Tools and methods for monitoring the health of the urban greenery

Akshit Gupta[1,2†], Simone Mora[1,3*†], Yakir Preisler[4], Fàbio Duarte[1], Venkatesha Prasad[2], Carlo Ratti[1,5]

[1*]Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA.
[2]Technische Universiteit Delft, The Netherlands.
[3]Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway.
[4]Harvard University, USA.
[5]Politecnico di Milano, Italy.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): moras@mit.edu;
†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Keywords: urban greenery, greenery health, SDGs, remote sensing, embedded sensors, thermal imaging, hypespectral imaging

Preface Urban greenery supports cities in achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), but it is increasingly affected by multiple stressors impacting its health. Due to the high costs of greenery inspection and monitoring, local governments often lack adequate data to effectively manage their urban greenery and prevent damage. In this Review, we present an overview of technology-supported methods and tools to measure the health of urban greenery and discuss the space-time resolution trade-offs associated with the various methods presented. To inform researchers and policy makers in global cities, we highlight how high-resolution urban greenery health data can support achieving SDGs at scale.

Introduction

Urban greenery provide a wide range of ecosystem services such as air filtering [1], carbon sequestration [2], stormwater runoff [3], and lower local temperatures [4–6]. Urban greenery also act as a barrier for traffic noise [7], may encourage physical activity [8], and act as spaces for physical and mental restitution [9]. It also helps achieve the

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) outlined by the United Nations Agenda 2030, including climate action (SDG 13), sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11), life on land (SDG 15), and good health and well-being for all at all ages (SDG 3).

Urban greenery encompasses greenery (trees, plants, flowers, shrubs, grass) on the ground and on buildings [10]. In this paper we mainly focus on greenery on ground, in particular trees [11], as they are the most widespread form of urban vegetation. Trees are characterized by a high heterogeneity across the urban landscape. They can be evergreen or deciduous, belong to different species and have different sizes. They can be found along streets, in parks, in wetlands, in unused land or sites under construction. They could be tightly nested with gray (human-constructed) structures such as fences, light poles, façades in a green-to-gray continuum [12].

Our definition of greenery is limited compared to the broader concept of Urban Ecological Infrastructure (UEI) [13], which encompasses ecological structures (ecosystem of species, soils, waterways, etc.) and ecological functions (e.g. lifecycles and pollination). In addition, our definition only covers the green part of UEI and only greenery that is, to some extent, managed. It also omits bare soil and aquatic vegetation. Yet, we don't exclude that the methods in this Review can be applied to forms of greenery other than urban managed trees, or provide information that is aggregated to an ecology level. We are aware that geographical and domain shifts play a key role in evaluating the methods reviewed. For instance, methods designed for American cities might not be applied to European cities due to different species distribution. Similarly, methods designed for monitoring deciduous trees might not apply to evergreen trees. The aim of this review is to give an overall picture of all methods available.

Urban greenery is often affected by an ample amount of *abiotic* stressors, such as the urban heat island (UHI) effect and soil salinity; and *biotic* stressors, such as insects and bacteria attacks. The negative effect of these conditions is currently exacerbated due to climate change [14, 15]. As a result, the functionality, productivity, and survival of urban greenery is of increasing concern. Trees with poor health cannot provide most of the beneficial ecosystem services [16] and thus, they are less effective in achieving the SDGs. For instance, trees with low transpiration rates do not cool the environment effectively and trees with low growth rates have a reduced shading effect.

Although frequent inspections can identify and rectify these stressors, inspection costs can make urban greenery a high-maintenance asset. Globally, the total cost of inspection, maintenance and settlement of tree damages is estimated to exceed $2 trillion USD [17, 18]. Maintaining large trees is particularly costly, yet large trees can provide up to 8 times more ecosystem benefits compared to smaller ones [19].

The practice of measuring and monitoring urban trees began over a century ago [20]. Currently, a tree's health can be inspected by arborists with good quality results, but usually at high costs [21]. This leads to an assessment that has a low spatial and temporal resolution, with cities conducting tree assessment rarely (e.g. every 3-5 years) [22]. In recent years, technology-assisted screening methods have been developed to complement manual methods, with trade-offs involved. Satellite-based imaging can provide data over large areas, with the data quality susceptible to external parameters such as availability of clear skies, depending on the type of sensor [23]. Yet, high spatial-temporal resolutions (<10m) is achievable only through targeted acquisitions, thus limiting the size of area covered [24]. Airborne sensing using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) or airplanes leads to an increased spatial granularity [23], yet it involves high operational costs and may not be suitable in urban environments due to aviation authority regulations. Furthermore, depending on the canopy density, both airborne sensing and satellite imagery can only capture the overhead view of the urban greenery. As a result, lower vegetation elements such as green walls, short trees, or shrubs are often missed or misinterpreted in the gathered data [25]. In addition to traditional approaches, a number of research projects have investigated the use of low-cost alternatives to survey the presence and species of urban greenery. For instance, using Google Street View (GSV) images to detect the presence of trees [25], or to calculate changes in tree species diversity in cities [26]. These projects are set within the field of opportunistic and low-cost sensing, aimed at developing environmental platforms that can be deployed and operated without the need for expensive infrastructures.

As the examples above demonstrated, the importance of urban greenery has been fostering the use of different methods and tools to quantity urban greenery and, more particularly, to assess tree health. They range from highly specialized and costly unmanned aerial vehicles to engaging residents in citizen-science approaches. Scientific literature often presents detailed descriptions and discussions about one particular approach.

In this paper, we review research methods and tools to map the health of urban greenery on the ground. We highlight the type of attributes and information that can be mapped, and how technology-supported methods can complement traditional, labor-intensive approaches. We propose use cases for the methods reviewed and we discuss how scholars and policy makers can utilize greenery health data to support achieving SDGs at scale. We highlight existing research gaps with the aim at informing the development of new approaches.

Tree's attributes and health

The health, survival and functionality of trees depends on three main aspects: (i) the ability of the root system to transport nutrients and dispose pollutants, (ii) functioning water conduits (xylem) transferring water and healthy sieve-tube elements (phloem) to all live organs; (iii) healthy leaves, the main site for gas exchange with the atmosphere through photosynthesis processes.

