8SM

Urban Systems and Other Settlements Supplementary Material

Coordinating Lead Authors:
Shuaib Lwasa (Uganda), Karen C. Seto (the United States of America)

Lead Authors:
Xuemei Bai (Australia), Hilda Blanco (the United States of America), Kevin R. Gurney (the United States of America), Şiir Kılkış (Turkey), Oswaldo Lucon (Brazil), Jin Murakami (Japan), Jiahua Pan (China), Ayyoob Sharifi (Japan/Iran), Yoshiki Yamagata (Japan)

Contributing Authors:
Vanesa Castán Broto (United Kingdom/Spain), Winston Chow (Singapore), Galina Churkina (the Russian Federation/Germany), Felix Creutzig (Germany), David Dodman (Jamaica/United Kingdom), Burak Güneralp (Turkey/the United States of America), Rafiq Hamdi (Belgium), Bronwyn Hayward (New Zealand), Angel Hsu (the United States of America/Singapore), Lucy Hutyra (the United States of America), Nadja Kabisch (Germany), Meredith Keller (the United States of America), Timon McPhearson (the United States of America), Peter Newman (Australia), David Nowak (the United States of America), Alan Organschi (the United States of America), Minal Pathak (India), Mark Pelling (United Kingdom), Clara Pregitzer (the United States of America), Anu Ramaswami (the United States of America), Mia Reback (the United States of America), Diana Reckien (Germany), Jen Shin (the United States of America), Michael Westphal (the United States of America), Lee White (Australia)

Review Editors:
Carolina Burle Schmidt Dubeux (Brazil), Diana Ürge-Vorsatz (Hungary)

Chapter Scientists:
Meredith Keller (the United States of America), Enock Ssekuubwa (Uganda)

This chapter should be cited as:
Lwasa, S., K.C. Seto, X. Bai, H. Blanco, K.R. Gurney, S. Kilkiş, O. Lucon, J. Murakami, J. Pan, A. Sharifi, Y. Yamagata, 2022: Urban systems and other settlements Supplementary Material. In IPCC, 2022: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [P.R. Shukla, J. Skea, R. Slade, A. Al Khourdajie, R. van Diemen, D. McCollum, M. Pathak, S. Some, P. Vyas, R. Fradera, M. Belkacemi, A. Hasija, G. Lisboa, S. Luz, J. Malley, (eds.)]. Available from https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/.

Table of Contents

In Chapter 8, Figure 8.4 on co-benefits of urban mitigation actions in Section 8.2, and Figure 8.18 on the feasibility assessment based on the enablers and barriers of implementing mitigation options for urban systems in Section 8.5 refer to supplementary materials 8.SM.1 and 8.SM.2, respectively. These two materials for the SDG linkages and the feasibility assessment are contained in this contribution.

8.SM.1 Supplementary Material to Section 8.2 on SDG Linkages

Co-benefits and trade-offs in the scope of urban mitigation are focused in Section 8.2.1. Based on the urban mitigation options that are synthesised in Section 8.4, SDG linkages are further considered per urban mitigation option, including the integration of urban mitigation options through integrated approaches. The evaluations are based on the linkages with the SDGs considering synergies (+) and trade-offs (–). These linkages are context specific and the possible synergies and/or trade-offs with the SDGs will change according to the specific urban area. Synergies and/or trade-offs may be more significant in certain contexts than others. **Table 8.SM.1** includes the evaluation of the SDG linkages of the mitigation options for urban systems and indicates the levels of confidence as high (H), medium (M) and low (L). **Table 8.SM.2** includes the references/line of sight for these SDG linkages with 64 references that involve the urban context and extends the mappings that are provided in Thacker et al. (2019) and Fuso Nerini et al. (2018) in addition to the synthesis that is provided in the main chapter text. The evaluations further support Chapter 17 on 'Accelerating the transition in the context of sustainable development'. Urban mitigation with a view of the SDGs can support shifting pathways of urbanisation towards sustainability (also see Cross-Chapter Box 5 on 'Shifting development pathways to increase sustainability and broaden mitigation options' in Chapter 4). Moreover, the multi-dimensional feasibility assessment of mitigation options for urban systems indicates that feasibility is malleable and can increase when more enablers come into play. Strengthened institutional capacity that supports scale and coordination can increase the synergies of the urban mitigation options with the SDGs.

Table 8.SM.1 | Evaluation of the SDG linkages of the mitigation options for urban systems.

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban land use and spatial planning	Electrification of the urban energy system	District heating and cooling networks
SDGs	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**
SDG 1 End poverty	(+) Provides employment density and supports productivity (H) (+) Can reduce exposure and vulnerability to climate change given policy integration (H)	(+) Can address energy poverty that is linked to poverty; eradicating poverty is supported by access to modern energy services for all (M)	(+) Can address energy poverty that is linked to poverty; eradicating poverty is supported by access to modern energy services for all (M)
SDG 2 Zero hunger	(+) Better spatial planning will reduce pressures on land-use change, including croplands (H) (–) Growth in urban extent can still reduce cropland if not sufficiently managed (H)	(+) Electrification can support welfare; electric stoves can support nutritional food intake (M) (–) Can have trade-offs if food systems are coupled with electricity and bioenergy (M)	(–) Can have trade-offs if food systems are coupled with bioenergy and heat (M)
SDG 3 Good health and wellbeing	(+) Improves access to health infrastructure; improves air quality when coupled to shifting energy use, improves well-being with green and blue infrastructure (H)	(+) Improves air quality when coupled to shifting energy use as included in the option; avoids air pollution from energy and transport infrastructure; supports energy services for quality health services in hospitals (H)	(+) Improves air quality when coupled to shifting energy use as included in the option; supports energy services for quality health services in hospitals (M)
SDG 4 Quality education	(+) Better spatial planning increases educational opportunities (M)	(+) Electrification and access to electricity supports quality education and educational attainment (H)	
SDG 5 Gender equality	(+) Can increase equal opportunities and effective participation of women, including urban governance (M)	(+) Supports equal opportunities, also through electricity for internet access if previously lacking (M)	
SDG 6 Clean water and sanitation	(+) Can improve water quality, water-use efficiency, water harvesting and wastewater treatment; efficient urbanization can also reduce GHG emissions from water infrastructure (H)	(+) Renewable-energy-powered water treatment facilities can support clean water and sanitation (M)	
SDG 7 Affordable and clean energy	(+) Can reduce energy use and enable access to modern energy infrastructure while urban infrastructure for energy services varies (H)	(+) Supports renewable energy, energy efficiency and access to affordable, reliable and modern energy; renewable-energy generation technologies can enhance infrastructure resilience (H)	(+) Supports renewable energy, energy efficiency and access to affordable, reliable and modern energy (M)

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban land use and spatial planning	Electrification of the urban energy system	District heating and cooling networks
SDGs	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**
SDG 8 Decent work and economic growth	(+) Provides employment density and supports productivity (H)	(+) Supports technological upgrading, innovation and decent job creation (H)	(+) Supports technological upgrading, innovation and decent job creation (M)
SDG 9 Industry, innovation and infrastructure	(+) Sustainable urbanisation and settlement planning requires development across all infrastructure sectors (H)	(+) Supports sustainable and resilient infrastructure and can support domestic technology development; renewable-energy generation technologies can enhance infrastructure resilience (H)	(+) Is being used to support sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including adaptation and mitigation (M)
SDG 10 Reduced inequalities	(+) Spatial inequalities within cities can be reduced; urban infrastructure gap between cities can be reduced (H) (–) Unintended gentrification and spatial inequalities are still possible (M)	(+) Supports equal opportunities, e.g., through internet access if previously lacking (H)	
SDG 11 Sustainable cities and communities	(+) Supports capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning (Target 11.3) and protecting the poor and vulnerable (Target 11.5) (H)	(+) Supports adequate, safe and affordable housing as well as safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport (Targets 11.1 and 11.2) (H)	(+) Supports capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning (Target 11.3) (H)
SDG 12 Responsible consumption and production	(+) Urbanisation with lower material demands will support responsible consumption and production (H) (–) Urban population growth contributes to increased demand for resources with differences in scenarios; increase in urban water demand can increase pressures on water scarcity; over-exploitation of groundwater needs to be avoided (M)	(+) Allows leapfrogging to more resource-efficient urban development (H) (–) Material demands of electrification technologies will increase; policies are important (M)	(+) Allows leapfrogging to more resource-efficient urban development (M)
SDG 13 Climate action	(+) Contributes to both climate mitigation and adaptation given integration in urban planning (H)	(+) Energy infrastructure can also strengthen climate resilience and adaptive capacity if addressed together (M)	(+) Energy infrastructure can also strengthen climate resilience and adaptive capacity if addressed together (M)
SDG 14 Life below water	(+) Can reduce growth in urban expansion that can help protect coastal and marine ecosystems (M) (–) Urban development can still impact coastal and marine ecosystems (M)	(+) Energy systems can be designed to minimise impacts on water ecosystems (M)	
SDG 15 Life on land	(+) Can reduce growth in urban expansion that can help protect biodiversity on land and terrestrial and inland freshwaters (H) (–) Urban development can still impact biodiversity (M)	(+) Clean energy will reduce the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and terrestrial ecosystems (H) (–) Hydropower development and biofuel cultivation may impact ecosystems while there are multiple alternatives, e.g., use of degraded lands for solar energy farms (M)	(+) Clean energy will reduce the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and terrestrial ecosystems (H)
SDG 16 Peace, justice and strong institutions	(+) Has synergies with responsive, inclusive and participatory decision-making at all levels, and transparent institutions (M)	(+) Improvement in governance through inclusive decision-making improves ability for energy systems to contribute to sustainable development (M)	(+) Improvement in governance through inclusive decision-making improves ability for energy systems to contribute to sustainable development (M)
SDG 17 Partnerships for the goals			

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban green and blue infrastructure	Waste prevention, minimisation and management	Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations
SDGs	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**
SDG 1 End poverty	(+) Can increase employment and food security, e.g., urban agriculture (H)	(+) Can reduce informality in the waste sector and support poverty alleviation (H)	(+) Increases employment density, reduces poverty and exposure and vulnerability to climate change (H)
SDG 2 Zero hunger	(+) Can increase employment and food security, e.g., urban agriculture (M)	(+) Can support reducing food waste in municipalities and urban centres (M)	(+) Supports livelihoods, reduces pressures on croplands and consumption-related land-use impacts (H)
SDG 3 Good health and wellbeing	(+) Better ecosystem services improve health and well-being, can improve air quality (H)	(+) Better waste management improves air quality (H) (–) Can depend on air pollution control techniques if waste incineration is involved (M)	(+) Improves access to health infrastructure; improves air quality when coupled to shifting energy use, improves well-being with green and blue infrastructure (H)
SDG 4 Quality education	(+) Urban green and blue infrastructure can increase opportunities and sites for environmental education (M)		(+) Can increase education opportunities, access to electricity and environmental education (H)
SDG 5 Gender equality			(+) Can increases equal opportunities and effective participation of women, including urban governance (M)
SDG 6 Clean water and sanitation	(+) Also supports water-sensitive urban planning and protection of water-related ecosystems (H)	(+) Improved water and wastewater infrastructure will reduce water pollution (H)	(+) Can improve water quality, water-use efficiency, water harvesting and wastewater treatment; efficient urbanisation can also reduce GHG emissions from water infrastructure (H)
SDG 7 Affordable and clean energy	(+) Produces a cooling effect, lowering energy use when in relative proximity (M)		(+) Supports renewable energy, energy efficiency and access to affordable, reliable and modern energy (H)
SDG 8 Decent work and economic growth	(+) Can stimulate new green economies and green jobs (M)	(+) Can stimulate employment for value added products (M) (–) Transforming informality of waste recycling activities into programmes is important (M)	(+) Supports technological upgrading, innovation and decent job creation (H)
SDG 9 Industry, innovation and infrastructure	(+) Supports sustainable and resilient infrastructure (H)	(+) Supports sustainable and resilient infrastructure (H)	(+) Supports sustainable and resilient infrastructure (H)
SDG 10 Reduced inequalities	(+) Can support equity given policy design (M) (–) Can push out low-income residents from main city areas without inclusive policy design (M)		(+) Can reduce the urban infrastructure gap; sustainable urbanisation can support reducing inequality within and among cities; inclusivity of inhabitants in the informal sector is important (H)

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban green and blue infrastructure	Waste prevention, minimisation and management	Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations
SDGs	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**	**Evaluation of synergies and trade-offs**
SDG 11 Sustainable cities and communities	(+) Supports air quality and universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible green and public spaces (Target 11.7) (H)	(+) Directly related to waste management; supports links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas (Target 11.a) (H)	(+) Supports integrated policies and plans for inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation (Target 11.b) (H)
SDG 12 Responsible consumption and production	(+) Supports sustainable development and lifestyles also 'in harmony with nature' as emphasised (Target 12.8) (H)	(+) Reduces waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse (Target 12.5) (H) (–) Waste segregation at source and waste processing facilities differs across context (H)	(+) Allows leapfrogging to more resource-efficient urban development (H)
SDG 13 Climate action	(+) Contributes to both climate mitigation and adaptation given integration in urban planning (H)	(+) Reduces emissions through better management of urban waste in different contexts and is important for resilience, including coastal areas (M)	(+) Contributes to both climate mitigation and adaptation given integration in urban planning (H)
SDG 14 Life below water	(+) Blue infrastructure can contribute to protecting coastal and marine ecosystems (H)	(+) Better waste management and wastewater treatment will protect coastal and marine ecosystems, reduce marine debris and nutrient pollution (H)	(+) Can reduce growth in urban expansion that can help protect coastal and marine ecosystems (M)
SDG 15 Life on land	(+) Enhances biodiversity within urban areas and ecosystem services (H)	(+) Better waste management and wastewater treatment will protect terrestrial and inland freshwaters (H)	(+) Can reduce growth in urban expansion that can help protect biodiversity on land and terrestrial and inland freshwaters (H)
SDG 16 Peace, justice and strong institutions	(+) Has synergies with responsive, inclusive and participatory decision-making at all levels and transparent institutions (M)	(+) Has synergies with responsive, inclusive and participatory decision-making at all levels and transparent institutions (M)	(+) Has synergies with responsive, inclusive and participatory decision-making at all levels and transparent institutions (M)
SDG 17 Partnerships for the goals			(+) Partnerships support sustainable infrastructure for urban areas; supports policy coherence for sustainable development (Target 17.14) (H)

Table 8.SM.2. | References/line of sight for the SDG linkages of the mitigation options for urban systems.

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban land use and spatial planning	Electrification of the urban energy system	District heating and cooling networks
SDGs	References/line of sight	References/line of sight	References/line of sight
SDG1	Xu et al. (2018); Lall et al. (2021)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Bonatz et al. (2019); Villalobos et al. (2021)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Bonatz et al. (2019); Villalobos et al. (2021)
SDG2	Güneralp et al. (2020)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); IRENA (2021)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018)
SDG3	Madill et al. (2016); Ramirez-Rubio et al. (2019)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Thacker et al. (2019); Karlsson et al. (2020)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018)
SDG4	Kleibert et al. (2020)	Sovacool and Ryan (2016); Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2019b)	
SDG5	Horelli (2017); Raparthi (2021)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Stewart et al. (2018)	
SDG6	Zhang et al. (2019a)	Stewart et al. (2018); Madurai Elavarasan et al. (2021)	
SDG7	Stokes and Seto (2016)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Madurai Elavarasan et al. (2021)	IEA (2021); IRENA (2021)
SDG8	Lall et al. (2021)	IEA (2021); IRENA (2021)	IEA (2021); IRENA (2021)
SDG9	Thacker et al. (2019)	Adenle et al. (2015); Thacker et al. (2019)	Landauer et al. (2019)
SDG10	Giles-Corti et al. (2020); Kamiya et al. (2020); Lall et al. (2021)	Stewart et al. (2018)	
SDG11	Kii et al. (2017); Thacker et al. (2019)		UNEP (2015); Lee and Erickson (2017)
SDG12	Swilling et al. (2018); Kookana et al. (2020); Schandl et al. (2020)	Sovacool et al. (2020); IRENA (2021)	UNEP (2015); Swilling et al. (2018)
SDG13	Hurlimann et al. (2021)	Fuso Nerini et al. 2018	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018)
SDG14	de Andrés et al. (2018)	Thacker et al. (2019)	
SDG15	Ibáñez-Álamo et al. (2020)	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018); Thacker et al. (2019)	
SDG16		(Fuso Nerini et al. 2018)	
SDG17			

Urban mitigation options/SDGs	Urban green and blue infrastructure	Waste prevention, minimisation and management	Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations
SDGs	References/line of sight	References/line of sight	References/line of sight
SDG1	Raymond et al. (2017)		Xu et al. (2018); Lall et al. (2021)
SDG2	de Macedo et al. (2021); Davis et al. (2022)	Richter and Bokelmann (2018); Ananno et al. (2021)	
SDG3	Raymond et al. (2017); IPBES (2019); de Macedo et al. (2021)	Beylot et al. (2018)	Beylot et al. (2018); Ramirez-Rubio et al. (2019)
SDG4	Wolsink (2016)		
SDG5			Horelli (2017); Kiranmayi (2021)
SDG6	Kuller et al. (2017); IPBES (2019); Serrao-Neumann et al. (2019); Raymond et al., 2017; de Macedo et al. (2021)	Thacker et al. (2019)	Zhang et al. (2019a)
SDG7	Wong et al. (2021); Quaranta et al. (2021)		
SDG8	Raymond et al. (2017)	de Bercegol and Gowda (2019); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2020)	Raymond et al. (2017); IEA (2021); IRENA (2021); Lall et al. (2021)
SDG9	Ürge-Vorsatz et al. (2018); IPBES (2019); de Macedo et al. (2021)	Thacker et al. (2019)	Thacker et al. (2019)
SDG10	Andersson et al. (2019); Keeler et al. (2019)		Abubakar and Aina (2019); Kamiya et al. (2020)
SDG11	IPBES, (2019); de Macedo et al. (2021)	AlQattan et al. (2018); Baffoe et al. (2021)	Zinkernagel et al. (2018); Abubakar and Aina, (2019); Thacker et al. (2019)
SDG12		Kumar et al. (2017); Kaza et al. (2018)	
SDG13	Ürge-Vorsatz et al. (2018); IPBES (2019); de Macedo et al. (2021)	Lenhart et al. (2015); Islam (2018); Yoshioka et al. (2021)	Hurlimann et al. (2021)
SDG14	IPBES (2019); de Macedo et al. (2021)		
SDG15	IPBES (2019); Ibáñez-Álamo et al. (2020); de Macedo et al. (2021)		
SDG16	Fuso Nerini et al. (2018)		
SDG17			Anwar et al. (2017); CDP (2021); Negreiros et al. (2021)

References

Abubakar, I.R., and Y.A. Aina, 2019: The prospects and challenges of developing more inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities in Nigeria. *Land use policy*, **87**, 104105, doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104105.

Adenle, A.A., H. Azadi, and J. Arbiol, 2015: Global assessment of technological innovation for climate change adaptation and mitigation in developing world. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **161**, 261–275, doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.05.040.

AlQattan, N. et al., 2018: Reviewing the potential of Waste-to-Energy (WTE) technologies for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) numbers seven and eleven. *Renew. Energy Focus*, **27**, 97–110, doi.org/10.1016/j.ref.2018.09.005.

Ananno, A.A. et al., 2021: Sustainable food waste management model for Bangladesh. *Sustain. Prod. Consum.*, **27**, 35–51, doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.10.022.

Andersson, E. et al., 2019: Enabling Green and Blue Infrastructure to Improve Contributions to Human Well-Being and Equity in Urban Systems. *Bioscience*, **69(7)**, 566–574, doi:10.1093/biosci/biz058.

