Title: **Testing our thinking - Developing an enduring National Infrastructure Plan**

Organisation: **Infrastructure Sustainability Council**

Reference: **NIPC24-0003064** | Submitted: **10/12/2024 01:03 pm** | Submitted by:

Summary of information submitted

Page 1 - Introduction

NIPC24-0003064

We're seeking feedback

Our Discussion Document, Testing our thinking: Developing an enduring National Infrastructure Plan, sets out our thinking as we begin work to develop a National Infrastructure Plan. The Discussion Document sets out what we expect the Plan will cover and the problem it's trying to solve, as well as the approach we're proposing to take to develop it.

We're sharing this now to test our thinking and give you the chance to share your thoughts. Let us know if we've got it right or if there are issues you think we've missed.

We'll use your feedback as we develop the Plan. We'll be sharing our thinking by presenting at events around the country, hosting workshops and webinars, and sharing updates through our website, newsletter, and social media. We'll also seek feedback on a draft Plan before publishing the final Plan in December 2025.

Submission overview

You'll find 17 main questions that cover the topics found in the Discussion Document. You can answer as many questions as you like and can provide links to material within your responses. On the final page (6. Next steps) you can provide any other comments or suggestions that you would like us to consider as we develop the National Infrastructure Plan. Submissions are welcomed from both individuals and organisations.

A few things to note:

- You can save progress using the button at the top right of this form.
- A red asterisk (*) denotes a mandatory field that must be completed before the form can be submitted.
- We expect organisations to provide a single submission reflecting the views of their organisation. Collaboration within your organisation and internal review of your submission (before final submission), is supported through our Information Supply Platform. You'll need to be registered with an Infrastructure Hub account, and be affiliated with your organisation to utilise these advanced features. Many organisations will already have a '*Principal respondent*' who can manage submissions and assign users at your organisation with access to the draft responses.
- Submissions will be published on our website after the closing date. The names and details of organisations that submit will be published, but all personal and any commercial sensitive information will be removed.

Further assistance

Each submission that is started is provided a unique reference identifier. These identifiers are shown in the top right of each application page. Use this identifier when seeking further assistance or communicating with us about this submission by using one of the following methods.

- Use info@tewaihanga.govt.nz to contact us with any questions relating to our Discussion Document and consultation.
- Use inform@tewaihanga.govt.nz for help managing roles and permissions of user accounts affiliated with your organisation in the Information Supply Platform (ISP).

Submission method

Our preferred method is to receive responses through this form. However, we anticipate some submitters will wish to upload a pdf document, especially where their submission is complex or long. If this submission method is necessary, please use this word template and save as a pdf. We ask that you retain the structure and headings provided in the template as this will support our processing of responses.

Select a submission method

To continue, select the method you will be using.

Online form

Page 2 - Context for the Plan

NIPC24-0003064

Testing our thinking

The Discussion Document includes five sections. Below we're seeking feedback on why we need a National Infrastructure Plan. We also want to test our thinking on our long-term needs and make sure we have a clear view of what investment is already planned.

Section one: Why we need a National Infrastructure Plan

A National Infrastructure Plan can provide information that can help improve certainty, while retaining enough flexibility to cancel or amend projects as circumstances or priorities change.

1. What are the most critical infrastructure challenges that the National Infrastructure Plan needs to address over the next 30 years?

Overall, the Infrastructure Sustainability Council (ISC) believe the Te Waihanga Strategy and the thinking presented on critical infrastructure challenges to be well thought through and supported by good evidence. The ISC see the most critical challenges as:

- *Keeping people and communities at the centre of infrastructure planning, focusing on delivering beneficial and equitable outcomes for people and the natural environment.*
- *Urgently addressing decarbonisation and infrastructure resilience and adaptation to current and future climate-related impacts.*
- *Applying a Nature Positive lens to protect environmental assets and address New Zealand's biodiversity crisis*
- *Integrating whole of life economic, social and environmental outcomes into infrastructure planning and decision-making – maximising value from current infrastructure assets and delivering affordable and flexible infrastructure to enable future capabilities and needs.*
- *Taking a connected and systems approach to infrastructure planning, management and development. Avoiding siloed thinking and action and maximising benefit realisation e.g. multi-modal transport assets; nature-based solutions that provide flood protection and restore ecological and cultural value.*
- *Addressing the need to improve community literacy on the link between infrastructure and social wellbeing.*

2. How can te ao Māori perspectives and principles be used to strengthen the National Infrastructure Plan's approach to long-term infrastructure planning?