Early detection of conditions affecting those three components, such as cavities and diseases, can guide preemptive actions to maintain a tree's optimal functionality [27]. Unlike external physical damage, physiological stress and internal damage are often undetectable to the human eye, and the severe damage can be reached long before symptoms become visible [28–30]. Furthermore, trees under stress reduce their transpiration rate to prevent excessive water loss, store less CO2 and decrease their growth rate. Such trees have a weak defensive mechanism and their general health state is damaged, making them more vulnerable to the attack of parasites and diseases, thus increasing their chances of mortality.

Stressors affecting trees can be categorized as *abiotic* - caused by non-living factors, and *biotic* - provoked by living agents.

Abiotic stressors are often related to soil and sunlight factors. Soil health is a primary determinant of a tree health. Urban soils can have highly variable attributes such as different densities and different contents of organic matter due to a patchy distribution of natural or human-made materials, such as gravel or construction waste. Furthermore, limited soil leads to restricted space for roots to develop, preventing proper tree growth and eventually reducing a tree's lifespan significantly [16]. Due to the presence of pollutants, urban soils often have an increased salinity, which reduces the ability of the roots to extract water and nutrients. Many urban environments provide limited or irregular sunlight due to the shadows projected by buildings which can prevent the tree to reach its optimum photosynthesis machinery [31]. In addition, the above-average air temperatures and heatwaves, which are increasingly occurring in urban environments [32] leads to trees losing an excessive amount of water. To counteract water loss, trees close their *stomata* - small pores in the leaves, reducing their beneficial ambient cooling effect. Another outcome of the "life-saving" stomatal regulation is a reduction in the photosynthesis process; thus resulting in reduced growth.

Biotic stressors are often related to the physiological response of trees to the attack of agents such as insects, fungi, viruses, or bacteria [33]. Such response is usually expressed in a decrease in functionality and productivity that can eventually result in the death of the affected tree [34]. A tree's defense mechanism against biotic agents requires a functional and healthy internal state. If resources are limited, e.g. due to a preexisting abiotic stress, the tree might succumb to the attack [19]. The development and fast-spreading nature of biotic agents, as well as species homogeneity of many urban environments, also contribute to the worsening of these biotic stressors [35].

If the health of a tree is poor, its contribution to the urban ecosystem is impaired. Unlike trees in natural or planted forests, rectification measures for urban trees are needed at a faster rate, due to the rapid rate of changes in local conditions (e.g.- infrastructure, construction work, pruning) and due to immediate implications such as potential physical damages to pedestrians and properties.

Inspection strategies for greenery health

We survey inspection strategies and tools using two lenses.

First, we scope popular sensing principles and technologies. The choice of these methods directly affects the type of health information that can be sensed, as well as the quality of the assessment. For example, hyperspectral and multispectral imaging sensors are useful to estimate NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) values, while thermal imaging sensors can be used to compute CWSI (Crop Water Stress Index) values. These strategies lie within three clusters: manual techniques, physical and chemical sensors, and imaging-based sensors.

Second, we discuss sensor deployment strategies to collect data. Different strategies affect the time and space resolutions that can be achieved. For example, although sensors embedded in a tree can provide data at a high time resolution (more than once an hour), achieving high space resolution leads to high deployment costs (one sensor per tree). On the other hand, remote sensing techniques may lead to a higher space coverage more cost-effectively, yet with constraints on the time resolution (depending on the revisit rate of the sensor) and influence of environmental parameters such as sky conditions.

We also highlight the level of automation required to collect data. For example, embedded sensors can work with little (periodic calibration) to no supervision for years, while airborne sensors require manual intervention as well as supervision to configure and deploy airplanes or UAVs over vast areas. A detailed list of the reviewed works is provided in Supplementary Information (SI).

Manual Techniques

As a first step, arborists measure the health of trees by visual inspection and utilizing non-invasive tools for screening, diagnostic, or evaluation purposes [36, 37]. Water limitations can be quantified by sensing air dryness (relative humidity and temperature), and by measuring the tree water consumption [38–40]. Insect-induced physical damage to the leaves and other elements can be detected visually [41–43]. However, external symptoms of decay may be absent even in the presence of internal decay [36]. In turn, this may lead to delayed actions taking place [44].

To provide more complete information, visual inspection might be supplemented by non-invasive methods such as electronic nose to detect fungal decay. However, these simple methods have low resolution and may miss small wooden decays or diseases at very early stages. Hence, for improved resolutions, arborists may also use invasive methods like electrical resistivity measurements (attaching electrodes and passing an electric current through the trunk) or destructive instruments like increment borers (tools for extraction of a wooden core sample from the trunk of the tree). Although effective, such invasive methods which require penetration in the living wood may create an entry path for pathogens or may alter the structural integrity of a tree. Finally, for the highest accuracy, high-cost methods such as electromagnetic or multi-path stress wave tomography may be used. Overall, arborists usually start with the method that causes the least damage, and successively apply more aggressive and costly techniques to get more accurate information.[45].

Various manual inspection techniques exist and they are summarised in Supplementary Table 1 with their working principle, detection resolution, cost and invasiveness. The cost for each method has been estimated based on the scale in [36]. Further details on the in-depth principle of manual methods can be found in [36, 37, 46].

Both invasive and non-invasive manual inspection techniques require intensive human labor as *deployment* medium, leading to low *automation* prospects. Thus, manual techniques usually lead to poor scalability, as highlighted in Figure 2. In contrast, methods discussed in the upcoming sections, which are summarised in Supplementary Table 2 have different automation prospects and deployment media.

Physical, chemical and electrical sensors

These sensors are usually embedded into the bark (the protective outer sheath of the wooden parts of a tree), or in the soil. The physical property under scrutiny can vary, from the detection of sudden vibrations induced by the presence of parasites to the measurement of water uptake and transpiration. The data is generated at high temporal resolution with little or no human supervision required.

Accelerometer-based sensors can detect the presence of insects and larvae by monitoring sudden minimal vibrations provoked by the insects' activities such as feeding and locomotion [47]. Accelerometers can also be used in tandem with other sensors that measure moisture, light, temperature, humidity, and air quality.

