

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Informal Problem Description | 3 |
| 1.1 | Context | 3 |
| 1.2 | Stakeholders' Needs | 3 |
| 1.3 | Problem Description | 3 |
| 1.4 | Why a Computer-Based System | 4 |
| 1.5 | Expected Features of the System | 4 |
| 1.6 | Conclusion | 4 |
| 2 | Goal-Oriented Analysis | 5 |
| 2.1 | Requirements Elicitation | 5 |
| 2.1.1 | Citizens' Requirements | 5 |
| 2.1.2 | Local Administration Requirements | 5 |
| 2.1.3 | Environmental Experts Requirements | 6 |
| 2.1.4 | System Requirements | 6 |
| 2.1.5 | Non-Functional Requirements | 6 |
| 2.2 | Goal Modeling Overview | 7 |
| 2.3 | Abstract Goals | 7 |
| 2.4 | Goal Refinements | 7 |
| 2.4.1 | Refinement of G1: Improve Urban Green Areas Quality | 7 |
| 2.4.2 | Refinement of G2: Support Sustainable Urban Development | 8 |
| 2.4.3 | Refinement of G3: Improve Decision-Making in Public Administration | 8 |
| 2.5 | Operational Goals and Requirements | 8 |
| 2.6 | Conflicts and Trade-offs | 8 |
| 2.7 | Summary | 9 |
| 3 | Problem Frames | 9 |
| 3.1 | 3.1 Context Diagram | 9 |
| 3.2 | 3.2 Problem Diagram | 9 |
| 3.3 | 3.3 Citizen Interaction Problem Frame | 10 |
| 3.3.1 | Description | 10 |
| 3.3.2 | Domains | 10 |
| 3.3.3 | Correctness Argument | 10 |
| 3.4 | 3.4 Local Administration Problem Frame | 11 |
| 3.4.1 | Description | 11 |
| 3.4.2 | Domains | 11 |
| 3.4.3 | Correctness Argument | 11 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 3.5 | 3.5 Environmental Data Management Problem Frame | 11 |
| 3.5.1 | Description | 11 |
| 3.5.2 | Domains | 11 |
| 3.5.3 | Correctness Argument | 11 |
| 3.6 | 3.6 AI Analysis Problem Frame | 12 |
| 3.6.1 | Description | 12 |
| 3.6.2 | Domains | 12 |
| 3.6.3 | Correctness Argument | 12 |
| 3.7 | 3.7 Notification and Feedback Problem Frame | 12 |
| 3.7.1 | Description | 12 |
| 3.7.2 | Domains | 12 |
| 3.7.3 | Correctness Argument | 13 |
| 3.8 | 3.8 UML Behavioral Diagrams | 13 |
| 3.9 | 3.9 Summary | 13 |
| 4 | Feasibility Analysis | 13 |
| 4.1 | 4.1 Technical Feasibility | 14 |
| 4.1.1 | 4.1.1 Data Collection and Management | 14 |
| 4.1.2 | 4.1.2 AI-based Analysis | 14 |
| 4.1.3 | 4.1.3 Core Management System | 14 |
| 4.1.4 | 4.1.4 User Interfaces and Accessibility | 15 |
| 4.1.5 | 4.1.5 Security and Privacy Considerations | 15 |
| 4.2 | 4.2 Economic Feasibility | 15 |
| 4.2.1 | 4.2.1 Costs | 15 |
| 4.2.2 | 4.2.2 Benefits | 16 |
| 4.2.3 | 4.2.3 Value for Public Administration | 16 |
| 4.2.4 | 4.2.4 Return on Investment (ROI) | 16 |
| 4.2.5 | 4.2.5 Risk Analysis | 16 |
| 4.3 | 4.3 Summary | 17 |

1 Informal Problem Description

1.1 Context

Urban green areas such as parks, public gardens, tree-lined streets, and small urban forests play a crucial role in improving the quality of life of citizens. They contribute to reducing air and noise pollution, mitigating urban heat islands, supporting biodiversity, and providing spaces for social interaction and well-being.

Despite their importance, many municipalities struggle to manage and maintain these green areas effectively. Maintenance activities are often reactive rather than preventive, relying on manual inspections, citizen complaints, or sporadic interventions. As a result, green areas may become degraded, unsafe, or underutilized, while public administrations face increasing costs and limited resources.