The ISC endorse the importance and value of this question.

- *Our latest rating tools have a strong emphasis on engagement and partnership with Indigenous Peoples across those areas identified as important to them.*
- *Mana Whenua involvement in infrastructure planning and delivery can bring an important intergenerational perspective and a critical focus on ecological and*

cultural values, as well as economic development opportunities for local communities and businesses.

Section two: Our long-term needs

The National Infrastructure Plan will reflect on what New Zealanders value and expect from infrastructure. To do this, the Plan needs to consider New Zealanders' long-term aspirations and how these could be impacted over the next 30 years.

3. What are the main sources of uncertainty in infrastructure planning, and how could they be addressed when considering new capital investments?

No response

Section three: What investment is already planned

We already gather and share data on current or planned infrastructure projects through the National Infrastructure Pipeline. This data, alongside other information gathered by the Treasury or published by infrastructure providers, helps to paint a picture of investment intentions.

4. How can the National Infrastructure Pipeline be used to better support infrastructure planning and delivery across New Zealand?

No response

Section four: Changing the approach

We have used our research and publicly available information on infrastructure investment challenges to identify key areas for change. The next question and the following three pages seek further detail on the three themes in section four of our paper. Within each of the three themes, we explore some topics in more detail, outlining the evidence, discussing the current 'state of play', and asking questions about where more work is needed.

5. Are we focusing on the right problems, and are there others we should consider?

The ISC consider the problems highlighted by Te Waihanga are very relevant in developing the National Infrastructure Plan. We believe the following should be strongly considered as significant opportunities for impact in infrastructure planning. Integrating these considerations early into the framework for infrastructure planning and decision-making will drive the greatest impact over the long term:

- *The critical role of infrastructure in addressing a broad range of societal / community needs – i.e. not limited to economic development but including broader benefits such as health and wellbeing*
- *The need to effectively involve the community in infrastructure planning and decision making*
- *A longer-term focus on resilience – current focus seems to be about the here and now; is it sitting in the right space under asset management?*
- *The role of infrastructure in protecting and enhancing the natural environment – to support ecosystem services provision and to reverse extensive and continuing biodiversity loss.*
- *Nature-based solutions and demand-side management as beneficial and valid infrastructure solutions.*

A useful reference regarding biodiversity and infrastructure investment is the recent report by Oliver Wyman and WWF: https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/biodiversity-and-infrastructure-investing-how-infrastructure-investors-are-factoring-biodiversity-impacts-into-decision-makin

Page 3 - Capability to plan and build

NIPC24-0003064

Changing the approach — Capability to plan and build

Section four looks at changes that we can make to our infrastructure system to get us better results. We've broken these changes down into three themes: capability to plan and build, taking care of what we have, and getting the settings right.

For the first theme, we look at three key areas:

- Investment management: Stability, consistency, and future focus
- Workforce and project leadership: Building capability is essential
- Project costs: Escalation means less infrastructure services.

Investment management: Stability, consistency, and future focus

We're interested in your views on how we can address the challenges with government infrastructure planning and decision-making.

6. What changes would enable better infrastructure investment decisions by central and local government?

The ISC highlights the importance of integrated infrastructure planning and transparent and consistent business case development which considers economic, social and environmental outcomes over the long term.

- *Broader benefits need a real seat at the decision-making table; these are not optional add-ons (or indeed drop-offs) after the key investment decisions have been made.*
- *Owing to the legacy and benefits of infrastructure, transparency in decision-making can be made possible with a multi-year rolling forecast of needs at national, regional and city levels.*
- *Governance structures that follow the Te Waihanga IPP review process will further support better decision making from the outset provided broader outcomes are integrated into this process as has become evident within the Australian I-bodies review process.*

The ISC recommends incorporating sustainability performance as a requirement for government funding by including it in the minimum service level requirements.

- *This ensures that governments can consistently align their investments with long-term societal and environmental goals.*
- *Accountability for outcomes, through regular, consistent post-completion reviews which track benefits realisation are critical for informing continuous learning for better broader outcomes.*
- *Such reviews are encouraged for all projects and programs of national significance, both for new and existing asset maintenance.*

7. How should we think about balancing competing investment needs when there is not enough money to build everything?

No response

Workforce and project leadership: Building capability is essential

We're interested in your views on how we can build capability in the infrastructure workforce.

8. How can we improve leadership in public infrastructure projects to make sure they're well planned and delivered? What's stopping us from doing this?

