The Economic Impact of Persistent Infrastructure Identity – By UMIP Inc.

A Financial Model for Lifecycle Efficiency in the Built Environment

The $300 Billion Infrastructure Identity Problem

March 3, 2026

A new economic impact by UMIP inc., model suggests that fragmented infrastructure records and the absence of a persistent identity system may be contributing to more than $300 billion in annual lifecycle inefficiencies across the global built environment.

Unlike vehicles or aircraft, which rely on standardized identity systems such as VIN numbers or aircraft registration numbers, buildings and infrastructure assets have never had a persistent identity framework capable of maintaining documentation continuity across ownership changes, operational transitions, and technology systems.

As infrastructure assets move through developers, contractors, insurers, lenders, operators, and owners across their lifecycle, documentation is frequently fragmented across organizations and software platforms.

This report explores the economic implications of that fragmentation and introduces the emerging concept **of** Persistent Infrastructure Identity as a potential foundational layer for the digital built environment.

Key Insight

Fragmented infrastructure identity may contribute to more than
$300 Billion annually in global lifecycle inefficiencies.

Prepared by: Trevor Vick

Founder & Architect of Persistent Infrastructure Identity | UMIP Inc.

Date: March 3, 2026

Important Disclaimer

This paper introduces the concept of Persistent Infrastructure Identity and examines the economic impact of identity continuity within the built environment.

This report presents an economic impact model evaluating the potential lifecycle financial effects of persistent infrastructure identity within the built environment.

The analysis is based on publicly available industry benchmarks, financial modeling assumptions, and scenario-based projections intended to illustrate potential economic impacts of infrastructure identity continuity.

This report does not represent a survey, audit, or independent third-party study, and the figures presented should be interpreted as illustrative economic modeling rather than definitive financial outcomes.

Actual results may vary depending on project characteristics, asset class, geographic conditions, operational practices, and implementation environments.

Future UMIP pilot implementations and industry partnerships may refine these assumptions with empirical data.

Executive Summary

Infrastructure assets represent one of the largest categories of economic value in the global economy. Buildings, transportation networks, utilities, and industrial facilities collectively represent hundreds of trillions of dollars in global asset value.

Despite their economic importance, infrastructure assets lack a persistent identity system capable of maintaining continuity of documentation, lifecycle records, and asset verification across ownership transitions and software environments.

Instead, infrastructure documentation is typically fragmented across multiple stakeholders including contractors, owners, facility operators, insurers, and financial institutions.

This fragmentation frequently results in:

• missing or incomplete documentation
• inefficient lifecycle maintenance planning
• increased insurance claims investigation complexity
• transaction due diligence delays
• reconstruction of asset records following ownership changes

These inefficiencies introduce financial friction across the infrastructure lifecycle, increasing operational costs and reducing transparency across the built environment.

This report evaluates the potential economic impact of introducing persistent infrastructure identity, a framework designed to enable infrastructure assets to maintain a continuous verifiable identity and documentation history across their lifecycle.

The economic model presented in this report examines the potential financial differences between:

Scenario A: Infrastructure assets operating within the current fragmented documentation environment

Scenario B: Infrastructure assets operating with persistent identity and lifecycle documentation continuity

The model evaluates lifecycle cost drivers including:

• construction rework
• documentation reconstruction
• insurance claims investigation friction
• maintenance inefficiencies
• transaction due diligence delays

Using conservative assumptions based on industry benchmarks, the model indicates that persistent infrastructure identity could reduce lifecycle asset friction costs by approximately **15–25% over a 10-year period**.

For a representative **$75 million commercial building**, this model suggests potential lifecycle efficiency improvements of approximately **$1.7 million over ten years**.

When scaled across the broader construction and infrastructure industry, fragmented infrastructure identity may contribute to tens of billions of dollars in annual economic inefficiency within the United States, and potentially hundreds of billions globally.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks such as UMIP are designed to introduce a neutral identity layer for infrastructure assets, enabling lifecycle continuity independent of ownership or software platforms.

Such identity frameworks could support improved transparency across construction, insurance, asset management, and infrastructure finance ecosystems.

The $300 Billion Infrastructure Identity Problem

Infrastructure assets represent one of the largest concentrations of economic value in the global economy. Buildings, transportation systems, utilities, and industrial facilities collectively represent hundreds of trillions of dollars in asset value worldwide.

