techUK

techUK.org | @techUK

Plan for the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy – techUK feedback

HM Treasury have released their Plan for the Ten Year Infrastructure Strategy and are welcoming feedback on the below questions. Please find the questions, and the passages of the Plan they refer to, below:

Are the principles and focus areas for the Strategy the right ones to prioritise?

The Strategy has three objectives:

- *Enabling resilient growth*
  - *Boosting growth*
  - *Removing barriers to growth*
  - *Ensuring growth is resilient to future threats*
- *Delivering the clean energy superpower mission*
  - *Clean power by 2030*
  - *Accelerating to Net Zero by 2050*
- *Ensuring social infrastructure can support public services*
  - *Hospital and healthcare facilities*
  - *Schools and colleges*
  - *Prisons*

The Strategy will have four principles:

- *Mission-oriented prioritisation*
- *Providing long-term confidence*
- *Addressing crosscutting challenges*
- *Ensuring deliverability and affordability*

We welcome the three objectives that the strategy will prioritise.

We particularly welcome the focus on infrastructure needed for digitisation and for digital transformation. This does not just include digital infrastructure needed for economic growth, even if explicit references to telecoms infrastructure and additional references to data centres as Critical National Infrastructure (CNI) would be welcome in the Strategy, but also digital infrastructure needs in UK social infrastructure and the energy infrastructure needs of both. A recent report from the Social Market Foundation, *How to Power AI*, and the *Wireless Infrastructure Strategy* are good examples of the need for holistic thinking to understand how digital, energy and social infrastructure each require the others to operate successfully and affordably.

In particular, there needs to be a holistic view taken across the Infrastructure Strategy and the soon to be released Industrial Strategy in a way that reinforce each other. This needs to be guided by an overall plan, for example an overall Digital or Green Economy plan, which

sets out the vision and roadmap to 2035 and beyond in terms of Britain's place in the world, its sectors and areas of competitive advantage and creating a favourable economic and policy environment to both attract investment and catalyse growth of homegrown businesses to scale, including SMEs, and tap into international markets.

Similarly, the need to ensure there is a plentiful supply of affordable energy must be a priority of the Infrastructure Strategy. Energy costs has been cited by techUK members as the biggest barrier to doing business in the UK, and is a significant cost for telecoms and data centre operators given the UK has amongst the most expensive energy costs in Europe. We would welcome the Infrastructure Strategy taking on recommendations from our response to the National Planning Policy Framework, in which techUK outlined in detail how the Government could support digital infrastructure, including telecoms and data centres.

We welcome the priority given to growth, and the clarity that Infrastructure Strategy will link closely to the Industrial Strategy. As part of this, the Infrastructure Strategy should identify areas of overlap between technologies that need support to develop appropriate open access infrastructure to support innovation. This can include looking at an open access foundry with Pilot Lines capability to bolster R&D in areas where the UK can be internationally competitive, such as in compound semiconductors, nanofabrication, quantum and silicon photonics. More can be found in techUK's latest Plan for Chips, which examines this infrastructure necessary for innovation more closely and outlines how the Infrastructure Strategy can maximise gains from infrastructure for innovation.

Overall, however, we are concerned that the Strategy may limit itself to a 10-year timeframe. Many larger aspects of infrastructure delivery – especially in areas such as transport, data centres, energy and telecoms – often require significantly longer periods to design, approve, and deliver. It is important that this Strategy does not mean that larger, more time-consuming infrastructure projects become deprioritised, and there is a danger that an already volatile and uncertain investment landscape is worsened by the perception that this might occur. Related to this, it is essential that this focus on innovation must be present throughout the lifecycle of infrastructure projects, from construction to the eventual operation and management of the finished project. We want to see a clear vision of the country's ambition and a roadmap in delivering the vision of innovative infrastructure development, construction, deployment and operation. We have also noticed that there is a lack of mention of innovation and how to foster innovation, commercial pathways, and de-risking innovative projects.

Similarly, it is necessary that all future scale infrastructure projects must consider and include the role of telecoms and data centres to support the construction phase and the operation of infrastructure, noting as well the need for enhanced operational telecommunications to facilitate the Net Zero transition. The fundamental needs of telecoms networks and data centres are essentially the same across types and generations: access to power at a reasonable price, access to environmentally controlled/cooled space, access to cabling and access to physical infrastructure that can support antennas/radio/fixed equipment, and these must be considered to ensure this essential infrastructure can be built quickly and easily. There is also a need to consider the increasing use of space and satellite communications, especially as part of a more resilient, diversified telecoms network and for reaching Very Hard to Reach Areas.