1.2 Stakeholders' Needs

The primary stakeholders involved in the management of urban green areas include:

- **Local Administration:** Municipalities need effective tools to monitor the condition of green areas, prioritize maintenance interventions, and allocate resources efficiently. They also need to justify decisions to citizens and policymakers, ensuring transparency and compliance with environmental regulations.
- **Citizens:** Citizens expect clean, safe, and accessible green spaces that enhance their quality of life. They want to be informed about the state of public spaces, to report issues easily, and to see timely responses from the administration.
- **Environmental Experts:** Botanists, environmental consultants, and maintenance staff need accurate and up-to-date data about vegetation health, soil conditions, and environmental stress factors to plan appropriate interventions.

1.3 Problem Description

The current management of urban green areas is often fragmented and inefficient. Data related to vegetation health, maintenance history, environmental conditions, and citizen feedback are scattered across different systems or not collected at all. This leads to delayed interventions, higher long-term costs, and dissatisfaction among citizens.

Moreover, the lack of predictive capabilities prevents administrations from anticipating issues such as plant diseases, drought stress, or degradation of public spaces. Decisions are frequently based on limited information and subjective judgment rather than on comprehensive and continuously updated data.

1.4 Why a Computer-Based System

A computer-based system enhanced with AI techniques represents a suitable solution to address these challenges. Such a system can integrate heterogeneous data sources, from environmental sensors to citizen reports, analyze them and provide actionable insights to decision-makers.

Artificial intelligence can support:

- *Continuous Monitoring* of urban green areas.
- *Early Detection* of potential problems.
- *Prioritization of Interventions* based on risk, impact, and available resources.
- *Improved Communication* between citizens and local administrations.

1.5 Expected Features of the System

The proposed AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System should include the following key features:

1. **Urban Green Areas Dashboard:** A centralized interface providing an overview of all green areas, including their location, condition, and maintenance status.
2. **Data Collection and Integration:** The system should collect and integrate data from multiple sources, such as environmental sensors, external datasets, and citizen reports.
3. **AI-based Analysis and Prediction:** AI models should analyze historical and real-time data to detect anomalies, predict future issues, and support maintenance planning.
4. **Citizen Interaction and Reporting:** Citizens should be able to report issues and receive feedback on planned or completed interventions.
5. **Decision Support for Administrations:** The system should support local administrations in prioritizing actions, estimating costs, and evaluating the impact of different strategies.

1.6 Conclusion

The proposed AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System addresses a relevant and timely problem faced by many public administrations. By leveraging artificial intelligence within a well-defined public-sector context, the system aims to improve environmental sustainability, operational efficiency, and citizens' quality of life.

This problem is well-suited for a requirements engineering project, as it involves multiple stakeholders with potentially conflicting goals, alternative solution strategies, and clear feasibility considera-

tions, making it an ideal candidate for goal-oriented analysis, problem frames, and feasibility evaluation.

2 Goal-Oriented Analysis

2.1 Requirements Elicitation

This section presents the requirements elicitation phase for the AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System.

The elicitation process has been conducted by identifying the main stakeholders involved in the context of urban green area management and by analyzing their needs, expectations, and constraints.

The requirements are grouped according to stakeholder categories, following an approach similar to the one adopted in the Fine Management System project, distinguishing between user requirements, administrative requirements, system requirements, and non-functional requirements.

2.1.1 Citizens' Requirements

Citizens represent one of the primary stakeholders, as they are the main beneficiaries of well-maintained urban green areas. Their requirements include:

- **Access to Information:** Citizens should be able to access clear and updated information about the condition of public green areas, including ongoing or planned maintenance activities.
- **Issue Reporting:** Citizens should be able to report problems related to urban green areas (e.g., damaged trees, lack of maintenance, safety issues) through a simple and accessible interface.
- **Feedback and Transparency:** Citizens should receive feedback about the status of their reports and be informed when an intervention is planned or completed.
- **Usability and Accessibility:** The system should be easy to use and accessible to citizens with different levels of digital literacy.

2.1.2 Local Administration Requirements

Local administrations are responsible for planning, coordinating, and executing maintenance activities for urban green areas. Their requirements include:

- **Centralized Monitoring:** Administrations should be able to monitor all urban green areas through a centralized dashboard.

- **Prioritization of Interventions:** Administrations should be supported in prioritizing maintenance actions based on urgency, environmental impact, and available resources.
- **Decision Support:** The system should provide decision-support functionalities to assist administrators in planning short-term and long-term maintenance strategies.
- **Accountability and Reporting:** Administrations should be able to generate reports to justify decisions and resource allocation to policymakers and funding bodies.