Despite this scale, the built environment has historically lacked a persistent identity system capable of maintaining asset documentation continuity across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Unlike vehicles or aircraft, which rely on standardized identity systems such as Vehicle Identification Numbers (VIN) or aircraft registration numbers, buildings and infrastructure assets do not possess a persistent identity framework that remains associated with the asset across ownership changes, operational transitions, and software environments.

As a result, infrastructure documentation frequently becomes fragmented across the lifecycle of an asset.

Infrastructure assets may pass through dozens of stakeholders over time, including:

• developers
• architects and engineers
• contractors and subcontractors
• insurers and risk managers
• lenders and investors
• asset owners
• facility operators

Each participant often maintains independent records within separate documentation systems. When assets transition between stakeholders or ownership groups, documentation may become incomplete, inconsistent, or difficult to verify.

This fragmentation can introduce operational inefficiencies across multiple lifecycle phases including construction delivery, facility maintenance, insurance evaluation, and infrastructure financing.

Industry Scale of the Problem

The economic modeling presented in this report suggests that fragmented infrastructure documentation may contribute to significant lifecycle inefficiencies within the built environment.

Based on conservative modeling assumptions, fragmented infrastructure identity may be associated with more than:

$20 billion in annual lifecycle inefficiencies within the United States

and potentially over:

$300 billion annually across the global built environment.

These inefficiencies may arise from several factors including:

- construction rework resulting from incomplete information
- reconstruction of asset documentation following ownership transfer
- extended insurance claims investigation timelines
- maintenance inefficiencies caused by incomplete asset records
- increased transaction due diligence costs

While individual projects may experience varying degrees of impact, the cumulative effect across global infrastructure systems may be substantial.

The Missing Identity Layer in Infrastructure

Many industries rely on persistent identity systems that enable lifecycle transparency across multiple stakeholders.

Examples include:

Industry	Identity Framework
Automotive	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
Aviation	Aircraft Registration Numbers
Finance	ISIN and SWIFT identifiers
Internet	IP and MAC addressing systems

These identity systems allow organizations across entire ecosystems to coordinate around a shared reference identity.

The built environment has historically lacked a comparable identity framework for infrastructure assets.

As infrastructure systems become increasingly digitized, the absence of a persistent infrastructure identity layer becomes more visible.

Emerging Concept: Persistent Infrastructure Identity

Persistent infrastructure identity refers to a framework in which infrastructure assets receive a unique identifier that remains associated with the asset across its lifecycle.

Within such a framework, infrastructure documentation, including engineering records, inspections, maintenance history, and insurance information, may be anchored to a persistent asset identity.

This approach may enable infrastructure assets to maintain a continuous and verifiable documentation history regardless of ownership transitions or software platform changes.

Persistent infrastructure identity may therefore represent an emerging foundational layer for the digital infrastructure ecosystem.

Founder Perspective

"Infrastructure assets represent hundreds of trillions of dollars in global value, yet the built environment has never had a persistent identity framework comparable to VIN numbers in the automotive industry," said Trevor Vick, Founder and Architect of Persistent Infrastructure Identity at UMIP Inc.

"As infrastructure systems continue to digitize, introducing a persistent identity layer may help improve lifecycle transparency, reduce documentation fragmentation, and enable better coordination across the infrastructure ecosystem."

Category Implication

Persistent infrastructure identity introduces a new concept within the built environment: an identity infrastructure layer designed to support lifecycle documentation continuity for infrastructure assets.

Rather than replacing existing software platforms used across construction, operations, and asset management, such frameworks may provide a shared reference identity that enables multiple systems to coordinate around the same underlying infrastructure asset.

If adopted broadly, persistent infrastructure identity may serve as a foundational digital layer supporting the next generation of infrastructure lifecycle management systems.

1. The Fragmentation Problem in Infrastructure Data

Infrastructure assets pass through numerous stakeholders throughout their lifecycle, including developers, contractors, engineers, inspectors, insurers, lenders, owners, and facility operators.

Each participant typically maintains independent records, often stored in separate systems or documentation environments.

Common record types include:

• construction drawings
• inspection reports
• engineering documentation
• equipment records
• warranties and maintenance documentation
• insurance claims records
• regulatory compliance documentation

Because these records are not anchored to a persistent identity layer, documentation frequently becomes fragmented across organizations and software systems.

Ownership transitions represent a particularly significant source of fragmentation.