Anwar, B., Z. Xiao, S. Akter, and R.-U. Rehman, 2017: Sustainable Urbanization and Development Goals Strategy through Public–Private Partnerships in a South-Asian Metropolis. *Sustainability*, **9(11)**, doi:10.3390/su9111940.

Baffoe, G. et al., 2021: Urban–rural linkages: effective solutions for achieving sustainable development in Ghana from an SDG interlinkage perspective. *Sustain. Sci.*, **16(4)**, 1341–1362, doi:10.1007/s11625-021-00929-8.

Beylot, A. et al., 2018: Municipal Solid Waste Incineration in France: An Overview of Air Pollution Control Techniques, Emissions, and Energy Efficiency. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **22(5)**, 1016–1026, doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12701.

Bonatz, N., R. Guo, W. Wu, and L. Liu, 2019: A comparative study of the interlinkages between energy poverty and low carbon development in China and Germany by developing an energy poverty index. *Energy Build.*, **183**, 817–831, doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.09.042.

CDP, 2021: *Cities on the Route to 2030: Building a zero emissions, resilient planet for all*. CDP, London, UK, 35 pp. https://www.cdp.net/en/research/global-reports/cities-on-the-route-to-2030 (Accessed October 29, 2021).

Coalition for Urban Transitions, 2020: *Seizing the Urban Opportunity: Supporting National Governments to Unlock the Economic Power of Low Carbon, Resilient and Inclusive Cities*. Coalition for Urban Transitions (CUT), Washington, DC, USA, 48 pp. https://urbantransitions.global/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Seizing_the_Urban_Opportunity_web_FINAL.pdf.

Davis, J. et al., 2022: Precision approaches to food insecurity: A spatial analysis of urban hunger and its contextual correlates in an African city. *World Dev.*, **149**, 105694, doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105694.

de Andrés, M., J.M. Barragán, and J. García Sanabria, 2018: Ecosystem services and urban development in coastal Social-Ecological Systems: The Bay of Cádiz case study. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **154**, 155–167, doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.01.011.

de Bercegol, R. and S. Gowda, 2019: A new waste and energy nexus? Rethinking the modernisation of waste services in Delhi. *Urban Stud.*, **56(11)**, 2297–2314, doi:10.1177/0042098018770592.

de Macedo, L.V., M.E.B. Picavet, J.A.P. de Oliveira, and W. Shih, 2021: Urban green and blue infrastructure: A critical analysis of research on developing countries. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **313**, 127898.

Fuso Nerini, F. et al., 2018: Mapping synergies and trade-offs between energy and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nat. Energy*, **3(1)**, 10–15, doi:10.1038/s41560-017-0036-5.

Giles-Corti, B., M. Lowe, and J. Arundel, 2020: Achieving the SDGs: Evaluating indicators to be used to benchmark and monitor progress towards creating healthy and sustainable cities. *Health Policy (New York)*, **124**(6), 581–590, doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2019.03.001.

Güneralp, B., M. Reba, B.U. Hales, E.A. Wentz, and K.C. Seto, 2020: Trends in urban land expansion, density, and land transitions from 1970 to 2010: a global synthesis. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15(4)**, 044015, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab6669.

Horelli, L., 2017: Engendering urban planning in different contexts – successes, constraints and consequences. *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, **25(10)**, 1779–1796, doi:10.1080/09654313.2017.1339781.

Hurlimann, A., S. Moosavi, and G.R. Browne, 2021: Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation actions. *Land use policy*, **101**, 105188, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105188.

Ibáñez-Álamo, J.D. et al., 2020: Biodiversity within the city: Effects of land sharing and land sparing urban development on avian diversity. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **707**, 135477, doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135477.

IEA, 2021: *Empowering Cities for a Net Zero Future: Unlocking resilient, smart, sustainable urban energy systems*. International Energy Agency (IEA), Paris, France, 108 pp.

IPBES, 2019: *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. [Brondizio, E.S., J. Settele, S. Díaz, and H.T. Ngo, (eds.)]. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) secretariat, Bonn, Germany, https://www.ipbes.net/global-assessment (Accessed March 29, 2021).

IRENA, 2021: *World Energy Transitions Outlook: 1.5°C Pathway*. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Abu Dhabi, 312 pp. https://www.irena.org/publications/2021/Jun/World-Energy-Transitions-Outlook (Accessed October 31, 2021).

Islam, K.M.N., 2018: Municipal solid waste to energy generation: An approach for enhancing climate co-benefits in the urban areas of Bangladesh. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **81**, 2472–2486, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.06.053.

Kamiya, M., M. Prakash, and H. Berggren, 2020: *Financing Sustainable Urbanization: Counting the Costs and Closing the Gap*. UN-Habitat, Nairobi, 8 pp. https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/2020/02/financing_sustainable_urbanization_-_counting_the_costs_and_closing_the_gap_february_2020.pdf (Accessed November 1, 2021).

Karlsson, M., E. Alfredsson, and N. Westling, 2020: Climate policy co-benefits: a review. *Clim. Policy*, **20(3)**, 292–316, doi:10.1080/14693062.2020.1724070.

Kaza, S., Y. Lisa, P. Bhada-Tata, and F. Van Woerden, 2018: *What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050*. The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 38 pp.

Keeler, B.L. et al., 2019: Social-ecological and technological factors moderate the value of urban nature. *Nat. Sustain.*, **2(1)**, 29–38, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0202-1.

Kii, M., K. Doi, and K. Nakamura, 2017: Urban Planning Research in the Climate Change Era: Transdisciplinary Approach Toward Sustainable Cities BT - Carbon Footprint and the Industrial Life Cycle: From Urban Planning to Recycling. In: *Carbon Footprint and the Industrial Life Cycle* [Álvarez Fernández, R., S. Zubelzu, and R. Martínez, (eds.)]. Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 37–51.

Kleibert, J.M., A. Bobée, T. Rottleb, and M. Schulze, 2020: Transnational education zones: Towards an urban political economy of 'education cities'. *Urban Stud.*, **58(14)**, 2845–2862, doi:10.1177/0042098020962418.

Kookana, R.S., P. Drechsel, P. Jamwal, and J. Vanderzalm, 2020: Urbanisation and emerging economies: Issues and potential solutions for water and food security. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **732**, 139057, doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139057.

Kuller, M., P.M. Bach, D. Ramirez-Lovering, and A. Deletic, 2017: Framing water sensitive urban design as part of the urban form: A critical review of tools for best planning practice. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, **96**, 265–282, doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.07.003.

Kumar, S. et al., 2017: Challenges and opportunities associated with waste management in India. *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, **4**, 160764, doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160764.

Lall, S., M. Lebrand, H. Park, D. Sturm, and A.J. Venables, 2021: *Pancakes to Pyramids: City Form to Promote Sustainable Growth*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 154 pp. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/urbandevelopment/publication/pancakes-to-pyramids (Accessed October 21, 2021).

Landauer, M., S. Juhola, and J. Klein, 2019: The role of scale in integrating climate change adaptation and mitigation in cities. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **62(5)**, 741–765, doi:10.1080/09640568.2018.1430022.

Lee, C.M. and P. Erickson, 2017: How does local economic development in cities affect global GHG emissions? *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **35**, 626–636, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.08.027.

Lenhart, J., B. van Vliet, and A.P.J. Mol, 2015: New roles for local authorities in a time of climate change: the Rotterdam Energy Approach and Planning as a case of urban symbiosis. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **107**, 593–601, doi:10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2015.05.026.

Madill, R., H. Badland, and B. Giles-Corti, 2016: Health service access in urban growth areas: examining the evidence and applying a case study approach. *Aust. Plan.*, **53**(2), 83–90, doi:10.1080/07293682.2015.1118393.

Madurai Elavarasan, R. et al., 2021: Envisioning the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through the lens of energy sustainability (SDG 7) in the post-COVID-19 world. *Appl. Energy*, **292**, 116665, doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116665.

Negreiros, P. et al., 2021: *The State of Cities Climate Finance Part 1: The Landscape of Urban Climate Finance*. Climate Policy Initiative (CPI), San Francisco, USA, 82 pp.

Quaranta, E., C. Dorati, and A. Pistocchi, 2021: Water, energy and climate benefits of urban greening throughout Europe under different climatic scenarios. *Sci. Rep.*, **11**, 12163, doi:10.1038/s41598-021-88141-7.

Ramirez-Rubio, O. et al., 2019: Urban health: an example of a "health in all policies" approach in the context of SDGs implementation. *Global. Health*, **15(1)**, 87, doi:10.1186/s12992-019-0529-z.

Raparthi, K., 2021: Assessing the Relationship Between Urban Planning Policies, Gender, and Climate Change Mitigation: Regression Model Evaluation of Indian Cities. *J. Urban Plan. Dev.*, **147**, 5021007.

Raymond, C. M. et al., 2017: A framework for assessing and implementing the co-benefits of nature-based solutions in urban areas. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **77**, 15–24, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.07.008.

Richter, B. and W. Bokelmann, 2018: The significance of avoiding household food waste – A means-end-chain approach. *Waste Manag.*, **74**, 34–42, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.12.012.

Schandl, H. et al., 2020: Shared socio-economic pathways and their implications for global materials use. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **160**, 104866, doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104866.

Serrao-Neumann, S., M.A. Renouf, E. Morgan, S.J. Kenway, and D. Low Choy, 2019: Urban water metabolism information for planning water sensitive city-regions. *Land use policy*, **88**, 104144, doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104144.

Sovacool, B.K., and S.E. Ryan, 2016: The geography of energy and education: Leaders, laggards, and lessons for achieving primary and secondary school electrification. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **58**, 107–123, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.219.

Sovacool, B.K. et al., 2020: Sustainable minerals and metals for a low-carbon future. *Science*, **367**(6473), 30–33, doi:10.1126/science.aaz6003.

Stewart, I.D., C.A. Kennedy, A. Facchini, and R. Mele, 2018: The Electric City as a Solution to Sustainable Urban Development. *J. Urban Technol.*, **25(1)**, 3–20, doi:10.1080/10630732.2017.1386940.

Stokes, E.C. and K.C. Seto, 2016: Climate change and urban land systems: bridging the gaps between urbanism and land science. *J. Land Use Sci.*, **11(6)**, 698–708, doi:10.1080/1747423X.2016.1241316.

Swilling, M. et al., 2018: *The Weight of Cities: Resource Requirements of Future Urbanization*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 280 pp. https://www.resourcepanel.org/sites/default/files/documents/document/media/the_weight_of_cities_full_report_english.pdf (Accessed March 31, 2021).

Thacker, S. et al., 2019: Infrastructure for sustainable development. *Nat. Sustain.*, **2(4)**, 324–331, doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0256-8.

UNEP, 2015: *District Energy in Cities: Unlocking the Potential of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 138 pp. https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/9317 (Accessed November 21, 2020).

Ürge-Vorsatz, D. et al., 2018: Locking in positive climate responses in cities. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8(3)**, 174–177, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0100-6.

Villalobos, C., C. Chávez, and A. Uribe, 2021: Energy poverty measures and the identification of the energy poor: A comparison between the utilitarian and capability-based approaches in Chile. *Energy Policy*, **152**, 112146, doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112146.

Wolsink, M., 2016: Environmental education excursions and proximity to urban green space – densification in a 'compact city.' *Environ. Educ. Res.*, **22(7)**, 1049–1071, doi:10.1080/13504622.2015.1077504.

Wong, N.H., C.L. Tan, D.D. Kolokotsa, and H. Takebayashi, 2021: Greenery as a mitigation and adaptation strategy to urban heat. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, **2(3)**, 166–181, doi:10.1038/s43017-020-00129-5.

Xu, Q., Y. Dong, and R. Yang, 2018: Influence of the geographic proximity of city features on the spatial variation of urban carbon sinks: A case study on the Pearl River Delta. *Environ. Pollut.*, **243**, 354–363, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.08.083.

Yoshioka, N., M. Era, and D. Sasaki, 2021: Towards integration of climate disaster risk and waste management: A case study of urban and rural coastal communities in the Philippines. *Sustainability,* **13**, 1624, doi:10.3390/su13041624.

Zhang, Q. et al., 2019a: Urbanization impacts on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of the water infrastructure in China: Trade-offs among sustainable development goals (SDGs). *J. Clean. Prod.*, **232**, 474–486, doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.333.

Zhang, T., X. Shi, D. Zhang, and J. Xiao, 2019b: Socio-economic development and electricity access in developing economies: A long-run model averaging approach. *Energy Policy*, **132**, 223–231, doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.05.031.

Zinkernagel, R., J. Evans, and L. Neij, 2018: Applying the SDGs to Cities: Business as Usual or a New Dawn? *Sustainability*, **10(9)**, doi:10.3390/su10093201.

8.SM.2 Supplementary Material to Section 8.5 on the Feasibility Assessment

This Supplementary Material to Chapter 8 provides an overview of the extent to which different factors affect the feasibility of mitigation options in urban systems that may differ across context, time and scale of implementation and the line of sight upon which the feasibility assessment in Figure 8.19 in Section 8.5 is based. The multi-dimensional feasibility assessment is based on 18 indicators in the 6 dimensions of geophysical, environmental-ecological, technological, economic, socio-cultural and institutional feasibility. An indicator in this assessment framework can pose positive and/or negative impacts as enablers or barriers of the mitigation option. Indicators that provide positive impacts as enablers (E) are marked in blue while those that can have negative impacts as barriers (B) are marked in orange in **Table 8.SM.3**. Levels of confidence (LoC) are evaluated as *low*, *medium* or *high* based on the robustness and agreement of the evidence and shaded in light to dark tones. Lines of sight that are used per indicator of the feasibility assessment are contained in **Table 8.SM.4**, including 414 references across urban mitigation options. Lines of sight utilise the systematic assessment of urban case studies considering 1373 scientific references during the timeframe of the AR6 cycle based on Lamb et al. (2019) and additional systematic searches according to the indicators of the feasibility assessment. The lines of sight further build upon the feasibility assessment for land use and urban planning that was initiated by SR1.5 (IPCC 2018). The feasibility assessment for integrating sectors, strategies and innovations is based on multiple urban mitigation options implemented concurrently, such as co-located densities and electrification of the urban energy system whenever relevant (Figure 8.21). The feasibility assessment method is explained in detail in Annex II.11 and Annex II.12.

Table 8.SM.3 | Feasibility assessment of mitigation options in urban systems.

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning		Electrification of the urban energy system		District heating and cooling networks	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
1. Geophysical						
Physical potential	(E) LoC = 3	Reduces pressures on land, e.g, a total of 125,000 km^2 of land could be saved between the years 1970 and 2020 if population density remained the same as 1970 levels while cities have had different dynamics of stable, outward and/or upward growth	(E) LoC = 3	The realisation of the available physical potential depends on the ability to electrify the urban energy system while supporting flexibility and sector coupling options for deep decarbonisation	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on district heating and cooling demands in comparison to the spatial characteristics of urban areas, e.g., heat demand density is a function of both population density and heat demand per capita where physical suitability can be equally present in urban areas with high population density or high heat demand per capita
Geophysical resources	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the ability of the mitigation option to limit demands on materials for urban construction needs, thereby avoiding and shifting pressures on geophysical resources, including scarce resources	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the demands on geophysical resources in comparison to other energy technologies, recycling of relevant energy technologies and energy storage needs at suitable levels	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on optimization of the piping layout with metal use and the implementation of eco-design principles for resource efficiency
Land use	(E) LoC = 3	Land-use efficiency reduces pressures on growth in urban extent while urban land use changes according to the drivers in SSP scenarios. Scenarios that involve sustainability involve lower urban land use, e.g., 1.1 million km^2 in 2100 in SSP1 versus 3.6 million km^2 in SSP5	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the energy supply to support electrification and the ability to use urban density to increase the penetration of renewable power and electric public transport, e.g., mixed-use neighbourhoods for grid balancing	(E) LoC = 3	Improves based on urban design parameters, including density, block area, and elongation with close impact of urban density on energy density. Walkable and higher density urban form can further enable its implementation
2. Environmental-ecological						

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning		Electrification of the urban energy system		District heating and cooling networks	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
Air pollution	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the energy mix that is involved in the urban infrastructure (energy use in buildings, private vehicles and public transport) while energy use due to vehicle transport is reduced with walkable urban form	(E) LoC = 3	Level of improvement depends on the shift to non-polluting energy sources, e.g., shifting to 100% renewable energy can save about 408,270 lives per year due to better air quality in 74 metropolitan areas around the world, enabling its implementation	(E) LoC = 3	Level of improvement depends on the energy resource that is replaced and air quality regulations when applicable
Toxic waste, ecotoxicity, eutrophication	(E) LoC = 2	Better urban land-use and spatial planning will limit negative impacts depending on urban land use, urban surface (permeable versus impermeable), ability to limit urban stormwater runoff and discharge	(E) LoC = 2	Depends on the source of the electrification of urban energy systems while favourable. It is also possible to displace water and soil pollution from conventional fuels	(E) LoC = 2	The energy resource that is replaced can provide additional environmental benefits, e.g., replacing coal use improves air and water pollution
Water quantity and quality	(E) LoC = 2	Improves based on the urban water system (supply, purification, distribution, drainage, the magnitude, source and location of water supply), and the level of integration between urban land-use and water planning that requires both policy integration and innovation (*see last option on integrating sectors, strategies and innovations*)	(E) LoC = 2	Depends on the source of the electrification of urban energy systems while favourable. It is also possible to displace water and soil pollution from conventional fuels	(E) LoC = 2	Resource-efficient and strategic densification for 84 cities indicate lifecycle assessment benefits for water that can also increase when integrated with other options, e.g., urban metabolism
Biodiversity	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the context, including the ability to limit urban growth, governance capacity, and integrating ecosystem service information into spatial planning. Land-use change for urban areas can threaten biodiversity	(E) LoC = 2	Deep decarbonisation pathways involve electrification, including urban vehicle kilometres and reduction in land use, including for urban areas. These pathways have a positive impact on biodiversity considering reduced land and climate impacts	(E) LoC = 2	Increases with the interaction of urban energy planning with urban land-use and spatial planning, e.g., limiting the growth in urban extent together with this option can avoid impacts on biodiversity

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning		Electrification of the urban energy system		District heating and cooling networks	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
3. Technological						
Simplicity	(E/B) LoC =3	Urban land-use and spatial planning supports other mitigation options as a fundamental necessity for climate mitigation while complex in many ways. The geographical coverage of harmonised algorithms to monitor land-use change also remains one of the current gaps in knowledge	(E/B) LoC =3	Simplicity varies according to the scale of electrification, energy system interactions and system integration to support flexibility in energy systems with high renewable energy penetration	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on economies of scope in urban areas with access to already existing excess heat, system integration, level of climate ambition for climate neutrality, urban infrastructure and support from geographic information systems (GIS) for planning district heating and cooling networks that also provide an entry point for decarbonising thermal needs
Technological scalability	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the stage of urban development with more opportunities at earlier stages and/or differences in opportunities, e.g., strategic intensification. Scalability also depends on combining urban land-use and spatial planning practices with climate mitigation as well as sustainable development objectives	(E) LoC = 3	Holds advantages for rapid pace of decarbonisation despite carbon lock-in across urban typologies. Also depends on support from flexibility options, e.g., demand response, power-to-heat and electric mobility to increase the penetration of renewable energy in the urban system. The choice of options, e.g., electrified urban rail, can integrate with existing urban design based on walkable neighbourhoods in rapidly growing cities	(E) LoC = 3	Is technologically scalable in different regions that increases with the geographic heat/cold demand density of the urban area. There are relatively more opportunities with urban energy planning processes. District heating and/or cooling networks are able to also support flexibility in the energy system and act as low-cost storage options
Maturity and technology readiness	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable, while further depending on the level of integration, e.g., energy-driven urban design for optimising the impact of urban form on energy infrastructure	(E) LoC = 3	Maturity is favourable, including demand response based on power-to-heat in support of electrification and other options that have technical feasibility for providing flexibility in the energy system, particularly based on municipal level demonstrations	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the generation with a role for low-temperature, fourth-generation district heating and cooling networks in emerging and future energy networks with high renewable energy penetration
4. Economic						
Costs in 2030 and long term	(E) LoC = 3	Provides cost benefits that increase with characteristics of urban development. Beyond costs, limiting the growth in urban extent has multiple benefits for climate mitigation	(E) LoC = 3	Costs are favourable. Renewable electricity is also relevant for decarbonising the heating sector through power-to-heat that can be a cost-effective option, including large-scale heat pumps in district heating and cooling networks	(E) LoC = 3	Can already provide total annual cost savings over building-level solutions. Future improvements depend on system optimisation, the ability to integrate low-temperature renewable energy sources and excess electricity from renewables in upgrading existing or implementing new district heating and cooling networks, and modular approach across suitable urban areas
Employment effects and economic growth	(E) LoC = 3	The concentration of people and activity in walkable, higher density urban areas increases productivity based on proximity and efficiency while providing employment density. The ability to decouple urban economic growth from emissions and other parameters, e.g., vehicle kilometres travelled, can further increase sustainable growth	(E) LoC = 3	Is positive and increases with the ability to establish local jobs and use revenues locally. Access to renewable electricity reduces the operational GHG emissions of the local economy, thereby increasing competitiveness, while providing a net status of long-term, full-time jobs	(E) LoC = 3	Is positive and increases with the ability to stimulate a green economy, e.g., access to renewable-energy-based district heating and cooling networks reduces the operational GHG emissions of the local economy, increases competitiveness and supports jobs in design and implementation, equipment manufacturing, operation and maintenance