Electrical Impedance Spectroscopy (EIS) is used to assess trees' physiological status by leveraging electrical impedance, a measure of the opposition of a material to the flow of alternating currents. Using a pair of electrodes placed in the trunk at diametrically opposite positions to measure impedance values, it has been demonstrated that it is possible to disambiguate between multiple health states and identify water stress, and diseases [44].

Dendrometers are tools employed to measure trunk growth and shrinkage happening during long-term seasonal growth patterns, daily cycles of water uptake, and transient conditions like swelling after heavy rainfall. They could either be fully analog tools, as simple as a metal strap that is affixed around a tree stem using a spring fastener, or fully digital tools based on contact or non-contact technologies. Dendrometers have been used for different purposes, including community-based monitoring using DIY techniques [48], for irrigation scheduling [49] and to assess climate change effect on *Pinus sylvestris* [50].

Internet of Things (IoT) approaches are often adopted to monitor multiple health-related parameters at a high frequency and to provide real-time alerts [51]. Data from multiple embedded sensors can be used as features to train neural networks models for health classification and early warnings generation [52, 53]; and to develop aggregated health indexes combining dynamic ambient features (e.g. light and wind exposure) with static or predictable features (e.g. species, age) [17].

Besides being used in research, several sensing approaches have recently paved their way into commercial products, including non-invasive microneedle-based electrical impedance sensors, multi-sensory platforms for stability monitoring application; and sensors embedded in the soil to monitor moisture and acidity. A review of additional physical, chemical, and electrical sensors is provided in [54].

Similarly to manual techniques, physical, chemical and electrical sensors require physical access to trees. **Fig. 1**

Imaging-based sensors

Measuring Infrared (IR) radiation emitted from biological materials, a technique called Infrared Thermography (IRT), is one of the emerging approaches for tree health monitoring.

The analysis of thermal images (see Figure 1-left) allows for early detection of various health conditions including cavities, bark necrosis, and decay [55]. Thermal cameras are non-invasive and scalable tools, e.g. when the camera is mounted on a moving vehicle. Differences in thermal patterns on the tree surface can indicate deteriorated areas: sections with cavities or physical damages show local cooler temperatures [45, 56], sections affected by infections caused by spores or bacteria display local warmer temperatures [57, 58]. However, this approach requires a substantial amount of manual work to review the images by experts and it is often paired with manual inspections; the technique does not allow for the fully quantitative assessment that could enable scalability [55]. In addition, to provide optimal results, the bark should be shielded from direct sunlight, dry, and free from moss — elements that could interfere with temperature readings, hiding potential damages. Although some of these factors can be mitigated by comparing temperature patterns within different parts of the tree expected to behave similarly [45], IRT performs well only to assess significant external damages [59]. In addition, there are no generalized temperature patterns that can be used to detect damage across various species [37].

IRT can also be used to measure water stress [23]. Rather than bark temperature, the focus is on leaf temperature — a physiological trait that can be used as a proxy for tree irrigation [60, 61]. For this specific application, thermal images are fused with RGB images, in order to use image segmentation algorithms to automate the extraction of thermal data from leaves only (e.g. removing thermal data of the sky and the soil). The usefulness of IRT as a plant water stress indicator has been evaluated with different species, including *persimmon* and *citrus trees* [62], *apple orchards* [63], and *conifers* [64].

In hyperspectral and multispectral imaging (HMI), various bands in the electromagnetic spectrum are captured. This data is used to calculate various vegetation indexes, including Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI). NDVI synthesizes the ratio between the visible red radiation and the Near Infrared Radiation (NIR) reflected by the vegetation. It leverages the property of chlorophyll in the leaves to absorb red light, and the cell structure of leaves to reflect NIR light. High NDVI values are a proxy for healthy photosynthetic capacity. Low NDVI values can be linked to overall poor health, the presence of stress or parasites, or the absence of greenery. The calibration of HMI sensors is an important aspect that affects the overall quality of results, especially for low-cost sensors [65, 66]. Once calibrated, HMI sensors are highly reliable, at least when comparing NDVI values within the same species, as the ranges of healthy NDVI values can vary between species. Low-cost HMI sensor alternatives have been recently presented, e.g. modifying regular RGB cameras to capture light outside the visible spectrum [67]. HMI sensors are usually deployed on satellites and drones [68, 69], although static sensors also exist. In the latter case, the sensors are cheaper, but they need to be located in close proximity to the leaves. A sample HMI image is depicted in Figure 1-center.

Likewise IRT sensors, HMI instruments can be deployed in tandem with other sensors, most commonly, with Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) instruments. LiDAR uses the time-of-flight of pulsed laser light to determine the distance between the sensor and an object or a surface. LiDAR is used for greenery health applications to measure geometrical parameters such as the number of leaves surrounding a branch, the crown diameter, and the Leaf Area Index (LAI). LAI is computed by measuring the total area of leaves per unit of ground area and it's directly related to the amount of light that can be intercepted by a tree. Although neither the geometrical properties of a tree nor the LAI is a direct measure of greenery health, they can be used to assess the development of a tree over time with respect to target growth goals for each species. LiDAR combined with HMI sensors have also been useful for species identification [70]. Similarly to other imaging-based methods, LiDAR and HMI sensors have been deployed using airborne [71] and ground-based approaches [72]. A sample LiDAR point cloud is depicted in Figure 1-right.

Street-view images captured for mapping and navigation purposes have been recently used to quantify the extent and the location of urban greenery [73, 74], their species [26], and shading effect [75]. Although the extraction of health parameters from street view images is still to be investigated, information about the location and coverage can be combined with a city's inventory of trees to provide an indirect health assessment.

Finally, several methods can be combined in multi-sensory approaches provide a higher-fidelity assessment of a single parameter; for example combining LiDAR and hyperspectral cameras [76]. This strategy also serves to map how a single stressor impacts different aspects of a tree [64].

