

Trade-offs between sustainable development goals in systems of cities

J. Raimbault^{1,2,3,4} and D. Pumain⁴
juste.raimbault@ign.fr

¹LASTIG, Univ Gustave Eiffel, IGN-ENSG

²CASA, UCL

³UPS CNRS 3611 ISC-PIF

⁴UMR CNRS 8504 Géographie-cités

2022 IGU Urban Commission Annual Meeting
July 25th 2022

SDG 11: “Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable” [Nations, 2015]

- Cities as a transition state? [Batty, 2018] Incubators of social change and innovation, both the source and solution to sustainability issues? [Pumain, 2010]
- Environmental Kuznet Curve hypothesis [Dinda, 2004, Stern, 2004]: inverted U-shaped relationship between environmental impact and income per-capita; not validated empirically [Harbaugh et al., 2002]
- Trade-offs between SDGs in urban systems [Viguié and Hallegatte, 2012]



Journal of Urban Management

Volume 11, Issue 2, June 2022, Pages 237-245



Research Article

Trade-offs between sustainable development goals in systems of cities

Juste Rimbault ^{a, b, c, d} , Denise Pumain ^d

Show more

+ Add to Mendeley Share Cite

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2022.05.008>

Under a Creative Commons license

Get rights and content

Open access

- More dimensions and SDGs with trade-offs?
- Several models introduced with the evolutionary urban theory [Pumain, 2018] tackle complementary dimensions (see [Raimbault et al., 2020a] for a benchmark)

Research objective:

Couple several models for complementary dimensions of urban dynamics (innovation, economic exchanges, infrastructure) into a multi-model for the dynamics of urban systems at the macroscopic scale, to explore trade-offs between SDGs in synthetic systems of cities.



Exploration of trade-offs with two dimensions: urban evolution model [Raimbault and Pumain, 2022]

- **Innovation diffusion** is a crucial process in artificial life evolutionary systems and open-ended evolution [Bedau et al., 2000]
- Artificial societies used to study the dynamics of innovation [Zenobia et al., 2009]
- Innovations diffuse hierarchically in systems of cities [Hagerstrand, 1968], potential explanation of urban scaling laws [Pumain et al., 2006]


Innovation diffusion as a privileged entry to understand urban evolution

- Agents are cities, macroscopic scale (regional, country, continental) and long time scales (century)
- Cities characterised by their size in terms of population; genome as adoption proportions of innovations (social or technological) for each city (one single dimension to simplify)
- Following [Favaro and Pumain, 2011], attractivity of cities due to level of innovation drive their population growth through spatial interactions; innovation diffuse through an other spatial interaction model [Fotheringham and O'Kelly, 1989]
- Mutations occur in cities as new innovations appear


Model description




Model description



Model description



Model description



Model formalisation

At each time step, with $P_i(t)$ population, $\delta_{c,i}(t)$ genome, u_c utility of innovation, $p_{c,i,t}$ share of total population adopting innovation c in city i

- ① Crossover through the diffusion of innovations

$$\delta_{c,i,t} = \frac{\sum_j p_{c,j,t-1}^{\frac{1}{u_c}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{d_{ij}}{d_I}\right)}{\sum_c \sum_j p_{c,j,t-1}^{\frac{1}{u_c}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{d_{ij}}{d_I}\right)}$$

- ② Population growth through spatial interactions

$$P_i(t) - P_i(t-1) = w_I \cdot \sum_j \frac{V_{ij}}{\langle V_{ij} \rangle} \text{ with}$$

$$V_{ij} = \frac{P_i(t-1) \cdot P_j(t-1)}{\left(\sum_k P_k(t-1)\right)^2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{d_{ij}}{d_G} \cdot \prod_c \delta_{c,i,t}^{\phi_{c,t}}\right)$$

$$\text{and } \phi_{c,t} = \sum_i \delta_{i,c,t} \cdot P_i(t-1) / \sum_{i,c} \delta_{i,c,t} \cdot P_i(t-1)$$

