

Stakeholder Day: Thursday 14 November 2013
Edgbaston Cricket Ground, Birmingham



Breakout and Discussion Sessions

Breakout Session 1: 'Burning Issues'

Following the overview presentation of the iBUILD vision, aims and programme, participants were invited to raise any 'burning issues' they had in relation to the programme, and the topics of infrastructure interdependencies and infrastructure business models more generally. Subsequently, issues were presented and delegates had five votes to indicate which were of most importance to them. These are listed below together with a summary of the voting, with votes from the members of the research team listed separately. The final column of the table indicates which iBUILD work packages will cover the issues raised.

	Practitioner Votes	Academic Votes	iBUILD Coverage
Funding – public procurement laws, lack of financial resources. How can investors be attracted?	12	4	WP 3.3
How can we exploit smart systems and their data to develop innovative business models?	8	1	WP 1.5
Work on regulatory frameworks must happen alongside work on business models. How can we enable local government to be a catalyst for implementing novel business models?	9	9	WP 1.4
Establish the costs (impacts) of NOT investing in infrastructure	8	2	WP 1.2
Transparent capture of full spectrum of benefits, to which iterative weightings could be applied by different stakeholders and at different scales.	3	3	WP 2.1, 2.2, 2.4
Understand (now) the priorities of those to whom we are providing solutions (e.g. jobs, growth, social value)	3	2	WP 5.2-5.4
Enabling community ownership and influence in infrastructure provision.	12	12	WP 2.4
Business models for integrated infrastructure provision (e.g. shared space for utilities).	3	4	WP 1.3
How do we make decisions/investments in the face of uncertainty and future change? Transient decision makers, demand, demographics. Business models must be robust to policy change.	22	23	WP 1.2, 1.3, 1.5
How do we match short-term costs and long-term benefits?	17	11	WP 1.3
What kind of 'resilience' do we want? What is the unit of resilience?	2	5	WP 1.1, 1.2
What are the business models for infrastructure that encourage lower consumption/resource management?	10	12	WP 1.3, 3.1
Valuing service and assets, now and into the future and aspects which are not easily 'priced'. New tools and methodologies for capturing value through interdependencies.	40	25	WP 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4

Breakout Session 2: Interdependencies, Value and Scale

Three groups discussed the three main strands of the iBUILD programme in more detail: interdependencies, value and scale. The following questions were considered:

- What are the key dimensions and issues related to interdependencies/value/scale?
- Identify examples of good/best/different practice.
- How do the examples relate to different/new business models?

The primary issues that were raised in the discussions are summarised below:

Interdependencies

- Understanding the complex systems associated with infrastructure operation and delivery
- Appreciating that creating interdependencies is affected by the various organisational structures and cultures of actors
- Incentivising creation of robust, secure, sustainable interdependencies
- The need to recognise that interdependencies are both opportunities (e.g. greater efficiency), and risks (e.g. progressive failure)
- Alignment of regulation, government policy and capital programmes, among other things, is required to permit radical change.

Value

- Timescales need to be looked at explicitly – e.g. current valuation is too fixed on present value and short-term gain
- Case studies should cover a range of communities and locations, thus recognising different perspectives on value – build into selection criteria
- Can we learn from historical, and particularly ‘bad practice’ case studies? – e.g. Birmingham Northern Relief Road (i.e. the M6 Toll Road)
- Valuation frameworks should offer flexibility – a set of principles rather than rules or rigid frameworks to allow adaptability – one model does not fit all
- Value should be considered in a ‘system’ or network rather than a chain, which is too linear

Scale

Dimensions and issues related to scale

- Does our capability match our complexity?
- Collaboration can achieve scale, but actors are reluctant to collaborate before it is proved that it can work

Examples of good/different practice

- LEPs: Birmingham LEP can have an impact, while other LEPs are likely to be too small and poorly funded to work well.
- Sheffield District Heating: some network already exists, this can make extension easier, but is existing network compatible with new?

How do examples relate to different/new business models?

- Collaboration can take place across organisations as well as boundaries, i.e. electric vehicle infrastructure may be viable if enough organisations switched their fleet at once

Plenary Discussion: Case Studies and Mechanisms for Interaction and Engagement

In an open discussion two main questions were posed:

How would you like to work with/communicate with the iBUILD team?

- Community organisations, SMEs and local government are important stakeholders – it may be easier to engage with them via online input/discussion forums.
- Different engagement strategies are likely to be required for different organisations, taking account of their resources and in-house engagement strategies.
- Virtual meetings: webinars on specific topics/case studies.
- Establish expert panels for specific work packages.
- Website.
- Newsletter.
- Ask our stakeholders to consider questions around issues ahead of meetings.
- More specifically, throw challenges at our stakeholders.

Do you have particular suggestions for integrative case studies?

- Explore opportunities for researchers to be seconded to organisations to work on case studies.
- Cross-sectoral case studies may be difficult given the current regulatory framework.
- The ICE is currently travelling the UK gathering evidence for the 2014 Infrastructure Scorecards exercise.