Imaging-based methods can allow for more flexibility compared to manual and chemical, physical and electrical methods. They can be used to map greenery in remote areas, when deployed on drones or satellites, and in areas where frequent physical access to greenery might be precluded due to safety reasons, e.g. along highways. Further the output of these sensors, such as the NDVI index, can be used to assess the conditions of greenery beyond street trees, including plants, grass and shrubs.

Relevance for the SDGs

Large-scale monitoring of urban greenery can deliver *hyper-local* data useful for a broad range of applications, tailored on issues of specific geographical areas. Hyper-local data has a fine-granular space-time resolution and is meaningful to address (greenery health) issues that are relevant to a very specific and small geographical areas (for instance, at the street level, or at individual trees). This Section highlights use cases and their relevance for the SDGs. Each use case (UC) has a numerical identifier (e.g. UC1), a title and a mention to the SDG(s) it relates to.

SDG 15 proposes "Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss". We identify at least two advantages of having hyper-local data on greenery that can help cities to achieve this goal.

UC1 Selective Watering (SDG 15) - Currently, urban trees irrigation is irregular and inconsistent or absent [77, 78], resulting in trees being over-irrigated (which may lead to anoxia) or under-irrigated (which may lead to soil-drought). This issue mainly occurs due to high heterogeneity in water consumption by individual trees and soil hydraulic properties. Data at high temporal and spatial resolution can help create the feedback loops necessary to implement selective watering strategies, optimizing irrigation as a function of each tree's water use. In turn, data-driven urban irrigation (a practice that is becoming common in agriculture [79]), can save water and improve trees' overall health along with soil fertility. Methods and tools capable to capture CWSI (Crop Water Stress Index) information, including EIS [44], and IRT [23] can be applied.

UC2 Early detection of diseases (SDG 15) - Diseases and parasites lead to a reduction in tree health and increased mortality [80]. Detecting diseases at an early stage can prevent permanent damage, and mitigate the risk of mortality. For instance, some early signals can be detected using parameters generated by multispectral/hyperspectral images [43], as well as continuous measurements via embedded sensors [28]. These methods can also be used to measure the efficacy of pest treatments over time, via repetitive measurements. Further, data from multiple parameters at high temporal and spatial resolutions can serve as training datasets to allow the development of machine-learning algorithms for the automatic identification of specific parasites.

SDG 11 proposes "Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable".

UC3 Continuous monitoring (SDG 11) Long-term monitoring data is essential to understand changes over time, including trends in tree growth, health, and mortality. Without detailed data collected over time, it is not possible to implement effective management solutions and measure their success rates, estimate urban forest value, or inform policy-making [81]. Yet,the frequency of monitoring campaigns is hampered by resource limitation and specifically the lack of staff time [82]. Several recent survey methods have an elevated degree of automation (as reported in Supplementary Table 2), which enables long-term monitoring campaigns. In addition, advances in AI allow for training machine learning (ML) algorithms can perform tasks such as sensor calibration, calculation of geometric property of trees, and pattern identification based on multi-sensory input [52, 53]. Although human judgment is still required at certain stages of the process, AI has the potential to decrease human involvement in repetitive and trivial tasks and reduce the number of site visits.

Additionally to SDG 11, we highlight how hyper-local, continuous monitoring and can also benefit SDG 8: "Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all."

UC4 Quantifying cost-gain balances (SDGs 8,11) The global cost for tree maintenance exceeds 2 trillion dollars worldwide [17, 18]. Yet a comprehensive quantification of the economic benefits provided by urban greenery is tangled by the multifaced nature of the ecosystem benefits as well as the lack of models (and data) for several regions around the globe [83]. Data on urban trees' location, species, health, and age can help develop economic models to assess the value of urban trees in relation to their environmental risk mitigation, public health, and energy-saving benefits; as well as their aesthetic and cultural relevance.

Another application that can be improved with hyper-local data is the mitigation of urban heat island effects and carbon removal, which we argue is connected with SDG 3 ("Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages") and SDG 13 ("Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts").

UC5 Mitigation of Urban Heat Island Effect (SDGs 3,13) - Urban surfaces, such as façades and road pavements, play an important role in the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect [4]. UHI happens when dense urban environments show higher local temperatures than suburbs and rural areas [84, 85] — and this condition is being exacerbated by climate change. Increased greenery is associated with a reduction in Land Surface Temperature (LST) and reduced risk for pedestrian heat exposure [86, 87]. By quantifying the cooling effect for different species as a function of their health statuses, such as canopy density, tree height, and leaf thickness, guidelines for planting and maintenance strategies tailored to specific UHI risk areas can be defined.

One of the key applications that can be improved with hyper-local data is community engagement, which is present in several SDGs. We particularly highlight SDG 4 ("Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all"), SDG 10 ("Reduce inequality within and among countries"), SDG 11, and SDG 17 ("Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development").

UC6 Community Engagement (SDGs 4,10,11,17) Citizen involvement in the monitoring of urban greenery can complement traditional approaches conducted by government agencies, companies, and research institutes. This action can build on several methods and tools in the field of *citizen science* — the inclusion of non-experts in research efforts [88–90]. In addition to providing data to public administrations, it increases public awareness of the benefit provided by urban greenery, fostering a sense of stewardship and appreciation [91], and steering public debates around equity and environmental justice. Community engagement also fosters lifelong learning, as the volunteers need to be trained to collect data [81]. This approach has been demonstrated by several campaigns such as the 2015 TreesCount! inventory in NYC and the i-Tree Eco assessment in London, England. Novel low-cost and open-source greenery health mapping tools [25, 48, 66, 67, 92] can facilitate the work of citizen scientists enabling them to collect quantitative evidence in a cost-efficient way, which is of particular relevance for low-income communities.

We believe that collecting hyper-local data, although an absolute optimum, could be unnecessary for certain use cases. For example for SDGs 4, 10, 17 addressed in the "community engagement" use case, accessibility (e.g. open source code) and cost of implementation are the main drivers for the selection of a method. For SDGs 8,11 the priority might be the degree of automation of the methods. More in detail, we believe that hyper-local data is relevant for UC1 to understand water consumption at the tree level, UC2 to have a big dataset to train ML algorithms for disease detection, UC3 to allow for evaluation of changes or interventions over time, and UC5 because UHI is a hyperlocal phenomenon itself. On the other hand, we believe that hyper-local data is less relevant for UC4 whereas widespread coverage is a priority, as well as UC6 where cost and open access to data and analysis tools could be more relevant.

