

Selwyn District Council's Feedback on the Draft National Infrastructure Plan

Selwyn District Council welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on New Zealand's Infrastructure Commission's Draft National Infrastructure Plan. The submission represents the collective opinion of the Council and focuses on issues from the perspective of a territorial authority. The Council recognises infrastructure planning as critical to support our country and it is important there is a plan to address New Zealand's challenges.

The Selwyn District (the district) is a territorial authority in Te Waipounamu | South Island and covers 6,400km² embodying ki uta ki tai, from the mountains to the sea. Te Taumutu Rūnanga and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga have the predominant takiwā interests, both of whom are papatipu rūnanga that form part of the governing body of Ngāi Tahu.

The Selwyn district has experienced unprecedented growth, change and development in recent decades, and so far, Council has responded well to the pressures and opportunities this growth entails. Continued growth of the Selwyn District is expected into the future, which will need to be supported by appropriate regulatory system settings if Selwyn is to achieve its long-term vision of "A liveable, innovative and connected Waikirikiri Selwyn, filled with opportunity and prosperity."

The feedback is provided following the structure of the online feedback process, with the context, challenge, and recommendation from the draft plan provided to assist the development of the feedback.

Overall Comments

The Selwyn District Council supports the direction of the plan. The Council agrees that infrastructure enables the connectedness between people and communities and a greater emphasis on initiatives that improve access to infrastructure and communities, including our rural towns, should be prioritised. Council's commitment to infrastructure is demonstrated through expenditure of \$181 million during the 24/25 financial year towards roading and water projects across the district as well as the \$145.8 million allocated to future infrastructure projects in the 25/26 Annual Plan.

The Council agrees that consideration of all outcomes is as important for infrastructure as focusing solely on economic outcomes. The Council supports additional mechanisms for co-investment and co-planning between central government and high-growth councils. High-quality pro-active infrastructure investment can encourage people to move to an area, and give them certainty of services available, improving their quality of life. Infrastructure investment can help promote intensifying where possible and overall contributing to greater outcomes, helping a shift to public and active transport and reducing the having more infrastructure to maintain. This is especially important given the aging/growing population projections for our towns.

Infrastructure has been an aspect of growth that has been under-invested in for years and it is critical that a greater focus on upkeep and producing high-quality infrastructure is prioritised. Selwyn District Council currently has an internal audit programme, and it is recommended that central government adopt a similar system to effectively analyse the quality of execution of our infrastructure projects. Furthermore, big projects in New Zealand are often sold on excitement rather than evidence and understanding. Politics can often get in the way of good decision-making processes around infrastructure, and increased transparency and auditing provides the opportunity to keep our infrastructure projects focused on delivering for our communities.

The Council would like to see a bigger focus on resilience to natural hazards within the plan, especially with the alpine fault, increasing flood risk etc.

1. Establish affordable and sustainable funding

New Zealand already spends a lot on infrastructure - more than most countries like us - but we're not always getting good value for what we spend. At the same time, both the Government and households are facing tighter budgets. Ageing infrastructure still needs to be looked after, and new infrastructure is needed for a changing population and growing economy, while managing the effects of climate change and other natural hazards. We need a smarter way to decide who pays, when, and how much, while making sure essential services remain affordable for everyone.

To what extent do you agree that 'establishing affordable and sustainable funding' is a priority for New Zealand?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | Affordable and sustainable funding is of the highest importance in meeting New Zealand's current and future needs. Infrastructure underpins our economy and supports our changing population; however, infrastructure projects are becoming increasingly complex adding to their costs. Smarter methods are needed that allow new infrastructure to be funded easier. It is noted that Selwyn currently does not receive its fair allocation of infrastructure funding (for example transport, health, and police) and this must be addressed. The balance between a user pays model and general taxation must also be identified as smaller and more isolated communities will likely be left behind or face high prices, if a sole user pays model is implemented. | | | | | |

Recommendation 1:

The challenge

Decision makers don't always have access to the information they need to make sure infrastructure investment is matched to New Zealanders' long-term needs in an affordable way.