- ③ Mutations with innovations introduced with probability

$\beta \cdot (P_i(t) / \max_k P_k(t))^{\alpha_i}$ and an initial penetration rate r_0 ; new utility u_c randomly distributed (normal or log-normal) with average current average utility and standard deviation a given parameter σ_u

Synthetic configurations

Model applied on synthetic systems of cities (so that conclusions are independent of geographical contingencies [Raimbault et al., 2019]):

- random positions and rank-size hierarchy $P_i(0) = \frac{P_{max}}{i^{\alpha_0}}$ with $\alpha_0 = 1.0$ and $P_{max} = 100,000$
- regional urban system scale: $N = 30$ cities
- simulated for $t_f = 50$ macroscopic time steps (order of magnitude of a century)

Model parameters for the innovation model

Parameter	Not.	Process	Range	Def.
Number of cities	N	Spatial scale	[10; 100]	30
Initial hierarchy	α_0	System of cities	[0.5; 2.0]	1
Initial population	P_{max}	System of cities	[10^4 ; 10^7]	10^5
Simulation steps	t_f	Temporal scale	[10; 100]	50
Growth rate	w_I	Pop. growth	[0.001; 0.01]	0.005
Gravity range	d_G	Crossover	[0; 2]	1
Innovation range	d_I	Crossover	[0; 2]	1
Innovation rate	β	Mutation	[0; 1]	0.5
Innovation hierarchy	α_I	Mutation	[0; 2]	1
Innov. utility std.	σ_U	Mutation	[0.7; 2]	1
Penetration rate	r_0	Mutation	[0.1; 0.9]	0.5
Utility type	-	Mutation	{n; ln}	ln

Implementation

Model implemented in scala; relatively large parameter space; integration into the spatialdata scala library for spatial sensitivity analysis [Raimbault et al., 2020b]

→ integration into the OpenMOLE model exploration open source software [Reuillon et al., 2013]



Enables seamlessly (i) model embedding; (ii) access to HPC resources; (iii) exploration and optimization algorithms

<https://openmole.org/>

Trade-offs between SDGs

→ Which trade-offs between innovation (SDG 9: innovation) and emissions (SDG 14: climate) in systems of cities?

Application of the urban evolution model, optimising with NSGA2 for conflicting objectives in synthetic systems of cities:


- ① total utility of innovations

$$U = \sum_{t,i,c} \delta_{t,i,c} \cdot u_c$$

- ② gravity mobility flows as proxy for emissions


$$E = \sum_{t,i,j} \frac{P_{t,i} P_{t,j}}{P_t^2} \cdot \exp(-d_{ij}/d_G)$$

Trade-offs between SDG9 and SDG14




Pareto front confirms the existence of a trade-off

Influence of urban hierarchy



Higher inter-urban inequalities yield stronger trade-offs

Influence of innovation hierarchy



*More balanced innovation yield higher utilities and less emissions
(dominating Pareto front)*

Generic multi-model of urban dynamics

Other dimensions benchmarked by [Raimbault et al., 2020a] to fit population dynamics on several large urban systems

Models integrated:

- Innovation diffusion urban evolution model [Raimbault and Pumain, 2022]
- Marius model for economic exchanges [Cottineau et al., 2015]
- Co-evolution model for cities and infrastructure networks [Raimbault, 2021]

“Semi-weak” coupling of submodels:

$$S_0 \rightarrow \left[S_1^{(0)} = M_0(S_0) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S_1^{(K-1)} = M_{K-1}(S_1^{(K-2)}) = S_1 \right] \longrightarrow \dots \\ \longrightarrow \left[S_T^{(0)} = M_0(S_{T-1}) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S_T^{(K-1)} = M_{K-1}(S_T^{(K-2)}) = S_T \right] \quad (1)$$