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning		Electrification of the urban energy system		District heating and cooling networks	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
5. Socio-cultural						
Public acceptance	(E) LoC = 2	Increases with processes that are involved in the planning and implementation of the urban mitigation option, i.e., co-design	(E) LoC = 3	Depends on the provision of clean and affordable energy services through electrification of the urban energy system and socially-accepted potential for load shifting	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on role in climate neutrality targets, co-benefits for air quality, addressing energy poverty, citizen and consumer ownership models, technology perception as well as public and consumer awareness
Effects on health and well-being	(E) LoC = 3	Increases with the quality of spatial planning to increase co-benefits for health and well-being, e.g., balancing urban green areas with density	(E) LoC = 3	Increases with the energy resource that is displaced through electrification of the urban energy system. Residential electricity access also provides a positive influence on health and well-being, as well as life expectancy	(E) LoC = 3	Provides improvement in both indoor and outdoor air quality, provision of thermal comfort, alleviation of the urban heat island effect, and improved safety with gas supply outside accommodation as an enabler of the mitigation option
Distributional effects	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the policy tools that shape the impacts or benefits of urban densification on affordable housing while evidence for transit-induced gentrification is partial and inconclusive	(E) LoC = 3	Increases with the ability of addressing aspects of energy poverty as well as increasing energy access in informal settlements based on urban planning. Urbanisation is also a driver of access to electricity, which if combined with renewable energy, can further support sustainable development. Business models and nature of ownership can increase intra-generational equity while shifting to inter-generational equity	(E) LoC = 3	Increases based on the business model with local ownership of district heating and cooling networks having the most positive impact on local benefits. Also contributes to addressing energy poverty based on the provision of affordable energy for satisfying thermal comfort in urban areas
6. Institutional						
Political acceptance	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on context, increasing with the ability to integrate opportunities for climate mitigation with co-benefits for health and wellbeing	(E) LoC = 3	Depends on the coordination ability of local authorities and the local level renewable energy target setting and implementation with close to 1000 cities having adopted climate neutrality targets, including some that further extend into urban climate positive targets	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to plan and implement structural policies for climate neutrality as well as the population size of municipalities
Institutional capacity and governance, cross-sectoral coordination	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to implement integrated urban planning as well as relations between urban mobility, buildings, energy systems, water systems, ecosystem services, other urban sectors and climate adaptation	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on policy coherence to avoid policy fragmentation and electrification at scale. High renewable energy targets, high climate ambition as well as high fuel and CO_2 prices support the diffusion of related options	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on coordination with urban planning, the scope of urban energy planning, forming of partnerships and local ownership
Legal and administrative feasibility	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the capacity for implementing land-use zoning and regulations consistently with urban land-use and spatial planning	(E) LoC = 3	Enabled by the policy and financing instruments that are used to support and increase electrification of the urban energy system, including green bonds and green procurement strategies	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to implement policy instruments to exploit and integrate local resources for supplying thermal energy cost-effectively to urban areas while implementing climate targets. Bottom-up and interactive regulatory frameworks based on multi-level policies are suggested for facilitating coordination among energy sectors as an enabler

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban green and blue infrastructure		Waste prevention, minimisation and management		Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
1. Geophysical						
Physical potential	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable, increasing with the physical space that is available for urban green/blue space and infrastructure to an extent that will support climate mitigation strategies	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable, also depending on alleviating resource usage and upstream emissions from urban settlements based on the mitigation option	(E) LoC = 3	The ability to reduce pressures on physical land resources for urban areas is a feasibility enabler
Geophysical resources	(E) LoC = 2	Urban green and blue infrastructure are based on ecomimicry and sustainability innovations and do not represent pressures on geophysical resource demands	(E) LoC = 3	Resource benefits increase with the scale of waste prevention, minimisation and material recovery, e.g., reducing demands for new virgin raw resources	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on lowering the material demands for urban development with opportunities for considering materials with lower GHG impacts and selection of urban development plans with lower material demands
Land use	(E) LoC = 3	Depends on the scope of green and blue infrastructure while restoration-based nature-based solutions can also restore degraded urban land area	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable, also depending on reducing ecological footprint due to integrated waste management and possibly biochar to improve soil quality. Walkable urban form can also reduce distances for waste collection	(E) LoC = 3	Increases with the role of urban land-use and spatial planning in the low-carbon development (*see first mitigation option on urban land-use and spatial planning*) and the relevance of brownfield urban development for the project
2. Environmental-ecological						
Air pollution	(E) LoC = 3	The indicator is an enabler while the highest benefits depend on the design of urban ecological infrastructure and related parameters that influence better air quality, including leaf area index, foliage density and the impact on reducing urban energy usage	(E) LoC = 3	Better waste management enables better air quality, further depending on the adopted waste hierarchy principles and the energy use of facilities for material and/or energy recovery in the urban vicinity, if any	(E) LoC = 3	Integrating across urban land-use and spatial planning, electrification of urban energy systems, district heating and cooling networks, urban green and blue infrastructure and waste management has positive impacts on improving air quality
Toxic waste, ecotoxicity, eutrophication	(E) LoC = 3	Urban green and blue infrastructure can be used for also remediating brownfield sites, e.g., phytoremediation and bioremediation, and limiting urban runoff	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable, also considering the avoided environmental burden of local strategies for waste and wastewater management and avoided resource use	(E) LoC = 2	Level of improvement depends on the demands of low-carbon development on materials and urban metabolism performance
Water quantity and quality	(E) LoC = 3	Is an enabler based on the ability to reduce water runoff, increase permeable surfaces and increase the quality of waterways and wetlands	(E) LoC = 3	Increases with the ability of integrated waste management to avoid environmental contamination, including micropollutants, groundwater and marine pollution, and stringency of municipal wastewater treatment systems	(E) LoC = 3	Level of improvement depends on the interaction and inclusion of low-carbon development options that reduce impacts on water use and increase quality, including water-use efficiency, demand management and recycling
Biodiversity	(E) LoC = 2	Benefits for biodiversity increase depending on the location, ecosystem and context of intervention as well as connectivity of natural habitats	(E) LoC = 2	Level of improvement depends on avoiding waste to landfill and landfill leachate as well as activities for land reclamation for biodiversity preservation	(E) LoC = 2	Level of improvement depends on urban metabolism and biophilic urbanism towards urban areas that regenerate natural capital

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban green and blue infrastructure		Waste prevention, minimisation and management		Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations	
Dimensions/ indicators	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation	Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)	Role of context, time and scale of implementation
3. Technological						
Simplicity	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable and increases with the ability to harness local resources and available technologies in multi-actor and cross-scalar processes	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the context of implementing the waste hierarchy from prevention onward and the effectiveness of practices for waste separation at source	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to initiate and learn from experimentation and the ability to support GHG emission reductions based on both structural, behavioural and lifestyle changes
Technological scalability	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to up-scale interventions, including for urban regeneration and restoration, and the utilisation of available urban areas for multifunctional, place- and location-based ecological solutions	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the waste management system as well as the stage of urban development, including material use and waste from urban construction	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the mitigation options integrated, the stage of urban development and typology of the urban area with certain contexts providing additional opportunities over others
Maturity and technology readiness	(E) LoC = 3	Maturity is favourable while further depending on the ability to up-scale interventions and the role of nature-based solutions in urban sustainability, resilience and transformations	(E) LoC = 3	Maturity is favourable that further depends on the choices for waste management. There are also opportunities for reducing the embodied energy that is used during material recovery	(E/B) LoC = 2	Multiple technologies are available for integration while further depending on context and the level of integration, e.g., energy-driven urban design for optimising the impact of urban form on energy infrastructure
4. Economic						
Costs in 2030 and long term	(E) LoC = 3	The benefit-to-cost ratio is already favourable based on monetary costs excluding co-benefits while the exact values depend on context and scale	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable with changes according to the choice of technology, strategy and awareness of system users that can represent time-dependent costs and revenue changes	(E) LoC = 2	Provides cost benefits that increase with a portfolio approach for cost-effective, cost-neutral and re-investment options with evidence across different urban typologies as well as cost reduction options with urban form
Employment effects and economic growth	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the upscaling of interventions to support local employment opportunities and sustainable growth, including employment for urban forestry	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on labour efficiency, ability to stimulate employment for value added products through circular economy and innovation activities with an estimated 45 million jobs in the waste management sector by 2030	(E) LoC = 3	Increases based on the speed that the mitigation option triggers economic decoupling with a positive impact on employment and local competitiveness
5. Socio-cultural						
Public acceptance	(E) LoC = 3	Public acceptance is commonly high and represents a positive lock-in with awareness and recreational use also given that potential concerns for green gentrification are addressed	(E) LoC = 3	Is favourable and increases with reduced system costs for citizens, greater awareness of primary waste separation and possible positive behavioural spillover across environmental policies	(E/B) LoC =3	Contexts that involve a participatory approach towards urban transformation with a shared understanding of future opportunities and challenges are enablers. Public acceptance increases with citizen engagement and citizen empowerment as well as an awareness of the co-benefits
Effects on health and well-being	(E) LoC = 3	Urban green/blue infrastructure can provide reductions in the urban heat island effect, provide cleaner air as well as cardiovascular and mental health benefits that are related to availability and accessibility	(E) LoC = 3	Contributes to health and well-being through liveable cities, reducing human toxicity, particulate matter, photochemical oxidant and similar with possibilities of increasing the nutrition status of urban diets also considering food systems with less waste, less water, GHG emissions and land impacts	(E) LoC = 3	The scope of low-carbon urban development measures provides significant potential for co-benefits for public health and well-being

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Mitigation options	Urban green and blue infrastructure		Waste prevention, minimisation and management		Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations	
Dimensions/ indicators	**Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)**	**Role of context, time and scale of implementation**	**Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)**	**Role of context, time and scale of implementation**	**Feasibility barriers or enablers (LoC)**	**Role of context, time and scale of implementation**
Distributional effects	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the availability (percentage of total area), accessibility (proportion of the urban population living within an accessible distance) of urban green areas and public versus private ownership. Distributional effects for urban green and blue infrastructure are important and may or may not represent inequalities that depends on inclusive policy design and empowerment	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the sharing of costs and benefits and the ability to transform informality of waste recycling activities into programmes	(E) LoC = 3	Level of improvement depends on integrating issues of equity, inclusivity and affordability, safeguarding urban livelihoods, access to basic services, lowering energy bills, addressing energy poverty, and improving public health
6. Institutional						
Political acceptance	(E) LoC = 3	Political acceptance is commonly high with potential additional support from collaborative planning, co-creating solutions and mandate for urban greening in development	(E) LoC = 3	Efficient waste management infrastructure is the most widely adopted strategy, including among 210 circular economy strategies in urban areas	(E/B) LoC = 2	Depends on the GHG reduction or climate neutrality target that is set, as well as support from participatory processes
Institutional capacity and governance, cross-sectoral coordination	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on transdisciplinary coordination for urban ecological infrastructure that encompasses terrestrial and/or aquatic ecosystems, as well as institutional and community capacity for holistic design that is better connected with the ecological constraints of Earth systems	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the organisational structure for promoting integrated waste management and capabilities related to programme administration	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the ability to form partnerships to overcome barriers, including technology development, rule-setting and demonstration, capacity to manage transitions, establishing integrated departments and funding schemes for low-carbon urban development, implementing system innovations and aligning system actors, engaging in policy learning among cities and implementing supportive policy mixes
Legal and administrative feasibility	(E) LoC = 3	Favourable while further depending on the governance content as well as new targets for restoring degraded ecosystems	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on local legislation and policies, choices within municipal waste management strategies to reduce investment costs, and compliance with targets for circular economy	(E/B) LoC =3	Depends on the capacity to implement relevant policy instruments in an integrated way and leverage multi-level policies as relevant

Levels of Confidence (LoC)	*Low*	*Medium*	*High*
Enablers (E)			
Barriers (B)			

Table 8.SM.4 | Line of sight for the feasibility assessment of mitigation options in urban systems

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning	Electrification of the urban energy system	District heating and cooling networks
Dimensions/ indicators	**References/line of sight**	**References/line of sight**	**References/line of sight**
1. Geophysical			
Physical potential	Mahtta et al. (2019); Güneralp et al.(2020)	Hsieh et al. (2017); Wang et al. (2018); Aghahosseini et al. (2019); Bogdanov et al. (2019); Child et al. (2019); Hansen et al. (2019); Aghahosseini et al. (2020); Ram et al. (2020)	Swilling et al. (2018); Möller et al. (2019); Persson et al. (2019); UNEP IRP (2020)
Geophysical resources	Müller et al. (2013); Bai et al. (2018); Swilling et al. (2018); Magnusson et al. (2019); UNEP IRP (2020)	Gibon et al. (2017); IEA (2020); Sovacool et al. (2020)	Wang et al. (2016); UNEP IRP (2020)
Land use	EC JRC (2018); Gao and O'Neill (2020); Güneralp et al. (2020); Daunt et al. (2021)	Hsieh et al. (2017); Tong et al. (2017); Fichera et al. (2018)	Fonseca and Schlueter (2015); Shi et al. (2020)
2. Environmental-ecological			
Air pollution	Burgalassi and Luzzati (2015); Zhang et al. (2018a); Zhang et al. (2018b); Pierer and Creutzig (2019)	Jacobson et al. (2018); Ajanovic and Haas (2019); Bagheri et al. (2019); Gai et al. (2020); Jacobson et al. (2020)	Tuomisto et al. (2015); Dénarié et al. (2018); Zhai et al. (2020); REN21 (2021)
Toxic waste, ecotoxicity, eutrophication	Phillips et al. (2018); Regier et al. (2020); Charters et al. (2021)	Gibon et al. (2017); Lohrmann et al. (2021)	Bartolozzi et al. (2017); Zhai et al. (2020)
Water quantity and quality	Serrao-Neumann et al. (2017); Rodríguez-Sinobas et al. (2018); Xu et al. (2018); Ahmad et al. (2020); Lei et al. (2021)	Gibon et al. (2017); Lohrmann et al. (2021)	Swilling et al. (2018)
Biodiversity	Huang et al. (2018a); McDonald et al. (2018); Cortinovis and Geneletti (2020); Güneralp et al. (2020); IPBES (2019); McDonald et al. (2020)	Bataille et al. (2020); Schipper et al. (2020)	Huang et al. (2018a); McDonald et al. (2018); Cortinovis and Geneletti (2020); Güneralp et al. (2020); IPBES (2019); McDonald et al. (2020)
3. Technological			
Simplicity	Reba and Seto (2020)	Kennedy et al. (2017); Kennedy et al. (2018); Drysdale et al. (2019); Thellufsen et al. (2020)	UNEP (2015); Persson et al. (2019); REN21 (2020)
Technological scalability	Lall et al. (2013); Große et al. (2016); Cheshmehzangi and Butters (2017); Facchini et al. (2017); Lwasa (2017); Stokes and Seto (2019)	Lund et al. (2015); Calvillo et al. (2016); Salpakari et al. (2016); Seto et al. (2016); Kennedy et al. (2017); Newman (2017); Sangiuliano (2017); Zenginis et al. (2017); Bartłomiejczyk (2018); De Luca et al. (2018); Kennedy et al. (2018); McPherson et al. (2018); Sharma (2018); Stewart et al. (2018); Yuan et al. (2018); Drysdale et al. (2019); Narayanan et al. (2019); Bellocchi et al. (2020); Calise et al. (2020); Gjorgievski et al. (2020); Meha et al. (2020); Thellufsen et al. (2020); You and Kim (2020); Yuan et al. (2021); Pfeifer et al. (2021)	Borelli et al. (2015); Webb (2015); Xiong et al. (2015); Felipe Andreu et al. (2016); Zhang et al. (2016); Hui et al. (2017); Loibl et al. (2017); Lund et al. (2017); Pavičević et al. (2017); Bünning et al. (2018); Chaer et al. (2018); Dominković et al. (2018); Hast et al. (2018); Köfinger et al. (2018); Popovski et al. (2018); Yeo et al. (2018); Bozhikaliev et al. (2019); Dominković and Krajačić (2019); Dorotić et al. (2019a); Möller et al. (2019); Persson et al. (2019); Pieper et al. (2019); Sorknæs et al. (2020); Yuan et al. (2021b)
Maturity and technology readiness	Asarpota and Nadin (2020); Lall et al. (2021)	Kennedy et al. (2017); Kennedy et al. (2018); Gjorgievski et al. (2020); IEA (2020); Meha et al. (2020); Sethi et al. (2020)	(Baldvinsson and Nakata (2017); Lund et al. (2018a); Lund et al. (2018b); IEA (2020); UNEP IRP (2020); Novosel et al. (2021)
4. Economic			
Costs in 2030 and long term	Lall et al. (2021)	Newman (2017); Bloess et al. (2018); Jacobson et al. (2018); Bogdanov et al. (2021)	Xiong et al. (2015); Bordin et al. (2016); Petersen (2016); Pavičević et al. (2017); Dorotić et al. (2019b); Möller et al. (2019); Persson et al. (2019); Aunedi et al. (2020); Djørup et al. (2020); Doračić et al. (2020); Pursiheimo and Rämä (2021)
Employment effects and economic growth	Lee and Erickson (2017); Salat et al. (2017); Gao and Newman (2018); Han et al. (2018); Li and Liu (2018); Lall et al. (2021)	Mikkola and Lund (2016); Lee and Erickson (2017); Kennedy et al. (2017); Jacobson et al. (2018); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2020); Jacobson et al. (2020); Ram et al. (2020b); REN21 (2020); Ram et al. (2022)	UNEP (2015); Lee and Erickson (2017)
5. Socio-cultural			

