

11 August 2022

Director, Engagement, Advisory and Projects Section
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts
GPO Box 594
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Via email: IA.Review@infrastructure.gov.au

Attn: Nicole Lockwood and Mike Mrdak AO,

Independent Review of Infrastructure Australia

Overview

The *Planning Institute of Australia* (PIA) welcomes the opportunity to provide its response to the review of Infrastructure Australia.

Firstly, we would like to congratulate IA for the direction it has taken in recent years with a more sophisticated alignment of infrastructure with place making and strategic spatial plans. We applaud the inclusion of social, blue and green considerations. It will be important to continue this trajectory to fully and correctly respond to the community's needs - and achieve joined-up results for supply chains, industries, cities or places. PIA are pleased to see these directions defining IA's vision and recommendations in the *Australian Infrastructure Plan*.

The Commonwealth's infrastructure investment strategy should not be 'spatially blind' but relate to people and places.

Secondly, the proposed *Cities and Suburbs Unit (CSU)* is also very welcomed. In essence, the CSU creates an opportunity to bring a spatial perspective to policy thinking within the *Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts*, and simultaneously bring an evidence-based strategic planning perspective to IA's publications, project assessments and investment sequencing.

The continuing use of City Deals / Partnerships remains important for implementing connected outcomes for places and communities. IA can better advise the Government on achieving the best return from partnerships, via more transparent, spatially integrated, and evidence-based agreements with adopted performance outcomes.

IA's Purpose

IA is the pre-eminent source of infrastructure advice to Government. IA is uniquely positioned to work with all jurisdictions and other advice bodies. To do so, it must operate in the sweet-spot of

Commonwealth involvement where it works in genuine partnership with the state and territories. This involves working together to thoughtfully define the problem, and then follow with the infrastructure solutions— rather than focus on assessing Business Cases when there is no agreement on the best solution.

This will need to be done with a suite of robust scenario models combining timelines with the forecast cumulative and compounding impacts of climate change.

In summary, IA's role needs to include:

- Building on its thought leadership recognising 'place' as a priority.
- Consider the full scope of matters relevant to cities and suburbs, including: population and settlement, productivity, sustainability, liveability and governance – in line with IA's quadruple bottom line evaluation approach
- Focus on network challenges in energy, water, transport and the decarbonization challenge – especially those that cross jurisdiction borders.
- Build resilience to climate change and address the carbon contribution of infrastructure in its spatial setting.
- Identify and assist acquisition of key strategic corridors, nodes or precincts.
- Evaluate aggregations of diverse projects (bundled) in network or place-based programs – in addition to the evaluation of individual projects.
- Develop common national infrastructure planning parameters and demand assumptions.
- Draw on a nation-wide suite of joined-up & time-sequenced regional spatial plans
- The pre-eminence of IA advice to Government on infrastructure would need to be acknowledged in relation to advice from the Office of Northern Australia, SPIDO and other entities.

To achieve its purpose, IA will need to be resourced as an independent entity with continuity to deliver a rolling program of outputs in time with key investment decisions of Government.

PIA urge the Government to consider renaming IA: ***Infrastructure and Places Australia*** in recognition of it having a more proactive and place outcomes focus.

The IA Board

The IA Board naturally must hold the competency to perform required governance roles to the highest standards. They must also be able to articulate the success indicators and the critical enablers to achieve that success.

To support and guide IA, the Board must have view on the future of urban Australia and include a deep understanding of the complexity and interdependencies of urban systems.

The IA Board therefore must include a qualified and highly experienced urban and regional planning professional.

Cities and Suburbs Unit

PIA welcomes the proposal to establish a dedicated Cities and Suburbs Unit, given the significant role of urban areas in Australia's future.

PIA recognizes the Government's election commitment to establish this Unit within IA rather than within a Commonwealth Department.

However, the reality and urgency of this moment in time to achieve the highest social and economic benefits from our infrastructure investments during rapid decarbonization needs a deep understanding of the complexity of urban systems.

This is the case for both Infrastructure Australia and the Department for related but separate reasons.

This understanding of urban systems needs to permeate and influence federal policy, including a National Urban Policy. Given the intention to establish a Cities and Suburbs Unit within IA, PIA urges the Australian Government to expand the existing functions within the *Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts* to include a broader Cities and Regions Strategy Division, with commensurate resources and authority.

This would ensure policy capability to match and complement the advisory role of IA's Cities and Suburbs Unit. In addition, to be nationally successful it must be supported by being a core component of any COAG-type structure and process.