Recommendation

Regularly update 'forward guidance' - long-term information about what New Zealanders need and where, which projects can best meet those needs in the most affordable way, and what infrastructure is in progress in the national 'pipeline' - so that decision makers have what they need to make well informed decisions.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | A strong long-term pipeline that is largely 'locked-in' will provide better certainty to our communities, which in turn supports additional investment. Well informed decisions require a degree of certainty in relation to some fundamental underpinning assumptions. Reliable statistical information in relation to population and demographic growth would be useful for ensuring strategic funding decisions are targeted to where the greatest benefit will be achieved over time. The underpinning data/information on which critical infrastructure funding decisions are based should have a high degree of certainty | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | and be beyond political challenge. Given the changes to the census system going forward, local and central government will still require such information to make well informed decisions. |
|--|--|

Recommendation 2:

The challenge

New Zealand often makes decisions about infrastructure based more on how much money we have available to spend each year, rather than on our long-term national needs. Our current approach means central government agencies' investment planning is divorced from what's affordable in the long run.

Recommendation

Use independent advice from the Infrastructure Commission to guide long-term budgeting, so that decisions about how much we can spend in the future are based on evidence of what New Zealand needs, to ensure we can invest the right amount in the right places, at the right time.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| Response | | Y | | | | |

Infrastructure investment should be seen through the lens of the longer-term benefits they bring. Limiting the benefits to 'only' the 10 or 30-year horizon may mean key projects aren't delivered early enough. For example, a sub-regional rail system may not have a financial benefit in early years but can have generational impact on a region.

There should be alignment in terms of the timeframes that central and local government apply to infrastructure decisions. For example, where there is a requirement for local government to make funding commitments over a 10-year LTP time period, spanning multiple political cycles, there should be similar requirements for central government decisions to span aligned timeframes (that will also endure multiple political cycles).

An example of this, in Selwyn's case, is Waka Kotahi's funding being released after Selwyn's LTP is adopted. This creates challenges when anticipated or assumed funding changes

Decisions also need to have enough flexibility to accommodate real-world timing or unforeseen market changes. In the Selwyn district, growth has occurred at a much faster rate than anticipated. A recommendation to accommodate for this challenge may be to implement a 5-year monitoring programme into infrastructure decisions, to allow for the most recent lens and evidence to be applied.

Recommendation 3:

The challenge

Funding for government agencies often changes from year to year, which makes it challenging to deliver infrastructure projects that take a long time to plan and build. The result can be a stop-start approach.

Recommendation

Allow government agencies that plan and perform well to get funding that covers multiple years, so they can better deliver infrastructure projects with less disruption.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | The uncertainty of project funding, especially when the government changes, can add delays and lead to loss of key staff and other supporting funding. Certainty is key for investment. | | | | | |

Recommendation 4:

The challenge

We usually try to collect the cost of network infrastructure, like transport, water, electricity, and telecommunications from the people who use or benefit from it through things like fuel taxes, rates and bills. But at the moment, this doesn't always work for roads, rail and water networks.

This means that money we collect through our general taxes is needed to top up the cost of things like roads and water pipes, when it could be used for social infrastructure like hospitals, schools, parks, and defence and justice facilities.

Recommendation

Take a more consistent approach to the way New Zealanders pay for network infrastructure (like roads and water) by making sure charges to users and those who benefit cover the costs. This means we'll have more money from general taxation for social infrastructure (like hospitals and schools).

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | <p>This matches the government idea of growth paying for growth. If the more direct users can pay for infrastructure's cost and use, then the less it is required to be subsidised from a general basis.</p> <p>The challenge is with the indirect costs of upgrades that become harder to quantify and therefore generally funded.</p> <p>A key problem with relying on taxation, rates or subsidies is that these mechanisms are highly influenced by political forces/political cycles. Funding decisions need to apply to appropriate timeframes and have enough certainty upfront to withstand political change.</p> <p>Defining "who benefits" is also particularly important and key to determining where costs should lie. It is important that the 'true' costs of growth sit with those initiating growth and do not ultimately trickle down to the general rate payer. This could be supported by more transparency over margins achieved by the private sector (or benefits of growth) so as to be able to ensure costs are fairly distributed, especially where the private sector is pursuing unanticipated, or 'out of sequence' development/growth. However, again, it is reiterated that a balance between a user pays model and general taxation needs to be identified so that more isolated communities do not get left behind when they inevitably cannot in a 'user pays for growth' model.</p> | | | | | |

Recommendation 5:

The challenge

Currently, the money that drivers pay through charges like fuel taxes doesn't actually cover the full cost of

building and looking after our roads. The same is true for the rail network. The extra cost falls back on all taxpayers, leaving less money for other public goods and services.