Remarks: strictly weak coupling does not capture dynamics nor synergies; stronger coupling may exist to better capture interdependencies processes (here no specific coupling ontology, only population and distance matrix are shared between submodels)



MARIUS family of models [Cottineau et al., 2015]:

Initial wealth as a power law of population (exponent α_W)

- 1) Update supply and demands as super-linear functions of population (exponents α_S, α_D)
- 2) Exchange goods according to a gravity potential of interaction (distance decay d_M), supplies and demands; update wealth accordingly
- 3) Update population such that population difference is a power law of wealth difference (economic multiplier e_M and exponent α_P)

Infrastructure co-evolution model

System of cities interaction model including network evolution.



Raimbault, J. (2020). Indirect evidence of network effects in a system of cities. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 47(1), 138-155.

Raimbault, J. (2021). Modeling the co-evolution of cities and networks. In *Handbook of Cities and Networks* (pp. 166-193). Edward Elgar Publishing.


Raimbault, J. (2020). Hierarchy and co-evolution processes in urban systems. *Forthcoming in Hierarchy in infrastructure networks*, J. Fen-Chong, ed. ISTE Editions.

Proxies for SDGs:

- Total utility of innovations (SDG 9 “Innovation”)
- Total spatial interaction flows across submodels (SDG 13 “Climate”)
- Average distance between cities (SDG 9 “Resilient infrastructure”)
- Economic inequalities (SDG 10 “Inequalities”)
- Total wealth of cities (SDG 8 “Economic Growth”)


Optimisation parameters: fixed synthetic urban system parameters but random configurations (10 repetitions); 8 parameters for innovation; 6 parameters for economic exchanges; 6 parameters for co-evolution

Optimisation results



Scatterplots of the 5D Pareto front. Color level: Gini economic wealth.

Optimisation results



Radar plot for the many-objective optimisation (colour: best solution along each dimension)

Discussion

Parametrisation on case studies:

- Patent data as a proxy for innovation: geolocation of inventors not straightforward [Bergeaud and Verluise, 2021] [De Rassenfosse et al., 2019]; which technological (sub-)classes? Model with one dimension (extension with a matrix genome?); semantic content to better capture innovation diffusion? [Bergeaud et al., 2017]
- Emissions: inter-urban mobility emissions difficult to capture (need an additional transport model?)
- Historical infrastructure networks data?

Work in progress

- Many-objective optimisation: NSGA3 algorithm
- Empirical stylised facts on possible trade-offs in systems of cities

Future work

- Towards multi-scale models: quantifying goal 11 (sustainable cities and communities) implies in some cases intra-urban dynamics (mobility, segregation, e.g.)
- Transfer to policies and planning? Models with multiple functions? [Varenne, 2018] (towards companion modeling and stakeholder involvement)

Conclusion

- Towards an integrative urban and territorial science applied to sustainable planning at multiple scales
- Transfer to decision-making, policies and governance? *e-team* of the CSDC campus

To use OpenMOLE (free and open software) and contribute:
<https://openmole.org>

Model code and results open source at
<https://github.com/JusteRaimbault/SDGTradeoffs> and
<https://github.com/openmole/spatialdata>

References I

-  Batty, M. (2018).
Inventing future cities.
MIT press.
-  Bedau, M. A., McCaskill, J. S., Packard, N. H., Rasmussen, S., Adami, C., Green, D. G., Ikegami, T., Kaneko, K., and Ray, T. S. (2000).
Open problems in artificial life.
Artificial life, 6(4):363–376.
-  Bergeaud, A., Potiron, Y., and Raimbault, J. (2017).
Classifying patents based on their semantic content.
PloS one, 12(4):e0176310.
-  Bergeaud, A. and Verluise, C. (2021).
Patentcity: A century of innovation: New data and facts.