PIA believes the role of the Cities and Suburbs Unit within IA should include:

- To act as an independent centre of excellence for research and advice on policy and regulatory matters in relation to the future needs of Australia's cities and suburbs (eg Liveable Cities report)
- To produce an annual State of Australia's Cities and Suburbs Report and publish other relevant reports and research on Australia's cities and suburbs from time-to-time.
- To review and provide internal advice on the core legislative work of Infrastructure Australia, including:
 - Infrastructure Priority Lists
 - Infrastructure Plans
 - Infrastructure Audits
- To support and input to a National Urban Policy, which should be led by the *Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts*.
- To support and input to the negotiation of evidence-based City Partnerships, including:
 - recommending priority locations for City Deals / Partnerships to the Australian Government
 - identifying priority opportunities and challenges for City Deals / Partnerships to address in each location
 - evaluating impact of City Deals / Partnerships
 - (whilst recognising City Partnerships will be negotiated by the respective levels of government).

Whilst the Cities and Suburbs Unit may have a significant interest in infrastructure matters, it should not be limited to infrastructure matters. Cities are complex systems, and it is impossible to consider elements in isolation. It should therefore consider the full scope of matters relevant to cities and suburbs.

Advocates for the public interest

PIA will not derive any benefit or detriment from the outcome of this *Infrastructure Australia* review. Our focus is achieving a productive and sustainable living environment in which investment decisions are aligned with adopted strategic directions for industries, cities and regions.

PIA Response to guiding questions

PIA has addressed most of the guiding questions in **Attachment A** (overleaf) based on the [Terms of Reference](#). We would like to request an opportunity to present to the Inquiry. I would also be pleased to clarify our submission or offer further information, please contact

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely



David Williams
CEO, Planning Institute of Australia

ATTACHMENT A: PIA Response to IA Review Guiding Questions

Infrastructure Australia's role

1. IA was established to advise the Australian Government on nationally significant infrastructure matters including transport, energy, communications and water infrastructure.

- Do you consider IA best placed to provide advice on nationally significant infrastructure?

- *Yes, the Commonwealth Government needs a pre-eminent source of infrastructure advice – and IA is well positioned as a statutory authority to provide this advice with a high degree of independence.*

IA perform a distinct and valuable role in setting a national infrastructure investment strategy (Plan) and setting a benchmark for the development of project and program business cases and their appraisal. The outcome (Priority List) represents an expression of this rigor - and an indication of how and where best value can be achieved from public investment in infrastructure.

IA also act to improve infrastructure appraisal practice via thought leadership and methodology development studies and partnerships – IA's knowledge and practice leadership is an exemplar for other jurisdictions.

- How can IA best support infrastructure investment into the future?

- *By, broadening their scope into all aspects and classes of infrastructure – including social infrastructure - and by recognising the importance of the spatial planning context of infrastructure projects and programs. Programs and projects should address revealed community needs - and achieve joined-up results for supply chains, industries, cities or places.*
- *By operating where there is a clear jurisdictional gap – such as infrastructure / networks crossing borders (eg interstate energy grid, water supply, cross border health/social services)*
- *By identifying and investing in corridor, node and precinct preservation to maintain options for future infrastructure needs.*
- *By adopting infrastructure appraisal methodologies that address wider economic impacts, promote carbon reduction and climate adaptation resulting in a more resilient infrastructure investment pipeline – that 'de-risks' industry investment in technology and skills vital for a carbon constrained economy and transformed cities and regions.*
- *By informing where and how City Deals / Partnerships can offer most value by providing connected outcomes for places and communities. IA can better advise the Government on achieving best return from partnerships, via more transparent, spatially integrated, and evidence-based agreements with adopted performance outcomes.*
- *To do this IA will need to be resourced to be forward-looking to develop an infrastructure investment strategy that defines spatial problems in advance of specific projects or programs – to expose diverse solutions and even identify 'no-build' approaches.*

- Is there a role for a national investment plan, and if so, what role should IA take in this?