Leadership of public infrastructure projects relies on strong governance, well developed and articulated project objectives and metrics, rigorous risk & opportunity management and the right incentives – along with skilled and experienced teams and effective and efficient management systems.

- *Procurement and tender processes need to include well-defined project scope and meaningful and measurable objectives.*
- *This includes clearly defined tender requirements based on strong business case assessment and investigations and identified resourcing and experience requirements.*
- *Project leaders must have the knowledge, skills and mindsets to drive and deliver the broad set of project outcomes required in 21st Century Aotearoa New Zealand.*

9. How can we build a more capable and diverse infrastructure workforce that draws on all of New Zealand's talent?

The ISC recognises the need to build a more capable and diverse infrastructure workforce drawing on all New Zealand's talent.

- *We work actively with our members and key external stakeholders to support this goal and have recently published research undertaken in conjunction with the NSW Government which suggests that roles that improve the sustainability outcomes on infrastructure projects can also be a pathway to a more diverse and inclusive workforce.https://www.iscouncil.org/sustainability-a-career-in-construction/*
- *Use of the IS Rating Tools drives and rewards sustainable procurement practice, as well as supply chain and workforce capability building and diversity initiatives resulting in enhanced outcomes for traditionally discriminated or disadvantaged groups within the construction sector.*

The Infrastructure Australia Report on market capacity – with recommendations on active demand management, material supply, workforce supply and improving construction productivity - has been highly valued amongst our members.

- *The ISC's engagement in New Zealand suggests the issues identified are similar in the NZ market: 2023 Infrastructure Market Capacity report | Infrastructure Australia*

Project costs: Escalation means less infrastructure services

We're interested in your views on further opportunities to improve our ability to deliver good infrastructure at an affordable cost.

10. What approaches could be used to get better value from our infrastructure dollar? What's stopping us from doing this?

The ISC recommends that consideration of value and return on investment include societal benefits and costs – environmental, social and economic - over the life cycle of infrastructure assets.

- *While these benefits and costs should be quantified where possible, non-quantifiable aspects (e.g. community connectedness; regenerative practices; intergenerational equity) should not be ignored just because they cannot be monetised or quantified easily.*

What's stopping us:

- *Assessment of value often focuses on traditional cost-benefit approaches and a focus on selecting the lowest cost (CAPEX) option.*
- *Clearer guidance and a common framework for broader and stronger benefit and cost consideration in decision making is required.*
- *Such a framework needs to be accompanied by capability building with the infrastructure planning, delivery and assessment management professions.*

NIPC24-0003064

Changing the approach — Taking care of what we've got

The second theme in section four looks at how we can get better at taking care of what we have. It looks at three areas:

- Asset management: Managing what we already have is the biggest task
- Resilience: Preparing for greater disruption
- Decarbonisation: A different kind of challenge.

Asset management: Managing what we already have is the biggest task

Asset management means looking after our infrastructure. We are interested in your views on how we can improve planning for this.

11. What strategies would encourage a better long-term view of asset management and how could asset management planning be improved? What's stopping us from doing this?

The ISC agrees with the need for investment in maintaining and developing existing assets including strengthening asset management skills and systems. This includes:

- *Going beyond minimum maintenance of the original asset, emphasising longer term asset management strategies for and investment in maintaining, upgrading and repurposing existing assets.*
- *Broader consideration of outcomes related to asset management e.g. decarbonising assets, use of tools such as digital twins.*
- *Improving data collection across a wider range of societal and environmental outcome metrics.*
- *Considering the "no build" option (as per the PAS 2080 Carbon Management in Infrastructure standard) as part of business case development and options assessment in the Planning phase.*
- *Fully considering Capex and whole of life operating costs across the asset life cycle within the business case processes and design and construction options assessment; transitional and end-of-life considerations need to be factored in upfront and kept front of mind over time.*
- *The IS Planning Rating (released September 2023) delivers whole of life sustainability outcomes, including decarbonisation, by embedding these outcomes in project business cases, through options assessment and selection, opportunity identification, concept design development and setting of procurement requirements. The IS Planning Rating tools align with Australian I-Body gateways and New Zealand Better Business Case frameworks, and were developed with input*

from I-bodies, transport authorities, the design and construction industry, and ESG funders and investors.