Retrofitting new technology may be a concern, but it is far more expensive to retrofit the supporting infrastructure for necessary telecoms networks than to ensure the fundamentals are right and swap out the telecoms infrastructure on top. This is particularly important when considering social infrastructure, where the need to ensure connectivity to hospitals, prisons and other essential sites is paramount for the adoption of technologies such as AI in these settings.

We also recommend that the Government establish a clear, long-term vision for infrastructure resilience to climate change, supported by detailed roadmaps that extend beyond the typical 10-year planning window. This vision should include a structured approach to quantifying and understanding climate related risks, such as water, telecoms, data centre and energy infrastructure resilience, and use this data to guide investment decisions. Given the potentially monumental costs of inaction, there must be a clear framework to assess the return on investment in adaptation and resilience, even when immediate costs appear high. For example, there are environmental benefits to sunsetting 3G and 2G, which are less energy efficient than 4G and 5G. Prioritising infrastructure resilience–both physical and digital–will be essential to ensuring the continuity of society and business services in the face of climate risks. We also encourage further collaboration with experts in climate adaptation to refine this approach and ensure that resilience planning aligns with broader environmental and economic strategies.

This is one area where we recommend the final Strategy take account of the need to crowd in international investment and facilitate UK exports to the rest of the world, and not automatically take a wholly-in-UK approach. Organisations and partnerships such as NATO, AUKUS and others provide already-existing forums for international investment and collaboration on infrastructure. A further area that would be particularly fruitful for this kind of collaboration is in ensuring that UK infrastructure is physically resilient and cyber resilient to hostile actors, which the Strategy should also seek to address to ensure UK infrastructure-enabled growth is resilient growth.

Finally, we also think the Strategy should be expressly creative in its adoption of emerging technologies as a way of ensuring that infrastructure both supports and is supported by the most appropriate technology. To facilitate this, the Infrastructure Strategy should look to promote standardised specifications of information requirements across industries. Defining unique specifications for individual projects limits data interoperability and slows down technology adoption, whereas having more standardised specifications allows solutions to be geared towards these specifications and useful for more projects and further incentivising development. This is particularly useful for cross-sector collaboration, allowing different types of infrastructure to more easily support one another alongside the gains for innovation.

Which functions of a spatial strategy are most important for you?

Government is considering the degree to which the Strategy can be a spatial strategy, and how future iterations of the Strategy will further this ambition. While the option of integrating the various spatial strategies being developed by individual departments – including the Strategic Spatial Energy Plan and the Land Use Framework – will remain available to government, at present it has no detailed national spatial framework. However, government will:

- *Maximise the benefits of its investment: for example by coordinating investment in transport, energy, and housing to maximise the growth benefits of both.*
- *Provide a place-based perspective: illustrate the real world impact of proposed investments in case study areas.*
- *Consider the implications of investment on wider infrastructure need: for example, by setting out the implications for future water and energy demand on government housing targets.*

techUK's 2024 Local Digital Index shows the potential of the tech sector to bring economic growth across the entirety of the United Kingdom. However, without suitable infrastructure, this potential will go unfulfilled.

techUK has also recognised the potential of spatial infrastructure plans to deliver growth as a benefit of digitising UK infrastructure. In our Growth Plan, we recommended the Government place digitisation the heart of plans for the National Energy System Operator (NESO) to produce the first ever Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP). Improving the visibility of the entire network, through use of digital technologies such as digital twins, will enable and support the creation of Strategic National and Regional Spatial Energy Plans and will help set out what needs to be built, where and when, to achieve net zero. However, this goes hand in hand with the digitisation of infrastructure, which cannot be ignored as part of implementing strategies such as these. Although in principle the SSEP will provide a comprehensive, long term perspective on the energy sources required to achieve net zero, as well as identifying their most suitable locations across Great Britain on a zonal basis. Additionally, it raises the issue of adopting a zonal approach to energy system modelling during the preparation phase. We want to flag discrepancies in policy development between our proposals and the Government's current planning.