When assets are sold or transferred, documentation is often incomplete, inconsistent, or stored across multiple systems that are not easily transferable.

As a result, new owners frequently undertake document reconstruction efforts involving engineering review, legal verification, and facility inspection to rebuild asset history.

This fragmentation introduces inefficiencies across the infrastructure lifecycle.

2. Lifecycle Financial Friction in the Built Environment

Fragmented infrastructure documentation contributes to financial friction across several lifecycle categories.

These categories are widely recognized across construction, facilities management, insurance, and infrastructure finance sectors.

Construction Rework

Construction rework occurs when work must be repeated due to incorrect information, coordination failures, or missing documentation.

Industry research suggests rework commonly represents **5–9% of project cost**.

Improved documentation continuity and traceability can help reduce these occurrences.

Documentation Reconstruction

Infrastructure documentation frequently becomes fragmented following project completion or ownership transfer.

Organizations may incur costs associated with:

• locating historical records
• engineering verification
• legal documentation review
• rebuilding asset records

These activities can create delays and additional costs during transactions and operational transitions.

Insurance Claims Investigation

Insurance claims involving infrastructure assets frequently require investigation into asset conditions, maintenance history, and construction details.

Incomplete documentation can increase:

• investigation time
• dispute resolution complexity
• legal involvement

Improved lifecycle documentation continuity may support more efficient claims evaluation.

Maintenance Inefficiency

Facility management teams often lack complete documentation of equipment installations, maintenance records, and warranty coverage.

Incomplete information can lead to:

• inefficient maintenance scheduling
• unnecessary equipment replacement
• increased lifecycle operating costs

Transaction Due Diligence

During infrastructure transactions or refinancing events, buyers and lenders must evaluate asset documentation.

Incomplete records can lead to:

• extended due diligence timelines
• additional inspections
• increased legal and engineering review costs

Persistent identity frameworks may support more efficient verification of asset history.

3. Economic Model: Infrastructure With and Without Persistent Identity

To evaluate the potential economic impact of persistent infrastructure identity, this report models lifecycle financial outcomes for a representative commercial infrastructure asset.

The model compares lifecycle cost drivers across two scenarios:

Scenario A — Fragmented Infrastructure Documentation Environment

Infrastructure assets operate under current industry conditions where documentation is distributed across multiple stakeholders and software systems without a persistent identity framework.

Scenario B — Persistent Infrastructure Identity Environment

Infrastructure assets operate with a persistent identity framework that enables lifecycle documentation continuity, cross-platform traceability, and ownership-independent record preservation.

The model focuses on lifecycle financial friction associated with documentation fragmentation and data discontinuity.

Representative Infrastructure Asset

For modeling purposes, the analysis uses a representative commercial building.

Metric	Value
Asset Type	Commercial Building
Construction Value	$75,000,000
Building Size	250,000 sq ft
Modeled Lifecycle Period	10 Years

This asset size reflects a typical commercial development project and allows the economic model to illustrate lifecycle impacts in a realistic industry context.

Key Lifecycle Cost Drivers Modeled

The analysis focuses on five categories of lifecycle financial friction commonly associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation.

Construction Rework

Construction rework may occur when incorrect or incomplete information leads to repeated work or coordination failures.

Industry research indicates that construction rework may represent **5–9% of total project cost** depending on project complexity and documentation quality.

Documentation Reconstruction

Following project completion or ownership transfer, organizations often incur costs associated with reconstructing asset documentation, including engineering verification, document recovery, and legal review.

Insurance Claims Investigation

Insurance claims involving infrastructure assets frequently require detailed analysis of asset condition, maintenance history, and construction documentation.

Incomplete records may increase claims investigation time and dispute resolution complexity.

Maintenance Inefficiency

Incomplete lifecycle documentation may increase facility maintenance costs by reducing visibility into equipment history, warranty coverage, and maintenance schedules.

Transaction Due Diligence

During infrastructure sale or refinancing events, buyers and lenders must evaluate asset documentation and operational history.

Incomplete records may increase transaction timelines and due diligence costs.

Baseline Lifecycle Cost Model (Without Persistent Identity)

The following table estimates lifecycle financial friction under current industry conditions.

Cost Category	Estimated Lifecycle Cost
Construction Rework	$3,750,000
Documentation Reconstruction	$375,000
Insurance Claims Investigation Friction	$1,500,000
Maintenance Inefficiency	$2,250,000
Transaction Due Diligence	$600,000

Total Estimated Lifecycle Friction Cost (10 Years)

$8,475,000

These costs represent estimated financial inefficiencies resulting from fragmented infrastructure documentation and identity discontinuity.

