does Participating in Physical Activity in Outdoor Natural Environments Have a Greater Effect on Physical and Mental Wellbeing than Physical Activity Indoors? A Systematic Review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **45**, 1761-1772, doi:10.1021/es102947t (2011).

- 68 Hedblom, M., Heyman, E., Antonsson, H. & Gunnarsson, B. Bird song diversity influences young people's appreciation of urban landscapes. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **13**, 469-474 (2014).
- 69 Parsons, R., Tassinary, L. G., Ulrich, R. S., Hebl, M. R. & Grossman-Alexander, M. THE VIEW FROM THE ROAD: IMPLICATIONS FOR STRESS RECOVERY AND IMMUNIZATION. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **18**, 113-140, doi:10.1006/jevp.1998.0086 (1998).
- 70 Hahmann, S., Miksch, J., Resch, B., Lauer, J. & Zipf, A. Routing through open spaces – A performance comparison of algorithms. *Geo-spatial Information Science* **21**, 247-256, doi:10.1080/10095020.2017.1399675 (2018).
- 71 Harper, C. D., Hendrickson, C. T., Mangones, S. & Samaras, C. Estimating potential increases in travel with autonomous vehicles for the non-driving, elderly and people with travel-restrictive medical conditions. *Transp. Res. Pt. C-Emerg. Technol.* **72**, 1-9, doi:10.1016/j.trc.2016.09.003 (2016).
- 72 Wei, J. W., Lee, B. & Wen, L. B. Citizen Science and the Urban Ecology of Birds and Butterflies-A Systematic Review. *Plos One* **11**, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156425 (2016).
- 73 Schuttler, S. G., Sorensen, A. E., Jordan, R. C., Cooper, C. & Shwartz, A. Bridging the nature gap: can citizen science reverse the extinction of experience? **16**, 405-411, doi:10.1002/fee.1826 (2018).
- 74 Jepson, P. & Ladle, R. J. Nature apps: Waiting for the revolution. *Ambio* **44**, 827-832, doi:10.1007/s13280-015-0712-2 (2015).
- 75 Botello, B., Buehler, R., Hankey, S., Mondschein, A. & Jiang, Z. Planning for walking and cycling in an autonomous-vehicle future. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives* **1**, 100012, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2019.100012> (2019).
- 76 Gulsrud, N. M. in *Routledge Research Companion to Landscape Architecture* 103-111 (2018).

- 77 Potts, S. G., Neumann, P., Vaissière, B. & Vereecken, N. J. Robotic bees for crop pollination: Why drones cannot replace biodiversity. *Sci. Total Environ.* **642**, 665-667, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.06.114 (2018).
- 78 Kahn, P. H., Severson, R. L. & Ruckert, J. H. The Human Relation With Nature and Technological Nature. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **18**, 37-42, doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01602.x (2009).
- 79 Mackay, C. M. L. & Schmitt, M. T. Do people who feel connected to nature do more to protect it? A meta-analysis. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **65**, 101323, doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2019.101323 (2019).
- 80 Truong, M. X. A. & Clayton, S. Technologically transformed experiences of nature: A challenge for environmental conservation? *Biol. Conserv.* **244**, 7, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108532 (2020).
- 81 Nitoslawski, S. A., Galle, N. J., Van Den Bosch, C. K. & Steenberg, J. W. N. Smarter ecosystems for smarter cities? A review of trends, technologies, and turning points for smart urban forestry. *Sustainable Cities and Society* **51**, 101770, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101770> (2019).
- 82 Alonzo, M., McFadden, J. P., Nowak, D. J. & Roberts, D. A. Mapping urban forest structure and function using hyperspectral imagery and lidar data. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **17**, 135-147, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2016.04.003 (2016).
- 83 Fairbrass, A. J. *et al.* CityNet—Deep learning tools for urban ecoacoustic assessment. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**, 186-197, doi:10.1111/2041-210x.13114 (2019).
- 84 Bohmann, K. *et al.* Environmental DNA for wildlife biology and biodiversity monitoring. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**, 358-367, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2014.04.003 (2014).
- 85 Ampatzidis, Y., De Bellis, L. & Luvisi, A. iPathology: Robotic Applications and Management of Plants and Plant Diseases. **9**, 1010, doi:10.3390/su9061010 (2017).
- 86 Nasi, R. *et al.* Remote sensing of bark beetle damage in urban forests at individual tree level using a novel hyperspectral camera from UAV and aircraft. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **30**, 72-83, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2018.01.010 (2018).