Outlook

Fig. 2

Due to the high costs involved with manual approaches, cities survey their urban greenery once every few years, with several cities that have never carried out a census. The development of highly scalable and reliable approaches is necessary to acquire large data about the health of urban greenery, which fosters in achieving various SDGs.

Achieving scalability is complex. The health attributes monitored are dictated by the type of sensing technology employed, and the deployment strategies affect the potential for scalability. For instance, physical, chemical, and electrical sensors can only be embedded into the trunk or in the near proximity of a tree. They generate continuous streams of data at high temporal resolutions; however, the spatial resolution might be limited — embedding sensors on every tree in the city will result in high costs. On the contrary, imaging-based sensors can be used hand-held during manual inspections, or deployed on satellites, UAVs, or even terrestrial vehicles. While satellite and airborne-based remote sensing approaches can cover large areas [23], the data is generated at a low temporal resolution mainly constrained by the revisit rate of the vessel and the availability of clear skies. Airborne sensing using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) or airplanes leads to an increased spatial granularity [23], yet it involves high operational costs and may not be suitable in highly urbanized environments due to aviation authority regulations. Furthermore, these approaches can only provide an eye-bird view of the greenery, ignoring information about the trunk as well as shorter elements such as shrubs and green walls that might lie hidden under larger trees. On the other side of the spectrum, street-view-based methods [74, 75, 93, 94] are highly scalable, but they are only able to quantify the presence and species of urban greenery rather than its health and are limited to mapping public spaces. Yet, ground-based sensing can look at urban greenery in a more holistic manner. The deployment of sensors in a *drive-by* scheme has the potential for high scalability [95]. In this research strand, only a few works [23] have investigated ground-based monitoring approaches with hyperspectral/multispectral and thermal imaging. Although scalability can be increased by deploying sensors on vehicles, most research initiatives, except very few [23, 64] still requires manual judgment and processing by humans on the data collected. Finally, imaging-based methods deployed as drive-by platforms or handheld devices may raise privacy or ethical concerns [96], although several techniques are available to tackle this issue; e.g. by pedestrians' thermal fingerprints [97].

The high heterogeneity of the urban landscape also affects the choice of method used for monitoring. For example, trees may be accessible via pedestrian-only routes, public or private roads, or be confined in private backyards. Drive-by methods (Figure 2) can only be applied to trees close to private or public roads. Physical access to trees for visual inspection, installation and maintenance of embedded sensors could be limited by safety barriers; for example trees along busy roads, informal settlements or in high-crime neighborhoods. Remote sensing is less suitable when green and gray structures [12] are tightly nested due to occlusion.

Another challenge concerns the validity of the studies available in the literature. Most of the reviewed techniques, except for a few [17, 55, 56, 98] have been evaluated on a few dozen of trees, in a controlled environment. It's still unclear how factors like the weather, climate, and interference from elements of the built environment might affect the validity and performance of those techniques. Finally, the transferability of methods across species hasn't been achieved. Most methods still require a substantial amount of manual work, either for analyzing the data, e.g. in the case of thermal images; or for sensor deployment and operations, as in the case of operating UAVs.

Scalable methods and tools for urban forest monitoring are necessary to support SDGs for all. We hope that this review will spur interest and collaboration among different stakeholders, ranging from urban planners and policy advisors to environmental engineers and computer scientists. For the first group, our work can be used to inform planting strategies, measure the outcome of greenery maintenance practices, and foster community engagement. For the latter, it can be used as a foundation to overcome the trade-offs and challenges related to the scalability, robustness, and transferability of the methods and tools currently available.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank all the members of the MIT Senseable City Lab Consortium for funding this research: Consiglio per la Ricerca in Agricoltura e l'Analisi dell'Economia Agraria (CREA) with Carabinieri Forestali, Dubai Future Foundation, Toyota Woven City, UnipolTech, Volkswagen Group America, FAE Technology, MipMap, GoAigua, Shell, ENEL Foundation, Kyoto University, Weizmann Institute of Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, AMS Institute and the cities of Helsingborg, Stockholm, Amsterdam. A.G. thank Renswoude Foundation, FAST Delft and EFL Stichting for their financial support.

Authors Contributions. Conceptualization: A.G., S.M., Y.P.; data curation: A.G.; methodology: S.M.; formal analysis: A.G., S.M., Y.P.; writing - original draft: A.G., S.M., Y.P., F.D.; writing - review & editing: A.G., S.M., Y.P., F.D., V.P., C.R.; supervision: S.M.; project administration: S.M., F.D., V.P.; funding acquisition: C.R..

Competing Interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials. Correspondence should be adressed to Simone Mora at moras@mit.edu.

References

[1] Escobedo, F. J., Kroeger, T. & Wagner, J. E. Urban forests and pollution mitigation: Analyzing ecosystem services and disservices. *Environmental Pollution* **159**, 2078–2087 (2011).

[2] Nowak, D. J., Greenfield, E. J., Hoehn, R. E. & Lapoint, E. Carbon storage and sequestration by trees in urban and community areas of the united states. *Environmental Pollution* **178**, 229–236 (2013). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.03.019.

[3] Kirnbauer, M., Baetz, B. & Kenney, W. Estimating the stormwater attenuation benefits derived from planting four monoculture species of deciduous trees on vacant and underutilized urban land parcels. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* **12**, 401–407 (2013). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2013.03.003.

[4] Wong, N. H., Tan, C. L., Kolokotsa, D. D. & Takebayashi, H. Greenery as a mitigation and adaptation strategy to urban heat. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* **2**, 166–181 (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-00129-5.

[5] Gregory McPherson, E. Accounting for benefits and costs of urban greenspace. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **22**, 41–51 (1992). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-2046(92)90006-L.

[6] Hobbie, S. E. & Grimm, N. B. Nature-based approaches to managing climate change impacts in cities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0124.