- *There is a clear role for a national (infrastructure) investment plan that reconciles the needs and priorities of different jurisdictions.*
- *IA is well placed to curate a 'national (infrastructure) investment plan' using inputs from the CSU and the Centre for Population. To achieve this it would need to apply the directions and insights of a 'National Settlement Strategy' to ensure the Commonwealth's infrastructure investment decisions are not 'spatially blind' and respond to the needs of different places. PIA has advocated for this to be a partnership between tiers of Government informed by Commonwealth guidance on the infrastructure demand parameters, timeframes and population scenarios used in region / city strategies so that a national picture of spatial priorities can be built up.*
- *The current Infrastructure Priority List is not a national investment plan. It does not apply a national priority filter to infrastructure proposals received – nor does it include proactive initiatives based on future needs that have been identified using a coherent and spatial process. Currently information on population projections and other infrastructure demand parameters are not linked to a coherent national understanding for where and how growth will occur. Analysis by PIA of 57 Regional Plans show no consistency in how the plans address growth hotspots nor how they use different scenarios for the distribution and scale of growth.*
- *Philip Davies, former CEO of IA noted (Speech, 25 June 2018) "A national settlement plan would focus on how we grow, not how much we grow, and it would allow us to plan beyond political and budgetary cycles."*

Effectiveness

2. IA publishes a range of products including: the Australian Infrastructure Audit; the Australian Infrastructure Plan; the Infrastructure Priority List; Infrastructure Market Capacity reports; business case evaluation summaries; and other research reports as requested by the Government.

- Which of IA's products is the most effective for your work or organisation, and why?

- *The IA products should not be evaluated in isolation. They form integrated system of inputs driving better value investment. Ultimately the Infrastructure Plan sends a clear message to jurisdictions/proponents on what projects and programs (using what methodologies) are in the national interest.*
- *IA products contribute to a cycle of continuous improvement – from backward-looking audit and the regional strengths and weaknesses report through to more forward-looking knowledge leadership pieces (eg on Liveable Cities / Corridor Preservation / Infrastructure Resilience), to the Infrastructure Plans and the consequent Priority List. Each of these products are supported by methodological guidance notes to improve the scope and accuracy of the infrastructure planning (eg IA Assessment Framework)*

- How can IA's products be improved to better meet your needs?

- *The Infrastructure Plan and ensuing Priority List should respond to a coherent spatial long-term plan for national growth and settlement.*
- *IA is well placed to curate a 'national (infrastructure) investment plan' using inputs from the CSU and the Centre for Population. To achieve this it would need to apply*

the directions and insights of a 'National Settlement Strategy' to ensure the Commonwealth's infrastructure investment decisions are not 'spatially blind' and respond to the needs of different places. PIA has advocated for this to be a partnership between tiers of Government informed by Commonwealth guidance on the infrastructure demand parameters and population scenarios used in region / city strategies so that a national picture of spatial priorities can be built up.

3. IA is required to review infrastructure proposals where more than \$250 million in Australian Government funding has been committed.

- Do you think this is the right threshold? Why or why not?

- *The \$250M threshold is adequate in major cities – but appears too high in regional settings where smaller projects / programs may have a relatively more significant impact.*
- *More importantly, the nature of a proposal needs to be reconsidered to avoid favouring discrete mega-projects. A program of many smaller place-based projects bundled to add up to >\$250M could have greater impact in achieving a strategic plan outcome – especially where groupings of interrelated social and green/blue infrastructure projects could make a significant contribution to the carbon performance, resilience, productivity or prosperity of a place.*

- What other considerations do you think are appropriate for IA to evaluate a business case?

- *The evaluation and consistent articulation or monetisation of wider economic benefits.*
- *The evaluation of operational and embodied carbon emissions of infrastructure over whole of life.*
- *An appraisal of the resilience and adaptability of an infrastructure investment under scenarios for natural hazards and other facets of a changing environment.*
- *An evaluation of the alignment of a proposal with a strategic outcome linked to an adopted place or industry strategy. While IA publications on corridor protection, liveable cities and infrastructure resilience offer strong background, PIA support a holistic consideration of line-of-sight with an infrastructure plan based on a National Settlement Strategy.*

- How effective has IA been in integrating the planning and investment decisions/approaches governments have taken for transport, energy, communications and utilities. What more needs to be done?

- *IA has been especially effective in prioritising cross-jurisdictional opportunities such as the interstate transmission network.*
- *IA has used the information available to evaluate those infrastructure proposals put forward (and a few of their own - eg EV charging), however the IPL has not been spatial coherent – it remains unclear how investment translates to place or industry outcomes.*
- *A pro-active national infrastructure plan should be prepared - based on:*
 - *a National Settlement Strategy to reveal opportunities for investing in more liveable and productive cities and regions – and potential city deals / partnerships; and*
 - *industry plans which lead and integrate national decarbonisation, energy transition, productivity and sustainable economy agendas.*

Governance

4. IA was established as an independent body, to ensure the integrity of Commonwealth investment in infrastructure.

- Is IA fulfilling this role?

