Int. J. Urban Manage Energy Sustainability, 2(1): 1-9 Winter 2021
DOI: 10.22034/IJUMES.2019.4.10.036

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Explanation of Resilience Urban Infrastructure Principles in Approach to Sustainability

S. V. Kamyar[1]

[1]*Department of Art, Faculty of Industrial Design, Islamic Azad University, Central Branch, Tehran, Iran*

Received 02 Apr 2020 revised 10 Sep 2020 accepted 30 Oct 2020 available online 10 Nov 2020

ABSTRACT: The concept of resilience emerged as a central theme of industrial and urban development, although recent resilience approaches, such as spatial resilience, general resilience, and urban resilience, have dealt with Infrastructure subjects and, conversely, some works in urban issues have tried to comprehend the complexity of urban-natural environments, an explicit Industrial perspective on urban resilience is still lacking in research. The paper is divided into main parts: formal thinking of resilience, the resilience of urban infrastructure), and sustainability approaches. This inquiry is of a descriptive-analytical nature, and in terms of design, it is a character of development research that is borne out in the course of a recapitulation of the documents of the latest research achievements, and ultimately bringing into account the concepts of a sustainable urban infrastructure.
Sustainable infrastructure refers to infrastructure projects that are contrived, projected, built, worked, and decommissioned in a fashion to assure economic and financial, social, environmental and institutional sustainability over the full life cycle of the project, this research aimed to explain the sustainability of infrastructure in urbanity and try to reveal that how the industrial approach can have utilized main ideas to spatial form in modern urban centers.

Keywords: Resilience, urban development, urban infrastructure, Sustainable infrastructure, industrial approach

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the concept of resilience emerged as a central theme of industrial and urban development. It is capable of serving as the basis and tools for solving the most pressing matters of advanced culture, including strategic investments by leading development institutions and humanitarian communities around the globe. Despite the importance of vital infrastructures and systems and expected development of future climatic hazards, relatively few works have addressed these issues and no methodology for the analytic thinking of such an impact has ever got to a universal consensus. As of today, it looks (to our knowledge) that there is no quantitative definition of resilience and strategic preparedness to which a majority would support. The quantitative and qualitative analysis of resilience as related to urban infrastructures takes its origins from the feeling and concept of industrial resilience. In this paper, the urban infrastructure resilience is defined both verbally and strictly in conditional probabilistic terms, as all the parameters which describe resilience quantitatively, are random. The conditionality of the resilience probabilities is due to the probabilistic and the uncertain nature of the impact, and of the financial, societal and other restrictions on the critical infrastructure, for which the resilience is measured.

Infrastructure is essential for increasing economic progress and cutting poverty. The picks made in the type and scale of infrastructure investment also have major implications for environmental sustainability. To date, however, limited progress has been built in expanding infrastructure access in the vast bulk of developing nations, with the noted exception of the East-Asian NICs and other nations in the region. Moreover, infrastructure expansion often has come

*Corresponding Author Email: S.vahidian@Hotmail.com
Tell: +989353301269

at the expense of the local environment, as well as complicating responses to the long-term challenge of climate alteration. These observations emphasize the difficulty in planning, building, and sustaining the infrastructure for both social- economic advancement and environmental sustainability.

Infrastructure services, such as the supply of drinking water and electricity, the disposition and treatment of wastewater, the mobility of people and goods, and the preparation of information and communication technologies, are the backbone for economic development, competitiveness and inclusive growth (Serebrisky, 2014; Calderón and Servén, 2014; Serebrisky et al., 2015; The New Climate Economy, 2016; Bhattacharya et al., 2016). Infrastructure investment needs in the area are calculated to be 3-8% of gross domestic product (GDP), yet investments range between 2% and 3% of GDP (Serebrisky, 2014: Fay et al., 2017). An increase of US$120–150 billion per year is needed to achieve the region's development objectives (Serebrisky et al., 2015), with particular challenges in the urban context (Bonilla-Roth and Zapparoli, 2017). Shutting down this investment gap will require calling up new sources of long-term finance, including from institutional investors (Bielenberg et al., 2016).