- *The IS Operations Rating Tool promotes and rewards asset management across a broad set of economic, social and environmental impact areas including improved risk management (e.g. supply chain, climate impacts and hazards); efficiency gains (energy, water, materials, waste management); whole of life asset management planning; and enhanced internal and external stakeholder relationships and knowledge sharing.*

What's stopping us:

- · *The politicalisation of infrastructure decision-making.*
- · *The structuring of public assets.*
- · *Under investment in asset management resourcing and subsequent flow-on effects.*
- · *Narrow contracting of asset management services and narrow margins on those contracts.*
- *The desire for asset shedding.*

Resilience: Preparing for greater disruption

We are interested in your views on how we can better understand the risks that natural hazards pose for our infrastructure.

12. How can we improve the way we understand and manage risks to infrastructure? What's stopping us from doing this?

It is strongly recommended that the National Infrastructure Plan incorporates sustainability and resilience as essential elements of any business case, along with forecast carbon baselines.

- *Climate and natural hazard risk assessments and consideration of mitigation and adaptation measures must become business-as-usual for infrastructure planning and asset management.*
- *Resilience planning at the network and wider systems level which informs localised asset development and asset management.*
- *Measures should include consideration of nature-based solutions e.g. mangroves for flood protection, which enhances ecological value and resilience.*
- *New data is required for decision-making at the planning, design and asset management stages of infrastructure investment e.g. social cost of carbon; life cycle impacts of materials (including end-of-life disposal)*

What's stopping us:

- *The politicalisation of infrastructure decision-making and of the climate change agenda*
- *Lack of coordinated approaches to resilience planning and flow through to individual assets and networks*
- *Lack of coordinated approaches to and investment in data collation, analysis and sharing.*

- *Need for capability building within the infrastructure planning, delivery and asset management professions as well as prioritisation in terms of objectives, targets and incentives*

Decarbonisation: A different kind of challenge

We're interested in your views on how we can improve understanding of the decarbonisation challenge facing infrastructure.

13. How can we lower carbon emissions from providing and using infrastructure? What's stopping us from doing this?

Clear policy and guidance on the requirement to align with New Zealand net zero targets needs to operate across all stages of infrastructure life cycle, from planning through to operations.

- · *Use of third-party verified IS Rating tools, measure and reward decarbonisation at every stage of the infrastructure life cycle – at planning, design and construction and operations – and provide compelling evidence that low-carbon projects can achieve broader sustainability outcomes.*
- · *Improving uptake and industry capability to employ these schemes will standardise the sector's evaluation of economic, social and environmental performance of infrastructure across the planning, design, construction and operational phases of infrastructure assets.*
- · *As highlighted above, considering "no build" options (as per the PAS 2080 Carbon Management in Infrastructure standard) should be integral to business case development and options assessment in the Planning phase*
- · *Asset repurposing and nature-based solutions are important tools in the decarbonisation toolkit. There is a need to upskill the sector to effectively propose, design and implement these alternative engineering solutions.*

The ISC is working closely with the finance sector and note:

- · *There is an increasing expectation that capital investment funds expect more independent auditing and verification of investment outcomes to support their Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) requirements).*
- · *The IS Rating Tools are being used to fulfil such requirements.*

Emerging technologies like low-carbon materials e.g. concrete and steel, offer a significant opportunity for New Zealand's infrastructure sector to significantly reduce its embodied carbon during construction.

- · *There are encouraging signs of some innovation and adoption in New Zealand, however the scale of change required is not occurring fast enough in the face of climate change.*
- · *Despite an urgency to achieve significant decarbonisation of the built environment, the infrastructure sector faces uncertain government settings and challenges to large-scale adoption.*

Recent resources from Australia that can support this important work include:

- *Infrastructure NSW's Decarbonising Infrastructure Delivery Policy that will apply to all NSW Government building projects valued over $50 million and linear infrastructure projects valued over $100 million.https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/expert-advice/decarbonising-infrastructure-delivery/*

Page 5 - Getting the settings right

NIPC24-0003064

Changing the approach — Getting the settings right

The third theme in section four looks at how we can get our settings right to get better results from our infrastructure system. It looks at three areas:

- Institutions: Setting the rules of the game
- Network pricing: How we price infrastructure services impacts what we think we need
- Regulation: Charting a more enabling path.

Institutions: Setting the rules of the game

We're interested in your views on what changes to our infrastructure institutions would make the biggest difference in giving us the infrastructure we need at an affordable cost.

14. Are any changes needed to our infrastructure institutions and systems and if so, what would make the biggest difference?