Lifecycle Cost Model (With Persistent Infrastructure Identity)

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may improve documentation continuity, traceability, and lifecycle transparency.

For modeling purposes, conservative efficiency improvements are applied to each lifecycle cost category.

Cost Category	Estimated Reduction	Revised Cost
Construction Rework	15%	$3,187,500
Documentation Reconstruction	70%	$112,500
Insurance Claims Investigation	30%	$1,050,000
Maintenance Inefficiency	10%	$2,025,000
Transaction Due Diligence	40%	$360,000

Total Lifecycle Friction Cost With Persistent Identity

$6,735,000

Lifecycle Financial Comparison

Scenario	Total Lifecycle Friction Cost
Fragmented Infrastructure Documentation	$8,475,000
Persistent Infrastructure Identity	$6,735,000

Estimated Lifecycle Efficiency Improvement

$1,740,000 per asset over a 10-year period

This represents approximately:

20.5% reduction in lifecycle friction costs

Portfolio Scale Impact

Large infrastructure owners frequently operate portfolios consisting of multiple buildings or infrastructure assets.

Applying the model across larger asset portfolios demonstrates the potential scale of lifecycle efficiency improvements.

Portfolio Size	Estimated 10-Year Efficiency Improvement
10 assets	$17,400,000
50 assets	$87,000,000
100 assets	$174,000,000
500 assets	$870,000,000

Persistent infrastructure identity may therefore introduce meaningful operational efficiencies across large asset portfolios.

Key Insight

Lifecycle inefficiencies associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation can accumulate significantly across infrastructure portfolios.

Persistent identity frameworks may reduce these inefficiencies by enabling infrastructure assets to maintain **continuous, verifiable lifecycle documentation independent of ownership or software platforms.**

Transition to Next Section

While the previous section modeled lifecycle financial impacts at the individual asset level, the following section evaluates how documentation fragmentation may scale across the broader construction and infrastructure industry.

The next section examines:

Industry Scale Economic Impact in the United States

and evaluates how lifecycle financial friction may affect the broader built environment.

4. U.S. Infrastructure Industry Impact

The lifecycle financial model presented in the previous section illustrates the potential impact of persistent infrastructure identity at the individual asset level. However, the broader significance of documentation fragmentation becomes more apparent when evaluated across the full scale of the U.S. construction and infrastructure industry.

The United States built environment represents one of the largest concentrations of physical asset value in the world, including commercial buildings, institutional facilities, transportation infrastructure, and industrial assets.

U.S. Construction Market Overview

Recent industry analysts estimate the following annual activity within the U.S. construction sector.

Metric	Estimated Value
Total U.S. construction spending annually	~$2.0 trillion
Commercial and institutional construction	~$1.1 trillion
Major new infrastructure assets annually	~10,000–20,000 projects

For modeling purposes, this report evaluates a conservative subset of 10,000 major infrastructure assets constructed annually, using an average project value consistent with the representative building modeled earlier.

Modeled Industry Asset Value

Metric	Value
Average asset value	$75 million
Assets created annually	10,000
Total new infrastructure value	**$750 billion annually**

This simplified model represents a conservative portion of the broader infrastructure economy.

Lifecycle Documentation Friction Across the Industry

Industry research consistently indicates that fragmented documentation, data discontinuity, and coordination inefficiencies contribute to lifecycle economic friction.

Across infrastructure assets, lifecycle inefficiencies are often estimated to range between:

3–7% of asset value

These inefficiencies arise from factors such as:

- construction rework
- missing or fragmented documentation
- maintenance inefficiencies
- insurance claims investigation complexity
- transaction due diligence delays

To maintain a conservative modeling approach, this report assumes:

3% lifecycle friction

Estimated Annual Economic Friction

Applying the conservative lifecycle friction estimate to the modeled infrastructure asset value produces the following estimate.

Metric	Value
Modeled infrastructure value	$750 billion
Lifecycle friction estimate	3%

Estimated Annual Economic Friction

$22.5 billion annually

This figure represents an estimate of lifecycle economic inefficiencies attributable to fragmented infrastructure documentation and identity discontinuity.