Mitigation options	Urban land-use and spatial planning	Electrification of the urban energy system	District heating and cooling networks
Dimensions/ indicators	References/line of sight	References/line of sight	References/line of sight
Public acceptance	Grandin et al. (2018); Webb et al. (2018)	Newman (2017); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2019); Corsini et al. (2019); Pfeiffer et al. (2021)	Karlsson et al. (2016); Hvelplund and Djørup (2017); Robinson et al. (2018); Palermo et al. (2020a); Palermo et al. (2020b)
Effects on health and well-being	Li et al. (2016a); Yang et al. (2018b); Pierer and Creutzig (2019)	Gai et al. (2020); Jacobson et al. (2020); Newman (2017); REN21 (2020); Steinberger et al. (2020)	UNEP (2015); Meggers et al. (2016); Zhai et al. (2020)
Distributional effects	Chava and Newman (2016); Jagarnath and Thambiran (2018); Padeiro et al. (2019); Debrunner and Hartmann (2020)	Kennedy et al. (2017); Aklin et al. (2018); Brandoni et al. (2018); Hunter et al. (2018a); Teferi and Newman (2018); Lekavičius et al. (2020)	UNEP (2015); Hvelplund and Djørup (2017); Robinson et al. (2018)
6. Institutional			
Political acceptance	Grandin et al. (2018); Asarpota and Nadin (2020)	Havas et al. (2015); Li et al. (2016b); Grandin et al. (2018); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2019); Data-Driven EnviroLab and NewClimate Institute (2020); Palermo et al. (2020a); Palermo et al. 2020b; REN21 (2020); Takao (2020)	Grandin et al. (2018); Palermo et al. (2020a); Palermo et al. (2020b)
Institutional capacity and governance, cross-sectoral coordination	Große et al. (2016); Broto (2017); Endo et al. (2017); Geneletti et al. (2017); Hersperger et al. (2018)	Fenton and Kanda (2017); Alkhalidi et al. (2018); Bloess et al. (2018); Glazebrook and Newman (2018); Krog (2019); Lammers and Hoppe (2019); Takao (2020)	Delmastro et al. (2016); Hvelplund and Djørup (2017); Tong et al. (2017); Guo and Hendel (2018); Kim et al. (2018); Chambers et al. (2019)
Legal and administrative feasibility	Deng et al. (2018); Yılmaz Bakır et al. (2018); Shen et al. (2019); Barzegar et al. (2021)	Byrne et al. (2017); Kennedy et al. (2017); Suo et al. (2017); Glazebrook and Newman (2018); Xie et al. (2018); Hadfield and Cook (2019); Data-Driven EnviroLab and NewClimate Institute (2020); Lewandowska et al. (2020)	Hvelplund and Djørup (2017); Möller et al. (2019); Doračić et al. (2020); Moser et al. (2020)

Mitigation options	Urban green and blue infrastructure	Waste prevention, minimisation and management	Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations
Dimensions/ indicators	References/line of sight	References/line of sight	References/line of sight
1. Geophysical			
Physical potential	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Keeler et al. (2019); Quaranta et al. (2021)	Swilling et al. (2018); Kaza et al. (2018); Chen et al. (2020); Harris et al. (2020)	Mahtta et al. (2019); Güneralp et al. (2020)
Geophysical resources	Collier et al. (2016); Quaranta et al. (2021)	López-Uceda et al. (2018); Russo (2018); Vaitkus et al. (2018)	Carpio et al. (2016); Liu et al. (2016); Ramage et al. (2017); Shi et al. (2017a); Stocchero et al. (2017); Bai et al. (2018); Swilling et al. (2018); UNEP IRP (2020); Zhan et al. (2018)
Land use	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Nastran and Regina (2016); Fan et al. (2017); Raymond et al. (2017); Slach et al. (2019); Quaranta et al. (2021)	Oliveira et al. (2017); Chiaramonti and Panoutsou (2018); Medick et al. (2018); Peri et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2018a)	Gao and O'Neill (2020); Güneralp et al. (2020); Xu et al. (2018)
2. Environmental-ecological			
Air pollution	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Jandaghian and Akbari (2018); Kim and Coseo (2018); Santamouris et al. (2018a); Scholz et al. (2018); Keeler et al. (2019); Song et al. (2019)	Ramaswami et al. (2017); Lima et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2020); Kanhai et al. (2021)	Diallo et al. (2016); Nieuwenhuijsen and Khreis (2016); Shakya (2016); Liu et al. (2017); Ramaswami et al. (2017); Sun et al. (2018b), Tayarani et al. (2018); Park and Sener (2019)
Toxic waste, ecotoxicity, eutrophication	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Risch et al. (2018); Keeler et al. (2019); Song et al. (2019)	Roig et al. (2012); Ibáñez-Forés et al. (2018); Lima et al. (2018); Zhou et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2020)	González-García et al. (2021)
Water quantity and quality	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Raymond et al. (2017); Albert et al. (2019); Keeler et al. (2019)	Ibáñez-Forés et al. (2018); Kaza et al. (2018); Lima et al. (2018); Pesqueira et al. (2020); Vergara-Araya et al. (2020); Proctor et al. (2021)	Koop and van Leeuwen (2015); Topi et al. (2016); Drangert and Sharatchandra (2017); Lam et al. (2017); Vanham et al. (2017); Kim and Chen (2018); Lam et al. (2018); James et al. (2018)
Biodiversity	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Schwarz et al. (2017); McDonald et al. (2018); McPhearson et al. (2018); Nero et al. (2018); Hale et al. (2019); Keeler et al. (2019)	Weng et al. (2015); Hale et al. (2019); IPBES (2019)	Thomson and Newman (2018); IPBES (2019)

Mitigation options	Urban green and blue infrastructure	Waste prevention, minimisation and management	Integrating sectors, strategies and innovations
Dimensions/ indicators	References/line of sight	References/line of sight	References/line of sight
3. Technological			
Simplicity	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Sasaki et al. (2018); Keeler et al. (2019)	Hunter et al. (2018b); Kaza et al. (2018); Sun et al. (2018a)	McLean et al. (2016); Matschoss and Heiskanen (2017); Williams (2017); Zhang and Li (2017); Aziz et al. (2018); Chen et al. (2018a)
Technological scalability	Chen (2015); Kabisch et al. (2015); Lee et al. (2015); Ruckelshaus et al. (2016); Cleveland et al. (2017); Ferrari et al. (2017); Lwasa (2017); Raymond et al. (2017); Gargiulo et al. (2018); Kanniah and Siong (2018); Albert et al. (2019); De Masi et al. (2019); De la Sota et al. (2019); Dorst et al. (2019); Grafakos et al. (2020)	Eriksson et al. (2015); Boyer and Ramaswami (2017); Lwasa (2017); Tomić and Schneider (2017); Jiang et al. (2017); Huang et al. (2018b); Islam (2018); Paul et al. (2018); Pérez et al. (2018); Tomić and Schneider (2018); Pérez et al. (2020); Sakcharoen et al. (2021)	Yamagata and Seya (2013); Dienst et al. (2015); Maier (2016); Beygo and Yüzer (2017); Lwasa (2017); Pacheco-Torres et al. (2017); Roldán-Fontana et al. (2017); Affolderbach and Schulz (2017); Ramaswami et al. (2017); Zhao et al. (2017); Alhamwi et al. (2018); Kang and Cho (2018); Lin et al. (2018); Collaço et al. (2019); Kılkış (2019); Kılkış and Kılkış (2019)
Maturity and technology readiness	Elmqvist et al. (2015); Collier et al. (2016); Elmqvist et al. (2019); Dorst et al. (2019)	Kabir et al. (2015); Soares and Martins (2017); Tomić and Schneider (2018); D'Adamo et al. (2021)	Hu et al. (2015); Shi et al. (2017b); Xue et al. (2017); Dobler et al. (2018); Egusquiza et al. (2018); Pedro et al. (2018); Soilán et al. (2018); Kılkış (2021); Mirzabeigi and Razkenari (2021)
4. Economic			
Costs in 2030 and long term	Elmqvist et al. (2015)	Khan et al. (2016); Chifari et al. (2017); Medick et al. (2018); Ranieri et al. (2018); Tomić and Schneider (2020)	Colenbrander et al. (2015); Gouldson et al. (2015); Colenbrander et al. (2016); Nieuwenhuijsen and Khreis (2016); Saujot and Lefèvre (2016); Sudmant et al. (2016); Yazdanie et al. (2017); Brozynski and Leibowicz (2018); Lall et al. (2021)
Employment effects and economic growth	Thomson and Newman (2016); Raymond et al. (2017); Kareem et al. (2020)	Alzate-Arias et al. (2018); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2020); Soukiazis and Proença (2020)	Kalmykova et al. (2015); Chen et al. (2018b); García-Gusano et al. (2018); Hu et al. (2018); Shen et al. (2018); Lall et al. (2021)
5. Socio-cultural			
Public acceptance	Raymond et al. (2017); Ürge-Vorsatz et al. (2018); Song et al. (2019)	Milutinović et al. (2016); Tomić and Schneider (2017); Díaz-Villavicencio et al. (2017); Ek and Miliute-Plepiene (2018); Romano et al. (2019); Tomić and Schneider (2020)	Blanchet (2015); Bjørkelund et al. (2016); Flacke and De Boer (2017); Gao et al. (2017); Herrmann et al. (2017); Neuvonen and Ache (2017); Sharp and Salter (2017); Gorissen et al. (2018); Fastenrath and Braun (2018); Moglia et al. (2018); Wiktorowicz et al. (2018)
Effects on health and well-being	Huang et al. (2017); van den Bosch and Sang (2017); Privitera and La Rosa (2018); Santamouris et al. (2018b); Andersson et al. (2019); Keeler et al. (2019); Song et al. (2019); Grafakos et al. (2020); Jamei et al. (2020); Quaranta et al. (2021)	Boyer and Ramaswami (2017); Newman (2017); Coalition for Urban Transitions (2020); Slorach et al. (2020)	Dodman (2009); Diallo et al. (2016); García-Fuentes and de Torre (2017); Liu et al. (2017);Newman (2017); Laeremans et al. (2018); Li et al. (2018)
Distributional effects	Lwasa et al. (2015); Huang et al. (2017); Andersson et al. (2019); Khumalo and Sibanda (2019); Keeler et al. (2019)	Conke (2018); de Bercegol and Gowda (2018); Grové et al. (2018)	Friend et al. (2016); Claude et al. (2017); Colenbrander et al. (2017); Ma et al. (2018); Mrówczyńska et al. (2018); Pukšec et al. (2018); Wiktorowicz et al. (2018); Ramaswami (2020)
6. Institutional			
Political acceptance	Collier et al. (2016); Fan et al. (2017); Linnenluecke et al. (2017); Grandin et al. (2018); Grafakos et al. (2020)	Yu and Zhang (2016); Affolderbach and Schulz (2017); Dong et al. (2018); Grandin et al. (2018); Hulgaard and Søndergaard (2018); Starostina et al. (2018); Matsuda et al. (2018); Petit-Boix and Leipold (2018)	Larondelle et al. (2016); Fang et al. (2017); Lu et al. (2017); Grandin et al. (2018); Powell et al. (2018); Van Den Dobbelsteen et al. (2018); Salvia et al. (2021)
Institutional capacity and governance, cross-sectoral coordination	He et al. (2015); Linnenluecke et al. (2017); Raymond et al. (2017); Albert et al. (2019); Childers et al. (2019); Jahanfar et al. (2018); Dorst et al. (2019); Keeler et al. (2019)	Hjalmarsson (2015); Kalmykova et al. (2016); Conke (2018); Marino et al. (2018); Yang et al. (2018a); Kanhai et al. (2021)	Dong and Fujita (2015); Kilkiş (2015); Lee and Painter (2015); Niemeier et al. (2015); Olsson et al. (2015); Delmastro et al. (2016); Große et al. (2016); McGuirk et al. (2016); Broto (2017); Engström et al. (2017); Petit-Boix et al. (2017); Valek et al. (2017); Peng and Bai (2018); den Hartog et al. (2018); Engels and Walz (2018); Leck and Simon (2018); Tayarani et al. (2018); Tillie et al. (2018); Westman and Broto (2018); Hölscher et al. (2019); Peng and Bai (2020)
Legal and administrative feasibility	Elmqvist et al. (2015); CDP (2021)	Potdar et al. (2016); Agyepong and Nhamo (2017); Tomić et al. (2017); Conke (2018); Tomić and Schneider (2020); Kanhai et al. (2021)	Agyepong and Nhamo (2017); Roppongi et al. (2017)

References

Affolderbach, J. and C. Schulz, 2017: Positioning Vancouver through urban sustainability strategies? The Greenest City 2020 Action Plan. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **164**, 676–685, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.234.

Aghahosseini, A., D. Bogdanov, L.S.N.S. Barbosa, and C. Breyer, 2019: Analysing the feasibility of powering the Americas with renewable energy and inter-regional grid interconnections by 2030. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **105**, 187–205, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2019.01.046.

Aghahosseini, A., D. Bogdanov, and C. Breyer, 2020: Towards sustainable development in the MENA region: Analysing the feasibility of a 100% renewable electricity system in 2030. *Energy Strateg. Rev.*, **28**, 100466, doi:10.1016/j.esr.2020.100466.

Agyepong, A.O. and G. Nhamo, 2017: Green procurement in South Africa: perspectives on legislative provisions in metropolitan municipalities. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **19(6)**, 2457–2474, doi:10.1007/s10668-016-9865-9.

Ahmad, S., H. Jia, Z. Chen, Q. Li, and C. Xu, 2020: Water-energy nexus and energy efficiency: A systematic analysis of urban water systems. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **134** (September), doi:10.1016/j.rser.2020.110381.

Ajanovic, A., and R. Haas, 2019: On the environmental benignity of electric vehicles. *J. Sustain. Dev. Energy, Water Environ. Syst.*, **7(3)**, 416–431, doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.d6.0252.

Aklin, M., S.P. Harish, and J. Urpelainen, 2018: A global analysis of progress in household electrification. *Energy Policy*, **122**, 421–428, doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.07.018.

Albert, C. et al., 2019: Addressing societal challenges through nature-based solutions: How can landscape planning and governance research contribute? *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **182**, 12–21, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.10.003.

Alhamwi, A., W. Medjroubi, T. Vogt, and C. Agert, 2018: Modelling urban energy requirements using open source data and models. *Appl. Energy*, **231**, 1100–1108, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.09.164.

Alkhalidi, A., L. Qoaider, A. Khashman, A.R. Al-Alami, and S. Jiryes, 2018: Energy and water as indicators for sustainable city site selection and design in Jordan using smart grid. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **37**, 125–132, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.10.037.

Alzate-Arias, S., Á. Jaramillo-Duque, F. Villada, and B. Restrepo-Cuestas, 2018: Assessment of government incentives for energy fromwaste in Colombia. *Sustainability*, **10(4)**, doi:10.3390/su10041294.

Andersson, E. et al., 2019: Enabling Green and Blue Infrastructure to Improve Contributions to Human Well-Being and Equity in Urban Systems. *Bioscience*, **69(7)**, 566–574, doi:10.1093/biosci/biz058.

Asarpota, K. and V. Nadin, 2020: Energy strategies, the Urban dimension, and spatial planning. *Energies*, **13(14)**, 3642, doi:10.3390/en13143642.

Aunedi, M., A.M. Pantaleo, K. Kuriyan, G. Strbac, and N. Shah, 2020: Modelling of national and local interactions between heat and electricity networks in low-carbon energy systems. *Appl. Energy*, **276**, 115522, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115522.

Aziz, H.M.A. et al., 2018: A high resolution agent-based model to support walk-bicycle infrastructure investment decisions: A case study with New York City. *Transp. Res. Part C Emerg. Technol.*, **86**, 280–299, doi:10.1016/j.trc.2017.11.008.

Bagheri, M., S.H. Delbari, M. Pakzadmanesh, and C.A. Kennedy, 2019: City-integrated renewable energy design for low-carbon and climate-resilient communities. *Appl. Energy*, **239** (June 2018), 1212–1225, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.02.031.

Bai, X. et al., 2018: Six research priorities for cities and climate change. *Nature*, **555**, 23–25, doi:10.1038/d41586-018-02409-z.

Baldvinsson, I. and T. Nakata, 2017: Cost Assessment of a District Heating System in Northern Japan Using a Geographic Information-Based Mixed Integer Linear Programming Model. *J. Energy Eng.*, **143(3)**, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)EY.1943-7897.0000371.

Bartłomiejczyk, M., 2018: Potential application of solar energy systems for electrified urban transportation systems. *Energies*, **11(4)**, doi:10.3390/en11040954.

Bartolozzi, I., F. Rizzi, and M. Frey, 2017: Are district heating systems and renewable energy sources always an environmental win-win solution? A life cycle assessment case study in Tuscany, Italy. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **80** (March), 408–420, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.231.

Barzegar, M., A. Rajabifard, M. Kalantari, and B. Atazadeh, 2021: A framework for spatial analysis in 3D urban land administration – A case study for Victoria, Australia. *Land use policy*, **111**, 105766, doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105766.

Bataille, C. et al., 2020: Net-zero deep decarbonization pathways in Latin America: Challenges and opportunities. *Energy Strateg. Rev.*, **30**, doi:10.1016/j.esr.2020.100510.

Bellocchi, S., M. Manno, M. Noussan, M.G. Prina, and M. Vellini, 2020: Electrification of transport and residential heating sectors in support of renewable penetration: Scenarios for the Italian energy system. *Energy*, **196**, 117062, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2020.117062.

Beygo, K., and M.A. Yüzer, 2017: Early energy simulation of urban plans and building forms. *A/Z ITU J. Fac. Archit.*, **14(1)**, 13–23, doi:10.5505/itujfa.2017.67689.

Bjørkelund, O.A., H. Degerud, and E. Bere, 2016: Socio-demographic, personal, environmental and behavioral correlates of different modes of transportation to work among Norwegian parents. *Arch. Public Heal.*, **74(1)**, doi:10.1186/s13690-016-0155-7.

Blanchet, T., 2015: Struggle over energy transition in Berlin: How do grassroots initiatives affect local energy policy-making? *Energy Policy*, **78**, 246–254, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.11.001.

Bloess, A., W.-P. Schill, and A. Zerrahn, 2018: Power-to-heat for renewable energy integration: A review of technologies, modeling approaches, and flexibility potentials. *Appl. Energy*, **212**, 1611–1626, doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.12.073.

Bogdanov, D. et al., 2019: Radical transformation pathway towards sustainable electricity via evolutionary steps. *Nat. Commun.*, **10(1)**, 1–16, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-08855-1.

Bogdanov, D. et al., 2021: Low-cost renewable electricity as the key driver of the global energy transition towards sustainability. *Energy*, **227**, 120467, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.120467.

Bordin, C., A. Gordini, and D. Vigo, 2016: An optimization approach for district heating strategic network design. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, **252(1)**, 296–307, doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2015.12.049.

Borelli, D., F. Devia, M.M. Brunenghi, C. Schenone, and A. Spoladore, 2015: Waste energy recovery from natural gas distribution network: CELSIUS project demonstrator in Genoa. *Sustain.*, **7(12)**, 16703–16719, doi:10.3390/su71215841.

Boyer, D. and A. Ramaswami, 2017: What Is the Contribution of City-Scale Actions to the Overall Food System's Environmental Impacts?: Assessing Water, Greenhouse Gas, and Land Impacts of Future Urban Food Scenarios. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **51(20)**, 12035–12045, doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b03176.

Bozhikaliev, V., I. Sazdovski, J. Adler, and N. Markovska, 2019: Techno-economic, social and environmental assessment of biomass based district heating in a Bioenergy village. *J. Sustain. Dev. Energy, Water Environ. Syst.*, **7(4)**, 601–614, doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.d7.0257.

Brandoni, C., N.N. Shah, I. Vorushylo, and N.J. Hewitt, 2018: Poly-generation as a solution to address the energy challenge of an aging population. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **171**, 635–646, doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2018.06.019.

Broto, V.C., 2017: Energy landscapes and urban trajectories towards sustainability. *Energy Policy*, **108**, 755–764, doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.01.009.

Brozynski, M.T. and B.D. Leibowicz, 2018: Decarbonizing power and transportation at the urban scale: An analysis of the Austin, Texas Community Climate Plan. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **43**, 41–54, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.08.005.

Bünning, F., M. Wetter, M. Fuchs, and D. Müller, 2018: Bidirectional low temperature district energy systems with agent-based control: Performance comparison and operation optimization. *Appl. Energy*, **209**, 502–515, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.10.072.