2.1.3 Environmental Experts Requirements

Environmental experts and technicians are responsible for assessing the health of green areas and executing maintenance activities. Their requirements include:

- **Accurate Environmental Data:** Experts should have access to reliable data regarding vegetation health, soil conditions, and environmental stress factors.
- **Predictive Insights:** The system should support experts by identifying early signs of degradation, diseases, or other risks affecting green areas.
- **Operational Support:** Maintenance staff should be supported in scheduling and coordinating interventions efficiently.

2.1.4 System Requirements

From a system perspective, the following requirements emerge:

- **Data Integration:** The system should integrate heterogeneous data sources, including sensor data, external datasets, historical maintenance records, and citizen reports.
- **AI-based Analysis:** The system should employ AI techniques to analyze collected data and generate insights useful for monitoring and prediction.
- **Scalability:** The system should be able to scale to support different city sizes and increasing volumes of data.
- **Interoperability:** The system should be able to interoperate with existing information systems used by public administrations.

2.1.5 Non-Functional Requirements

- **Security and Privacy** Sensitive data, especially citizen-related data, should be protected according to applicable data protection regulations.
- **Reliability** The system should provide accurate and reliable information to avoid incorrect or misleading decisions.

- **Transparency and Explainability** AI-generated insights should be understandable by human decision-makers to support trust and accountability.

2.2 Goal Modeling Overview

The goal-oriented analysis is conducted using the **KAOS approach**, which allows modeling stakeholder intentions and systematically refining them into requirements. At a high level, the system aims to support the *Sustainable and Effective Management of Urban Green Areas*.

2.3 Abstract Goals

The following high-level strategic goals have been identified:

1. **(G1) Improve Urban Green Areas Quality:** Urban green areas should be maintained in a healthy, safe, and accessible condition.
2. **(G2) Support Sustainable Urban Development:** Green areas should contribute to environmental sustainability and citizens' well-being.
3. **(G3) Improve Decision-Making in Public Administration:** Local administrations should make informed and timely decisions regarding maintenance and planning.

These goals are strategic and organization-wide, reflecting long-term objectives rather than specific system functionalities.

2.4 Goal Refinements

2.4.1 Refinement of G1: Improve Urban Green Areas Quality

G1 can be refined into the following sub-goals:

1. **(G1.1) Monitor the Condition of Urban Green Areas:** The condition of green areas should be continuously monitored.
2. **(G1.2) Detect Degradation and Risks Early:** Potential issues should be identified before they lead to serious degradation.
3. **(G1.3) Ensure Timely Maintenance Interventions:** Maintenance actions should be planned and executed in a timely manner.

2.4.2 Refinement of G2: Support Sustainable Urban Development

1. **(G2.1) Reduce Environmental Impact:** Maintenance strategies should minimize negative environmental effects.
2. **(G2.2) Increase Citizens' Quality of Life:** Green areas should promote social interaction, safety, and well-being.

2.4.3 Refinement of G3: Improve Decision-Making in Public Administration

1. **(G3.1) Provide Data-Driven Insights:** Decisions should be supported by data analysis rather than intuition alone.
2. **(G3.2) Optimize Resource Allocation:** Financial and human resources should be used efficiently.

2.5 Operational Goals and Requirements

Some refined goals are assigned to the software system and thus become requirements. For example:

1. **(R1) Provide a Monitoring Dashboard:** The system shall provide a dashboard displaying the condition of urban green areas.
2. **(R2) Analyze Data Using AI Techniques:** The system shall analyze integrated data to detect anomalies and predict risks.
3. **(R3) Support Intervention Prioritization:** The system shall support the prioritization of maintenance interventions.
4. **(R4) Enable Citizen Reporting:** The system shall allow citizens to submit reports regarding green area issues.

2.6 Conflicts and Trade-offs

Several potential conflicts emerge during goal analysis:

- **Transparency vs. Privacy:** Providing detailed information to citizens may conflict with privacy requirements.
- **Automation vs. Human Control:** AI-based recommendations must not fully replace human judgment in decision-making.

These conflicts require careful trade-offs, favoring transparency and automation while preserving privacy and human oversight.

2.7 Summary

The goal-oriented analysis clarifies *Why* the system is needed and *Which* objectives it must satisfy before defining specific technical solutions.

By refining high-level goals into operational requirements, this analysis provides a structured rationale for the system design and prepares the ground for the *Problem Frames Analysis*, which will further detail the interaction between the system and its environment.

3 Problem Frames

This chapter describes the problem and solution domains of the AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System using **Problem Frames**. The objective is to clarify the interaction between the system-to-be and its environment, identifying the involved domains and justifying the correctness of the proposed solutions with respect to the previously defined requirements.