References II

-  Cottineau, C., Reuillon, R., Chapron, P., Rey-Coyrehourcq, S., and Pumain, D. (2015).
A modular modelling framework for hypotheses testing in the simulation of urbanisation.
Systems, 3(4):348–377.
-  De Rassenfosse, G., Kozak, J., and Seliger, F. (2019).
Geocoding of worldwide patent data.
Scientific data, 6(1):1–15.
-  Dinda, S. (2004).
Environmental kuznets curve hypothesis: a survey.
Ecological economics, 49(4):431–455.
-  Favaro, J.-M. and Pumain, D. (2011).
Gibrat revisited: An urban growth model incorporating spatial interaction and innovation cycles.
Geographical Analysis, 43(3):261–286.

References III

-  Fotheringham, A. S. and O'Kelly, M. E. (1989).
Spatial interaction models: formulations and applications, volume 1.
Kluwer Academic Publishers Dordrecht.
-  Hagerstrand, T. (1968).
Innovation diffusion as a spatial process.
Chicago, USA: Univ. Chicago Press.
-  Harbaugh, W. T., Levinson, A., and Wilson, D. M. (2002).
Reexamining the empirical evidence for an environmental kuznets curve.
Review of Economics and Statistics, 84(3):541–551.
-  Nations, U. (2015).
17 goals to transform our world: United nations sustainable development 2015.
United Nations Press: New York, NY, USA.

References IV

-  Pumain, D. (2010).
Une théorie géographique des villes.
Bulletin de la Société géographie de Liège, 55(2):5–15.
-  Pumain, D. (2018).
An evolutionary theory of urban systems.
In Rozenblat C. Pumain D. Velasquez E. (eds.), *International and transnational perspectives on urban systems*, pages 3–18. Singapore, Springer Nature, Advances in Geographical and Environmental Sciences.
-  Pumain, D., Paulus, F., Vacchiani-Marcuzzo, C., and Lobo, J. (2006).
An evolutionary theory for interpreting urban scaling laws.
Cybergeo: European Journal of Geography.



Rimbault, J. (2020).

Indirect evidence of network effects in a system of cities.

Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science,
47(1):138–155.



Rimbault, J. (2021).

Modeling the co-evolution of cities and networks.

In *Handbook of Cities and Networks*, pages 166–193. Edward Elgar Publishing.



Rimbault, J. (2022).

Hierarchy and co-evolution processes in urban systems.

Forthcoming in Hierarchy in infrastructure networks, J. Fen-Chong, ed. ISTE Editions.

References VI

-  Rimbault, J., Cottineau, C., Le Texier, M., Le Néchet, F., and Reuillon, R. (2019).
Space matters: Extending sensitivity analysis to initial spatial conditions in geosimulation models.
Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, 22(4).
-  Rimbault, J., Denis, E., and Pumain, D. (2020a).
Empowering urban governance through urban science: Multi-scale dynamics of urban systems worldwide.
Sustainability, 12(15):5954.
-  Rimbault, J., Perret, J., and Reuillon, R. (2020b).
A scala library for spatial sensitivity analysis.
GISRUK.

References VII

-  Rimbault, J. and Pumain, D. (2022).
Trade-offs between sustainable development goals in systems of cities.
Journal of Urban Management.
-  Reuillon, R., Leclaire, M., and Rey-Coyrehourcq, S. (2013).
Openmole, a workflow engine specifically tailored for the distributed exploration of simulation models.
Future Generation Computer Systems, 29(8):1981–1990.
-  Stern, D. I. (2004).
The rise and fall of the environmental kuznets curve.
World development, 32(8):1419–1439.
-  Varenne, F. (2018).
Théories et modèles en sciences humaines: le cas de la géographie.
Éditions Matériologiques.

References VIII

-  Viguié, V. and Hallegatte, S. (2012).
Trade-offs and synergies in urban climate policies.
Nature Climate Change, 2(5):334–337.
-  Zenobia, B., Weber, C., and Daim, T. (2009).
Artificial markets: A review and assessment of a new venue for innovation research.
Technovation, 29(5):338–350.