Recommendation

Require that charges for using our roads and rail (e.g. fuel taxes, road user charges, congestion pricing) cover the cost of building and looking after them, making the land transport system self-sustaining.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | As above. It is recommended that, in the case of rail as a public transport method, road charges may be helpful in subsidising the construction of greater public transport options, given the benefits of less road users. | | | | | |

2. Clear the way for infrastructure

Even when the money is there, it can take a long time and cost too much to deliver the infrastructure we need. Multiple layers of regulation, shifting policies, and poorly coordinated planning between councils, government agencies, and private providers make it harder to make best use of the infrastructure we already have, and harder to get projects built on time and at reasonable cost. We need clearer rules, better coordination, more stability, and a longer view of workforce needs, so we can train and retain people with the right skills to get the job done. We also need to ensure public transparency and accountability, which are crucial for maintaining public confidence in infrastructure providers.

To what extent do you agree that 'clearing the way for infrastructure' is a priority for New Zealand?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | Large scale government projects impact local government projects and better coordination is welcome. The ability for government to leverage council's local relationships and communication channels should not be underestimated. Earlier communication and certainty in projects will help provide more transparency and accountability. The sector would benefit from certainty and stability with respect to resource management reform and the political nature of the decisions being taken. Any opportunity to 'depoliticise' decisions should be taken, | | | | | |

Recommendation 1:

The challenge

Planning rules often make it hard to make the most of infrastructure we already have, for example limiting the number of homes that can be built near train stations, schools, or water networks.

Recommendation

Make sure planning rules support more people to use the infrastructure we already have and that we plan to build.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Y | | | | | | |
| Response | <p>Recent resource management planning has enabled and supported housing and commercial development to occur alongside infrastructure investment. The next opportunity is to leverage the benefit of the infrastructure to promote and support or fund the associated housing and commercial opportunities. This has the added benefit of showing the community where good growth will occur and is supported by investment.</p> <p>Planning settings (for example those being developed for the nationally standardised zones) need to recognise that the 'market-led' preference today may not always lead to an optimal outcome longer term. For example, while the market might prefer a single story residential unit that happens to be located close to a critical transport node or corridor, the optimal outcome long-term would be for more dense development. The planning settings therefore need to set minimum requirements that support and consider optimal long-term infrastructure outcomes and costs.</p> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Recommendation 2:

The challenge

When infrastructure rules keep changing it becomes harder and riskier for investors to plan ahead, which drives up costs and slows down delivery. This is especially true for electricity, which needs to keep investing to keep prices affordable and supply reliable while transitioning to net-zero carbon emissions.

Recommendation

Set clear and stable policies so infrastructure investors can plan ahead with confidence — especially in key sectors like electricity.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | <p>The uncertainty of cost and the increases that occur are the key challenge for getting projects delivered. Better, clear policies, from a national to local scale are needed. It is important for market stability that general policy direction is as depoliticised as possible. This might mean that higher level policies need to be less prescriptive and more general but are ultimately more stable and less likely to be subject to political change which will result in increased stability.</p> | | | | | |

Recommendation 3:

The challenge

Infrastructure projects can take years to get consent. Constant changes to rules and unclear approval processes create delays, add cost, and make it harder to invest with confidence.

Recommendation

Make sure the resource management and planning rules enable important infrastructure projects — while still protecting the environment and managing interactions with surrounding communities.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Response | <p>Important infrastructure projects should always consider those nationally significant elements. Ensuring planning processes consider the public good of significant infrastructure projects is supported as long as the environment is protected and the community is involved. However, the evidence and level of detail required for each application could be streamlined.</p> <p>The constant legislative change and politicisation of planning issues is a fundamental to a lack of stability. Better higher-level policy direction would improve the stability and security of subordinate planning instruments.</p> |
|-----------------|---|

Recommendation 4:

The challenge

New homes, roads, and services are sometimes built in areas where there aren't enough water pipes, schools or other infrastructure to support them — or where it's very expensive to build. This leads to costly gaps, delays, and extra pressure on the infrastructure that's already there.

Recommendation

Use long-term regional growth plans — known as spatial plans — to align where new homes, roads, and other infrastructure will go. These plans bring together land use, infrastructure, and funding decisions in one place, so that growth happens where infrastructure is already planned, affordable, and easier to deliver.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | | <p>Spatial plans (with regulatory status) are key in providing certainty to the community, developers, local government and central government. The need for central government services to also react to new homes and businesses is essential on top of the development related infrastructure. Selwyn District Council is working on spatial plans and is part of the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan and has developed its own plan - Waikirikiri Ki Tua Future Selwyn.</p> <p>Spatial plans should not be entirely 'infrastructure-centric'. While infrastructure provision is of high importance, the real value of spatial planning lies in pulling together a range of necessary, unrelated threads that will form the fabric of the future.</p> | | | | |

Recommendation 5:

The challenge

New Zealand doesn't have enough skilled workers to plan, build and maintain our infrastructure, and we don't always train based on New Zealand's long-term needs. We can't always rely on overseas expertise to meet our needs. Without better planning, we risk not having the right workforce to meet future demand.