Potential Impact of Persistent Infrastructure Identity

The lifecycle model in Section 3 indicated that persistent infrastructure identity may reduce lifecycle friction costs by approximately **20%**.

Applying that reduction across the modeled infrastructure sector produces the following estimate.

Metric	Value
Estimated annual friction	$22.5 billion
Potential reduction.	20%

Estimated Annual Recoverable Value

$4.5 billion annually

This value represents the potential efficiency improvement if persistent infrastructure identity frameworks were broadly implemented across newly constructed infrastructure assets.

Long-Term Impact

Infrastructure assets typically operate across multi-decade lifecycles. Evaluating efficiency improvements over a longer horizon illustrates the cumulative potential impact.

Time Horizon	Potential Efficiency Improvement
5 years	$22.5 billion
10 years	$45 billion

These estimates reflect the potential cumulative value associated with improved lifecycle transparency and documentation continuity.

Impact Across Infrastructure Owners

Institutional asset owners frequently manage large infrastructure portfolios. Applying the lifecycle model to portfolio-scale ownership demonstrates how documentation continuity may influence operational efficiency.

Portfolio Size	Estimated 10-Year Efficiency Improvement
50 assets	$87 million
100 assets	$174 million
500 assets	$870 million

For institutional asset owners, improved lifecycle transparency may therefore represent meaningful long-term operational efficiencies.

Implications for Insurance and Capital Markets

Infrastructure documentation continuity may also influence adjacent sectors including insurance underwriting and infrastructure finance.

Insurance carriers frequently rely on asset documentation when evaluating:

• construction claims
• property damage events
• liability exposure

Incomplete records may increase claims investigation time and dispute complexity.

Similarly, lenders and investors evaluating infrastructure assets often require detailed asset documentation during financing or refinancing transactions.

Persistent identity frameworks may support improved documentation continuity across these processes.

Key Insight

Fragmented infrastructure documentation does not only affect individual projects; it introduces measurable economic friction across the broader infrastructure ecosystem.

Based on conservative modeling assumptions, fragmented infrastructure identity may contribute to more than:

$20 billion annually in economic inefficiency within the United States built environment.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks could reduce a portion of these inefficiencies by enabling infrastructure assets to maintain a **continuous and verifiable identity throughout their lifecycle.**

Transition to Next Section

While the previous section examined economic impacts within the United States, the fragmentation challenges affecting infrastructure identity are not limited to a single country.

The next section evaluates how documentation fragmentation scales across the **global infrastructure economy** and explores the potential impact of persistent infrastructure identity at a worldwide level.

Next Section

5. Global Infrastructure Economic Impact

While the previous section evaluated economic inefficiencies associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation within the United States, the underlying challenges of infrastructure identity fragmentation are present across the global built environment.

Infrastructure systems worldwide rely on complex networks of stakeholders, including developers, contractors, operators, insurers, regulators, and capital providers. Each participant often maintains independent records of infrastructure assets, frequently stored across different documentation systems and software platforms.

As infrastructure assets move through their lifecycle—from construction to operation, maintenance, refinancing, and eventual redevelopment—documentation continuity may become increasingly fragmented.

The absence of a persistent infrastructure identity layer capable of maintaining lifecycle documentation continuity represents a systemic challenge affecting infrastructure ecosystems globally.

Global Construction and Infrastructure Market Overview

Global infrastructure development represents one of the largest sectors of economic activity worldwide.

Estimates from global infrastructure research organizations indicate the following approximate annual activity.

Metric	Estimated Value
Global construction spending annually	$13–14 trillion
Global infrastructure asset value	$300+ trillion
New infrastructure created annually	$10–12 trillion

These figures include commercial buildings, industrial facilities, public infrastructure, utilities, and transportation systems.

Documentation Fragmentation in the Global Built Environment

Across global infrastructure markets, asset documentation is commonly distributed across multiple entities, including:

• engineering firms
• contractors and subcontractors
• facility operators
• asset owners
• insurers
• lenders and investors
• regulatory agencies

Each organization may maintain its own documentation environment, resulting in fragmented asset records.

When infrastructure assets change ownership or operational control, documentation transfer may be incomplete or inconsistent.

This fragmentation can introduce inefficiencies across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Global Lifecycle Economic Friction

Research across construction, asset management, and facilities operations sectors indicates that lifecycle inefficiencies associated with documentation fragmentation may range between:

3–7% of infrastructure asset value

These inefficiencies can arise from several sources, including:

• construction rework
• incomplete documentation transfer
• maintenance inefficiencies

• insurance claims investigation complexity
• transaction due diligence delays

To maintain a conservative modeling approach, this analysis applies a **3% lifecycle friction estimate**.