[7] Nourmohammadi, Z., Lilasathapornkit, T., Ashfaq, M., Gu, Z. & Saberi, M. Mapping urban environmental performance with emerging data sources: A case of urban greenery and traffic noise in sydney, australia. *Sustainability* **13** (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020605.

[8] Pyky, R. *et al.* Individual and environmental factors associated with green exercise in urban and suburban areas. *Health & Place* **55**, 20–28 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.11.001.

[9] Moreira, T. C. L. *et al.* Assessing the impact of urban environment and green infrastructure on mental health: results from the são paulo megacity mental health survey. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology* **32**, 205–212 (2022). URL https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-021-00349-x.

[10] Wong, K. D. T. H., N.H. Greenery as a mitigation and adaptation strategy to urban heat. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-00129-5.

[11] Blicharska, M. *et al.* Biodiversity's contributions to sustainable development. *Nature Sustainability* **2**, 1083–1093 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0417-9.

[12] Bartesaghi Koc, C., Osmond, P. & Peters, A. Towards a comprehensive green infrastructure typology: a systematic review of approaches, methods and typologies. *Urban Ecosystems* **20**, 15–35 (2017). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-016-0578-5.

[13] Childers, D. L. *et al.* Urban Ecological Infrastructure: An inclusive concept for the non-built urban environment. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* **7**, 46 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.385.

[14] Nitoslawski, S. A., Galle, N. J., van den Bosch, C. C. K. & Steenberg, J. W. Smarter ecosystems for smarter cities? a review of trends, technologies, and turning points for smart urban forestry. *Sustainable Cities and Society* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101770.

[15] Allan, R. P., Arias, P. A., Berger, S. & Canadell, e. a. *Summary for policymakers*, 3–32 (Cambridge University Press, 2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.001.

[16] Hilbert, D. R., Roman, L. A., Koeser, A. K., Vogt, J. & van Doorn, N. S. Urban tree mortality: a literature review. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry: 45 (5): 167-200.* **45**, 167–200 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25953.15204.

[17] Wu, C. K. *et al.* An iot tree health indexing method using heterogeneous neural network. *IEEE Access* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2918060.

[18] Kuser, J. *Handbook of Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast* (Springer US, 2013).

[19] Hand, K. L. & Doick, K. J. Understanding the role of urban tree management on ecosystem services. *UK Forestry Commission* (2019).

[20] Solotaroff, W. *Shade-trees in towns and cities: Their selection, planting, and care as applied to the art of street decoration; their diseases and remedies; their municipal control and supervision* (J. Wiley & Sons, 1912).

[21] Bárta, V., Hanuš, J., Dobrovolný, L. & Homolová, L. Comparison of field survey and remote sensing techniques for detection of bark beetle-infested trees. *Forest Ecology and Management* **506**, 119984 (2022). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.11998.

[22] Beery, S. *et al.* *The auto arborist dataset: A large-scale benchmark for multiview urban forest monitoring under domain shift*, 21294–21307 (2022).

[23] Fuentes, S., Tongson, E. J. & Viejo, C. G. Urban green infrastructure monitoring using remote sensing from integrated visible and thermal infrared cameras mounted on a moving vehicle. *Sensors* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/s21010295.

[24] Houborg, R. & McCabe, M. F. High-resolution ndvi from planet's constellation of earth observing nano-satellites: A new data source for precision agriculture. *Remote Sensing* **8** (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8090768.

[25] Li, X. *et al.* Assessing street-level urban greenery using google street view and a modified green view index. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* **14**, 675–685 (2015). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2015.06.006.

[26] Branson, S. *et al.* From google maps to a fine-grained catalog of street trees. *Isprs Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2017.11.008.

[27] Kwok, C. *et al.* *Detection of structural tree defects using thermal infrared imaging* (2020).

[28] Preisler, Y., Tatarinov, F., Grünzweig, J. M. & Yakir, D. Corrigendum: Seeking the "point of no return" in the sequence of events leading to mortality of mature trees. *Plant Cell and Environment* (2022). URL https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14302.

[29] Hammond, W. M. *et al.* Dead or dying? quantifying the point of no return from hydraulic failure in drought-induced tree mortality. *New Phytologist* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15922.

[30] Hammond, W. M., Johnson, D. M. & Meinzer, F. C. A thin line between life and death: Radial sap flux failure signals trajectory to tree mortality. *Plant Cell and Environment* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14033.

[31] Flexas, J. *et al.* Photosynthetic limitations in mediterranean plants: A review. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* (2014). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2013.09.002.

[32] Schiermeier, Q. Climate change made europe's mega-heatwave five times more likely. *Nature* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02071-z.

[33] Houston, D. R. Stress related to diseases. *Arboricultural Journal* **8**, 137–149 (1984). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03071375.1984.9746670.

[34] Trugman, A. T., Anderegg, L. D., Anderegg, W. R., Das, A. J. & Stephenson, N. L. Why is tree drought mortality so hard to predict? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **36**, 520–532 (2021).

[35] Oldfield, E. E. *et al.* Growing the urban forest: tree performance in response to biotic and abiotic land management. *Restoration Ecology* **23**, 707–718 (2015).

[36] Leong, E. C., Burcham, D. C. & Fong, Y.-K. A purposeful classification of tree decay detection tools. *Arboricultural Journal* (2012). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03071375.2012.701430.

[37] Vidal, D. & Pitarma, R. Infrared thermography applied to tree health assessment: A review. *Agriculture* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture9070156.

[38] Grossiord, C. *et al.* Plant responses to rising vapor pressure deficit. *New Phytologist* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16485.

[39] McCarthy, H. R. & Pataki, D. E. Drivers of variability in water use of native and non-native urban trees in the greater los angeles area. *Urban Ecosystems* (2010). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-010-0127-6.

[40] Marchionni, V., Guyot, A., Tapper, N., Walker, J. & Daly, E. Water balance and tree water use dynamics in remnant urban reserves. *Journal of Hydrology* **575**, 343–353 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.05.022.

[41] Ramcharan, A. *et al.* Using transfer learning for image-based cassava disease detection. *Frontiers in Plant Science* (2017). URL https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01852.