UML diagrams are used as a modeling language to represent the context, problem diagrams, and dynamic behavior of the system.

3.1 3.1 Context Diagram

The context of the system includes multiple interacting domains:

- **Citizens**, who interact with the system to access information and report issues.
- **Local Administration**, responsible for decision-making and coordination.
- **Environmental Experts and Maintenance Staff**, who rely on system outputs to plan and execute interventions.
- **Urban Environment**, representing the physical green areas being monitored.
- **External Data Sources**, such as environmental sensors or datasets.
- **AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System**, which acts as the machine domain.

The system acts as an intermediary between human stakeholders and the urban environment, collecting data, processing it, and supporting informed decision-making.

3.2 3.2 Problem Diagram

The main problem addressed by the system is the **inefficient and fragmented management of urban green areas**.

- The **Urban Environment** evolves independently and may degrade over time.
- The **Local Administration** needs reliable and timely information to intervene.
- **Citizens** observe issues but lack structured communication channels.
- The **System** observes data from the environment and stakeholders, processes it, and provides actionable information.

The shared phenomena include:

- Reports submitted by citizens;
- Environmental data collected from sensors or datasets;
- Maintenance decisions issued by the administration;
- Notifications and feedback provided by the system.

3.3 3.3 Citizen Interaction Problem Frame

3.3.1 Description

This problem frame focuses on the interaction between **Citizens** and the **System**.

Citizens want to:

- Access information about the condition of urban green areas;
- Report issues related to safety or maintenance;
- Receive feedback about reported problems.

3.3.2 Domains

- **Citizen** (biddable domain)
- **Management System** (machine domain)

3.3.3 Correctness Argument

The solution is correct if:

- Citizens can successfully submit reports through the system;
- Submitted reports are correctly recorded and associated with the corresponding green area;
- Citizens can access updated information and receive feedback on the status of interventions.

3.4 3.4 Local Administration Problem Frame

3.4.1 Description

This problem frame addresses the needs of the **Local Administration**, which must plan and prioritize maintenance activities.

3.4.2 Domains

- **Local Administration** (biddable domain)
- **Management System** (machine domain)
- **Urban Environment** (given domain)

3.4.3 Correctness Argument

The system is correct if:

- Administrators can access a comprehensive overview of urban green areas;
- The system supports prioritization of interventions based on data and identified risks;
- Decisions taken using the system are traceable and justifiable.

3.5 3.5 Environmental Data Management Problem Frame

3.5.1 Description

This frame focuses on the collection and management of environmental data.

3.5.2 Domains

- **External Data Sources** (given domain)
- **Urban Environment** (given domain)
- **Management System** (machine domain)

3.5.3 Correctness Argument

The solution is correct if:

- Environmental data are correctly collected and stored;

- Data accurately represent the condition of green areas;
- Data are made available to other system components in a reliable manner.

3.6 3.6 AI Analysis Problem Frame

3.6.1 Description

This problem frame captures the role of AI-based analysis within the system.

3.6.2 Domains

- **Management System** (machine domain)
- **Environmental Data Repository** (given domain)

3.6.3 Correctness Argument

The AI component is correct if:

- It analyzes available data to identify anomalies and potential risks;
- Predictions and insights are consistent with observed data;
- The system presents AI outputs in a way understandable by human decision-makers.

3.7 3.7 Notification and Feedback Problem Frame

3.7.1 Description

This frame describes how the system communicates outcomes and updates to stakeholders.

3.7.2 Domains

- **Management System** (machine domain)
- **Citizens** (biddable domain)
- **Local Administration** (biddable domain)

3.7.3 Correctness Argument

The notification mechanism is correct if:

- Stakeholders receive timely updates regarding reported issues and interventions;
- Notifications cease when no longer relevant;
- Information provided is accurate and consistent with system data.

3.8 UML Behavioral Diagrams

To support the problem frames analysis, behavioral UML diagrams are considered.

- **Activity Diagram** Describes the workflow from issue detection (via data or citizen report) to decision-making and intervention.
- **State Diagram** Models the lifecycle of a reported issue (e.g., *reported*, *validated*, *scheduled*, *resolved*).

These diagrams help clarify the temporal ordering of interactions between domains and ensure consistency with system requirements.

3.9 Summary

The Problem Frames analysis decomposes the overall problem into manageable sub-problems, each focusing on a specific interaction between the system and its environment. The provided correctness arguments justify that, if the specified conditions are met, the system satisfies the goals and requirements identified in the Goal-Oriented Analysis.

This chapter provides a solid foundation for evaluating the **feasibility** of the proposed system, which will be addressed in the next chapter.