- *Yes, within the limitations of its statutory remit and moderate resourcing. IA have consistently delivered an integrated 'ecosystem' of evolving infrastructure advice.*
- *The achievement of IA's role depends on the reception of IA advice and the extent to which Government entities demonstrably apply IA advice – and reconcile advice from other entities (eg ONA and SPIDO).*
- *The independence of IA advice is critical and enables it to set priorities, drive innovation and respond to future scenarios in ways that line agencies do not – where they are constrained by announced commitments.*

- How could IA's role be strengthened to improve the integrity of infrastructure investment across Australia, and across industries?

- *Yes, the board structure of IA is a critical safeguard to its independence. There is no need to have Departmental representation on the Board. Criteria for Board membership should be advancing the strategic agenda of IA and protecting its independence.*
- *A re-casting of executive orders to set out the way IA advice should be taken into account by Commonwealth agencies.*

- Is IA's structure fit-for-purpose, or what barriers do you believe prohibit useful work for IA?

- *Adequately resourcing IA to achieve its role as the pre-eminent source of infrastructure advice to Government – including funding key outputs as part of a rolling program rather than seeking annual ad hoc funds for important deliverables (eg. Regional Strengths report).*
- *A fit-for-purpose IA will take a more pro-active advisory role to identify emerging infrastructure opportunities. It would benefit from the successful integration of a CSU.*
- *This would involve establishing and funding CSU capabilities that improve alignment of infrastructure investment based on a coherent picture of the shape of settlement and future national infrastructure needs. PIA have highlighted the role of a National Settlement Strategy, including measures which encourage all jurisdictions to adopt consistent infrastructure demand parameters, climate factors and population planning scenarios.*

5. Part of IA's role is to ensure infrastructure investment is prioritised for nationally significant projects that deliver maximum benefits for Australia.

- Is IA achieving its objective on providing useful advice on nationally significant projects?

- What do you think should be added to IA's role into the future?

- How could IA's role be changed or strengthened to ensure the most beneficial or transformative projects are identified and prioritised for investment?

- *IA does provide useful guidance and insight on national priorities – but there are opportunities for its to be more proactive in partnership with other jurisdictions to*

identify national priorities and inform and shape candidate projects or programs – including encouraging bundling of smaller projects to achieve a place outcome and identifying where a city deal / partnership can work as a delivery mechanism.

- *IA is well placed to curate a ‘national (infrastructure) investment plan’ using inputs from the CSU and the Centre for Population. To achieve this it would need to apply the directions and insights of a ‘National Settlement Strategy’ to ensure the Commonwealth’s infrastructure investment decisions are not ‘spatially blind’ and respond to the needs of different places and communities .*
- *PIA has advocated for this to be a partnership between tiers of Government informed by Commonwealth guidance on the infrastructure demand parameters and population scenarios used in region / city strategies so that a national picture of spatial priorities can be built up.*

6. Since IA was established in 2008, most jurisdictions have established their own infrastructure body.

- Is it useful having advice from IA and the infrastructure body?

- *Infrastructure bodies play a prioritisation advisory role from a State perspective. A national advisory role by IA should identify connected opportunities and synergies (eg cross border networks) and reconcile and align state priorities in the context of the national interest.*
- *Not every state can be the focus of a particular industry or expect the same growth – IA should strengthen their national role reconciling proposals, building synergies and productive agglomerations – while avoiding duplication of infrastructure investment or over-servicing.*

7. How can the IA Board be most valuable, and what experience, skills and expertise is needed?

- Should the Board be completely independent, or should it have representatives from government and industry? Does the IA Board provide a useful function? Do you think the composition of the Board is right?