The SSEP Methodology suggests the division of the country into 17 economic land zones, while the Clean Power by 2030 (CP30) plan identifies 11 transmission zones and 8 distribution zones necessary for a decarbonised power system by 2030. These plans will also influence the management of the connections queue. Alongside this, 10 proposed Regional Energy System Plans (RESPs) for Great Britain are under consideration. It is critical to clarify how regional modelling for the future energy system aligns with these plans and how they affect the determination of project connections, requiring further analysis and input from NESO.

Regarding policy scenarios, we urge government to account for policies impacting economic growth including energy policy, Clean Power 2030, the AI Opportunities Action Plan, the Industrial Strategy, and the Industrial Decarbonisation Strategy. Proper integration of these policies at the initial stages is crucial to ensure that the PLEXOS model, designed to balance system costs with other variables, is fully effective.

The Government should also consider establishing a kind of National Spatial Data Centre which integrates relevant climate patterns and risks, land-use, core infrastructure, natural assets, topographical and other relevant data from both public and private sectors. This should then be used to drive a number of applications in infrastructure from design, place-based investment planning, climate resilience and compliance as well as ensuring future security in key areas such as communications, water, and food.

Furthermore, we have reviewed the proposed economic modelling approach for the SSEP but find it difficult to fully assess without more transparency on the underlying methodology, including specific assumptions and methods. Additionally, we note gaps in stakeholder engagement, particularly with local authorities, and concerns about how the modelling outputs will align with other planning efforts, integrate local area energy plans, and account for emerging technologies and zonal assessments given the long lead times for modelling.

In keeping with the general omission of telecoms infrastructure from the original Government paper, there is potential for a spatial strategy to address barriers to the further rollout of telecoms infrastructure in the UK. Streamlined planning processes are essential to facilitate the rapid use of new technologies. However, in the UK, the planning process is currently a significant barrier to deployment , with the reforms of the ECC not being realised uniformly across the country. Mobile network operators should be consulted on new development projects to prevent connectivity issues. All new developments, including

publicly funded ones, should have digital infrastructure integrated into their design and planning approvals, with the costs covered by developers or builders. This approach will allow for seamless integration of networks into building schemes.

Further investment and resource should be given to local planning authorities to reduce delays and facilitate alternative sites. The Infrastructure Strategy should take advantage of the reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework, which look to prevent Local Authorities from questioning the need for digital infrastructure, to make it an explicit priority. techUK's response to the NPPF consultation, which outlines the importance of data centre and telecoms infrastructure, can be found on our website. Outside of the Strategy, the ECC should also be implemented in full.

The Infrastructure Strategy should take account of Local Growth Plans and the spatial elements of the Industrial Strategy. The Infrastructure Strategy should ensure these are recognised, even if it is to provide framework for how infrastructure development and funding will take account of location-specific plans. Similarly, the Infrastructure Strategy will need to take account of devolved government and the heterogenous needs of the UK's four nations.

In this spirit, the Strategy should recognise that those regions with higher economic growth and those with high capacity for economic growth may both require distinct plans. The Government may need to decide whether it wished to prioritise building housing and transport links in prosperous areas, or in areas with the capacity to be more prosperous. This is something the Infrastructure Strategy should be clear on and show the Government making a conscious and directed choice.

Finally, whether or not the Government decides to adopt a spatial dimension to this Strategy, it is important that spatial aspects are fully considered, especially from a transport and mobility perspective. This is true not only for land-based issues, but also to ensure that efficient and effective use is made of the UK's waterways, shipping routes, and airspace. Aligning UK infrastructure with these opportunities can not only support economic growth, but infrastructure that supports transport efficiencies on land, at sea, and in the air can lower emissions and support the Strategy's other ambitions on net zero.

Whether the Government adopts a spatial element to the strategy or not, it is critical that the strategy maintain a whole-UK perspective and provides for development across the nations and regions.

Of the types of pipeline – which are the most important features to industry?

The government has committed to delivering an infrastructure pipeline to give industry a clear sense of the government's long-term infrastructure priorities. There are several options for a forward-looking pipeline, which will affect the specificity and timing of the pipeline.

- *Investment programme: a forward-looking planning document which identifies longer term allocated public investment and/or spending ahead of project materialisation and focussing on sector objectives*

- *Forward pipeline of projects: A document tracking expected projects from procurement to delivery. Projects are entered onto the pipeline once their cost and scheduling information has been determined.*
- *Priority projects list: This is a static list of future projects in order of priority when funding becomes available*

The tech sector would welcome some form of forward-looking project pipeline to understand Government priorities and plan investments accordingly. The Government should also focus on tracking delivery of projects, as well as intentions.