Shutting down the infrastructure gap needs both spending more on roads, power plants, and water, sewage systems, but also spending differently transforming the way infrastructure is designed, developed and controlled. Infrastructure that is built now will shape our climate future. It is estimated that globally, 60% of carbon emissions arise from the construction and operation of the existing infrastructure stock and a further 35–60% of the future carbon budget will be carried up by infrastructure (Muller et al., 2013; The New Climate Economy, 2016). Technological lock-in and the inherent inertia of long-lived assets such as infrastructure underscores the need to consider carefully the viability of new fossil fuel power generation, especially coal if the Paris Agreement objective of keeping the global temperature increase well below 2 degrees Celsius is to be achieved (Hansen et al., 2013). Indeed, Pfeiffer et al. (2016) suggest that during 2017 we had already progressed to the "2°C capital stock" limit for fossil-fuel-based electricity generation. Delivering infrastructure is increasingly complex, given climate change, environmental concerns, and social challenges. At the same time, advanced technologies will transform the way infrastructure is designed, built, and financed. Modern technologies and business models coupled with demographic and demand changes may cause certain types of infrastructure obsolete. The need to attract new sources of private finance increases the legal and regulatory challenges faced by government agencies looking to increase investment in sustainable infrastructure. The shocks of climate change or physical climate risk are rising businesses, reducing the predictability of future infrastructure needs as well as increasing the exposure of assets (Reyer et al., 2017). The area is one of the most vulnerable to the impacts of a changing climate; in 2017 it experienced severe losses from natural events, including floods in Peru that cost US$3. 1 billion and floods in Colombia that resulted in 329 fatalities (Munich Nat CatService, 2017). Vergara et al. (2013) estimate that climate change will cause damages costing US$100 billion a year across the region by 2050.

Loss of natural resources or ecosystem services, pollution, minimal local benefits in terms of infrastructure services or job creation and reduced local access to resources are creating social conflicts. Coupled with deficient planning, inadequate consultation, and inadequate levels of transparency, conflict is leading to infrastructure project delays, cost overruns, and reputational damage for governments, financiers, and the private sector (Watkins et al., 2017). Satisfying the need for future infrastructure plays against the possible negative environmental and social externalities that might result from these projects; this is a source of growing conflict between local communities and project supporters. The increasing force of civic order and social connectivity through technologies adds to the complexity of delivering infrastructure projects (Valenzuela et al., 2016; Watkins et al., 2017).

Globally, almost all states have devoted to multi-sector sustainability objectives through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Rural areas throughout have ratified the Paris Agreement and presented Nationally Determined Contributions setting out pledged mitigation and adaptation activities. The OECD suggests that decisive actions taken now for low-carbon investments can deliver significant growth benefits in the G20 countries (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development 2017c); climate- compatible policy frameworks can increase long-term GDP by 2.8%. Even so, the window for achieving this is considered "uncomfortably narrow," with less than five years to get to this critical transition. Shifting infrastructure investments toward a sustainable infrastructure that addresses and meets stakeholder concerns and that is consistent with a low-carbon and climate-resilient path of evolution is thus critical to reaching the ordered series of investment required to take on sustainability and development requirements.

Turning attention to the likelihood of stranded assets as a consequence of climate risk, which may be due to physical climate impacts, changing government regulations, technical change and relative prices, as well as litigation, can also affect the evaluation of infrastructure assets over their long life cycles (Caldecott et al., 2016). The report of the FSB Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures, 2017) has raised the fears of governments and investors alike over climate risk and stranded assets and for the potential for this to lead to systematic risk within the financial sector (Baku et al., 2017).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Growth and Infrastructure