[42] Näsi, R. *et al.* Remote sensing of bark beetle damage in urban forests at individual tree level using a novel hyperspectral camera from uav and aircraft. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2018.01.010.

[43] Näsi, R. *et al.* Using uav-based photogrammetry and hyperspectral imaging for mapping bark beetle damage at tree-level. *Remote Sensing* (2015). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs71115467.

[44] Borges, E. *et al.* Bioimpedance parameters as indicators of the physiological states of plants in situ a novel usage of the electrical impedance spectroscopy technique. *Advances in life sciences* (2014).

[45] Pitarma, R., Crisóstomo, J. & Ferreira, M. E. Contribution to trees health assessment using infrared thermography. *Agriculture* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture9080171.

[46] Goh, C. L., Abdul Rahim, R., Fazalul Rahiman, M. H., Mohamad Talib, M. T. & Tee, Z. C. Sensing wood decay in standing trees: A review. *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical* **269**, 276–282 (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sna.2017.11.038.

[47] Potamitis, I., Rigakis, I., Tatlas, N.-A. & Potirakis, S. In-vivo vibroacoustic surveillance of trees in the context of the iot. *Sensors* **19** (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/s19061366.

[48] Just, M. & Frank, S. Evaluation of an easy-to-install, low-cost dendrometer band for citizen-science tree research. *Journal of Forestry* **117** (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1093/jofore/fvz026.

[49] Drew, D. M., Drew, D. M. & Downes, G. M. The use of precision dendrometers in research on daily stem size and wood property variation: A review. *Dendrochronologia* (2009). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dendro.2009.06.008.

[50] Rocha, E. & Holzkämper, S. Assessing urban climate effects on pinus sylvestris with point dendrometers: a case study from stockholm, sweden. *Trees-structure and Function* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-020-02082-8.

[51] Shabandri, B., Madara, S. R. & Maheshwari, P. *IoT-Based Smart Tree Management Solution for Green Cities*, 181–199 (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-0663-5%5C_9.

[52] Wei, Y. *et al.* Proximity environmental feature based tree health assessment scheme using internet of things and machine learning algorithm. *Sensors* **19** (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/s19143115.

[53] Wang, H. *et al.* Nb-iot based tree health monitoring system. *2019 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT)* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/icit.2019.8755153.

[54] Torresan, C. *et al.* A new generation of sensors and monitoring tools to support climate-smart forestry practices. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2020-0295.

[55] Catena, A. & Catena, G. Overview of thermal imaging for tree assessment. *Arboricultural Journal* **30** (2008). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03071375.2008.9747505.

[56] Catena, A. Thermography reveals hidden tree decay. *Arboricultural Journal* **27**, 27–42 (2003). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/03071375.2003.9747360.

[57] Smigaj, M., Gaulton, R., Barr, S., Suarez, J. & Suarez, J. C. Uav-borne thermal imaging for forest health monitoring: Detection of disease-induced canopy temperature increase. *ISPRS - International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences* (2015). URL https://doi.org/10.5194/isprsarchives-xl-3-w3-349-2015.

[58] Majdák, A., Jakuš, R. & Blaženec, M. Determination of differences in temperature regimes on healthy and bark-beetle colonised spruce trees using a handheld thermal camera. *Iforest - Biogeosciences and Forestry* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.3832/ifor3531-014.

[59] Burcham, D., Leong, E., Fong, Y. & Tan, P.-Y. An evaluation of internal defects and their effect on trunk surface temperature in casuarina equisetifolia l. (casuarinaceae). *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* **38**, 277–286 (2012). URL https://doi.org/10.48044/jauf.2012.037.

[60] Jiménez-Bello, M., Ballester, C., Castel, J. & Intrigliolo, D. S. Development and validation of an automatic thermal imaging process for assessing plant water status. *Agricultural Water Management* (2011). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2011.05.002.

[61] Ballester, C., Jiménez-Bello, M., Castel, J. & Intrigliolo, D. S. Usefulness of thermography for plant water stress detection in citrus and persimmon trees. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* (2013). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.08.005.

[62] Nagy, A. Thermographic evaluation of water stress in an apple orchard. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Engineering Science and Technology* **2**, 2210–2215 (2015).

[63] Smigaj, M., Gaulton, R., Suarez, J., Suarez, J. C. & Barr, S. Use of miniature thermal cameras for detection of physiological stress in conifers. *Remote Sensing* (2017). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs9090957.

[64] Kim, J. Y. & Glenn, D. M. Multi-modal sensor system for plant water stress assessment. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* **141**, 27–34 (2017). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2017.07.009.

[65] Huang, S. *et al.* A commentary review on the use of normalized difference vegetation index (ndvi) in the era of popular remote sensing. *Journal of Forestry Research* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11676-020-01155-1.

[66] Qu, Y. *Leaf Area Index: Advances in Ground-Based Measurement*, 359–378 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48297-1%5C_11.

[67] Wang, L. *et al.* Precise estimation of ndvi with a simple nir sensitive rgb camera and machine learning methods for corn plants. *Sensors* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/s20113208.

[68] Lausch, A., Erasmi, S., King, D. J., Magdon, P. & Heurich, M. Understanding forest health with remote sensing -part i—a review of spectral traits, processes and remote-sensing characteristics. *Remote Sensing* (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs8121029.

[69] Karnieli, A. *et al.* Comments on the use of the vegetation health index over mongolia. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* (2006). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/01431160500121727.

[70] Mak, H., Hu, B. & Hu, B. Tree species identification and subsequent health determination from mobile lidar data. *2014 IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium* (2014). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/igarss.2014.6946688.

[71] Degerickx, J., Roberts, D., McFadden, J., Hermy, M. & Somers, B. Urban tree health assessment using airborne hyperspectral and lidar imagery. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* **73**, 26–38 (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2018.05.021.

[72] Wu, J., Yao, W., Polewski, P. & Polewski, P. Mapping individual tree species and vitality along urban road corridors with lidar and imaging sensors: Point density versus view perspective. *Remote Sensing* (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10091403.

[73] Li, X. & Ratti, C. Mapping the spatial distribution of shade provision of street trees in boston using google street view panoramas. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* **31**, 109–119 (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2018.02.013.