Naturally, we think transparency from an early stage will ensure that the Government can encourage innovative and novel solutions from the private sector from an early stage. This includes transparency about available Government resources for a project, as well as relevant grants and aid schemes (akin to the UK Business Climate Hub), which may aid in flagging where the Government is willing to prioritise work with the private sector and potentially underwrite risk.

This transparency, based on a roadmap of future core infrastructure projects, will also allow the Government to collaborate with the private sector on which programmes and projects to prioritise. This could also involve the Government establishing an objective set of criteria (economic, social, environmental) that infrastructure projects will be evaluated against to maximise growth, productivity, community development and natural capital security.

This pipeline project may also be a useful catalyst for improving co-operation between national and sub-national investment-promotion bodies to boost investment. A pipeline would require local and national decision makers to share knowledge and could lead to both working to fill the most promising growth sites in the UK if no project is scheduled, potentially through an 'opportunities' pipeline in parallel to the projects pipeline. Our Growth Plan advocated, as part of an effort to improve collaboration amongst local and national investment-promotion bodies, the Government implement the Harrington Review recommendation to build the capacity of the Office for Investment, which could manage any pipeline(s) at a national level.

However, it is imperative that any pipeline does not become a wish list, full of desirable but unlikely projects. If the pipeline evolves in this way, businesses will go back to being unsure of Government infrastructure priorities. This will stifle confidence in the plan generally and undermine the desire of the private sector to develop proposals to work with the Government and invest around Government projects.

Instead, it is imperative that when projects are added to the pipeline, there is at least a plan for delivery that the Government has committed to implementing, so that the private sector can understand how it can work with the Government to deliver projects, deliver innovative solutions, and begin planning third party investments around Government projects. This is critical as well for attracting investment from outside the UK into British infrastructure projects.

However the pipeline is presented, the Government should look to track the delivery progress of infrastructure projects. This will provide data that can be used to assess the success of the Government's Infrastructure Strategy and Local Growth Plans, as well as identify bottlenecks in the delivery process. This will also allow Government to identify other trends around project delivery, for example which stages encourage the greatest business investment.

Similarly, this pipeline should look to align with other Government strategies, for example the Wireless Infrastructure Strategy, so that there is clear information on how the Government

will deliver recommendations in those strategies, so that the private sector can identify and offer opportunities for partnership, and to increase accountability for the delivery of critical projects. In this way, it can also aid Government efforts at procurement by allowing novel technological solutions more time to be developed in anticipation of projects.

How best can the government provide greater certainty for industry? Including the role of the Strategy, a pipeline, and departments?

As of now (Early February 2025) the Government has announced a significant number of strategies, pipelines and projects. While this is of great utility for businesses to understand Government intentions, what is now needed are timelines and plans to deliver on these intentions.

In addition to this, the Government should continue communicating with the private sector about its priorities to build a two-way trust, as this will help with the eventual implementation of their strategies while helping to assuage the concerns of the private sector.

To do this, the Government should utilise the business networks possessed by trade associations, who can use their existing member networks to facilitate communication between the Government and the sectors they represent.

The Cabinet Office and Office for Investment also have key roles to play in leading conversations with industry and building trust with the private sector, including providing avenues for SME engagement and participation.

One area that displays Government commitment to the private sector is Government investment in skills. To invest in essential skills, which often come with a significant time lag, Government has to be ready to commit for the long term. Ensuring that a plan to invest in local skills comes alongside infrastructure projects, and that this will be something the Infrastructure Strategy encourages, will provide more certainty that Government involvement will last beyond construction.

When consulting on the future shape of the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy, it is important that industry is presented with a clear roadmap from Government in seeking input so they can plan out their response. This is particularly important given the current volume of separate consultations, such as in the energy sector, which is leading to a great deal of work being requested whilst resource is limited. This is creating pressure on industry stakeholders, and may lead to poor planning and regulation going undetected. By setting out a clear roadmap for seeking input, the risk of consultative duplication is also minimised, allowing business stakeholders to spend more time answering new questions in detail instead of rehashing old answers.