Common sense indicates that advanced economies cannot function without infrastructure, which supplies a sort of critical services in determining any economy's production and use possibilities. Even if the infrastructure is necessary for advanced economies to use, all the same, more infrastructure may not inevitably cause more development. The binding constraints may lie elsewhere than only in the total measure of infrastructure investment in poor managerial incentives or externalities from missing markets, for instance. The issue of infrastructure may also vary as changes in the economy influence firms' ability to take vantage of it. Thus the infrastructure's productive impact became a lot more pronounced after 1973 when the economy was liberalized (Albala-Bertrand and Mamatzakis 2004). Infrastructure can affect development through many canals. In summation to the conventional productivity effect, infrastructure is likely to bear upon the costs of investment adjustment, the durability of private capital, and both demand for and supply of health and education services. Many of these canals have been examined by trial and error. This is speculated in the broad diversity of findings in the abundant empirical literature on infrastructure and growth or productivity. Indeed, exhaustive reviews of the literature
(Briceño-Garmendia et al. 2004; Gramlich 1994; Romp and de Haan 2005; Straub and Vellutini 2006) show that, while some authors find negative or zero returns, others find a high impact of infrastructure on growth. Careful analysis of the literature shows broad agreement with the idea that infrastructure generally matters for growth and productivity, although some studies suggest its impact seems higher at lower layers of income (Romp and de Haan 2005; Calderon and Servén 2010, Briceño-Garmendia et al. 2004). However, there continues a tremendous change in the findings, particularly as to the magnitude of the force, with studies reporting widely varying returns and elasticities. In other words, the literature bears out the notion that infrastructure matters, but it cannot serve to unequivocally argue in favor of more or less infrastructure investment in specific cases.

The sort of findings is, in fact, not surprisingly. On that point is no cause to anticipate the effect of infrastructure to be invariant (or systematically positive), either over time or across areas or states. Furthermore, estimating the impact of infrastructure on growth is a complicated endeavor, and papers vary in how carefully they navigate the empirical and econometric pitfalls posed by network effects, heterogeneity, and indignity.

Sustainable infrastructure

Sustainable infrastructure refers to infrastructure projects that are contrived, projected, built, worked, and decommissioned in a fashion to assure economic and financial, social, environmental (including climate resilience), and institutional sustainability over the full life cycle of the project." it formulated guiding principles for each of the dimensions of sustainability.

Economic and Financial Sustainability

Infrastructure is economically sustainable if it engenders a positive net economic return, considering all benefits and monetary values over the project life cycle, including positive and negative externalities and spillovers. In summation, the infrastructure must generate an adequate risk-adjusted rate of paying back for project investors. Sustainable infrastructure projects must, therefore, generate a sound revenue stream based on adequate cost recovery and be sustained, where necessary, by well-targeted subsidies (to address affordability) or availability payments (when users cannot be identified), or where there are large spillover effects. Sustainable infrastructure must be planned to sustain inclusive and sustainable growth and boost productivity and to deliver high-quality and low-cost services. Hazards must be fairly and transparently distributed to the entities able to master the danger or to absorb its impact along the investment outcomes over the life cycle of the project.

Environmental Sustainability, including Climate Resilience

Sustainable infrastructure preserves restore and incorporate the natural surroundings, including biodiversity and ecosystems. It supports the sustainable and effective usage of innate resources, including energy, water, and materials. It also fixes all types of contamination over the life cycle of the project and conduces to a low-carbon, resilient, and resource-efficient economic system. Sustainable infrastructure projects are (or should be) sited and planned to ensure resilience to climate and natural disaster hazards. Sustainable infrastructure often depends on national circumstances, where the overall performance will need to be measured compared to what could have been made or developed instead.

Social Sustainability

Sustainable infrastructure is included and should accept the broad support of affected communities—it serves all stakeholders, including the short—and contributes to enhanced livelihoods and social well-being over the life cycle of the project. Tasks must be manufactured according to honest labor, health, and safety measures. The benefits generated by sustainable infrastructure services should be shared equitably and transparently. Services supplied by such projects should promote gender fairness, health, safety, and diversity while complying with human and labor rights. Involuntary resettlement should be avoided to the extent possible and when avoidance is not possible, the translation should be minimized by exploring alternative project plans. Where economic displacement and relocation of people is unavoidable, it must be done in a consultative, honest, and equitable manner and must integrate cultural and heritage conservation.