- *The IA Board performs valuable functions of*
 - *maintaining the independence of IA advice to Government; and*
 - *assuring that that IA is aware of and pursues a strategic agenda aligned with its mission – being the pre-eminent source of infrastructure investment advice to Government.*
- *To perform these functions the IA Board composition should:*
 - *reflect its independence of Government and not have Departmental representatives;*
 - *hold the competency to perform required governance roles to the highest standards. They must also be able to articulate the success indicators and the critical enablers to achieve that success;*
 - *have view on the future of urban Australia and include a deep understanding of the complexity and interdependencies of urban systems.*
 - *include members with the capacity to:*
 - *identify future strategic contexts for infrastructure appraisal – including authorities on planning spatial outcomes for places, cities*

and regions, as well as social outcomes for communities - therefore include a qualified and highly experienced urban and regional planning professional; and

- *lead on the implications of significant infrastructure challenges with respect to community health and wellbeing decarbonisation, the circular economy, climate adaptation and infrastructure resilience.*

Other functions

8. As part of the Government's six-point plan for cities policy, the Government has committed to the creation of an Australian Cities and Suburbs Unit (CSU).

- What role and responsibilities would best place a Cities and Suburbs Unit to support the Australian Government's Vision for Cities? What could be the focus and form of this role?

- *PIA believes the roles and responsibilities of a CSU should include:*
 - *To act as an independent centre of excellence for research and advice on policy and regulatory matters in relation to the future needs of Australia's cities and suburbs.*
 - *To produce an annual State of Australia's Cities and Suburbs Report - and publish other relevant reports and research on Australia's cities and suburbs from time-to-time.*
 - *To review and provide internal advice on the core legislative work of IA, including: Infrastructure Priority Lists, Plans and Audits.*
 - *To support and input to a National Urban Policy, which should be led by the Department.*
 - *To support and input to the negotiation (by levels of Government) of evidence-based City Partnerships, including: recommending priority locations for City Deals / Partnerships to the Government; identifying priority opportunities and challenges for City Deals / Partnerships to address in each location; and evaluating impact of City Deals / Partnerships*
- *Whilst the CSU may have a significant interest in infrastructure matters, it should not be limited to infrastructure matters. Cities are complex systems, and it is impossible to consider elements in isolation. It should therefore consider the full scope of matters relevant to cities and suburbs, including: population and settlement, productivity, sustainability, liveability, governance (SOAC Report Chapters). Whilst this implies a broader remit for Infrastructure Australia, PIA notes that IA has previously operated with a broad lens – having published reports on Liveable Cities, Population and Settlement.*

- What and where are the options for the structure and location for the CSU?

- *PIA's preference is that the proposed Cities and Suburbs Unit (CSU) be located in either the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts or the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (rather than IA). This would allow the Unit to lead Australia's National Urban Policy and carry responsibility for framing social, environmental and economic outcomes in a spatial context.*

- However, PIA also recognizes the Government's election commit to establish this Unit within IA. Like IA's other functions, this suggests that the CSU's functional responsibilities are likely to focus on advice, analysis and recommendations, rather than leadership of government policy. PIA therefore believes it is also essential that a Cities and Suburbs Unit located within IA should be complemented by a Cities Capability / Division within the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts that is well-resourced with deep expertise in relation to cities and spatial policy.
- The establishment of the CSU should be supported by amendments to the Infrastructure Australia Act 2008 (most likely to expand the Function provisions at s5). This will embed the role of the CSU and reflect the expanded responsibilities of IA.
- The CSU should be led by a qualified planning professional. Appropriate resourcing will be paramount to ensure the Unit can effectively deliver its functional responsibilities and support productive, sustainable and liveable cities and suburbs.

- How could the CSU responsibilities relate to other policy and program units within the Australian Public Service, noting their responsibilities, including providing advice to Ministers?

- CSU capabilities should support other policy and program units having and promoting a coherent and nationally consistent spatial vision for the growth and change of cities and regions. This includes informing entities including the ONA, SPIDO, line agencies – as well as being accessible as a resource for the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication and the Arts as they develop a National Urban Policy.
- This capability should be informed by a **National Settlement Strategy** and ensure that investment decisions across Government are not 'spatially blind' - but are aligned with achieving outcomes for a particular place and its community.

9. IA is currently legislated to focus its work on nationally significant infrastructure, which is defined to include transport, energy, communications and water infrastructure categories.

- What benefits might there be in including social infrastructure as an additional focus area for IA's work, where the Commonwealth is not generally involved in delivering or directly funding social infrastructure?

- IA would not be able to achieve their mission as the pre-eminent source of advice on infrastructure without considering social infrastructure - both as an infrastructure asset for prioritisation amongst other infrastructure types - as well as a context for other economic infrastructure projects to achieve outcomes for places and communities.
- Considering social infrastructure is necessary to determine alternative options to economic infrastructure – or 'no build' options. Without consideration of social infrastructure IA would not be able to advise on the best value infrastructure investments.