As identified above, clearer guidance and a common framework for broader and stronger benefit and cost consideration in decision making is required. Such a framework needs to be accompanied by capability building with the infrastructure planning, delivery and assessment management professions and institutions.

Network pricing: How we price infrastructure services impacts what we think we need

We're interested in your views on further opportunities to improve network infrastructure pricing.

15. How can best practice network pricing be used to provide better infrastructure outcomes?

No response

Regulation: Charting a more enabling path

We're interested in your views on further opportunities to improve regulation affecting infrastructure delivery.

16. What regulatory settings need to change to enable better infrastructure outcomes?

As highlighted above, the ISC recommends that consideration of value and return on investment for infrastructure more strongly focus on societal benefits and costs – environmental, social and economic - over the long term. This requires:

- *Planning processes which focus on benefits and costs over the long term – beyond the traditional BCR metrics - incorporating economic, environmental and social impacts in business case development and options assessment. For example, Infrastructure Australia's use of broader criteria within their Assessment Framework.*
- *Flow through of identified benefits and costs to procurement, design, construction and operations stages of infrastructure development to keep the focus on benefits realisation - with clearly stated objectives and metrics which are verified as part of performance management.*
- *Procurement guidelines and the capability of procurers to assess broader definition of value (e.g. the Australian Government's ESP Policy, see link above).*
- *Better guidelines for designers and constructors to deliver on broader outcomes e.g. use of sustainability rating tools; carbon budgets & targets;*
- *In Australia and New Zealand, mandating of sustainability rating standards at appropriate thresholds has resulted in consistently applied third party assured performance against a common set of broader outcomes (governance, economic, environmental and social).*

Page 6 - What happens next?

NIPC24-0003064

Additional information to support our development of the Plan

Section five in the Discussion Document is on the next steps. In this section, we're asking you for any additional comments, suggestions, or supporting documentation that we should consider in our development of the National Infrastructure Plan.

17. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions that you would like us to consider as we develop the National Infrastructure Plan?

Click 'Add another' to add multiple suggestions or comments.

Item 1

The Infrastructure Sustainability Council has worked as a peak body membership organisation, change facilitator and capability builder, and Rating Scheme operator for over 12 years – both in Australia and New Zealand.

- *· We have strong relationships with infrastructure sector stakeholders, delivery agencies, design and contracting businesses, product suppliers, financial investors and other researchers and civil society – especially related to the ESG / sustainability agenda.*
- *· We publish data on the collective impact of projects rated under our scheme; and continue to invest in data collation systems and analytics (in association with our partners), as illustrated in our 2024 Impact Report and Impact Notes on Low Embodied Carbon materials, Modern Slavery and Circular Economy.*

• https://www.iscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/ISC0028_2024-Impact-Report_FINAL-R.pdf

• https://www.iscouncil.org/is-impact-notes/

- *· We are proud to support a strong community of practice and host events and forums to share knowledge, build capability and promote and explore research, thinking and practice related to delivering the better future we want to see: Where society is powered by connected infrastructure that enables people to thrive on a healthy planet.*

T

II

Item 3

The following references are relevant to Question 13 - I couldn't add them in the form:

Recent resources from Australia that can support this important work include:

· Infrastructure NSW's Decarbonising Infrastructure Delivery Policy that will apply to all NSW Government building projects valued over $50 million and linear infrastructure projects valued over $100 million. https://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/expert-advice/decarbonising-infrastructure-delivery/

· Infrastructure Victoria's advice to the Victorian government: Opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of infrastructure which includes 3 principles and 10

recommendations. https://www.infrastructurevictoria.com.au/resources/opportunities-to-reduce-greenhouse-gas-emissions-of-infrastructure-2

· *The Department of Climate Change, Energy, The Environment and Water's Environmentally Sustainable Procurement (ESP) Policy and Reporting Framework. https://www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/protection/waste/sustainable-procurement/environmentally-sustainable-procurement-policy*

18. Attach any documents that support your submission

Click 'Add another' to add multiple attachments in PDF format.

Document 1

ISC Accompanying Letter_10.12.2024.pdf attachment is added to this document

Last modified 2024-12-10 10:9:23 am, file size 415.47 KB

Thank you for your response

Thank you for providing feedback on our Discussion Document. We'll use your comments as we continue to develop the Plan. This will not be the only opportunity for you to provide feedback, but it is an important way to test our emerging thinking on the development of an enduring National Infrastructure Plan.