Recommendation

Plan how we train and grow the infrastructure workforce based on a longer-term view of New Zealand's infrastructure needs, beyond current projects, to ensure we have the right skills, in the right places, at the right time.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | <p>With more long-term projects, and the associated management and maintenance of these, a skilled workforce will have more certainty to establish and continue in New Zealand.</p> <p>Central government agencies need to be clear about what they can achieve. Te Waihanga/ the Infrastructure Commission needs to maintain a close relationship with those other central government agencies that have responsibilities for the skills and expertise of the workforce.</p> <p>It is not often recognised by central government that Councils often provide a great training ground for young professionals to work alongside more experienced Infrastructure professionals. More could be done to draw attention to these existing avenues for building the right workforce to meet future needs. Further training and ongoing accreditation opportunities to grow our workforce would also future proof ourselves for our longer-term goals in relation to growing infrastructure needs.</p> | | | | | |

Recommendation 6:

The challenge

Government is responsible for many of New Zealand’s biggest infrastructure projects — but it often lacks enough skilled and experienced leaders to deliver them well. This reflects the challenges of planning and delivering complex projects when there are many stakeholders inside and outside of government.

Recommendation

Support the people leading government infrastructure projects by setting clear job expectations and creating better training and career pathways.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | <p>It is agreed that investment into training is crucial in creating a skilled workforce. This could be expanded and applied to all sectors of education including polytechnics courses where it has been identified that a lot of the workforce originates from.</p> | | | | | |

Recommendation 7:

The challenge

It’s difficult for most of us to see how well government agencies, councils, companies and others who are responsible for infrastructure are performing. There’s a range of ways to get this transparency, but they aren’t always applied consistently which makes it hard for the public to demand accountability.

Recommendation

Require infrastructure providers to publish clear and transparent information about their performance, to ensure that the interests of the people who use and pay for infrastructure are protected.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Response | Council supports transparent reporting on central and local government infrastructure performance. When creating requirements around publishing information it is important there is enough prescription to ensure “apples are being compared to apples”. This can be difficult if different Councils have different growth settings. For example, Selwyn District Council is a relatively ‘young’ district that has adopted a high growth strategy for at least the last decade. Genuine comparison with an ‘older district’ where there have been different infrastructure maintenance requirements and differing levels of growth, may be difficult. |
|-----------------|---|

3. Start with maintenance

New Zealand has fallen behind on maintaining some of the infrastructure we already have. Many schools, hospitals, roads, rail lines, and government buildings are in poor condition, and we don't always know how much we are spending or how big a problem we have. When maintenance is deferred, repairs become more expensive, services fail, and health and safety risks grow. We need to put maintenance at the front of the queue.

To what extent do you agree that ‘starting with maintenance’ is a priority for New Zealand?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | If more infrastructure is rushed, it exacerbates the maintenance issue into the future. Strong, well-funded, Asset Management Planning is critical to the success of long-term asset management and planning. Extending the life of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing the need for costly replacements and building resilience against natural hazards is identified as a crucial aspect of moving forward proactively. | | | | | |

Recommendation 1:

The challenge

Many government agencies don't fully know the condition of their infrastructure. This means that in many cases, they don't know what needs repairing and when, and when they need to improve infrastructure to meet new demands. Often, they'll only know something needs repairing or improving when it goes wrong. This is more expensive and means disruption for New Zealanders.

Recommendation

Require all central government agencies to develop and maintain full, accurate registers of their infrastructure and produce long-term plans for how they'll look after it and improve it.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | Central government should follow similar practice to local government, in terms of 10-year long term plans and 30-year infrastructure plans. There are challenges and barriers that prevent effective communication between central and local government agencies that have infrastructure responsibilities. Effective communication across different levels of government, especially that have a ‘hands-on’ role of providing and maintaining infrastructure would enable | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | any issues to be identified faster and fixed in a more efficient way. Technical staff across different 'levels' of government should be able to communicate effectively. |
|--|--|

Recommendation 2:

The challenge

Even if central government agencies do have a long-term plan for how they'll look after their infrastructure, it's not always clear how well they're tracking. This keeps decision-makers and the public in the dark and means we can't plan ahead.