Burgalassi, D. and T. Luzzati, 2015: Urban spatial structure and environmental emissions: A survey of the literature and some empirical evidence for Italian NUTS 3 regions. *Cities*, **49**, 134–148, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2015.07.008.

Byrne, J., J. Taminiau, K.N. Kim, J. Lee, and J. Seo, 2017: Multivariate analysis of solar city economics: impact of energy prices, policy, finance, and cost on urban photovoltaic power plant implementation. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Energy Environ.*, **6(4)**, doi:10.1002/wene.241.

Calise, F., F.L. Cappiello, M. Dentice d'Accadia, and M. Vicidomini, 2020: Energy efficiency in small districts: Dynamic simulation and technoeconomic analysis. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **220**, 113022, doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2020.113022.

Calvillo, C.F., A. Sánchez-Miralles, and J. Villar, 2016: Energy management and planning in smart cities. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **55**, 273–287, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.133.

Carpio, M., J. Roldán-Fontana, R. Pacheco-Torres, and J. Ordóñez, 2016: Construction waste estimation depending on urban planning options in the design stage of residential buildings. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **113**, 561–570, doi:10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.03.061.

CDP, 2021: *Cities on the Route to 2030: Building a zero emissions, resilient planet for all*. CDP, London, UK. https://www.cdp.net/en/research/global-reports/cities-on-the-route-to-2030 (Accessed October 29, 2021).

Chaer, I., I. Pope, M. Yebyio, and A. Paurine, 2018: Smart cities – Thermal networks for London. *Therm. Sci. Eng. Prog.*, **8**, 10–16, doi:10.1016/j.tsep.2018.07.011.

Chambers, J., K. Narula, M. Sulzer, and M.K. Patel, 2019: Mapping district heating potential under evolving thermal demand scenarios and technologies: A case study for Switzerland. *Energy*, **176**, 682–692, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.04.044.

Charters, F.J., T.A. Cochrane, and A.D. O'Sullivan, 2021: The influence of urban surface type and characteristics on runoff water quality. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **755**, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142470.

Chava, J. and P. Newman, 2016: Stakeholder deliberation on developing affordable housing strategies: Towards inclusive and sustainable transit-oriented developments. *Sustain.*, **8(10)**, 11–13, doi:10.3390/su8101024.

Chen, G., M. Hadjikakou, T. Wiedmann, and L. Shi, 2018a: Global warming impact of suburbanization: The case of Sydney. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **172**, 287–301, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.161.

Chen, S., B. Xu, and B. Chen, 2018b: Unfolding the interplay between carbon flows and socioeconomic development in a city: What can network analysis offer? *Appl. Energy*, **211**, 403–412, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.11.064.

Chen, S. et al., 2020: Physical and virtual carbon metabolism of global cities. *Nat. Commun.*, **11(1)**, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-13757-3.

Chen, W.Y., 2015: The role of urban green infrastructure in offsetting carbon emissions in 35 major Chinese cities: A nationwide estimate. *Cities*, **44**, 112–120, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2015.01.005.

Cheshmehzangi, A. and C. Butters, 2017: Chinese urban residential blocks: Towards improved environmental and living qualities. *Urban Des. Int.*, **22(3)**, 219–235, doi:10.1057/s41289-016-0013-9.

Chiaramonti, D. and C. Panoutsou, 2018: Low-ILUC biofuel production in marginal areas: Can existing EU policies support biochar deployment in EU MED arid lands under desertification? *Chem. Eng. Trans.*, **65**, 841–846, doi:10.3303/CET1865141.

Chifari, R., S. Lo Piano, S. Matsumoto, and T. Tasaki, 2017: Does recyclable separation reduce the cost of municipal waste management in Japan? *Waste Manag.*, **60**, 32–41, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.01.015.

Child, M., C. Kemfert, D. Bogdanov, and C. Breyer, 2019: Flexible electricity generation, grid exchange and storage for the transition to a 100% renewable energy system in Europe. *Renew. Energy*, **139**, 80–101, doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.02.077.

Childers, D.L. et al., 2019: Urban ecological infrastructure: An inclusive concept for the non-built urban environment. *Elementa*, **7(1)**, doi:10.1525/elementa.385.

Claude, S., S. Ginestet, M. Bonhomme, N. Moulène, and G. Escadeillas, 2017: The Living Lab methodology for complex environments: Insights from the thermal refurbishment of a historical district in the city of Cahors, France. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **32**, 121–130, doi:10.1016/j.erss.2017.01.018.

Cleveland, D.A. et al., 2017: The potential for urban household vegetable gardens to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **157**, 365–374, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.07.008.

Coalition for Urban Transitions, 2019: *Climate Emergency Urban Opportunity: How National Governments Can Secure Economic Prosperity and Avert Climate Catastrophe by Transforming Cities*. Coalition for Urban Transitions, Washington DC.

Coalition for Urban Transitions, 2020: *Seizing the Urban Opportunity: Supporting National Governments to Unlock the Economic Power of Low Carbon, Resilient and Inclusive Cities*. Coalition for Urban Transitions (CUT), Washington, DC, USA, 48 pp. https://urbantransitions.global/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Seizing_the_Urban_Opportunity_web_FINAL.pdf (Accessed March 28, 2021).

Colenbrander, S., A. Gouldson, A.H. Sudmant, and E. Papargyropoulou, 2015: The economic case for low-carbon development in rapidly growing developing world cities: A case study of Palembang, Indonesia. *Energy Policy*, **80**, 24–35, doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.01.020.

Colenbrander, S. et al., 2017: Can low-carbon urban development be pro-poor? The case of Kolkata, India. *Environ. Urban.*, **29(1)**, 139–158, doi:10.1177/0956247816677775.

Collaço, F.M. de A. et al., 2019: The dawn of urban energy planning – Synergies between energy and urban planning for São Paulo (Brazil) megacity. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **215**, 458–479, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.013.

Collier, M.J. et al., 2016: ScienceDirect Academic Communities of Interest SME Local Authority. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **22**, 57–62.

Conke, L.S., 2018: Barriers to waste recycling development: Evidence from Brazil. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **134**, 129–135, doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.03.007.

Corsini, F., C. Certomà, M. Dyer, and M. Frey, 2019: Participatory energy: Research, imaginaries and practices on people' contribute to energy systems in the smart city. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **142**, 322–332, doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.028.

Cortinovis, C., and D. Geneletti, 2020: A performance-based planning approach integrating supply and demand of urban ecosystem services. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **201** (May), 103842, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2020.103842.

D'Adamo, I., P.M. Falcone, D. Huisingh, and P. Morone, 2021: A circular economy model based on biomethane: What are the opportunities for the municipality of Rome and beyond? *Renew. Energy*, **163**, 1660–1672, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2020.10.072.

Data-Driven EnviroLab and NewClimate Institute, 2020: *Accelerating Net Zero: Exploring Cities, Regions, and Companies' Pledges to Decarbonise*. [Hsu, A. et al., (eds.)]. New Climate Institute, Singapore, 24 pp. http://datadrivenlab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Accelerating_Net_Zero_Report_Sept2020.pdf (Accessed March 28, 2021).

Daunt, A.B.P., L. Inostroza, and A.M. Hersperger, 2021: The role of spatial planning in land change: An assessment of urban planning and nature conservation efficiency at the southeastern coast of Brazil. *Land use policy*, **111**, 105771, doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105771.

de Bercegol, R. and S. Gowda, 2018: A new waste and energy nexus? Rethinking the modernisation of waste services in Delhi. *Urban Stud.*, **56(11)**, 2297–2314, doi:10.1177/0042098018770592.

De la Sota, C., V.J. Ruffato-Ferreira, L. Ruiz-García, and S. Alvarez, 2019: Urban green infrastructure as a strategy of climate change mitigation. A case study in northern Spain. *Urban For. Urban Green.*, **40**, 145–151, doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2018.09.004.

De Luca, G., S. Fabozzi, N. Massarotti, and L. Vanoli, 2018: A renewable energy system for a nearly zero greenhouse city: Case study of a small city in southern Italy. *Energy*, **143**, 347–362, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.07.004.

De Masi, R.F., F. de Rossi, S. Ruggiero, and G.P. Vanoli, 2019: Numerical optimization for the design of living walls in the Mediterranean climate. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **195**, 573–586, doi:10.1016/J.ENCONMAN.2019.05.043.

Debrunner, G. and T. Hartmann, 2020: Strategic use of land policy instruments for affordable housing – Coping with social challenges under scarce land conditions in Swiss cities. *Land use policy*, **99**, 104993, doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104993.

Delmastro, C., E. Lavagno, and L. Schranz, 2016: Underground urbanism: Master Plans and Sectorial Plans. *Tunn. Undergr. Sp. Technol.*, **55**, 103–111, doi:10.1016/j.tust.2016.01.001.

den Hartog, H. et al., 2018: Low-carbon promises and realities: Lessons from three socio-technical experiments in Shanghai. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **181**, 692–702, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.003.

Dénarié, A., M. Calderoni, and M. Aprile, 2018: Multicriteria approach for a multisource district heating. *Green Energy Technol.*, **(9783319757735)**, 21–33, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-75774-2_2.

Deng, Y., B. Fu, and C. Sun, 2018: Effects of urban planning in guiding urban growth: Evidence from Shenzhen, China. *Cities*, **83**(December 2017), 118–128, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2018.06.014.

Diallo, T., N. Cantoreggi, and J. Simos, 2016: Health Co-benefits of climate change mitigation policies at local level: Casestudy Geneva. *Environnement, Risques et Sante*, **15(4)**, 332–340, doi:10.1684/ers.2016.0890.

Díaz-Villavicencio, G., S.R. Didonet, and A. Dodd, 2017: Influencing factors of eco-efficient urban waste management: Evidence from Spanish municipalities. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **164**, 1486–1496, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.064.

Dienst, C. et al., 2015: Wuxi – A Chinese city on its way to a low carbon future. *J. Sustain. Dev. Energy, Water Environ. Syst.*, **3(1)**, 12–25, doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.2015.03.0002.

Djørup, S., K. Sperling, and P.A. Østergaard, 2020: District Heating Tariffs, Economic Optimisation and Local Strategies during Radical Technological Change. *Energies*, **13**, 1172, doi:doi:10.3390/en13051172.

Dobler, C., D. Pfeifer, and W. Streicher, 2018: Reaching energy autonomy in a medium-sized city – three scenarios to model possible future energy developments in the residential building sector. *Sustain. Dev.*, **26(6)**, 859–869, doi:10.1002/sd.1855.

Dodman, D., 2009: Blaming cities for climate change? An analysis of urban greenhouse gas emissions inventories. *Environ. Urban.*, **21(1)**, 185–201, doi:10.1177/0956247809103016.

Dominković, D.F., and G. Krajačić, 2019: District cooling versus individual cooling in urban energy systems: The impact of district energy share in cities on the optimal storage sizing. *Energies*, **12(3)**, doi:10.3390/en12030407.

Dominković, D.F., V. Dobravec, Y. Jiang, P.S. Nielsen, and G. Krajačić, 2018: Modelling smart energy systems in tropical regions. *Energy*, **155**, 592–609, doi:doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.05.007.

Dong, H., Y. Geng, X. Yu, and J. Li, 2018: Uncovering energy saving and carbon reduction potential from recycling wastes: A case of Shanghai in China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **205**, 27–35, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.343.

Dong, L., and T. Fujita, 2015: Promotion of low-carbon city through industrial and urban system innovation: Japanese experience and China's practice. *World Sci. Ref. Asia World Econ.*, 257–279, doi:10.1142/9789814578622_0033.

Doračić, B., T. Pukšec, D.R. Schneider, and N. Duić, 2020: The effect of different parameters of the excess heat source on the levelized cost of excess heat. *Energy*, **201**, 117686, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2020.117686.

Dorotić, H., T. Pukšec, and N. Duić, 2019a: Multi-objective optimization of district heating and cooling systems for a one-year time horizon. *Energy*, **169**, 319–328, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.11.149.

Dorotić, H., T. Pukšec, and N. Duić, 2019b: Economical, environmental and exergetic multi-objective optimization of district heating systems on hourly level for a whole year. *Appl. Energy*, **251**, 113394, doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113394.

Dorst, H., A. van der Jagt, R. Raven, and H. Runhaar, 2019: Urban greening through nature-based solutions – Key characteristics of an emerging concept. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **49**, 101620, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101620.

Drangert, J.-O. and H.C. Sharatchandra, 2017: Addressing urban water scarcity: Reduce, treat and reuse - the third generation of management to avoid local resources boundaries. *Water Policy*, **19(5)**, 978–996, doi:10.2166/wp.2017.152.

Drysdale, D., B.V. Mathiesen, and H. Lund, 2019: From carbon calculators to energy system analysis in cities. *Energies*, **12(12)**, doi:10.3390/en12122307.

EC JRC, 2018: *Atlas of the Human Planet 2018 – A World of Cities*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 153 pp. https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC114316 (Accessed March 31, 2021).

Egusquiza, A., I. Prieto, J.L. Izkara, and R. Béjar, 2018: Multi-scale urban data models for early-stage suitability assessment of energy conservation measures in historic urban areas. *Energy Build.*, **164**, 87–98, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.12.061.

Ek, C. and J. Miliute-Plepiene, 2018: Behavioral spillovers from food-waste collection in Swedish municipalities. *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.*, **89**, 168–186, doi:10.1016/j.jeem.2018.01.004.

Elmqvist, T. et al., 2015: Benefits of restoring ecosystem services in urban areas. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **14**, 101–108, doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2015.05.001.

Elmqvist, T. et al., 2019: Sustainability and resilience for transformation in the urban century. *Nat. Sustain.*, **2(4)**, 267–273, doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0250-1.

Endo, I. et al., 2017: Participatory land-use approach for integrating climate change adaptation and mitigation into basin-scale local planning. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **35**, 47–56, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.07.014.

Engels, A., and K. Walz, 2018: Dealing with multi-perspectivity in real-world laboratories: Experiences from the transdisciplinary research project urban transformation laboratories. *GAIA*, **27**, 39–45, doi:10.14512/gaia.27.S1.10.

Engström, R.E. et al., 2017: Connecting the resource nexus to basic urban service provision – with a focus on water-energy interactions in New York City. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **31**, 83–94, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.02.007.

Eriksson, M., I. Strid, and P.-A. Hansson, 2015: Carbon footprint of food waste management options in the waste hierarchy - A Swedish case study. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **93**, 115–125, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.01.026.

Facchini, A., C. Kennedy, I. Stewart, and R. Mele, 2017: The energy metabolism of megacities. *Appl. Energy*, **186(2017)**, 86–95, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.09.025.

Fan, P. et al., 2017: Nature-based solutions for urban landscapes under post-industrialization and globalization: Barcelona versus Shanghai. *Environ. Res.*, **156**, 272–283, doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.03.043.

Fang, K. et al., 2017: Carbon footprints of urban transition: Tracking circular economy promotions in Guiyang, China. *Ecol. Modell.*, **365**, 30–44, doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.09.024.

Fastenrath, S., and B. Braun, 2018: Ambivalent urban sustainability transitions: Insights from Brisbane's building sector. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **176**, 581–589, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.134.

Felipe Andreu, J., D.R. Schneider, and G. Krajačić, 2016: Evaluation of integration of solar energy into the district heating system of the city of Velika Gorica. *Therm. Sci.*, **20(4)**, 1049–1060, doi:10.2298/TSCI151106106A.

Fenton, P., and W. Kanda, 2017: Barriers to the diffusion of renewable energy: studies of biogas for transport in two European cities. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **60(4)**, 725–742, doi:10.1080/09640568.2016.1176557.

Ferrari, B., P. Corona, L.D. Mancini, R. Salvati, and A. Barbati, 2017: Taking the pulse of forest plantations success in peri-urban environments through continuous inventory. *New For.*, **48(4)**, 527–545, doi:10.1007/s11056-017-9580-x.

Fichera, A., M. Frasca, V. Palermo, and R. Volpe, 2018: An optimization tool for the assessment of urban energy scenarios. *Energy*, **156**, 418–429, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.05.114.

Flacke, J. and C. De Boer, 2017: An interactive planning support tool for addressing social acceptance of renewable energy projects in the Netherlands. *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, **6(10)**, doi:10.3390/ijgi6100313.

Fonseca, J.A., and A. Schlueter, 2015: Integrated model for characterization of spatiotemporal building energy consumption patterns in neighborhoods and city districts. *Appl. Energy*, **142**, 247–265, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.12.068.

Friend, R.M. et al., 2016: Re-imagining Inclusive Urban Futures for Transformation. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **20**, 67–72, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2016.06.001.

Gai, Y. et al., 2020: Health and climate benefits of Electric Vehicle Deployment in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area. *Environ. Pollut.*, **265**, 114983, doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114983.

Gao, J., and B.C. O'Neill, 2020: Mapping global urban land for the 21st century with data-driven simulations and Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Nat. Commun.*, **11(1)**, 1–12, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15788-7.

Gao, J. et al., 2017: Perceptions of health co-benefits in relation to greenhouse gas emission reductions: A survey among urban residents in three chinese cities. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **14(3)**, doi:10.3390/ijerph14030298.

Gao, Y. and P. Newman, 2018: Beijing's peak car transition: Hope for emerging cities in the 1.5°C agenda. *Urban Plan.*, **3(2)**, 82–93, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1246.

García-Fuentes, M.Á. and C. de Torre, 2017: Towards smarter and more sustainable cities: The remourban model. *Entrep. Sustain. Issues*, **4(3)**, 328–338, doi:10.9770/jesi.2017.4.3S(8).

García-Gusano, D., D. Iribarren, and J. Dufour, 2018: Towards energy self-sufficiency in large metropolitan areas: Business opportunities on renewable electricity in Madrid. In: Renewable Energies: Business Outlook 2050 [García Márquez, F., Karyotakis, A., Papaelias, M. (eds.)]. Springer, Cham, pp. 17–31, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-45364-4_2.

Gargiulo, C., A. Ayad, A. Tulisi, and F. Zucaro, 2018: Effect of urban greenspaces on residential buildings' energy consumption: Case study in a mediterranean climate. *Green Energy Technol.*, **PartF12**, 109–125, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-77682-8_7.

Geneletti, D., D. La Rosa, M. Spyra, and C. Cortinovis, 2017: A review of approaches and challenges for sustainable planning in urban peripheries. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **165**, 231–243, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.01.013.

Gibon, T., A. Arvesen, and E.G. Hertwich, 2017: Life cycle assessment demonstrates environmental co-benefits and trade-offs of low-carbon electricity supply options. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **76**, 1283–1290, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.078.

Gjorgievski, V.Z., N. Markovska, A. Abazi, and N. Duić, 2020: The potential of power-to-heat demand response to improve the flexibility of the energy system: An empirical review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **138**, 110489, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110489.

Glazebrook, G. and P. Newman, 2018: The city of the future. *Urban Plan.*, **3(2)**, 1–20, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1247.

González-García, S., M.R. Caamaño, M.T. Moreira, and G. Feijoo, 2021: Environmental profile of the municipality of Madrid through the methodologies of Urban Metabolism and Life Cycle Analysis. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **64** (April 2019), doi:10.1016/j.scs.2020.102546.

Gorissen, L., F. Spira, E. Meynaerts, P. Valkering, and N. Frantzeskaki, 2018: Moving towards systemic change? Investigating acceleration dynamics of urban sustainability transitions in the Belgian City of Genk. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **173**, 171–185, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.052.

Gouldson, A. et al., 2015: Exploring the economic case for climate action in cities. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **35**, 93–105, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.07.009.

Grafakos, S. et al., 2020: Integration of mitigation and adaptation in urban climate change action plans in Europe: A systematic assessment. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **121**, 109623, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109623.