10. Are there other areas of infrastructure that IA should assess, and why?

- The scope of infrastructure included should be defined by what is necessary to achieve IA's vision and address the priority recommendations of Australia's

Infrastructure Plan. This requires the inclusion of social, waste / circular economy, local mobility, green and blue infrastructure and digital / telecommunications infrastructure.

- The full range of social, economic and other infrastructure options should be assessed to ensure that best value is identified among alternative options – including advising avoiding, delaying or bundling different infrastructure investments to achieve an adopted outcome.*
- Some important infrastructure types may be place-based, localised and fragmented – such as open space networks, urban heat mitigation measures, waste / circular economy infrastructure, flood mitigation and management infrastructure (ie green and blue infrastructure). Individually works may be below the threshold and the infrastructure items would only present themselves for IA appraisal if aggregated into coherent place-based programs above \$250M. IA would be ignoring potentially high value investments unless measures to curate and bundle of local place-based infrastructure programs are encouraged. The South Creek waterways program related to Western Sydney City Deal is an example.*
- IA Guide to Program Appraisal (July 2021) sets out a process for assessing infrastructure programs and using a business case framework for place-based, linear and inter-related programs.*
- Corridor, node and precinct preservation and acquisition for infrastructure that is not yet committed is also an important opportunity. PIA support IA appraising land reservation/acquisition projects and tailoring a methodology to suit. The IA (2017) 'reform series' think piece ['Corridor Protection: Planning and investing for the long term'](#) Recommendation 9.4 sets out an approach. IA with input from the CSU is well placed to identify and evaluate strategic corridors or places.*
- The achieving the full range of benefits of most infrastructure projects relies on how well they integrate with the places and communities where they are located. PIA urges IA to encourage the inclusion of 'last mile' infrastructure and supporting social infrastructure into the project scope of economic infrastructure. An example is the inclusion of station precinct pedestrian improvements into a public transport project.*

The future investment challenge

11. How effective will the current IA role and responsibilities, and business approach be to handling the national investment challenges Australia faces in the coming decades?

- What role should IA take in integrating the national decarbonisation, energy transition, productivity and sustainable economy policies the Federal, state and local governments are pursuing?

- A proactive IA should appreciate the long-term investment context for infrastructure. To do this it must explore scenarios impacting growth and demand for infrastructure, potential risks and recognise paradigm shifts. IA's role should be informed by the initiatives and advice necessary to achieve the vision and fulfil the recommendations of the [Australian Infrastructure Plan](#).*
- All Australian Governments now have de-carbonisation commitments and have adopted rapid energy transition agendas. This has a direct impact on the investment performance – and IA have a role in strengthening the resilience of infrastructure investment. IA have access to insights from National and State entities and industry*

bodies (eg ISC). Already IA have partnered with INSW on a [‘Pathway to Infrastructure Resilience’](#) and have adopted overarching [sustainability principles](#) for infrastructure appraisal.

- *There is a role for IA communicating and embedding these principles as well as developing specific methods for appraising the operational and embodied carbon/emissions of projects – and setting benchmarks for resilience to natural hazards in a changing climate (eg heat, rainfall and flood, coastal inundation scenarios).*

- Is there a role for a national plan for investment which links and supports the economic re-structure required to transition the economy in the coming decade?

- *There is a clear role for a national (infrastructure) investment plan that reconciles the needs and priorities of different jurisdictions over the long term.*
- *IA is well placed to curate a ‘national (infrastructure) investment plan’ using inputs from the CSU and the Centre for Population. To achieve this it would need to apply the directions and insights of a [‘National Settlement Strategy’](#) to ensure the Commonwealth’s infrastructure investment decisions are not ‘spatially blind’ and respond to the needs of different places . PIA has advocated for this to be a partnership between tiers of Government informed by Commonwealth guidance on the infrastructure demand parameters, timeframes and population scenarios used in region / city strategies so that a national picture of spatial priorities can be built up.*
- *The current Infrastructure Priority List is not a national investment plan. It does not apply a national priority filter to infrastructure proposals received – nor does it include proactive initiatives based on future needs that have been identified using a coherent and spatial process. Currently information on population projections and other infrastructure demand parameters are not linked to a coherent national understanding for where and how growth will occur. Analysis by PIA of 57 Regional Plans show no consistency in how the plans address growth hotspots nor how they use different scenarios for the distribution and scale of growth.*