# Review of Screening Tools to Assess Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Infrastructure Development

**Josh Sawislak and Emily McKenzie**

28 November 2017, GGKP Sustainable Infrastructure Conference,

# Agenda

1. Introduction and context
2. Approach
3. Review of the findings
4. Opportunities and further research

# Introduction and context

# Introduction and context

- $90 trillion in infrastructure investment needed globally by 2030
- Climate risk screening tools relatively recent
- Infrastructure sustainability standards evolving

# Approach

# Scope of the review

## Financial Institutions

- Asian Development Bank (ADB)
- Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)
- African Development Bank (AfDB)
- Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)
- European Investment Bank (EIB)
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
- KfW Development Bank (KfW)
- World Bank (including IBRD and IDA)
- International Finance Corporation (IFC)

## Infrastructure assessment standards

- BREEAM Infrastructure
- CEEQUAL
- Envision®
- SuRe® Standard
- Equator Principles
- Green Guidelines for the Belt and Road Initiative

# Focus of the review

**Infrastructure development process**

# Analysis of findings

# Review of the findings

## Tools used across different stages of infrastructure development process:

| Financial Institution / infrastructure standard | Planning | Design | Finance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Asian Development Bank | | | |
| Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank | | | |
| African Development Bank | | | |
| Agence Française de Développement | | | |
| European Bank for Reconstruction and Development | | | |
| European Investment Bank | | | |
| Inter-American Development Bank | | | |
| KfW Development Bank | | | |
| World Bank (including IBRD, IDA) | | | |
| International Finance Corporation | | | |
| Equator Principles | | | |
| BREEAM Infrastructure | | | |
| CEEQUAL | | | |
| Envision® | | | |
| SuRe® Standard | | | |
| Belt and Road Initiative Green Guidelines | | | |

# Key Finding 1

All financial institutions reviewed have policies to use social and environmental assessments in deciding to finance infrastructure projects.

**But similar assessments for climate risk and resilience are often not publicly available or universally applied.**

# Key Finding 2

When climate risk and sustainability screening tools are applied, they are largely limited to the project design phase and focused at the project level.

**There is limited opportunity to change projects to substantially address climate risk or resilience needs at this project design phase.**

# Key Finding 3

- **A multiplicity of standards are emerging, which would benefit from alignment.**

- At present, no tools, or procedures have been developed as part of the Chinese BRI Green Guidelines

# Conclusion

- There is substantial opportunity for financial institutions and standard developers to **work further upstream in the project cycle in the planning phase.**

- This would address planning needs to reduce climate risks and promote resilience, and coordinate with national efforts around the Sustainable Development Goals and Nationally Determined Contributions of the 2015 Paris Agreement.

# Opportunities and further research

# Opportunities and further research

1. Deeper review and testing of standards and screening tools to identify gaps and tailor to countries and regions.

2. Tools to incorporate information on natural capital in risk assessments, investment screening and planning.

3. Case studies needed of hybrid and ecological infrastructure for financial institutions and policy-makers.

**Josh Sawislak**
Global Director of Resilience, A
E: josh.sawislak@aecom.com

**Emily McKenzie**
Chief Adviser, Economics, WW
E: emily.mckenzie@wwf.org