- 87 Smith, R. J., Verissimo, D., Isaac, N. J. B. & Jones, K. E. Identifying Cinderella species: uncovering mammals with conservation flagship appeal. *Conserv. Lett.* **5**, 205-212, doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00229.x (2012).
- 88 Cooper, N., Brady, E., Steen, H. & Bryce, R. Aesthetic and spiritual values of ecosystems: Recognising the ontological and axiological plurality of cultural ecosystem 'services'. *Ecosys. Servs.* **21**, 218-229, doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.07.014 (2016).
- 89 Colding, J., Colding, M. & Barthel, S. The smart city model: A new panacea for urban sustainability or unmanageable complexity? *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 2399808318763164, doi:10.1177/2399808318763164 (2018).
- 90 Cadotte, M. W., Yasui, S. L. E., Livingstone, S. & MacIvor, J. S. Are urban systems beneficial, detrimental, or indifferent for biological invasion? *Biol. Invasions* **19**, 3489-3503, doi:10.1007/s10530-017-1586-y (2017).
- 91 Jurdak, R. *et al.* Autonomous surveillance for biosecurity. *Trends Biotechnol.* **33**, 201-207, doi:10.1016/j.tibtech.2015.01.003 (2015).
- 92 Martinez, B. *et al.* Technology innovation: advancing capacities for the early detection of and rapid response to invasive species. *Biol. Invasions* **22**, 75-100, doi:10.1007/s10530-019-02146-y (2020).
- 93 Mulero-Pazmany, M. *et al.* Unmanned aircraft systems as a new source of disturbance for wildlife: A systematic review. *Plos One* **12**, 14, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0178448 (2017).
- 94 Rush, G. P., Clarke, L. E., Stone, M. & Wood, M. J. Can drones count gulls? Minimal disturbance and semiautomated image processing with an unmanned aerial vehicle for colony-nesting seabirds. *Ecology and Evolution* **8**, 12322-12334, doi:10.1002/ece3.4495 (2018).
- 95 Ditmer, M. A. *et al.* Bears Show a Physiological but Limited Behavioral Response to Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 2278-2283, doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.07.024 (2015).

- 96 Lam, T. L. & Xu, Y. Climbing Strategy for a Flexible Tree Climbing Robot—Treebot. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* **27**, 1107-1117, doi:10.1109/TRO.2011.2162273 (2011).
- 97 Zvereva, E. L. & Kozlov, M. V. Responses of terrestrial arthropods to air pollution: a meta-analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **17**, 297-311, doi:10.1007/s11356-009-0138-0 (2010).
- 98 Zvereva, E. L., Toivonen, E. & Kozlov, M. V. Changes in species richness of vascular plants under the impact of air pollution: a global perspective. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **17**, 305-319, doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00366.x (2008).
- 99 Francis, C. D. & Barber, J. R. A framework for understanding noise impacts on wildlife: an urgent conservation priority. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **11**, 305-313, doi:10.1890/120183 (2013).
- 100 Irwin, A. The dark side of light: how artificial lighting is harming the natural world. *Nature* **553**, 268-270, doi:10.1038/d41586-018-00665-7 (2018).
- 101 Knop, E. *et al.* Artificial light at night as a new threat to pollination. *Nature* **548**, 206-209, doi:10.1038/nature23288 (2017).
- 102 Cabrera-Cruz, S. A., Smolinsky, J. A. & Buler, J. J. Light pollution is greatest within migration passage areas for nocturnally-migrating birds around the world. *Scientific Reports* **8**, 3261, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-21577-6 (2018).
- 103 Cashikar, A., Li, J. & Biswas, P. Particulate Matter Sensors Mounted on a Robot for Environmental Aerosol Measurements. **145**, 04019057, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001569 (2019).
- 104 Shah, M., Shah, S. K. & Shah, M. in *2018 International Conference on Manipulation, Automation and Robotics at Small Scales (MARSS)* 1-6 (2018).
- 105 Alfeo, A. L. *et al.* Urban Swarms: A new approach for autonomous waste management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.07910* (2018).
- 106 Perkins, D. N., Brune Drisse, M.-N., Nxele, T. & Sly, P. D. E-Waste: A Global Hazard. *Annals of Global Health* **80**, 286-295, doi:10.1016/j.aogh.2014.10.001 (2014).