Similarly, issuing a single roadmap and working to prevent duplication can encourage greater inter-departmental working. For example, DESNZ and DSIT would need to work together on any infrastructure resilience roadmap, helping to create collaboration between departments, one such example would be the potential opportunity for the relevant Government Departments and Regulators to come together to facilitate dedicated spectrum access to facilitate the Net Zero transition. By extending this duty to regulators, they too may be encouraged to collaborate more and prevent efforts to duplicate their work.

We also recommend that the Government look at creating a policy and delivery framework to support projects that will last for longer than 10 years, from inception to operation, and that is able to take an integrated view and decisions across relevant departments covering

planning, land leasing, procurement, economic and environmental assessments and through to build and operate. This long-term commitment will boost certainty for the private sector.

We also encourage the Government to engage in a diverse range of consultative practices in addition to written responses, and welcome this opportunity to feed in thoughts on the plan for the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy as part of this. Not all businesses, particularly SMEs, may have the ability to feed in detailed written response but will nonetheless have valuable perspectives the Government will want to hear. Alternative forms of input, such as roundtables, combined with a consultative roadmap, will best enable these small businesses to plan their input and ensure the Government collects a diverse range of perspectives. These new practices would not replace opportunities for written input, but augment these existing opportunities.

Do you have views on the early priorities for NISTA to support the delivery of the Strategy?

The Government has committed to creating the National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority (NISTA) to oversee the implementation of the Strategy. NISTA will be a joint unit of HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office, embedded in HM Treasury with the Chief Secretary to the Treasury as the lead minister. The Strategy will also support Skills England in their assessment of where skills gaps exist that will need to be addressed to successfully deliver key infrastructure projects

We are glad the Plan for the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy lays out exactly how the Infrastructure Strategy will be institutionally governed, as well as how it will relate to other Government projects. However, the lack of clarity on those other projects and bodies limits the utility of this exercise at the current moment.

Therefore, the Government can provide greater certainty by looking to outline its Industrial Strategy plans. Namely, how the Industrial Strategy Council will work, the Sector Growth Plans, the envisaged role of the private sector in the future governance and implementation of the strategy, and how they will be delivered over the course of ten years.

Similarly, the NISTA and the Infrastructure Strategy must bear in mind the importance of building infrastructure that facilitates the growth of key technology sectors. For example, the Infrastructure Strategy should support an open access foundry with Pilot Lines capability to bolster R&D in semiconductor technology, as recommended in techUK's latest Plan for Chips.

We also encourage the Industrial Strategy to encourage NISTA to adopt, promote and champion best practice standards. This includes in the Construction Playbook NISTA have stated they will build upon, which has a focus on driving digital transformation and was an encouraging sign to the sector. The Infrastructure Strategy should restate its commitment to building on this Playbook and other examples of best practice.

For example, NISTA should look to champion voluntary lean standards (ISO 18404) for infrastructure delivery, given the success of these principles in other departments. The Highways Agency have found the latest efficiency savings due to the application of Lean on the Smart Motorways Programme stands at £66.3 million, against a target of £60.0 million.

The Strategy should also confirm whether NISTA, as part of its role, will be empowered to orchestrate programmes across Departments. Furthermore, NISTA should also be encouraged to use digital, data and AI-enabled solutions including digital twins, spatial

planning tools and capital project management platforms to support these major programmes.

Outside of this, we would welcome clarity on whether the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy will relate to the digital and ICT Infrastructure part of NISTA's mission to replace legacy IT infrastructure, as found in the Infrastructure and Projects Authority *Annual Report on Major Projects 2022-23*. Replacing older government systems with new tools such as AI and Internet of Things (IoT) will require an update to physical digital and energy infrastructure systems in order to ensure capacity and connectivity for the new systems. Replacing legacy IT and ensuring transformational digital infrastructure is built are therefore linked and this should be clarified by NISTA as being part of their thinking. i.e. digitalisation initiatives should seek to leverage existing and new infrastructure to maximise the benefit.

NISTA should also look to improve the delivery of tech projects in the Government's Major Projects Portfolio. Currently, only 9% of major tech programmes in the GMPP are assessed as 'Green', or with successful delivery highly likely. Tech programmes are also 60% more likely to be assessed as 'Red', successful delivery highly at risk, than non-tech projects. NISTA should see narrowing this gap as a fundamental part of its role and the Ten Year Infrastructure Strategy should make this clear.