If you have prepared a submission on behalf of an organisation, you'll need to be an authorised *respondent* to make the final submission. If you entered a new organisation during sign-up, or your organisation does not already have a *Principal respondent* assigned, you will have been asked to nominate yourself or someone else for this role as you started this submission. Our team will have worked to verify these accounts allowing *Principal respondents* to manage access and assignment of requests for information to people within your organisation.

If you require any assistance please reach out to our team at inform@tewaihanga.govt.nz.

Submission to Te Waihanga on the "Testing our thinking: Developing an enduring National Infrastructure Plan" discussion document

Submission of the Infrastructure Sustainability Council – Accompanying Letter

The Infrastructure Sustainability Council (ISC) welcomes this opportunity to submit on the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission – Te Waihanga's National Infrastructure Plan discussion document: Developing an enduring National Infrastructure Plan.

This submission represents the views of Infrastructure Sustainability Council as a collective whole and may not necessarily represent the views of individual member organisations.

Our approach to this submission has been to respond to those questions and topics from the consultation document that we can best contribute to. The ISC would welcome further engagement from the Commission as it develops the draft National Infrastructure Plan.

The Infrastructure Sustainability Council is a for-purpose organisation that has certified sustainability performance across Australia and New Zealand since 2012. We assess infrastructure assets across the full spectrum of the asset lifecycle, and we measure impact across the quadruple bottom line of economic, environmental, social and governance. ISC is a member-based social enterprise that serves as the peak body for sustainable infrastructure. The ISC's sustainability framework, the IS Rating Scheme, is applicable to all asset types including water, road, rail, energy, and social infrastructure.

The IS Rating tools that certify infrastructure sustainability performance are widely recognised and mandated by jurisdictions and their associated delivery agencies including National, States and Territories, and municipal councils. ISC's direct contribution to improving the sustainability of infrastructure is illustrated by the fact that since 2012 the ISC registered 408 projects with a combined CAPEX of $386bn. Since 2018, 99 constructed and rated projects have delivered reductions in lifecycle carbon emissions of close to 24.9 million tonnes.

The most recent recognition of the value of IS Ratings can be found in its inclusion in the Australian Commonwealth Government's newly released Environmentally Sustainable Procurement Policy[i]. Under that policy one of the metrics for suppliers to meet Australian best practice standards is to show they have achieved a verified IS Rating from the Infrastructure Sustainability Council.

ISC has also led and/or collaborated in the development of several thought leadership pieces that aim to establish the scale of infrastructure's carbon emissions and identify pathways for addressing them. Most significantly, the widely referenced 2020 study by Climateworks, ISCA (now ISC) and ASBEC: *Reshaping Infrastructure for a Net Zero Emissions Future.*[ii]

Other important papers that are relevant to this submission include: *Advance Our Nations, Fair - World-Class Infrastructure for Thriving Nations*[iii], *A Net Zero future delivered through our infrastructure pipeline*[iv], *Place-based Approach to Net Zero*[v], and *Legacies that Last: Creating Social Value through Australia's Infrastructure and Built Environment*[vi].

It is also noteworthy, given the increased focus on ESG criteria in infrastructure financing and investment – with the need for market integrity, transparency and fairness, and with risks of greenwashing - that a global review of sustainability ratings tools by Stanford University and WWF[vii] recognised the ISC Ratings as the most rigorous in its requirement for third party verification and assessment.

The Infrastructure Sustainability Council thanks Te Waihanga for this opportunity to submit on what is an important building block towards greater certainty in planning for and delivering connected and resilient infrastructure that enables people to thrive on a healthy planet.

More information about ISC can be found at: https://www.iscouncil.org/

[i] DCCEEW 2024, Environmentally Sustainable Procurement Policy, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Canberra, July
[ii] https://www.iscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/RESHAPING-INFRASTRUCTURE-ISSUES-PAPER-MARCH-2020.pdf
[iii] https://www.iscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Advance-our-nations-fair-world-class-industry-for-thriving-nations_Final.pdf
[iv] https://www.constructors.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/A-net-zero-future-delivered-through-our-infrastructure-pipeline_Feb22.pdf
[v] https://www.iscouncil.org/place-based-approaches-to-net-zero/
[vi] https://www.iscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Legacies-that-last-Creating-social-value-through-Australias-infrastructure-and-built-environment.pdf
[vii] https://www.guggenheiminvestments.com/GuggenheimInvestments/media/PDF/WWF-Stanford-Infrastructure-Exec-Summary.pdf