Institutional Sustainability

Institutionally, sustainable infrastructure is aligned with national and international commitments, including the Paris Agreement, and is based on transparent and consistent governance systems over the task bike. Robust institutional capacity and clearly defined processes for task preparation, procurement, and operation are enablers for institutional sustainability. The growth of local capacity including mechanisms of knowledge transfer, promotion of advanced thinking, and project management is vital to enhance sustainability and encourage systemic change. Sustainable infrastructure must develop technical and engineering capacities as well as schemes for data collection, monitoring, and evaluation, to generate empirical evidence and quantify impacts or benefits.

Criteria for Project Preparation and Design

Established along the framework, we identified 66 criteria that should be addressed during project planning and intention to ensure that we “do projects right.” These measures are relatively comfortable to distinguish because of the consistency among the different approaches to sustainability, to sustainability assessment, and to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria. Tables 1–4 present sustainability criteria across the four principles in the project planning and design stage. These criteria apply to all project components, including components such as access roads, transmission lines, raw material extraction areas that are necessary for delivering the project.

Economic and Financial Sustainability		
Economic and Social Returns	1	Task plan for optimal economic growth
	2	Economic and social return over project life cycle
	3	Addition of local investment
	4	Service access and affordability
	5	Inspection and repair efficiency, quality, and dependability
	6	Infrastructure asset maintenance and optimal function
Financial Sustainability	7	Positive net present asset value
	8	The adequate risk-adjusted rate of recurrence
	9	Clarity on revenue streams
	10	Operating profitability
	11	Asset profitability
	12	Debt and financial sustainability
	13	Internal liquidity ratios
	14	Solvency ratios
Policy Attributes	15	Efficient risk allocation
	16	Commercial and regulatory incentives for sustainability

.Table 1: Sustainability criteria under the economic and financial sustainability principle for project planning and intention

Environmental Sustainability, including Climate Resilience		
Climate and Natural Disasters	1	Task plan for low GHG emissions
	2	Assessment of climate risks and project-resilient design
	3	Task plan and system optimization of disaster risk management
	4	Strength, flexibility, and recovery of design components and technical organizations
Contamination	5	Task plan and system optimization to minimize air pollutant emissions
	6	Task plan and system optimization to minimize water pollution
	7	Task plan and system optimization to minimize dirt and other contamination
The preservation of the natural environment	8	Environmental appraisal of project impacts
	9	Task plan for maximum ecological connectivity
	10	Conserve natural areas, areas with high ecological values, and farmlands
	11	Task conception and engineering science to minimize invasive species
	12	Task conception and engineering to optimize soil management
Efficient Use of Natural Recourses	13	Efficient use of water resources
	14	Material use and recycling
	15	Project design to minimize energy consumption and maximize the use of renewable
	16	Waste management and recycling
	17	Hazardous materials

.Table 2: Sustainability criteria under the environmental sustainability (including climate resilience) principle for project planning and intention

Social Sustainability		
Poverty, Social Impact, and Community Engagement	1	Social impact assessment of the project
	2	Social sustainability and growth program
	3	Stakeholder engagement is a process
	4	Community consultation and participation
	5	Task plan for fair benefit sharing and compensation to project-affected communities
	6	A project planned to minimize impacts of resettlement and economic shift
	7	Planning of public amenities within the project›s area of influence
	8	The project aims to maximize community mobility and connectivity
Respond effectively to international labor and human rights challenges	9	Universally accessible project design and engineering sciences
	10	Community wellness, safety, and security, and crime prevention
	11	Occupational health, safety, and labor standards throughout the task
	12	A project plan that maintains the rights of vulnerable groups
	13	Gender-inclusive project design
Cultural Preservation	14	A project design that does not limit communities› access to resources
	15	Cultural resources and heritage
	16	Indigenous and traditional peoples