Grandin, J., H. Haarstad, K. Kjærås, and S. Bouzarovski, 2018: The politics of rapid urban transformation. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **31**, 16–22, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2017.12.002.

Große, J., C. Fertner, and N.B. Groth, 2016: Urban structure, energy and planning: Findings from three cities in Sweden, Finland and Estonia. *Urban Plan.*, **1(1)**, 24–40, doi:10.17645/up.v1i1.506.

Grové, J., P.A. Lant, C.R. Greig, and S. Smart, 2018: Is MSW derived DME a viable clean cooking fuel in Kolkata, India? *Renew. Energy*, **124**, 50–60, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2017.08.039.

Güneralp, B., M. Reba, B.U. Hales, E.A. Wentz, and K.C. Seto, 2020: Trends in urban land expansion, density, and land transitions from 1970 to 2010: A global synthesis. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**, 044015, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab6669.

Guo, X., and M. Hendel, 2018: Urban water networks as an alternative source for district heating and emergency heat-wave cooling. *Energy*, **145**, 79–87, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.12.108.

Hadfield, P., and N. Cook, 2019: Financing the Low-Carbon City: Can Local Government Leverage Public Finance to Facilitate Equitable Decarbonisation? *Urban Policy Res.*, **37(1)**, 13–29, doi:10.1080/08111146.2017.1421532.

Hale, R., S.E. Swearer, M. Sievers, and R. Coleman, 2019: Balancing biodiversity outcomes and pollution management in urban stormwater treatment wetlands. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **233**, 302–307, doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.12.064.

Han, F., R. Xie, Y. Lu, J. Fang, and Y. Liu, 2018: The effects of urban agglomeration economies on carbon emissions: Evidence from Chinese cities. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **172**, 1096–1110, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.273.

Hansen, K., C. Breyer, and H. Lund, 2019: Status and perspectives on 100% renewable energy systems. *Energy*, **175**, 471–480, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.03.092.

Harris, S., J. Weinzettel, A. Bigano, and A. Källmén, 2020: Low carbon cities in 2050? GHG emissions of European cities using production-based and consumption-based emission accounting methods. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **248**, 119206, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119206.

Hast, A., S. Syri, V. Lekavičius, and A. Galinis, 2018: District heating in cities as a part of low-carbon energy system. *Energy*, **152**, 627–639, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.03.156.

Havas, L., J. Ballweg, C. Penna, and D. Race, 2015: Power to change: Analysis of household participation in a renewable energy and energy efficiency programme in Central Australia. *Energy Policy*, **87**, 325–333, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2015.09.017.

He, X., S. Shen, S. Miao, J. Dou, and Y. Zhang, 2015: Quantitative detection of urban climate resources and the establishment of an urban climate map (UCMap) system in Beijing. *Build. Environ.*, **92**, 668–678, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.05.044.

Herrmann, A. et al., 2017: Household preferences for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in four European high-income countries: Does health information matter? A mixed-methods study protocol. *BMC Public Health*, **18(1)**, doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4604-1.

Hersperger, A.M. et al., 2018: Urban land-use change: The role of strategic spatial planning. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **51**, 32–42, doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.05.001.

Hjalmarsson, L., 2015: Biogas as a boundary object for policy integration - The case of Stockholm. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **98**, 185–193, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.10.042.

Hölscher, K., N. Frantzeskaki, and D. Loorbach, 2019: Steering transformations under climate change: capacities for transformative climate governance and the case of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **19(3)**, 791–805, doi:10.1007/s10113-018-1329-3.

Hsieh, S. et al., 2017: Defining density and land uses under energy performance targets at the early stage of urban planning processes. *Energy Procedia*, **122**, 301–306, doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.07.326.

Hu, J., G. Liu, and F. Meng, 2018: Estimates of the effectiveness for urban energy conservation and carbon abatement policies: The case of Beijing City, China. *J. Environ. Account. Manag.*, **6(3)**, 199–214, doi:10.5890/JEAM.2018.09.002.

Hu, M.-C., C.-Y. Wu, and T. Shih, 2015: Creating a new socio-technical regime in China: Evidence from the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-City. *Futures*, **70**, 1–12, doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.04.001.

Huang, C., J. Yang, H. Lu, H. Huang, and L. Yu, 2017: Green Spaces as an Indicator of Urban Health: Evaluating Its Changes in 28 Mega-Cities. *Remote Sens.*, **9(1266)**.

Huang, C.W., R.I. McDonald, and K.C. Seto, 2018a: The importance of land governance for biodiversity conservation in an era of global urban expansion. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **173**(January), 44–50, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.01.011.

Huang, J., R. Zhao, T. Huang, X. Wang, and M.-L. Tseng, 2018b: Sustainable municipal solid waste disposal in the Belt and Road initiative: A preliminary proposal for Chengdu City. *Sustain.*, **10(4)**, doi:10.3390/su10041147.

Hui, L.W. et al., 2017: Technical & economic evaluation of district cooling system as low carbon alternative in Kuala Lumpur City. *Chem. Eng. Trans.*, **56**, 529–534, doi:10.3303/CET1756089.

Hulgaard, T., and I. Søndergaard, 2018: Integrating waste-to-energy in Copenhagen, Denmark. *Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng. Civ. Eng.*, **171(5)**, 3–10, doi:10.1680/jcien.17.00042.

Hunter, G.W., D. Vettorato, and G. Sagoe, 2018a: Creating smart energy cities for sustainability through project implementation: A case study of Bolzano, Italy. *Sustainability*, **10(7)**, doi:10.3390/su10072167.

Hunter, R.G., J.W. Day, A.R. Wiegman, and R.R. Lane, 2018b: Municipal wastewater treatment costs with an emphasis on assimilation wetlands in the Louisiana coastal zone. *Ecol. Eng.*, **137**, 21–25, doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.09.020.

Hvelplund, F., and S. Djørup, 2017: Multilevel policies for radical transition: Governance for a 100% renewable energy system. *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, **35(7)**, 1218–1241, doi:10.1177/2399654417710024.

Ibáñez-Forés, V., M.D. Bovea, C. Coutinho-Nóbrega, H.R. de Medeiros-García, and R. Barreto-Lins, 2018: Temporal evolution of the environmental performance of implementing selective collection in municipal waste management systems in developing countries: A Brazilian case study. *Waste Manag.*, **72**, 65–77, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2017.10.027.

IEA, 2020: *Energy Technology Perspectives 2020*. International Energy Agency (IEA) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris, France, 400 pp https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-technology-perspectives-2020 (Accessed March 31, 2021).

IPBES, 2019: *IPBES Global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. [Brondizio, E.S., J. Settele, S. Díaz, and H.T. Ngo, (eds.)]. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), Bonn, Germany, 1148 pp. https://www.ipbes.net/global-assessment (Accessed March 31, 2021).

IPCC, 2018: Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change. [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M. Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In press, 630 pp.

Islam, K.M.N., 2018: Municipal solid waste to energy generation: An approach for enhancing climate co-benefits in the urban areas of Bangladesh. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **81**, 2472–2486, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.06.053.

Jacobson, M.Z. et al., 2018: 100% clean and renewable Wind, Water, and Sunlight (WWS) all-sector energy roadmaps for 53 towns and cities in North America. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **42**, 22–37, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.06.031.

Jacobson, M.Z. et al., 2020: Transitioning all energy in 74 metropolitan areas, including 30 megacities, to 100% clean and renewable wind, water, and sunlight (WWS). *Energies*, **13(18)**, 1–40, doi:10.3390/en13184934.

Jagarnath, M. and T. Thambiran, 2018: Greenhouse gas emissions profiles of neighbourhoods in Durban, South Africa – an initial investigation. *Environ. Urban.*, **30(1)**, 191–214, doi:10.1177/0956247817713471.

Jahanfar, A., B. Sleep, and J. Drake, 2018: Energy and carbon-emission analysis of integrated green-roof photovoltaic systems: Probabilistic approach. *J. Infrastruct. Syst.*, **24(1)**, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000399.

Jamei, E. et al., 2020: Urban design parameters for heat mitigation in tropics. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **134** (September), doi:10.1016/j.rser.2020.110362.

James, J.-A. et al., 2018: Impacts of Combined Cooling, Heating and Power Systems, and Rainwater Harvesting on Water Demand, Carbon Dioxide, and NOx Emissions for Atlanta. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **52(1)**, 3–10, doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b01115.

Jandaghian, Z. and H. Akbari, 2018: The effect of increasing surface albedo on urban climate and air quality: A detailed study for Sacramento, Houston, and Chicago. *Climate*, **6(2)**, doi:10.3390/cli6020019.

Jiang, Y., E. van der Werf, E.C. van Ierland, and K.J. Keesman, 2017: The potential role of waste biomass in the future urban electricity system. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **107**, 182–190, doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.10.001.

Kabir, M.J., A.A. Chowdhury, and M.G. Rasul, 2015: Pyrolysis of municipal green waste: A modelling, simulation and experimental analysis. *Energies*, **8(8)**, 7522–7541, doi:10.3390/en8087522.

Kabisch, N., S. Qureshi, and D. Haase, 2015: Human–environment interactions in urban green spaces — A systematic review of contemporary issues and prospects for future research. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.*, **50**, 25–34, doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2014.08.007.

Kalmykova, Y., L. Rosado, and J. Patrício, 2015: Urban Economies Resource Productivity and Decoupling: Metabolism Trends of 1996-2011 in Sweden, Stockholm, and Gothenburg. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **49(14)**, 8815–8823, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b01431.

Kalmykova, Y., L. Rosado, and J. Patrício, 2016: Resource consumption drivers and pathways to reduction: economy, policy and lifestyle impact on material flows at the national and urban scale. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **132**, 70–80, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.027.

Kang, C.-N. and S.-H. Cho, 2018: Thermal and electrical energy mix optimization(EMO) method for real large-scaled residential town plan. *J. Electr. Eng. Technol.*, **13(1)**, 513–520, doi:10.5370/JEET.2018.13.1.513.

Kanhai, G., J.N. Fobil, B.A. Nartey, J. V Spadaro, and P. Mudu, 2021: Urban Municipal Solid Waste management: Modeling air pollution scenarios and health impacts in the case of Accra, Ghana. *Waste Manag.*, **123**, 15–22, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2021.01.005.

Kanniah, K.D., and H.C. Siong, 2018: Tree canopy cover and its potential to reduce CO2 in South of Peninsular Malaysia. *Chem. Eng. Trans.*, **63**, 13–18, doi:10.3303/CET1863003.

Kareem, B. et al., 2020: Pathways for resilience to climate change in African cities. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15(7)**, 73002, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab7951.

Karlsson, K.B., S.N. Petrović, and R. Næraa, 2016: Heat supply planning for the ecological housing community Munksøgård. *Energy*, **115**, 1733–1747, doi:10.1016/J.ENERGY.2016.08.064.

Kaza, S., L. Yao, P. Bhada-Tata, and F. Van Woerden, 2018: *What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management to 2050*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 295 pp.

Keeler, B.L. et al., 2019: Social-ecological and technological factors moderate the value of urban nature. *Nat. Sustain.*, **2(1)**, 29–38, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0202-1.

Kennedy, C., I.D. Stewart, A. Facchini, and R. Mele, 2017: The role of utilities in developing low carbon, electric megacities. *Energy Policy*, **106**, 122–128, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.02.047.

Kennedy, C.A., I.D. Stewart, M.I. Westphal, A. Facchini, and R. Mele, 2018: Keeping global climate change within 1.5°C through net negative electric cities. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **30**, 18–25, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.009.

Khan, M.M., S. Jain, M. Vaezi, and A. Kumar, 2016: Development of a decision model for the techno-economic assessment of municipal solid waste utilization pathways. *Waste Manag.*, **48**, 548–564, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.10.016.

Khumalo, N., and M. Sibanda, 2019: Does Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture Contribute to Household Food Security? An Assessment of the Food Security Status of Households in Tongaat, eThekwini Municipality. *Sustainability*, **11**, 1082, doi:10.3390/su11041082.

Kilkiş, Ş., 2015: Composite index for benchmarking local energy systems of Mediterranean port cities. *Energy*, **92** (Part 3), doi:10.1016/j.energy.2015.06.093.

Kim, G. and P. Coseo, 2018: Urban park systems to support sustainability: The role of urban park systems in hot arid urban climates. *Forests*, **9(7)**, doi:10.3390/f9070439.

Kim, H.-W. et al., 2018: Co-benefit potential of industrial and urban symbiosis using waste heat from industrial park in Ulsan, Korea. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **135**, 225–234, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.09.027.

Kim, H. and W. Chen, 2018: Changes in energy and carbon intensity in Seoul's water sector. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **41**, 749–759, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.06.001.

Kılkış, Ş., 2019: Benchmarking the sustainability of urban energy, water and environment systems and envisioning a cross-sectoral scenario for the future. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **103**, 529–545, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2018.11.006.

Kılkış, Ş., 2021: Transition towards urban system integration and benchmarking of an urban area to accelerate mitigation towards net-zero targets. *Energy*, **236**, 121394, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121394.

Kılkış, Ş. and B. Kılkış, 2019: An urbanization algorithm for districts with minimized emissions based on urban planning and embodied energy towards net-zero exergy targets. *Energy*, **179**, 392–406, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.04.065.

Köfinger, M. et al., 2018: Simulation based evaluation of large scale waste heat utilization in urban district heating networks: Optimized integration and operation of a seasonal storage. *Energy*, **159**, 1161–1174, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.06.192.

Koop, S.H.A. and C.J. van Leeuwen, 2015: Assessment of the Sustainability of Water Resources Management: A Critical Review of the City Blueprint Approach. *Water Resour. Manag.*, **29(15)**, 5649–5670, doi:10.1007/s11269-015-1139-z.

Krog, L., 2019: How municipalities act under the new paradigm for energy planning. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **47**, 101511, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101511.

Laeremans, M. et al., 2018: Black Carbon Reduces the Beneficial Effect of Physical Activity on Lung Function. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, **50(9)**, 1875–1881, doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001632.

Lall, S. et al., 2013: *Planning, Connecting and Financing Cities - Now: Priorities for City Leaders*. The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 131 pp.

Lall, S., M. Lebrand, H. Park, D. Sturm, and A.J. Venables, 2021: *Pancakes to Pyramids: City Form to Promote Sustainable Growth*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and The World Bank, Washington, DC, USA, 154 pp. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/urbandevelopment/publication/pancakes-to-pyramids (Accessed October 21, 2021).

Lam, K.L., S.J. Kenway, and P.A. Lant, 2017: Energy use for water provision in cities. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **143**, 699–709, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.056.

Lam, K.L., P.A. Lant, and S.J. Kenway, 2018: Energy implications of the millennium drought on urban water cycles in Southeast Australian cities. *Water Sci. Technol. Water Supply*, **18(1)**, 214–221, doi:10.2166/ws.2017.110.

Lamb, W.F., F. Creutzig, M.W. Callaghan, and J.C. Minx, 2019: Learning about urban climate solutions from case studies. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **9(4)**, 279–287, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0440-x.

Lammers, I. and T. Hoppe, 2019: Watt rules? Assessing decision-making practices on smart energy systems in Dutch city districts. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **47**, 233–246, doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.10.003.

Larondelle, N., N. Frantzeskaki, and D. Haase, 2016: Mapping transition potential with stakeholder- and policy-driven scenarios in Rotterdam City. *Ecol. Indic.*, **70**, 630–643, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.028.

Leck, H. and D. Simon, 2018: Local Authority Responses to Climate Change in South Africa: The Challenges of Transboundary Governance. *Sustainability*, **10(7)**, 2542.

Lee, C.M. and P. Erickson, 2017: How does local economic development in cities affect global GHG emissions? *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **35**, 626–636, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.08.027.

Lee, G.-G., H.-W. Lee, and J.-H. Lee, 2015: Greenhouse gas emission reduction effect in the transportation sector by urban agriculture in Seoul, Korea. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **140**, 1–7, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.03.012.

Lee, T. and M. Painter, 2015: Comprehensive local climate policy: The role of urban governance. *Urban Clim.*, **14**, 566–577, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2015.09.003.

Lei, C., P.D. Wagner, and N. Fohrer, 2021: Effects of land cover, topography, and soil on stream water quality at multiple spatial and seasonal scales in a German lowland catchment. *Ecol. Indic.*, **120**, 106940, doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106940.

Lekavičius, V., V. Bobinaitė, A. Galinis, and A. Pažėraitė, 2020: Distributional impacts of investment subsidies for residential energy technologies. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **130**, 109961, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109961.

Lewandowska, A., J. Chodkowska-Miszczuk, and K. Rogatka, 2020: Smart Energy in a Smart City : Utopia or Reality? Evidence from Poland. *Energies*, **13(21)**, 5795, doi:10.3390/en13215795.

Li, B. et al., 2016a: Spatio-temporal assessment of urbanization impacts on ecosystem services: Case study of Nanjing City, China. *Ecol. Indic.*, **71**, 416–427, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.07.017.

Li, Y. and X. Liu, 2018: How did urban polycentricity and dispersion affect economic productivity? A case study of 306 Chinese cities. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **173**(August 2017), 51–59, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.01.007.

Li, Y., C. Zhan, M. de Jong, and Z. Lukszo, 2016b: Business innovation and government regulation for the promotion of electric vehicle use: lessons from Shenzhen, China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **134**, 371–383, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.013.

Li, Y., T. Ren, P.L. Kinney, A. Joyner, and W. Zhang, 2018: Projecting future climate change impacts on heat-related mortality in large urban areas in China. *Environ. Res.*, **163**, 171–185, doi:10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.047.

Lima, P.D.M. et al., 2018: Environmental assessment of existing and alternative options for management of municipal solid waste in Brazil. *Waste Manag.*, **78**, 857–870, doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2018.07.007.

Lin, J. et al., 2018: Scenario analysis of urban GHG peak and mitigation co-benefits: A case study of Xiamen City, China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **171**, 972–983, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.040.

Linnenluecke, M.K., M.-L. Verreynne, M.J. de Villiers Scheepers, and C. Venter, 2017: A review of collaborative planning approaches for transformative change towards a sustainable future. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **142**, 3212–3224, doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.148.

Liu, M. et al., 2017: Estimating health co-benefits of greenhouse gas reduction strategies with a simplified energy balance based model: The Suzhou City case. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **142**, 3332–3342, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.137.

Liu, Y., H. Guo, C. Sun, and W.-S. Chang, 2016: Assessing cross laminated timber (CLT) as an alternative material for mid-rise residential buildings in cold regions in China-A life-cycle assessment approach. *Sustainability*, **8(10)**, doi:10.3390/su8101047.

Lohrmann, A., M. Child, and C. Breyer, 2021: Assessment of the water footprint for the European power sector during the transition towards a 100% renewable energy system. *Energy*, **233**, 121098, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121098.

Loibl, W., R. Stollnberger, and D. österreicher, 2017: Residential heat supply by waste-heat re-use: Sources, supply potential and demand coverage-A case study. *Sustainability*, **9(2)**, doi:10.3390/su9020250.

López-Uceda, A. et al., 2018: Risk assessment by percolation leaching tests of extensive green roofs with fine fraction of mixed recycled aggregates from construction and demolition waste. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, **25(36)**, 36024–36034, doi:10.1007/s11356-018-1703-1.

Lu, Z., J. Crittenden, F. Southworth, and E. Dunham-Jones, 2017: An integrated framework for managing the complex interdependence between infrastructures and the socioeconomic environment: An application in metropolitan Atlanta. *Urban Stud.*, **54(12)**, 2874–2893, doi:10.1177/0042098016652555.

Lund, H., P.A. Østergaard, D. Connolly, and B.V. Mathiesen, 2017: Smart energy and smart energy systems. *Int. J. Sustain. Energy Plan. Manag.*, **11**, 3–14, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.05.123.

Lund, H. et al., 2018a: The status of 4th generation district heating: Research and results. *Energy*, **164**, 147–159, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.08.206.