Recommendation

Require agencies to report how well they are delivering on their long-term infrastructure plans, including how their infrastructure is performing, so that decisions can be made based on up-to-date information.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | This information will be useful and tied to their associated long-term plans. | | | | | |

Recommendation 3:

The challenge

Government agencies currently self-assess whether their maintenance is good enough. We know that this way of doing things isn't working because information is inconsistent and not always accurate.

Recommendation

Have experts independently check whether government agencies' long-term infrastructure plans are sound and being followed.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | Council long-term infrastructure plans can often span longer timeframes than LTPs. Independent audits of infrastructure plans will allow for greater assurances that projects are being carried out successfully. Government Long Term Infrastructure plans should be audited in the same way as Local Government plans are. | | | | | |

4. Right-size new investment

Many big infrastructure projects get announced before they're fully ready. When they don't have full business cases, clear funding, or proper risk management, this can lead to delays, cost blowouts, or projects being cancelled halfway through. We need stronger processes so decision makers can ensure that only well-planned, affordable projects proceed, and we can review and learn, with transparency built-in so the public can see what's going on.

To what extent do you agree that 'right-sizing new investment' is a priority for New Zealand?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | Managing expectations and focusing on well-scoped funded projects is supported. | | | | | |

Recommendation 1:

The challenge

Key project decisions can happen with limited public information. This can make it hard for people to be confident that we are choosing the right projects, that will get us what we need, well into the future.

Recommendation

Make the information that government uses to decide on infrastructure projects public - like business cases, budget requests, and expert advice - so people can see how decisions are made.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | It is important that processes are transparent. Council supports a standardised, publicly transparent approach to all procedural steps that facilitate decision-making for infrastructure for others, including local government, and have confidence in Government processes. | | | | | |

Recommendation 2:

The challenge

We don't currently require an independent assessment of projects to make sure they are important, provide value for money, and are ready for investment, unlike many other countries. When we try to build things that aren't properly thought out, things can go wrong fast. Delays, cost blowouts and cancelled projects are not how we should be spending our limited infrastructure dollar.

Recommendation

All central government-funded infrastructure projects have an independent assessment to make sure they're ready before money is spent.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|----------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | It is important that when an infrastructure contract is tendered, that efforts are taken to avoid the need for variations, prices are certain and that an accepted tender is realistic. An independent assessment may be able to identify hidden costs, or flaws in the design of a project which may result in delays, cost blow-outs and cancelled projects. The cheapest tender may not always be the best. This may also provide an avenue to objectively consider contractors, and their history of delivering projects, on time, and within budget expectations. To ensure processes are not 'bogged down' in unnecessary processes, this recommendation should only apply to high value projects. | | | | | |

Recommendation 3:

The challenge

Not only is infrastructure costly, it's also complex. This makes it easy for things to go wrong. Projects face challenges when all the risks aren't properly considered and managed.

Recommendation

Stronger upfront risk management and assurance processes are required for all projects – making sure risks are visible and well-managed from start to finish.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|--|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | As above, relating to transparency. It may also be helpful to implement robust evaluation of infrastructure providers that is public. Having a robust means to manage performance and hold providers to account over non-performance has the potential to improve future infrastructure delivery outcomes. It is important that all infrastructure providers are held to a consistent standard and performance measures. | | | | | |

Recommendation 4:

The challenge

We need to learn from what went well, and what didn't, on past projects to ensure the next project goes better. However, information about past infrastructure projects isn't easy to find or understand. Making key project information public helps to ensure that future decisions are based on evidence and real outcomes, not guesswork or short-term thinking.

Recommendation

Track and publish what projects actually cost, when they're delivered, and what benefits they provide so that we can improve future infrastructure projects.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation will address this challenge?

| Scale | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | Y | | | | | |
| Response | As above, relating to transparency | | | | | |

What do you think are the most important infrastructure issues, opportunities, or priorities?

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Response | The key opportunity is that there is potential for partnerships with local government in providing coordinated investment. |
|-----------------|--|

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback.

For any clarification or discussion on points within this submission, please contact [REDACTED]

strategy@selwyn.govt.nz

Nāku noa, nā

On behalf of the Selwyn District Council



[Redacted]
Mayor of Selwyn | Koromatua o Waikirikiri