.Table 3: Sustainability criteria under the social sustainability principle for project planning and intention

Institutional Sustainability		
Global and National Strategies	1	Project contribution to national and international commitments for sustainable development
	2	Project alignment with national and sectoral infrastructure plans
	3	Soil usage and urban planning integration
Governance and Systemic Change	4	Project alignment with economic, territorial, and urban schemes
	5	Project alignment with natural, environmental, and social strategies
	6	Organization of corporate organization structures
	7	Environmental management systems and biodiversity
	8	Social management systems and grievance redress mechanisms for external stakeholders and for workers, including contractors
	9	Task plan and systems selection in alignment with certified providers
	10	Anti-corruption and transparency framework
Management Systems, Accountability	11	Project design and systems for engineering and technological feasibility
	12	Project organization to assure accountability, collaboration, and invention
	13	Task conception and preparation to ensure optimal execution
Capacity Building	14	Project design and systems to promote institutional capacity building
	15	Local capacities and awareness
	16	Task conception and engineering works for sustainability performance

Table 4: Sustainability criteria under the institutional sustainability principle for project preparation and design

Table 1: Sustainability criteria under the economic and financial sustainability principle for project planning and intention.

Table 2: Sustainability criteria under the environmental sustainability (including climate resilience) principle for project planning and intention.

Table 3: Sustainability criteria under the social sustainability principle for project planning and intention.
Table 4: Sustainability criteria under the institutional sustainability principle for project preparation and design

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Using Financing to Drive the Sustainable Infrastructure Transformation

Financing and financial systems are critical to driving the transformation toward sustainable infrastructure (Yuan and Gallagher, 2015; Berensmann et al., 2017; EU High-Level Expert Group on Sustainable Finance, 2017). The EU High-Level Expert Group on Sustainable Finance (2017) identified three complementary action areas to better delivery of sustainable infrastructure:

• Ensure that projects adhere to sustainability measures through the espousal of the IFC Performance Standards or the incorporation of ESG requirements.
• Provide targeted finance for key subsets that meet sustainability targets—for example, toward delivering on SDGs or the Paris Agreement.
• Align financial system institutions to deliver finance that addresses key sustainability risks and provides long-term support for infrastructure.

Investor interest in "green financing"—targeted investments toward climate mitigation, climate resilience/adaptation, and environmental sustainability—is rising, as shown by the rapid increase in the green bond market. Continued development will depend on standardizing green finance practices, enhancing transparency and disclosure standards for risks, enhancing markets for green investments, and supporting developing-country sustainable finance roadmaps (Berensmann et al., 2017).

For economic and financial sustainability: Governments and financiers should ensure that projects are borne away by explicit plans describing how the project supports productivity and maximizes sustainability co-benefits. All tasks should be established on an infrastructure service provision agreement and on concession agreements that incorporate and incentivize sustainability requirements, quantify usage and demand forecasts as part of project viability, and allocate risks to assure alignment of interests among the parties and to optimize risk management. Project sponsors should incorporate monetized analysis of ESG liabilities and analysis of environmental, technical, institutional, supply, and demand risks. Projects should demonstrate how they increase access to affordable, quality, and reliable services.

Projects should demonstrate an analytic thinking of financial structuring and evidence of comprehensive financial due diligence. The due diligence should include evaluating the creditworthiness of project participants, modeling operational net revenues against external dangers, and evaluating competitive, construction, termination, political, and macroeconomic risks, including as these relate to suppliers, clients, and challenges.