Lund, H., N. Duic, P.A. Østergaard, and B.V. Mathiesen, 2018b: Future district heating systems and technologies: On the role of smart energy systems and 4th generation district heating. *Energy*, **165**, 614–619, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.09.115.

Lund, P.D., J. Mikkola, and J. Ypyä, 2015: Smart energy system design for large clean power schemes in urban areas. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **103**, 437–445, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.005.

Lwasa, S., 2017: Options for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the low-emitting city and metropolitan region of Kampala. *Carbon Manag.*, **8(3)**, 263–276, doi:10.1080/17583004.2017.1330592.

Lwasa, S. et al., 2015: A meta-analysis of urban and peri-urban agriculture and forestry in mediating climate change. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **13**, 68–73, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.02.003.

Ma, Y., K. Rong, D. Mangalagiu, T.F. Thornton, and D. Zhu, 2018: Co-evolution between urban sustainability and business ecosystem innovation: Evidence from the sharing mobility sector in Shanghai. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **188**, 942–953, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.323.

Magnusson, S., M. Johansson, S. Frosth, and K. Lundberg, 2019: Coordinating soil and rock material in urban construction – Scenario analysis of material flows and greenhouse gas emissions. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **241**, 118236, doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118236.

Mahtta, R., A. Mahendra, and K.C. Seto, 2019: Building up or spreading out? Typologies of urban growth across 478 cities of 1 million+. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **14(12)**, 124077, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab59bf.

Maier, S., 2016: Smart energy systems for smart city districts: case study Reininghaus District. *Energy. Sustain. Soc.*, **6(1)**, doi:10.1186/s13705-016-0085-9.

Marino, A.L., G. de L.D. Chaves, and J.L. dos Santos Junior, 2018: Do Brazilian municipalities have the technical capacity to implement solid waste management at the local level? *J. Clean. Prod.*, **188**, 378–386, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.311.

Matschoss, K., and E. Heiskanen, 2017: Making it experimental in several ways: The work of intermediaries in raising the ambition level in local climate initiatives. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **169**, 85–93, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.037.

Matsuda, T. et al., 2018: Monitoring environmental burden reduction from household waste prevention. *Waste Manag.*, **71**, 2–9, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2017.10.014.

McDonald, R., M. Colbert, M. Hamann, R. Simkin, and B. Walsh, 2018: *Nature in the Urban Century: A global assessment of where and how to conserve nature for biodiversity and human wellbeing*. The Nature Conservancy, Future Earth, and The Stockholm Resilience Centre, Arlington, Virginia, 85 pp. http://www.urbannature100.org (Accessed July 11, 2021).

McDonald, R.I. et al., 2020: Research gaps in knowledge of the impact of urban growth on biodiversity. *Nat. Sustain.*, **3(1)**, 16–24, doi:10.1038/s41893-019-0436-6.

McGuirk, P.M., H. Bulkeley, and R. Dowling, 2016: Configuring urban carbon governance: Insights from Sydney, Australia. *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, **106(1)**, 145–166, doi:10.1080/00045608.2015.1084670.

McLean, A., H. Bulkeley, and M. Crang, 2016: Negotiating the urban smart grid: Socio-technical experimentation in the city of Austin. *Urban Stud.*, **53(15)**, 3246–3263, doi:10.1177/0042098015612984.

McPhearson, T. et al., 2018: *Urban Ecosystems and Biodiversity*. In: Climate Change and Cities: Second Assessment Report of the Urban Climate Change Research Network. [Rosenzweig, C., W. Solecki, P. Romero-Lankao, S. Mehrotra, S. Dhakal, and S. Ali Ibrahim (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, New York, 257–318 pp.

McPherson, M., M. Ismail, D. Hoornweg, and M. Metcalfe, 2018: Planning for variable renewable energy and electric vehicle integration under varying degrees of decentralization: A case study in Lusaka, Zambia. *Energy*, **151**, 332–346, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.03.073.

Medick, J., I. Teichmann, and C. Kemfert, 2018: Hydrothermal carbonization (HTC) of green waste: Mitigation potentials, costs, and policy implications of HTC coal in the metropolitan region of Berlin, Germany. *Energy Policy*, **123**, 503–513, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.08.033.

Meggers, F. et al., 2016: Urban cooling primary energy reduction potential: System losses caused by microclimates. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **27**, 315–323, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.08.007.

Meha, D., A. Pfeifer, N. Duić, and H. Lund, 2020: Increasing the integration of variable renewable energy in coal-based energy system using power to heat technologies: The case of Kosovo. *Energy*, **212**, 118762, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118762.

Mikkola, J. and P.D. Lund, 2016: Modeling flexibility and optimal use of existing power plants with large-scale variable renewable power schemes. *Energy*, **112**, 364–375, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2016.06.082.

Milutinović, B., G. Stefanović, S. Milutinović, and Ž. Ćojbašić, 2016: Application of fuzzy logic for evaluation of the level of social acceptance of waste treatment. *Clean Technol. Environ. Policy*, **18(6)**, 1863–1875, doi:10.1007/s10098-016-1211-2.

Mirzabeigi, S. and M. Razkenari, 2021: Design optimization of urban typologies: A framework for evaluating building energy performance and outdoor thermal comfort. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **76**, 103515, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103515.

Moglia, M. et al., 2018: Urban transformation stories for the 21st century: Insights from strategic conversations. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **50** (January), 222–237, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.04.009.

Möller, B. et al., 2019: Heat Roadmap Europe: Towards EU-Wide, local heat supply strategies. *Energy*, **177**, 554–564, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.04.098.

Moser, S., S. Puschnigg, and V. Rodin, 2020: Designing the Heat Merit Order to determine the value of industrial waste heat for district heating systems. *Energy*, **200**, 117579, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2020.117579.

Mrówczyńska, M., M. Skiba, A. Bazan-Krzywoszańska, D. Bazuń, and M. Kwiatkowski, 2018: Social and infrastructural conditioning of lowering energy costs and improving the energy efficiency of buildings in the context of the local energy policy. *Energies*, **11(9)**, doi:10.3390/en11092302.

Müller, D.B. et al., 2013: Carbon Emissions of Infrastructure Development. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **47**, 11739–11746, doi:10.1021/es402618m.

Narayanan, A., K. Mets, M. Strobbe, and C. Develder, 2019: Feasibility of 100% renewable energy-based electricity production for cities with storage and flexibility. *Renew. Energy*, **134**, 698–709, doi:10.1016/j.renene.2018.11.049.

Nastran, M. and H. Regina, 2016: Advancing urban ecosystem governance in Ljubljana. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **62**, 123–126, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.06.003.

Nero, B.F., D. Callo-Concha, and M. Denich, 2018: Structure, diversity, and carbon stocks of the tree community of Kumasi, Ghana. *Forests*, **9(9)**, doi:10.3390/f9090519.

Neuvonen, A. and P. Ache, 2017: Metropolitan vision making – using backcasting as a strategic learning process to shape metropolitan futures. *Futures*, **86**, 73–83, doi:10.1016/j.futures.2016.10.003.

Newman, P., 2017: The rise and rise of renewable cities. *Renew. Energy Environ. Sustain.*, **2**, 10, doi:10.1051/rees/2017008.

Niemeier, D., R. Grattet, and T. Beamish, 2015: "Blueprinting" and climate change: Regional governance and civic participation in land use and transportation planning. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, **33(6)**, 1600–1617, doi:10.1177/0263774X15614181.

Nieuwenhuijsen, M.J., and H. Khreis, 2016: Car free cities: Pathway to healthy urban living. *Environ. Int.*, **94**, 251–262, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2016.05.032.

Novosel, T., M. Grozdek, J. Domac, and N. Duić, 2021: Spatial assessment of cooling demand and district cooling potential utilizing public data. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **75**, 103409, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103409.

Oliveira, L.S.B.L., D.S.B.L. Oliveira, B.S. Bezerra, B. Silva Pereira, and R.A.G. Battistelle, 2017: Environmental analysis of organic waste treatment focusing on composting scenarios. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **155(1)**, 229–237, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.08.093.

Olsson, L., L. Hjalmarsson, M. Wikström, and M. Larsson, 2015: Bridging the implementation gap: Combining backcasting and policy analysis to study renewable energy in urban road transport. *Transp. Policy*, **37**, 72–82, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2014.10.014.

Pacheco-Torres, R., J. Roldán, E.J. Gago, and J. Ordóñez, 2017: Assessing the relationship between urban planning options and carbon emissions at the use stage of new urbanized areas: A case study in a warm climate location. *Energy Build.*, **136**, 73–85, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.11.055.

Padeiro, M., A. Louro, and N.M. da Costa, 2019: Transit-oriented development and gentrification: a systematic review. *Transp. Rev.*, **39(6)**, 733–754, doi:10.1080/01441647.2019.1649316.

Palermo, V., P. Bertoldi, M. Apostolou, A. Kona, and S. Rivas, 2020a: Assessment of climate change mitigation policies in 315 cities in the Covenant of Mayors initiative. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **60**, 102258, doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102258.

Palermo, V., P. Bertoldi, M. Apostolou, A. Kona, and S. Rivas, 2020b: Data on mitigation policies at local level within the Covenant of Mayors' monitoring emission inventories. *Data Br.*, **32**, 106217, doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.106217.

Park, E.S. and I.N. Sener, 2019: Traffic-related air emissions in Houston: Effects of light-rail transit. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **651**, 154–161, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.09.169.

Paul, S., A. Dutta, F. Defersha, and B. Dubey, 2018: Municipal Food Waste to Biomethane and Biofertilizer: A Circular Economy Concept. *Waste Biomass Valor.*, **9(4)**, 601–611, doi:10.1007/s12649-017-0014-y.

Pavičević, M., T. Novosel, T. Pukšec, and N. Duić, 2017: Hourly optimization and sizing of district heating systems considering building refurbishment – Case study for the city of Zagreb. *Energy*, **137**, 1264–1276, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.06.105.

Pedro, J., C. Silva, and M.D. Pinheiro, 2018: Scaling up LEED-ND sustainability assessment from the neighborhood towards the city scale with the support of GIS modeling: Lisbon case study. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **41**, 929–939, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2017.09.015.

Peng, Y. and X. Bai, 2018: Experimenting towards a low-carbon city: Policy evolution and nested structure of innovation. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **174**, 201–212, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.116.

Peng, Y. and X. Bai, 2020: Financing urban low-carbon transition: The catalytic role of a city-level special fund in Shanghai. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **282**, 124514, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124514.

Pérez, J., J.M. de Andrés, J. Lumbreras, and E. Rodríguez, 2018: Evaluating carbon footprint of municipal solid waste treatment: Methodological proposal and application to a case study. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **205**, 419–431, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.103.

Pérez, J., J. Lumbreras, and E. Rodríguez, 2020: Life cycle assessment as a decision-making tool for the design of urban solid waste pre-collection and collection/transport systems. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **161** (January), doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104988.

Peri, G., P. Ferrante, M. La Gennusa, C. Pianello, and G. Rizzo, 2018: Greening MSW management systems by saving footprint: The contribution of the waste transportation. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **219**, 74–83, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.04.098.

Persson, U., E. Wiechers, B. Möller, and S. Werner, 2019: Heat Roadmap Europe: Heat distribution costs. *Energy*, **176**, 604–622, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.03.189.

Pesqueira, J.F.J.R., M.F.R. Pereira, and A.M.T. Silva, 2020: Environmental impact assessment of advanced urban wastewater treatment technologies for the removal of priority substances and contaminants of emerging concern: A review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **261**, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121078.

Petersen, J.-P., 2016: Energy concepts for self-supplying communities based on local and renewable energy sources: A case study from northern Germany. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **26**, 1–8, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2016.04.014.

Petit-Boix, A. and S. Leipold, 2018: Circular economy in cities: Reviewing how environmental research aligns with local practices. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **195**, 1270–1281, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.05.281.

Petit-Boix, A. et al., 2017: Application of life cycle thinking towards sustainable cities: A review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **166**, 939–951, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.08.030.

Pfeifer, A., L. Herc, I. Batas Bjelić, and N. Duić, 2021: Flexibility index and decreasing the costs in energy systems with high share of renewable energy. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **240**, 114258, doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2021.114258.

Pfeiffer, C. et al., 2021: A Case Study of Socially-Accepted Potentials for the Use of End User Flexibility by Home Energy Management Systems. *Sustainability*, **13(1)**, 132, doi:10.3390/su13010132.

Phillips, R., H.K. Jeswani, A. Azapagic, and D. Apul, 2018: Are stormwater pollution impacts significant in life cycle assessment? A new methodology for quantifying embedded urban stormwater impacts. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **636(2018)**, 115–123, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.200.

Pieper, H., T. Ommen, B. Elmegaard, and W. Brix Markussen, 2019: Assessment of a combination of three heat sources for heat pumps to supply district heating. *Energy*, **176**, 156–170, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.03.165.

Pierer, C. and F. Creutzig, 2019: Star-shaped cities alleviate trade-off between climate change mitigation and adaptation. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **14(8)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab2081.

Popovski, E., T. Fleiter, H. Santos, V. Leal, and E.O. Fernandes, 2018: Technical and economic feasibility of sustainable heating and cooling supply options in southern European municipalities-A case study for Matosinhos, Portugal. *Energy*, **153**, 311–323, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.04.036.

Potdar, A. et al., 2016: Innovation in solid waste management through Clean Development Mechanism in India and other countries. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, **101**, 160–169, doi:10.1016/j.psep.2015.07.009.

Powell, J.T., M.R. Chertow, and D.C. Esty, 2018: Where is global waste management heading? An analysis of solid waste sector commitments from nationally-determined contributions. *Waste Manag.*, **80**, 137–143, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.09.008.

Privitera, R. and D. La Rosa, 2018: Reducing Seismic Vulnerability and Energy Demand of Cities through Green Infrastructure. *Sustainability*, **10(8)**, doi:10.3390/su10082591.

Proctor, K. et al., 2021: Micropollutant fluxes in urban environment – A catchment perspective. *J. Hazard. Mater.*, **401**, 123745, doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.123745.

Pukšec, T., P. Leahy, A. Foley, N. Markovska, and N. Duić, 2018: Sustainable development of energy, water and environment systems 2016. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **82**, 1685–1690, doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2017.10.057.

Pursiheimo, E. and M. Rämä, 2021: Optimal capacities of distributed renewable heat supply in a residential area connected to district heating. *J. Sustain. Dev. Energy, Water Environ. Syst.*, **9(1)**, 1080328, doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.d8.0328.

Quaranta, E., C. Dorati, and A. Pistocchi, 2021: Water, energy and climate benefits of urban greening throughout Europe under different climatic scenarios. *Sci. Rep.*, **11**, 12163, doi:10.1038/s41598-021-88141-7.

Ram, M., A. Aghahosseini, and C. Breyer, 2020a: Job creation during the global energy transition towards 100% renewable power system by 2050. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **151**, 119682, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2019.06.008.

Ram, M., A. Aghahosseini, and C. Breyer, 2020b: Job creation during the global energy transition towards 100% renewable power system by 2050. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **151**, 119682, doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2019.06.008.

Ram, M., J.C. Osorio-Aravena, A. Aghahosseini, D. Bogdanov, and C. Breyer, 2022: Job creation during a climate compliant global energy transition across the power, heat, transport, and desalination sectors by 2050. *Energy*, **238**, 121690, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121690.

Ramage, M.H. et al., 2017: The wood from the trees: The use of timber in construction. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **68**, 333–359, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2016.09.107.

Ramaswami, A., 2020: Unpacking the Urban Infrastructure Nexus with Environment, Health, Livability, Well-Being, and Equity. *One Earth*, **2(2)**, 120–124, doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.02.003.

Ramaswami, A. et al., 2017: Urban cross-sector actions for carbon mitigation with local health co-benefits in China. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7(10)**, 736–742, doi:10.1038/nclimate3373.

Ranieri, L., G. Mossa, R. Pellegrino, and S. Digiesi, 2018: Energy recovery from the organic fraction of municipal solid waste: A real options-based facility assessment. *Sustainability*, **10(2)**, doi:10.3390/su10020368.

Raymond, C.M. et al., 2017: A framework for assessing and implementing the co-benefits of nature-based solutions in urban areas. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **77**(July), 15–24, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.07.008.

Reba, M. and K.C. Seto, 2020: A systematic review and assessment of algorithms to detect, characterize, and monitor urban land change. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **242** (May 2019), doi:10.1016/j.rse.2020.111739.

Regier, P.J. et al., 2020: Water quality impacts of urban and non-urban arid-land runoff on the Rio Grande. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **729**, 138443, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138443.

REN21, 2020: *Renewables in Cities: 2019 Global Status Report*. REN21 Secretariat, Paris, France, 174 pp. https://www.ren21.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/REC-2019-GSR_Full_Report_web.pdf (Accessed March 31, 2021).

REN21, 2021: *Renewables in Cities 2021 Global Status Report*. REN21 Secretariat, Paris, France, 202 pp. https://www.ren21.net/reports/cities-global-status-report/ (Accessed October 31, 2021).

Risch, E. et al., 2018: Impacts from urban water systems on receiving waters – How to account for severe wet-weather events in LCA? *Water Res.*, **128**, 412–423, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2017.10.039.

Robinson, C., D. Yan, S. Bouzarovski, and Y. Zhang, 2018: Energy poverty and thermal comfort in northern urban China: A household-scale typology of infrastructural inequalities. *Energy Build.*, **177**, 363–374, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.07.047.

Rodríguez-Sinobas, L., S. Zubelzu, S. Perales-Momparler, and S. Canogar, 2018: Techniques and criteria for sustainable urban stormwater management. The case study of Valdebebas (Madrid, Spain). *J. Clean. Prod.*, **172**, 402–416, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.070.

Roig, N. et al., 2012: Relationship between pollutant content and ecotoxicity of sewage sludges from Spanish wastewater treatment plants. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **425(2012)**, 99–109, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.03.018.

Roldán-Fontana, J., R. Pacheco-Torres, E. Jadraque-Gago, and J. Ordóñez, 2017: Optimization of CO_2 emissions in the design phases of urban planning, based on geometric characteristics: a case study of a low-density urban area in Spain. *Sustain. Sci.*, **12(1)**, 65–85, doi:10.1007/s11625-015-0342-4.

Romano, G., A. Rapposelli, and L. Marrucci, 2019: Improving waste production and recycling through zero-waste strategy and privatization: An empirical investigation. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **146** (March), 256–263, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.03.030.

Roppongi, H., A. Suwa, and J.A. Puppim De Oliveira, 2017: Innovating in sub-national climate policy: the mandatory emissions reduction scheme in Tokyo. *Clim. Policy*, **17(4)**, 516–532, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1124749.

Ruckelshaus, M.H. et al., 2016: Evaluating the Benefits of Green Infrastructure for Coastal Areas: Location, Location, Location. *Coast. Manag.*, **44(5)**, 504–516, doi:10.1080/08920753.2016.1208882.

Russo, A., 2018: Innovation and circular economy in water sector: The CAP group. In: Italian Water Industry Cases of Excellence. [Gilardoni, A. (eds)] Springer, Cham,, 215–224, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-71336-6_15.

Sakcharoen, T., C. Ratanatamskul, and A. Chandrachai, 2021: Factors affecting technology selection, techno-economic and environmental sustainability assessment of a novel zero-waste system for food waste and wastewater management. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **314**, 128103, doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128103.

Salat, S., L. Bourdic, and M. Kamiya, 2017: *Economic Foundations for Sustainable Urbanization: A Study on Three-Pronged Approach: Planned City Extensions, Legal Framework, and Municipal Finance*, Paris.

Salpakari, J., J. Mikkola, and P.D. Lund, 2016: Improved flexibility with large-scale variable renewable power in cities through optimal demand side management and power-to-heat conversion. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **126**, 649–661, doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2016.08.041.