- 107 Boyer, T. & Polasky, S. J. Valuing urban wetlands: a review of non-market valuation studies. **24**, 744-755 (2004).
- 108 Rouse, M. The worldwide urban water and wastewater infrastructure challenge. *International Journal of Water Resources Development* **30**, 20-27, doi:10.1080/07900627.2014.882203 (2014).
- 109 Yuan, Z. G. *et al.* Sweating the assets - The role of instrumentation, control and automation in urban water systems. *Water Res.* **155**, 381-402, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2019.02.034 (2019).
- 110 Hall, S., Price, R. & Mandhani, N. Use of autonomous vehicles for drinking water monitoring and management in an urban environment. *ASAE Annual International Meeting 2004*, 7855-7862 (2004).
- 111 Troutman, S. C., Love, N. G. & Kerkez, B. Balancing water quality and flows in combined sewer systems using real-time control. *Environ. Sci.-Wat. Res. Technol.* **6**, 1357-1369, doi:10.1039/c9ew00882a (2020).
- 112 McDonald, W. Drones in urban stormwater management: a review and future perspectives. *Urban Water J.* **16**, 505-518, doi:10.1080/1573062x.2019.1687745 (2019).
- 113 Kerkez, B. *et al.* Smarter Stormwater Systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **50**, 7267-7273, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b05870 (2016).
- 114 Chen, Y. & Han, D. Water quality monitoring in smart city: A pilot project. *Automation in Construction* **89**, 307-316, doi:10.1016/j.autcon.2018.02.008 (2018).
- 115 Booth, D. B., Roy, A. H., Smith, B. & Capps, K. A. Global perspectives on the urban stream syndrome. *Freshwater Science* **35**, 412-420, doi:10.1086/684940 (2016).
- 116 Prudencio, L. & Null, S. E. Stormwater management and ecosystem services: A review. *Environmental Research Letters* **13**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaa81a (2018).
- 117 Sadler, G. R., Lee, H.-C., Lim, R. S.-H. & Fullerton, J. Research Article: Recruitment of hard-to-reach population subgroups via adaptations of the snowball sampling strategy.

- Nursing & Health Sciences* **12**, 369-374, doi:10.1111/j.1442-2018.2010.00541.x (2010).
- 118 Mahler A.G. in *Oxford Bibliographies in Literary and Critical Theory* (ed E. O'Brien) Ch. Global South, (Oxford University Press, 2017).
 - 119 Ricciardi, A. et al. Invasion Science: A Horizon Scan of Emerging Challenges and Opportunities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **32**, 464-474, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.03.007> (2017).
 - 120 Danziger, S., Levav, J. & Avnaim-Pesso, L. Extraneous factors in judicial decisions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 6889-6892 (2011).
 - 121 Bryer, J. & Speerschneider, K. Package 'likert'. 22 (2016).
 - 122 R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org>, 2020).
 - 123 Goddard, M. A. & Dallimer, M. (University of Leeds Data Repository, 2020).
 - 124 Dubai Future Foundation. Future Foresight. (Dubai, 2018).
 - 125 Smart Nation and Digital Government Office. *Smart Nation Singapore*, <<https://www.smartnation.sg/>> (2020).