For environmental sustainability, including climate resilience: Projects to be financed should include life-cycle carbon assessment and a management plan for a net decrease of greenhouse gas discharges. Projects should assess climate change and disaster risks systematically. They should include a durability, flexibility, and recovery plan. Projects should include management plans for air pollution, for adverse impacts on human health and the environment, for adverse impacts from pollution and contamination, for accident prevention, and for environmental management—including pre-existing liabilities, soils, water resources, materials use, energy use, waste, and hazardous materials. (Zofnass Program for Sustainable Infrastructure of the Graduate School of Design Harvard University, 2012; International Finance Corporation, 2012; Véron-Okamoto and Sakamoto, 2014; Bhattacharya et al., 2016; Infrastructure Sustainability Council of Australia, 2017;)

For social sustainability: Infrastructure projects should include a comprehensive social impact management plan and document how benefits and compensations will be shared with project-affected communities and how they would be delivered, how grievances and social liabilities are managed, and how stakeholders will be engaged. Projects should include final local community agreements based on free, prior, and informed consent. They should avoid resettlement and displacement or include a resettlement and displacement management plan. They should include management plans to ensure the preservation or enhancement of public amenities, maintain urban connectivity, and avoid mobility disruptions.

Projects should ensure that services are fully accessible to disabled and disadvantaged users. They should include plans to manage impacts on community health and safety and to ensure compliance with healthy working conditions and occupational health and safety standards, adherence to human rights agreements, and gender inclusion. Projects should include agreements with local communities that protect community access to food, land, and water resources and that manage tangible and non-tangible cultural heritage and any potential impacts and risks to indigenous and traditional peoples from project activities. (Véron-Okamoto and Sakamoto, 2014; Bhattacharya et al., 2016; Infrastructure Sustainability Council of Australia, 2017; US Department of Transportation: Federal Highway Administration, 2017; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2017; International Finance Corporation, 2017.)

For institutional sustainability: Projects should have all relevant parliamentary, sectoral, environmental, social, and planning approvals and permits allowing development and construction work to commence. Risks emanating from potential changes in laws and regulations should be assessed and managed. Similarly, risks associated with the project and organizational structure with a focus on governance systems (executive and board) should be assessed and managed. Projects should have completed environmental and social assessments and management plans along with demonstrated human and financial resources to execute plans. They should establish and implement a comprehensive sustainable procurement program and should include commitments to anti-bribery and measures that promote integrity and increase transparency, including grievance redress mechanisms.

Projects should have mechanisms driving organizational collaboration, teamwork, knowledge sharing, and internal capacity building as well as improving local capacities and broadening understanding of the importance of sustainability. They should demonstrate integrated project delivery approaches and a comprehensive project procurement and technology management plan. Project contracts and subcontracts must be aligned with sustainability performance requirements through specific clauses and requirements. Projects should document the establishment of data collection and management systems and should demonstrate reporting and disclosure transparency and accountability on organizational and project sustainability. (SeeVéron-Okamoto and Sakamoto 2014)

Reference

Yuan, Fei, and Kevin P Gallagher. 2015. “Greening Development Finance in the Americas.

Watkins, Graham, Hendrik Meller, Sven Mueller, Maria Cecilia Ramirez, Tomas Serebrisky, and Andreas Georgoulias. 2017. Action Required: Lessons from Four Decades of Infrastructure Project Related Conflicts in Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank and Zofnass Program Harvard.

Véron-Okamoto, Adrien, and Ko Sakamoto. 2014. Toward a Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Transport. In ADB Sustainable Development Working Paper Series: Asian Development Bank.

Valenzuela, Sebastián, Sebastián Valenzuela, Nicolás M Somma, Nicolás M Somma, Andrés Scherman, Andrés Scherman, Arturo Arriagada, and Arturo Arriagada. 2016. “Social media in America: deepening or bridging gaps in protest participation?” Online Information Review 40 (5):695-711.

Serebrisky, Tomás. 2014. Sustainable Infrastructure for Competitiveness and Inclusive Growth. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Serebrisky, Tomás, Ancor Suárez-Alemán, Diego Margot, and Maria Cecilia Ramirez. 2015. Financing Infrastructure in Latin America and the Caribbean: How, How Much and by Whom? Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Serebrisky, Tomas, Ancor Suarez-Aleman, Cynthia

Pastor, and Andreas Wholhueter. 2017. Increasing the efficiency of public infrastructure delivery; Evidence-based potential efficiency gains in public infrastructure spending in Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington D.C.: IDB.

