

Responses to comments received during the consultative process for the Global Infrastructure Hub's

Reference Guide on Output Specifications for Quality Infrastructure

Comments and inputs were received from stakeholders over the open consultation period of four weeks. Comments were also received during the consultative workshop for the Reference Guide, and these have already been integrated into the final Reference Guide as appropriate. The case studies were drafted in close consultation with the relevant project stakeholders and we have received their approval for publication.

Section	Reference in document	Comment/query	GI Hub response
General comment		Undue emphasis on the output specification being outcomes focused. Whilst it is helpful for a supplier to understand what a client's ultimate desired outcomes are, we are generally contracting for outputs rather than outcomes. The guidance should make that point clearer as this could lead to some material misunderstanding if a client thinks they are contracting for - and transferring the risks associated with - outcomes.	The GI Hub recognises that the terms “outputs” and “outcomes” have been used somewhat interchangeably and has revised the document to ensure greater clarity of meaning. 25 occurrences of the word “outcome” were reviewed, and changes made where necessary.
5. Output Specifications	Page 21, Box: Achieving energy performance using performance monitoring and the payment mechanism: Canadian social infrastructure approach	<p>The section on Page 21 looks great. The energy box is excellent and a road safety version of this might be useful here or in section 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum infrastructure safety star rating standard specified for the project (e.g. 3-star or 3.5 star) • Higher Star Rating Performance is encouraged and incentivised encouraging market innovation (e.g. Private Partner offers 4.5 or 5-Star).....<i>(this also ensures good designs are not de-specced to just hit the minimum standard)</i> • The predicted additional road safety benefits are quantified in terms of fatalities, injuries and economic costs 	The GI Hub has not added a box on road safety, because the mechanism to share the predicted road safety benefits would live in the contractual terms, rather than the output specifications.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits are shared between the various stakeholders and/or included in the evaluation criteria 	
5. Output Specifications	Page 22, Box: Reliance on standards	This box could also include ISO39001 – Road traffic safety management systems https://www.iso.org/standard/44958.html	The GI Hub has added this standard to the box.
6. Lessons learned and observations	Page 25, Paragraph 2 - “... a properly crafted output specification requires striking a balance between performance requirements that allow the private sector freedom to innovate and drive value-for-money through life-cycle efficiencies;...”	Add “and enhanced performance outcomes” to the end of the first clause of the sentence because the output specification should allow innovation in performance, not just minimum performance requirements optimising life-cycle costs.	The GI Hub has not included this wording, as it would contradict the comment above on outputs vs. outcomes.
6. Lessons learned and observations	Page 29, dot point on “Ensure proactive monitoring and intervention”	In addition to Gautrain, a dot point on https://orr.gov.uk/ may be useful.	The GI Hub has decided not to include this, as it is a UK centric resource, rather than global.
6. Lessons learned and observations	Page 30, Additional industry example: Transport Infrastructure Safety Standards	Spell out SR4D - Star Rating for Designs “Repeatable qualification of road user risk” should be “repeatable quantification of road user fatality and serious injury risk”. If you would like to use a very recent example, the following was announced in Sao Paulo at the end of July 2019: http://www.saopaulo.sp.gov.br/spnoticias/governo-de-sp-lanca-maior-concessao-rodoviaria-do-pais/	The GI Hub has implemented the suggested changes to wording and has added the Sao Paulo concession example to the footnote.

6. Lessons learned and observations	Page 33, Social impacts and inclusiveness	There may be value in referencing Impact Investing (https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/social-impact-investment-taskforce and also https://gsgii.org/ and https://www.irap.org/project/impact-investment/ up front or at least in this section on social impacts and inclusiveness. A road safety specific reference could be https://www.fiafoundation.org/connect/publications/investing-to-save-lives . Interesting event coming up in Chile too that may be of interest https://gsgii.org/summit/ . This could also be presented in Section 7 as an area for further development and happy to help if needed.	The GI Hub has not added these references as they align more with the planning process rather than the output specification development process.
6. Lessons learned and observations	Page 35, Alignment of the project with economic and development strategies, Ability of the asset to respond to changes in resource availability, population levels, demographics and disruptive technology	A link to the SDGs and some ideas/examples could be used here... e.g. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/ or https://www.globalgoals.org/ and pointing to a few like Goal 3.6, 9.1 and 11.2 with examples - e.g. does the projectcontribute to a halving of road deaths and injuries (Goal 3.6); provide equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water (Goal 6.1); provide quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure (Goal 9.1)....	The GI Hub has added a link on the SDGs to a footnote.
7. Conclusion and areas for further development	Page 38, Section 7.1 Areas for further development, Establishing data management, benchmarking and measurement for quality infrastructure	In regard to data management there are a range of initiatives underway (e.g. https://sum4all.org/global-tracking-framework/ ; https://www.vaccinesforroads.org/irap-big-data-tool/ ; WHO Guidelines due for publication early 2020; https://www.itf-oecd.org/advancing-asian-road-safety)	The GI Hub has not added these links as the linkage between output specifications or project level data management is unclear.