A key sector that NISTA should also prioritise is telecommunications. We recommend placing a stronger emphasis on telecoms infrastructure as a distinct focus, rather than only considering its role within broader digitalisation efforts. It underpins growth opportunities for the entire UK economy and can directly address the three core objectives of this strategy. Telecoms infrastructure and data centres are also CNI and has a sector plan in the Wireless Infrastructure Strategy that NISTA needs to aid in deploying.

It is vital that Government can support the sector in achieving this potential. At present it faces challenges with the speed of deployment that are hampered by policy constraints, which in turn impacts the broader market and investment conditions.

In 5G for example, there are several significant barriers for the UK to more widely deploy this technology, which may prevent the consistent deployment of it nationwide unless the right market, investment and policy conditions are put in place. This includes taking a smart approach to regulation, with Government undertaking a Mobile Market Review to identify barriers to further deployment, such as planning. If we don't create these conditions for the private sector to build new digital infrastructure the choice will be between having no 5G for most rural areas, many towns and smaller cities or having to use public funding in fill the gap, as seen with the full fibre Gigabit broadband programme.

We have outlined our broader thoughts around the sector in techUK's Telecoms Action Plan last year, which identified three core areas of support with recommendations to drive uptake and investment:

1. **Enabling digital infrastructure to be built more quickly**

   Recommendations included optimising the planning system as a key priority, ensuring the tax system incentivises further investment, the provision for future spectrum management and a future skills pipeline.

2. **Improving telecoms networks economics to deliver full fibre and 5G ambitions**

   The key suggestion here were to initiate a Future Connectivity Strategy post 2025 Spending Review to support industry on delivery and uptake of future facing digital infrastructure and connectivity.

3. **Maintaining healthy competition, economic security and growth through the right regulation**

Ensuring the right signals to industry and investors are provided through long term regulatory certainty, holding the regulator to account in overseeing an environment that delivers economic benefits, including growth, to the UK.

We believe this approach will support numerous sectors in their growth agenda as well as address many public sector issues. It is important that HMT ensure a joined-up approach across departments to maximise the opportunities.

The Strategy may also want to outline how NISTA can work with the Regulatory Innovation Office (RIO) to address certain barriers to further deployment and collaboration in the infrastructure sector. As part of this, NISTA could play a central function role to coordinate between direct stakeholders and wider networks of partners to align interests, transfer knowledge and facilitate collective action. This will require taking a strategic view of the infrastructure projects, the ones that are likely to be technically viable commercially feasible, and sustainable and to make sure that these align with wider industrial strategy.

Alongside this focus, it is key that NISTA takes a holistic view of infrastructure and ensures both that projects in one sector are supported by infrastructure delivery in another and that all projects' knock-on benefits are fully realised. For example, digital connectivity infrastructure is not only vital for consumer and business communications but is also vital to deliver many of the transport and mobility developments that the Government is also working on, such as rolling out autonomous vehicles on the roads and digital signalling and driverless cabs on the railways. It is also vital for energy deployments, such as for reducing emissions through digitalisation. This is further backed by the National Infrastructure Commission's Second National Infrastructure Assessment, which called for the Government to identify the specific telecommunications needs of the transport, energy and water sectors and to ensure that such infrastructure is delivered to meet said needs, and data centre needs should also be considered here as part of this effort. This need to ensure different types of infrastructure works in concert to support each other is also a key reason why the Infrastructure Strategy should promote data standardisation, as this can help with the monitoring, assessment, operation and continued transformation of interconnected management of infrastructure.

Although there is an increasing need for more physical infrastructure, NISTA should also work collaboratively to ensure that physical infrastructure is supported digitally. For example, connectivity infrastructure will only really be of value if there are underlying cybersecurity, data-sharing, and data-standardisation measures implemented by Government, both generally and project-specifically. These data standardisation measures will also facilitate cross-sector collaboration and incentivise technological development that can be applied in more than one infrastructure sector.

Overall, there has been increasing frustration in industry in recent years about delays and -- above all – frequent, last-minute changes to projects and government focus, leading to comparatively low-levels of private investment in UK infrastructure delivery. This is particularly notable in nationwide infrastructure transformation and in individual major projects. We are glad that the Government is recognising this, and we hope that providing ambition, certainty, and predictability will be the hallmarks of NISTA's activity.