Reyer, Christopher P.O., Sophie Adams, Torsten Albrecht, Florent Baarsch, Alice Boit, Nella Canales Trujillo, Matti Cartsburg, Dim Coumou, Alexander Eden, Erick Fernandes, Fanny Langerwisch, Rachel Marcus, Matthias Mengel, Daniel Mira-Salama, Mahé Perrette, Paola Pereznieto, Anja Rammig, Julia Reinhardt, Alexander Robinson, Marcia Rocha, Boris Sakschewski, Michiel Schaeffer, Carl-Friedrich Schleussner, Olivia Serdeczny, and Kirsten Thonicke. 2017. "Climate change impacts in Latin America and the Caribbean and their implications for development." Regional Environmental Change 17 (6):1601-1621. doi: 10.1007/s10113-015-0854-6.

Pfeiffer, Alexander, Richard Millar, Cameron Hepburn, and Eric Beinhocker. 2016. "The '2 C capital stock' for electricity generation: Committed cumulative carbon emissions from the electricity generation sector and the transition to a green economy." Applied Energy 179:1395-1408.

Muller, Daniel B, Gang Liu, Amund N Løvik, Roja Modaresi, Stefan Pauliuk, Franciska S Steinhoff, and Helge Brattebø. 2013. "Carbon emissions of infrastructure development." Environmental Science & Technology 47 (20):11739-11746.

Munich NatCatService. 2017. Natural catastrophe review for the first half of 2017. Accessed 13th November 2017.

Hansen, James, Pushker Kharecha, Makiko Sato, Valerie Masson-Delmotte, Frank Ackerman, David J Beerling, Paul J Hearty, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Shi-Ling Hsu, and Camille Parmesan. 2013. "Assessing "dangerous climate change": required reduction of carbon emissions to protect young people, future generations and nature." PloS one 8 (12):e81648

Caldecott, Ben, Elizabeth Harnett, Theodor Cojoianu, Irem Kok, and Alexander Pfeiffer. 2016. Stranded Assets: A Climate Risk Challenge. Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Bonilla-Roth, Marcia E, and Isabelle Zapparoli. 2017. "The Challenge of Financing Urban Infrastructure for Sustainable Cities."

Bielenberg, Aaron, Mike Kerlin, Jeremy Oppenheim, and Melissa Roberts. 2016. Financing change: How to mobilize private-sector financing for sustainable infrastructure

Berensmann, Kathrin, Ulrich Volz, Isabella Alloisio, Celine Bak, Amar Bhattacharya, Gerd Leipold, Hannah Schindler, Lawrence MacDonald, Tian Huifang, and Qingqing Yang. 2017. Fostering sustainable global growth through green finance – what role for the G20. G20 Insights.

Bak, Céline, Amar Bhattacharya, Ottmar Edenhofer, and Brigitte Knopf. 2017. Towards a comprehensive approach to climate policy, sustainable infrastructure, and finance. In Economics Discussion Papers, No. 2017-41: Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW).

Albala-Bertrand, José, and Emmanuel Mamatzakis. 2004. "The Impact of Public Infrastructure on the Productivity of the Chilean Economy." Review of Development Economics 8 (2): 266– 78.

Briceño-Garmendia, Cecilia, Antonio Estache, and Nemat Shafik. 2004. "Infrastructure Services in Developing Countries: Access, Quality, Costs, and Policy Reform." Policy Research Working Paper 3468. The World Bank, Washington, DC.

Briceño-Garmendia, Cecilia, Karlis Smits, and Vivien Foster. 2008. "Financing Public Infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa: Patterns and Emerging Issues", Background Paper No 15.

Africa Infrastructure Country Diagnostics www.infrastructureafrica.org.

Romp, Ward, and Jakob de Haan. 2005. "Public Capital and Economic Growth: A Critical Survey." EIB Papers 2/2005. European Investment Bank, Luxemburg.