Salvia, M. et al., 2021: Will climate mitigation ambitions lead to carbon neutrality? An analysis of the local-level plans of 327 cities in the EU. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **135**, 110253, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110253.

Sangiuliano, S.J., 2017: Community energy and emissions planning for tidal current turbines: A case study of the municipalities of the Southern Gulf Islands Region, British Columbia. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **76**, 1–8, doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.036.

Santamouris, M. et al., 2018a: Progress in urban greenery mitigation science – assessment methodologies advanced technologies and impact on cities. *J. Civ. Eng. Manag.*, **24(8)**, 638–671, doi:10.3846/jcem.2018.6604.

Santamouris, M. et al., 2018b: On the energy impact of urban heat island in Sydney: Climate and energy potential of mitigation technologies. *Energy Build.*, **166**, 154–164, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.02.007.

Sasaki, Y. et al., 2018: Sea breeze effect mapping for mitigating summer urban warming: For making urban environmental climate map of Yokohama and its surrounding area. *Urban Clim.*, **24**, 529–550, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2017.07.003.

Saujot, M., and B. Lefèvre, 2016: The next generation of urban MACCs. Reassessing the cost-effectiveness of urban mitigation options by integrating a systemic approach and social costs. *Energy Policy*, **92**, 124–138, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.01.029.

Schipper, A.M. et al., 2020: Projecting terrestrial biodiversity intactness with GLOBIO 4. *Glob. Change Biol.*, **26(2)**, 760–771, doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14848.

Scholz, T., A. Hof, and T. Schmitt, 2018: Cooling effects and regulating ecosystem services provided by urban trees-Novel analysis approaches using urban tree cadastre data. *Sustain.*, **10(3)**, doi:10.3390/su10030712.

Schwarz, N. et al., 2017: Understanding biodiversity-ecosystem service relationships in urban areas: A comprehensive literature review. *Ecosyst. Serv.*, **27**, 161–171, doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.08.014.

Serrao-Neumann, S., M. Renouf, S.J. Kenway, and D. Low Choy, 2017: Connecting land-use and water planning: Prospects for an urban water metabolism approach. *Cities*, **60**, 13–27, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.07.003.

Sethi, M., W. Lamb, J. Minx, and F. Creutzig, 2020: Climate change mitigation in cities: A systematic scoping of case studies. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15(9)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab99ff.

Seto, K.C. et al., 2016: Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **41**, 425–452, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085934.

Shakya, S.R., 2016: Benefits of low carbon development strategies in emerging cities of developing country: A case of Kathmandu. *J. Sustain. Dev. Energy, Water Environ. Syst.*, **4(2)**, 141–160, doi:10.13044/j.sdewes.2016.04.0012.

Sharma, R., 2018: Financing Indian urban rail through land development: Case studies and implications for the accelerated reduction in oil associated with 1.5°C. *Urban Plan.*, **3(2)**, 21–34, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1158.

Sharp, D. and R. Salter, 2017: Direct impacts of an urban living lab from the participants' perspective: Livewell Yarra. *Sustainability*, **9(10)**, doi:10.3390/su9101699.

Shen, L. et al., 2018: Analysis on the evolution of low carbon city from process characteristic perspective. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **187**, 348–360, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.190.

Shen, X., X. Wang, Z. Zhang, Z. Lu, and T. Lv, 2019: Evaluating the effectiveness of land use plans in containing urban expansion: An integrated view. *Land use policy*, **80** (October 2018), 205–213, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.10.001.

Shi, Y., Y.-X. Yun, C. Liu, and Y.-Q. Chu, 2017a: Carbon footprint of buildings in the urban agglomeration of central Liaoning, China. *Chinese J. Appl. Ecol.*, **28(6)**, 2040–2046, doi:10.13287/j.1001-9332.201706.007.

Shi, Z., J.A. Fonseca, and A. Schlueter, 2017b: A review of simulation-based urban form generation and optimization for energy-driven urban design. *Build. Environ.*, **121**, 119–129, doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.05.006.

Shi, Z., S. Hsieh, J.A. Fonseca, and A. Schlueter, 2020: Street grids for efficient district cooling systems in high-density cities. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **60** (April), doi:10.1016/j.scs.2020.102224.

Slach, O., V. Bosák, L. Krtička, A. Nováček, and P. Rumpel, 2019: Urban Shrinkage and Sustainability: Assessing the Nexus between Population Density, Urban Structures and Urban Sustainability. *Sustain.*, **11(15)**, doi:10.3390/su11154142.

Slorach, P.C., H.K. Jeswani, R. Cuéllar-Franca, and A. Azapagic, 2020: Environmental sustainability in the food-energy-water-health nexus: A new methodology and an application to food waste in a circular economy. *Waste Manag.*, **113**, 359–368, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2020.06.012.

Soares, F.R., and G. Martins, 2017: Using life cycle assessment to compare environmental impacts of different waste to energy options for Sao Paulo's municipal solid waste. *J. Solid Waste Technol. Manag.*, **43(1)**, 36–46, doi:10.5276/JSWTM.2017.36.

Soilán, M., B. Riveiro, P. Liñares, and M. Padín-Beltrán, 2018: Automatic parametrization and shadow analysis of roofs in urban areas from ALS point clouds with solar energy purposes. *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, **7(8)**, doi:10.3390/ijgi7080301.

Song, Y. et al., 2019: Nature based solutions for contaminated land remediation and brownfield redevelopment in cities: A review. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **663**, 568–579, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.347.

Sorknæs, P. et al., 2020: The benefits of 4th generation district heating in a 100% renewable energy system. *Energy*, **213**, 119030.

Soukiazis, E., and S. Proença, 2020: The determinants of waste generation and recycling performance across the Portuguese municipalities – A simultaneous equation approach. *Waste Manag.*, **114**, 321–330, doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2020.06.039.

Sovacool, B.K. et al., 2020: Sustainable minerals and metals for a low-carbon future. *Science*, **367(6473)**, 30–33, doi:10.1126/science.aaz6003.

Starostina, V., A. Damgaard, M.K. Eriksen, and T.H. Christensen, 2018: Waste management in the Irkutsk region, Siberia, Russia: An environmental assessment of alternative development scenarios. *Waste Manag. Res.*, **36(4)**, 373–385, doi:10.1177/0734242X18757627.

Steinberger, J.K., W.F. Lamb, and M. Sakai, 2020: Your money or your life? The carbon-development paradox. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15(4)**, 44016, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab7461.

Stewart, I.D., C.A. Kennedy, A. Facchini, and R. Mele, 2018: The Electric City as a Solution to Sustainable Urban Development. *J. Urban Technol.*, **25(1)**, 3–20, doi:10.1080/10630732.2017.1386940.

Stocchero, A., J.K. Seadon, R. Falshaw, and M. Edwards, 2017: Urban Equilibrium for sustainable cities and the contribution of timber buildings to balance urban carbon emissions: A New Zealand case study. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **143**, 1001–1010, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.020.

Stokes, E.C. and K.C. Seto, 2019: Characterizing urban infrastructural transitions for the Sustainable Development Goals using multi-temporal land, population, and nighttime light data. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **234** (November 2018), doi:10.1016/j.rse.2019.111430.

Sudmant, A., J. Millward-Hopkins, S. Colenbrander, and A. Gouldson, 2016: Low carbon cities: is ambitious action affordable? *Clim. Change*, **138(3–4)**, 681–688, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1751-9.

Sun, L., M. Fujii, T. Tasaki, H. Dong, and S. Ohnishi, 2018a: Improving waste to energy rate by promoting an integrated municipal solid-waste management system. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **136**, 289–296, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.05.005.

Sun, L. et al., 2018b: A completive research on the feasibility and adaptation of shared transportation in mega-cities – A case study in Beijing. *Appl. Energy*, **230**, 1014–1033, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.09.080.

Suo, C. et al., 2017: Identifying optimal clean-production pattern for energy systems under uncertainty through introducing carbon emission trading and green certificate schemes. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **161**, 299–316, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.123.

Swilling, M. et al., 2018: *The Weight of Cities: Resource Requirements of Future Urbanization*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 280 pp. https://www.resourcepanel.org/sites/default/files/documents/document/media/the_weight_of_cities_full_report_english.pdf (Accessed March 31, 2021).

Takao, Y., 2020: Low-carbon leadership: Harnessing policy studies to analyse local mayors and renewable energy transitions in three Japanese cities. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **69** (February), doi:10.1016/j.erss.2020.101708.

Tayarani, M., A. Poorfakhraei, R. Nadafianshahamabadi, and G. Rowangould, 2018: Can regional transportation and land-use planning achieve deep reductions in GHG emissions from vehicles? *Transp. Res. Part D Transp. Environ.*, **63**, 222–235, doi:10.1016/j.trd.2018.05.010.

Teferi, Z.A. and P. Newman, 2018: Slum upgrading: Can the 1.5°C carbon reduction work with SDGs in these settlements? *Urban Plan.*, **3(2)**, 52–63, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1239.

Thellufsen, J.Z. et al., 2020: Smart energy cities in a 100% renewable energy context. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **129**, 109922, doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109922.

Thomson, G. and P. Newman, 2016: Geoengineering in the anthropocene through regenerative urbanism. *Geosciences*, **6(4)**, doi:10.3390/geosciences6040046.

Thomson, G. and P. Newman, 2018: Urban fabrics and urban metabolism – from sustainable to regenerative cities. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **132**, 218–229, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.01.010.

Tillie, N., J. Borsboom-van Beurden, D. Doepel, and M. Aarts, 2018: Exploring a stakeholder based urban densification and greening agenda for rotterdam inner city-accelerating the transition to a liveable low carbon city. *Sustainability*, **10(6)**, doi:10.3390/su10061927.

Tomić, T. and D.R. Schneider, 2017: Municipal solid waste system analysis through energy consumption and return approach. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **203**, 973–987, doi:10.1016/J.JENVMAN.2017.06.070.

Tomić, T. and D.R. Schneider, 2018: The role of energy from waste in circular economy and closing the loop concept – Energy analysis approach. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **98**, 268–287, doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2018.09.029.

Tomić, T. and D.R. Schneider, 2020: Circular economy in waste management – Socio-economic effect of changes in waste management system structure. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **267**, 110564, doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110564.

Tomić, T. et al., 2017: Waste to energy plant operation under the influence of market and legislation conditioned changes. *Energy*, **137**, 1119–1129, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.04.080.

Tong, X., T. Wang, and W. Wang, 2017: Impact of Mixed Function Community on Distributed Photovoltaic Application. *Yingyong Jichu yu Gongcheng Kexue Xuebao/Journal Basic Sci. Eng.*, **25(4)**, 793–804, doi:10.16058/j.issn.1005-0930.2017.04.014.

Topi, C., E. Esposto, and V. Marini Govigli, 2016: The economics of green transition strategies for cities: Can low carbon, energy efficient development approaches be adapted to demand side urban water efficiency? *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **58**, 74–82, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.01.001.

Tuomisto, J.T. et al., 2015: Building-related health impacts in European and Chinese cities: A scalable assessment method. *Environ. Heal. A Glob. Access Sci. Source*, **14(1)**, doi:10.1186/s12940-015-0082-z.

UNEP, 2015: *District Energy in Cities: Unlocking the Potential of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 138 pp. https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/9317 (Accessed March 29, 2021).

UNEP IRP, 2020: *Resource Efficiency and Climate Change: Material Efficiency Strategies for a Low-Carbon Future, A report of the International Resource Panel*. International Resource Panel (IRP), Nairobi, Kenya, 157 pp. https://www.resourcepanel.org/reports/resource-efficiency-and-climate-change (Accessed March 31, 2021).

Ürge-Vorsatz, D. et al., 2018: Locking in positive climate responses in cities. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **8(3)**, 174–177, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0100-6.

Vaitkus, A., J. Gražulytė, V. Vorobjovas, O. Šernas, and R. Kleizienė, 2018: Potential of MSWI bottom ash to be used as aggregate in road building materials. *Balt. J. Road Bridg. Eng.*, **13(1)**, 77–86, doi:10.3846/bjrbe.2018.401.

Valek, A.M., J. Sušnik, and S. Grafakos, 2017: Quantification of the urban water-energy nexus in México City, México, with an assessment of water-system related carbon emissions. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **590–591**, 258–268, doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2017.02.234.

van den Bosch, M. and O. Sang, 2017: Urban natural environments as nature-based solutions for improved public health – A systematic review of reviews. *Environ. Res.*, **158** (May), 373–384, doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.05.040.

Van Den Dobbelsteen, A., C.L. Martin, G. Keeffe, R.M. Pulselli, and H. Vandevyvere, 2018: From problems to potentials-the urban energy transition of Gruž, Dubrovnik. *Energies*, **11(4)**, doi:10.3390/en11040922.

Vanham, D., B.M. Gawlik, and G. Bidoglio, 2017: Food consumption and related water resources in Nordic cities. *Ecol. Indic.*, **74**, 119–129, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.11.019.

Vergara-Araya, M., H. Lehn, and W.R. Poganietz, 2020: Integrated water, waste and energy management systems – A case study from Curauma, Chile. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **156** (December 2019), doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104725.

Wang, G., J. Deng, F. Chen, H. Cheng, and L. Ye, 2016: Exploitation and application of bamboo fiber-reinforced filament-wound pressure pipe. *Linye Kexue/Scientia Silvae Sin.*, **52(4)**, 127–132, doi:10.11707/j.1001-7488.20160415.

Wang, M., X. Mao, Y. Gao, and F. He, 2018: Potential of carbon emission reduction and financial feasibility of urban rooftop photovoltaic power generation in Beijing. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **203**, 1119–1131, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.350.

Webb, J., 2015: Improvising innovation in UK urban district heating: The convergence of social and environmental agendas in Aberdeen. *Energy Policy*, **78**, 265–272, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.12.003.

Webb, R. et al., 2018: Sustainable urban systems: Co-design and framing for transformation. *Ambio*, **47(1)**, 57–77, doi:10.1007/s13280-017-0934-6.

Weng, Y.-C. et al., 2015: Management of landfill reclamation with regard to biodiversity preservation, global warming mitigation and landfill mining: experiences from the Asia–Pacific region. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **104**, 364–373, doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.014.

Westman, L. and V.C. Broto, 2018: Climate governance through partnerships: A study of 150 urban initiatives in China. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **50** (November 2017), 212–221, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.04.008.

Wiktorowicz, J. et al., 2018: WGV: An Australian urban precinct case study to demonstrate the 1.5°C agenda including multiple SDGs. *Urban Plan.*, **3(2)**, 64–81, doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1245.

Williams, J., 2017: Lost in translation: Translating low carbon experiments into new spatial contexts viewed through the mobile-transitions lens. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **169**, 191–203, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.236.

Xie, Y., H. Dai, and H. Dong, 2018: Impacts of SO_2 taxations and renewable energy development on CO_2, NO_x and SO_2 emissions in Jing-Jin-Ji region. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **171**, 1386–1395, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.057.

Xiong, W., Y. Wang, B.V. Mathiesen, H. Lund, and X. Zhang, 2015: Heat roadmap China: New heat strategy to reduce energy consumption towards 2030. *Energy*, **81**, 274–285, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2014.12.039.

Xu, Q., Y.-X. Dong, and R. Yang, 2018: Influence of the geographic proximity of city features on the spatial variation of urban carbon sinks: A case study on the Pearl River Delta. *Environ. Pollut.*, **243**, 354–363, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.08.083.

Xue, Y. et al., 2017: Transport emissions and energy consumption impacts of private capital investment in public transport. *Sustainability*, **9(10)**, doi:10.3390/su9101760.

Yamagata, Y. and H. Seya, 2013: Simulating a future smart city: An integrated land use-energy model. *Appl. Energy*, **112**, 1466–1474, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.01.061.

Yang, P.P.-J., S.J. Quan, D. Castro-Lacouture, and B.J. Stuart, 2018a: A Geodesign method for managing a closed-loop urban system through algae cultivation. *Appl. Energy*, **231(1)**, 1372–1382, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.12.129.

Yang, P.P.-J. et al., 2018b: Performance-based model for vertical urbanism. In: Vertical Urbanism: Designing Compact Cities in China. [Zhongjie, L. and Gámez, J.L.S. (eds)], Routledge, London, 149–169, doi:10.4324/9781351206839.

Yazdanie, M., M. Densing, and A. Wokaun, 2017: Cost optimal urban energy systems planning in the context of national energy policies: A case study for the city of Basel. *Energy Policy*, **110**, 176–190, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.08.009.

Yeo, S.G., N.T.H. Nhai, and J.-I. Dong, 2018: Analysis of waste-to-energy conversion efficiencies based on different estimation methods in Seoul area. *J. Mater. Cycles Waste Manag.*, **20(3)**, 1615–1624, doi:10.1007/s10163-018-0725-6.

Yılmaz Bakır, N., U. Doğan, M. Koçak Güngör, and B. Bostancı, 2018: Planned development versus unplanned change: The effects on urban planning in Turkey. *Land use policy*, **77** (June), 310–321, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.05.036.

You, C. and J. Kim, 2020: Optimal design and global sensitivity analysis of a 100% renewable energy sources based smart energy network for electrified and hydrogen cities. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **223**, 113252, doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2020.113252.

Yu, Y. and W. Zhang, 2016: Greenhouse gas emissions from solid waste in Beijing: The rising trend and the mitigation effects by management improvements. *Waste Manag. Res.*, **34(4)**, 368–377, doi:10.1177/0734242X16628982.

Yuan, M., J.Z. Thellufsen, H. Lund, and Y. Liang, 2021a: The electrification of transportation in energy transition. *Energy*, **236**, 121564, doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121564.

Yuan, M., J. Zinck Thellufsen, P. Sorknæs, H. Lund, and Y. Liang, 2021b: District heating in 100% renewable energy systems: Combining industrial excess heat and heat pumps. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **244**, 114527, doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2021.114527.

Yuan, X.-C., Y.-J. Lyu, B. Wang, Q.-H. Liu, and Q. Wu, 2018: China's energy transition strategy at the city level: The role of renewable energy. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **205**, 980–986, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.162.

Zenginis, I. et al., 2017: Cooperation in microgrids through power exchange: An optimal sizing and operation approach. *Appl. Energy*, **203**, 972–981, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.07.110.

Zhai, Y. et al., 2020: Is energy the key to pursuing clean air and water at the city level ? A case study of Jinan City , China. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **134** (December 2019), 110353.

Zhan, J., W. Liu, F. Wu, Z. Li, and C. Wang, 2018: Life cycle energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions of urban residential buildings in Guangzhou city. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **194**, 318–326, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.05.124.

Zhang, C. et al., 2018a: Co-benefits of urban concrete recycling on the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and land use change: A case in Chongqing metropolis, China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **201**, 481–498, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.07.238.

Zhang, J., and F. Li, 2017: Energy consumption and low carbon development strategies of three global cities in Asian developing countries. *J. Renew. Sustain. Energy*, **9(2)**, doi:10.1063/1.4978467.

Zhang, L. et al., 2016: Method for reducing excess heat supply experienced in typical Chinese district heating systems by achieving hydraulic balance and improving indoor air temperature control at the building level. *Energy*, **107**, 431–442, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2016.03.138.

Zhang, R., K. Matsushima, and K. Kobayashi, 2018b: Can land use planning help mitigate transport-related carbon emissions? A case of Changzhou. *Land use policy*, **74**, 32–40, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.04.025.

Zhang, R. et al., 2020: PET bottles recycling in China: An LCA coupled with LCC case study of blanket production made of waste PET bottles. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **260**, 110062, doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.110062.

Zhao, G., J.M. Guerrero, K. Jiang, and S. Chen, 2017: Energy modelling towards low carbon development of Beijing in 2030. *Energy*, **121**, 107–113, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.01.019.

Zhou, Z. et al., 2018: Environmental performance evolution of municipal solid waste management by life cycle assessment in Hangzhou, China. *J. Environ. Manage.*, **227**, 23–33, doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.08.083.