[74] Chen, X. *et al.* Evaluating greenery around streets using baidu panoramic street view images and the panoramic green view index. *Forests* (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/f10121109.

[75] Li, X., Ratti, C. & Seiferling, I. Quantifying the shade provision of street trees in urban landscape: A case study in boston, usa, using google street view. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **169**, 81–91 (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.08.011.

[76] Feng, Y. *et al.* Detection and health analysis of individual tree in urban environment with multi-sensor platform. *IGARSS 2018 - 2018 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium* (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/igarss.2018.8518369.

[77] Luketich, A. M., Papuga, S. A. & Crimmins, M. A. Ecohydrology of urban trees under passive and active irrigation in a semiarid city. *PloS one* **14**, e0224804 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224804.

[78] Marchin, R. M., Esperon-Rodriguez, M., Tjoelker, M. G. & Ellsworth, D. S. Crown dieback and mortality of urban trees linked to heatwaves during extreme drought. *Science of The Total Environment* **850**, 157915 (2022). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157915.

[79] Sishodia, R. P., Sishodia, R. P., Ray, R. L., Ray, R. L. & Singh, S. K. Applications of remote sensing in precision agriculture: A review. *Remote Sensing* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12193136.

[80] Ramsfield, T. D., Bentz, B. J., Faccoli, M., Jactel, H. & Brockerhoff, E. G. Forest health in a changing world: Effects of globalization and climate change on forest insect and pathogen impacts. *Forestry* (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/cpw018.

[81] Morgenroth, J. & Östberg, J. in *Measuring and monitoring urban trees and urban forests* 33–48 (Routledge, 2017).

[82] Roman, L. A., McPherson, E. G., Scharenbroch, B. C., Bartens, J. *et al.* Identifying common practices and challenges for local urban tree monitoring programs across the united states. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* **39**, 292–299 (2013).

[83] Song, X. P., Tan, P. Y., Edwards, P. & Richards, D. The economic benefits and costs of trees in urban forest stewardship: A systematic review. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* **29**, 162–170 (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2017.11.017.

[84] Akbari, H. & Kolokotsa, D. Three decades of urban heat islands and mitigation technologies research. *Energy and Buildings* **133**, 834–842 (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.09.067.

[85] Lee, S., Moon, H., Choi, Y., Yoon, D. K. & Yoon, D. K. Analyzing thermal characteristics of urban streets using a thermal imaging camera: A case study on commercial streets in seoul, korea. *Sustainability* (2018). URL https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020519.

[86] Coutts, A. M. *et al.* Thermal infrared remote sensing of urban heat: Hotspots, vegetation, and an assessment of techniques for use in urban planning. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **186**, 637–651 (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.09.007.

[87] Venter, Z. S., Krog, N. H. & Barton, D. N. Linking green infrastructure to urban heat and human health risk mitigation in oslo, norway. *Science of The Total Environment* **709**, 136193 (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.136193.

[88] Linda E. Kruger, M. A. S. Getting to know ourselves and our places through participation in civic social assessment. *Society & Natural Resources* **13**, 461–478 (2000). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/089419200403866.

[89] Conrad, C. C. & Hilchey, K. G. A review of citizen science and community-based environmental monitoring: issues and opportunities. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **176**, 273–291 (2011). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-010-1582-5.

[90] Vogt, J. M. & Fischer, B. C. A protocol for citizen science monitoring of recently-planted urban trees. *Urban Forests, Ecosystem Services and Management; Blum, J., Ed* 153–186 (2017).

[91] Van Herzele, A., Collins, K. & Tyrväinen, L. *Involving People in Urban Forestry — A Discussion of Participatory Practices throughout Europe*, 207–228 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27684-X_9.

[92] Seiferling, I., Naik, N., Ratti, C. & Proulx, R. Green streets quantifying and mapping urban trees with street-level imagery and computer vision. *Landscape and Urban Planning* (2017). URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.010.

[93] Zhang, Y., Li, S., Fu, X. & Dong, R. Quantification of urban greenery using hemisphere-view panoramas with a green cover index. *Ecosytem health and Sustainability 2021, Vol. 7, No. 1* (2021). URL https://doi.org/10.1080/20964129.2021.1929502.

[94] Xia, Y., Yabuki, N. & Fukuda, T. Development of an urban greenery evaluation system based on deep learning and google street view. *CAADRIA proceedings* (2020). URL https://doi.org/10.52842/conf.caadria.2020.1.783.

[95] O'Keeffe, K. P., Anjomshoaa, A., Strogatz, S. H., Santi, P. & Ratti, C. Quantifying the sensing power of vehicle fleets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 12752–12757 (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821667116.

[96] Uittenbogaard, R. *et al.* Privacy protection in street-view panoramas using depth and multi-view imagery (2019). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.01083.

[97] Pittaluga, F., Zivkovic, A. S. & Koppal, S. J. Sensor-level privacy for thermal cameras. *2016 IEEE International Conference on Computational Photography (ICCP)* (2016). URL https://doi.org/10.1109/iccphot.2016.7492877.

[98] Xiao, Q. & McPherson, E. G. Tree health mapping with multispectral remote sensing data at uc davis, california. *Urban Ecosystems* (2005). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-005-4867-7.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Left - A thermal image captured using longwave-infrared (@8µ- 14µ) FLIR Lepton 3.5 camera
Center - A multispectral image captured using a MAPIR Survey 3W camera (red@660nm, green@550nm, near-infrared@850nm)
Right - A LiDAR point cloud captured using an Apple iPhone 12 Pro and the Polycam 3D Scanner app

Fig. 2. Space/Time resolution of classes of methods reviewed with respect to SDGs requirements

Figures

Fig. 1: Left - A thermal image captured using longwave-infrared (@8µ- 14µ) FLIR Lepton 3.5 camera
Center - A multispectral image captured using a MAPIR Survey 3W camera (red@660nm, green@550nm, near-infrared@850nm)
Right - A LiDAR point cloud captured using an Apple iPhone 12 Pro and the Polycam 3D Scanner app



Fig. 2: Space/Time resolution of classes of methods reviewed with respect to SDGs requirements