

Feedback form: New Zealand's draft National Infrastructure Plan

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable)

Department of Conservation

Position (if applicable)

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Phone

[REDACTED]

About you

Please tell us which best describes you

☒ New Zealand citizen or resident

☐ New Zealand business owner/operator

☒ Industry professional

☐ Community organisation representative

☐ Local government representative

☒ Central government representative

☐ Researcher

☐ Other (please specify): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Sector or topic of interest

Please list or briefly describe the topics or sectors you are providing feedback on:

Asset Management Practice

Permissions

- ☒ I agree to Te Waihanga New Zealand Infrastructure Commission's [privacy statement](#)
- ☒ I would like to sign up to receive updates and communications via my email address

Publishing feedback

We might publish the feedback that you provide to us, but we will only publish your feedback if you give permission. We will remove personal details such as contact details and the names of individuals. If you do not want your feedback published, please let us know below.

- ☐ Do not publish this feedback

Official Information Act responses

Your feedback will be subject to requests made under the Official Information Act 1982 (even if it hasn't been published). We always remove personal details from content released under the Official Information Act.

Signature

Date

24/07/2025

Your feedback

- When providing your feedback, please let us know which chapter/recommendation/topic you are responding to.
- Alternatively, you may indicate that you are addressing challenges, gaps or opportunities not covered by the draft National Infrastructure Plan.
- Please explain, and if possible, provide examples or evidence.
- Please also include any proposed change or improvements that would address your feedback.

Informed asset management lifecycle decisions based on accurate and comprehensive asset data

With reference to the statement *Over half of all capital-intensive agencies do not have robust, comprehensive asset registers in place or adequate plans for looking after existing infrastructure*

Accurate, reliable asset data (consistent and comparable across agencies) is going to be essential to inform strategic national decision making. At an operational level investment decisions are often mis-directed simply because the organisational knowledge (that stems from accurate data) is not available.

Recommendation: Recognising the scale of the challenge, a national database of key assets across all agencies with clearly defined and consistently recorded attributes such as age, condition, criticality, etc would not only underpin both agency and national strategic investment decision making but also provide a current “state of the nation” for international comparison.

An equitable and transparent system for agreeing national investment priorities

The Draft National Infrastructure Plan identifies the need to centralise decision making based on consideration of parameters such as levels of service, demand and growth and risk, but the challenge is that these parameters can have different definitions depending on the agency or the context. For example, DOC may not have assets that fit the definition of “critical” under CO23(9), but DOC infrastructure is vitally important to the economy, bringing in \$3-\$4 billion per year. The work that DOC does is also essential in protecting the intangible natural and heritage values and taonga of Aotearoa that help define us as a nation.

Recommendation: develop a common, equitable and transparent national decision-making framework to reconcile the importance of investment in recreation and tourism-related infrastructure alongside other national investment demands. Cross-party agreement and commitments will be essential to ensure infrastructure decisions are guided by long-term national priorities rather than short term political agendas.

Working smarter through better use of emerging tools

With reference to the comment *“The use of digital tools, predictive analytics and advanced asset management technologies was also seen as essential to improving infrastructure efficiency and performance”*.

Innovative, out the box thinking is going to become increasingly necessary to consolidate diverse and conflicting requirements across multiple agencies within an increasingly complex environment of constrained spending and growing external challenges. We cannot continue to apply the old ways of thinking whilst expecting a different result.

Recommendation: Create a national “think tank” with appropriate SME and agency representation to explore emerging capabilities such as AI, compatible and integrated information systems, digital asset

management plans, etc, in order design, implement and future proof New Zealand's approach to consistent asset management across all portfolios.

The person compiling this feedback is adding feedback from another respondent here

Your details

Name

[REDACTED]

Organisation (if applicable)

Department of Conservation

Position (if applicable)

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Phone

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] reviewed the draft and at this time has no formal feedback, although gaps identified around tools and processes are"-

1. Treasury to adopt new and audited financial rating scores and evaluations for state and local government agencies
2. MBIE to develop and implement asset management maturity re- assessments or state and local government agencies aligned to ISO55000.
3. Audit NZ to updates self-score cards

However, this input is not relevant at this stage.

I found the forecast of NZ's debt to GDP ratio to increase from 40% to 100% over next 50 years terrifying, will likely cripple the nation. Australia for example is not forecasting any change from around 45%.

Thanking you.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]