4 Feasibility Analysis

This chapter analyzes the feasibility of the AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System. The analysis focuses on both **technical feasibility** and **economic feasibility**, evaluating whether the proposed solution can realistically be implemented and sustained within the context of a local public administration.

4.1 4.1 Technical Feasibility

The technical feasibility analysis evaluates whether the proposed system can be implemented using existing technologies and within the constraints of the public-sector environment.

4.1.1 4.1.1 Data Collection and Management

From a technical perspective, the collection and management of data related to urban green areas are feasible.

- Environmental data can be obtained from existing sources such as environmental sensors, public datasets, satellite imagery, and historical maintenance records.
- Citizen-generated data can be collected through web or mobile interfaces.
- Relational or hybrid databases can be used to store structured information about green areas, reports, and interventions.

The integration of heterogeneous data sources represents a challenge but is feasible using well-established data integration techniques.

4.1.2 4.1.2 AI-based Analysis

The use of AI techniques for monitoring and prediction is technically feasible.

- Machine learning models can be employed to detect anomalies, trends, or risks based on historical and real-time data.
- Predictive models can support early detection of degradation or maintenance needs.
- The system does not require fully autonomous decision-making; AI outputs are used as decision-support tools for human administrators.

Given the availability of mature AI frameworks and libraries, the development of such analytical components is considered feasible within the project scope.

4.1.3 4.1.3 Core Management System

The core system responsible for data integration, analysis, and interaction with stakeholders is technically feasible.

- Standard web-based architectures can support dashboards, reporting tools, and administrative interfaces.

- Modular design allows separation between data management, AI analysis, and user interaction components.
- The system can be deployed incrementally, starting with basic monitoring features and gradually introducing advanced AI functionalities.

4.1.4 4.1.4 User Interfaces and Accessibility

The development of user interfaces for citizens and administrators is feasible using standard technologies.

- Web-based interfaces ensure accessibility without requiring specialized hardware.
- Mobile-friendly designs support citizen participation and reporting.
- Accessibility guidelines can be applied to ensure inclusiveness.

4.1.5 4.1.5 Security and Privacy Considerations

From a technical standpoint, security and privacy requirements can be addressed using existing solutions.

- Authentication and authorization mechanisms can restrict access to sensitive functionalities.
- Data protection measures can be implemented to comply with relevant regulations.
- AI transparency and explainability mechanisms can be incorporated to improve trust in system outputs.

4.2 4.2 Economic Feasibility

The economic feasibility analysis evaluates costs, benefits, and overall sustainability of the proposed system.

4.2.1 4.2.1 Costs

The main cost categories include:

- **Development Costs** Costs related to software development, data integration, and AI model training.
- **Infrastructure Costs** Expenses for servers, cloud services, or data storage.
- **Maintenance Costs** Ongoing costs for system updates, model retraining, and technical support.
- **Training Costs** Training public administration staff to use and interpret system outputs.

4.2.2 4.2.2 Benefits

The system provides several tangible and intangible benefits:

- **Operational Efficiency** Improved planning and prioritization of maintenance interventions reduce waste of resources.
- **Cost Reduction** Preventive maintenance reduces long-term repair costs.
- **Improved Service Quality** Citizens benefit from better-maintained and safer green areas.
- **Data-Driven Decision-Making** Administrations gain stronger justification for decisions and investments.

4.2.3 4.2.3 Value for Public Administration

Although the system does not directly generate revenue, it creates value by:

- Reducing inefficiencies and administrative workload;
- Improving transparency and accountability;
- Supporting environmental sustainability goals.

These benefits justify the investment from a public-sector perspective.

4.2.4 4.2.4 Return on Investment (ROI)

The return on investment is not immediate but accumulates over time.

- Short-term ROI is achieved through improved coordination and reduced emergency interventions.
- Long-term ROI derives from lower maintenance costs, increased lifespan of green infrastructure, and improved quality of life.

4.2.5 4.2.5 Risk Analysis

Potential risks include:

- **Data Quality Issues** Inaccurate or incomplete data could affect AI outputs.
- **Resistance to Adoption** Stakeholders may be reluctant to trust AI-based recommendations.
- **Budget Constraints** Limited funding could restrict full system deployment.

These risks can be mitigated through phased deployment, stakeholder involvement, and continuous monitoring.

4.3 4.3 Summary

The feasibility analysis shows that the AI-based Urban Green Areas Management System is both **technically and economically feasible** within the context of a local public administration. While some challenges exist, they are manageable through incremental development, appropriate governance, and careful stakeholder engagement.