Estimated Global Economic Friction

Using a conservative estimate of **$12** trillion in new infrastructure created annually, lifecycle economic friction may be approximated as follows.

Metric	Value
Global infrastructure creation	$12 trillion
Lifecycle friction estimate	3%

Estimated Annual Global Economic Friction

$360 billion annually

This figure represents a simplified estimate of economic inefficiencies associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation and identity discontinuity across global infrastructure assets.

Potential Impact of Persistent Infrastructure Identity

The lifecycle model presented earlier suggested that persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may reduce lifecycle friction costs by approximately **20%**.

Applying this conservative reduction across the estimated global friction produces the following estimate.

Metric	Value
Estimated global friction	$360 billion
Potential reduction	20%

Estimated Global Efficiency Opportunity

$72 billion annually

This estimate reflects the potential value that could be recovered through improved lifecycle documentation continuity, infrastructure transparency, and reduced operational inefficiencies.

Long-Term Global Impact

Infrastructure assets typically operate across multi-decade lifecycles.

Evaluating the efficiency opportunity across a longer time horizon illustrates the cumulative potential value associated with improved infrastructure identity continuity.

Time Horizon	Potential Efficiency Opportunity
5 years	$360 billion
10 years	$720 billion

These estimates highlight the potential scale of lifecycle economic efficiencies associated with improved infrastructure identity frameworks.

Infrastructure Identity as a Global Platform Layer

If persistent infrastructure identity were implemented broadly, the identity framework could function as a foundational data layer supporting multiple infrastructure ecosystems, including:

• construction project delivery
• infrastructure insurance underwriting
• asset lifecycle management
• infrastructure financing and refinancing
• digital twin environments
• regulatory infrastructure oversight

Such a framework could enable infrastructure assets to maintain a continuous and verifiable identity across their lifecycle, independent of ownership or software platforms.

Comparable Identity Systems in Other Industries

Several major industries rely on persistent identity systems to enable lifecycle transparency and operational coordination.

Industry	Identity Standard
Automotive	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
Aviation	Aircraft Registration Number
Finance	ISIN / SWIFT
Internet	IP / MAC Address

These identity systems support lifecycle traceability, regulatory oversight, insurance verification, and asset transfer.

Infrastructure assets currently lack a comparable globally recognized identity framework.

Key Insight

The absence of persistent infrastructure identity represents a structural gap within the global infrastructure ecosystem.

Based on conservative modeling assumptions, fragmented infrastructure identity may contribute to more than:

$300 billion annually in global lifecycle economic inefficiency.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks could potentially recover a portion of this value by enabling infrastructure assets to maintain continuous, verifiable lifecycle documentation.

Transition to Next Section

While the previous sections examined the economic impact of fragmented infrastructure identity, an important question remains:

Why has persistent infrastructure identity not existed historically within the built environment?

The following section explores the structural factors that have historically prevented the development of an infrastructure identity framework and why recent technological developments may now enable its emergence.

Next Section

6. Why Persistent Infrastructure Identity Has Not Existed

Despite the significant economic value represented by infrastructure assets, the built environment has historically lacked a persistent identity system capable of maintaining lifecycle documentation continuity across ownership changes, operational transitions, and software environments.

The absence of such a system is not the result of limited demand for lifecycle transparency. Rather, it reflects several structural characteristics of the infrastructure industry that have historically prevented the development of a neutral identity layer.

Fragmented Stakeholder Ecosystems

Infrastructure assets pass through numerous stakeholders during their lifecycle.

These stakeholders commonly include:

• developers
• architects and engineers
• general contractors
• subcontractors
• inspectors and regulators
• insurers
• lenders and investors
• asset owners
• facility operators

Each participant typically maintains documentation within their own systems and organizational processes.

Because no neutral identity framework has historically existed to anchor these records, infrastructure documentation frequently becomes fragmented as assets transition between stakeholders.

Software-Centric Data Silos

Over the past two decades, the infrastructure industry has adopted a wide range of software platforms to manage project delivery and asset operations.

Common categories include:

• building information modeling (BIM) systems
• project management platforms
• document management systems
• facility management platforms
• asset lifecycle software

While these platforms provide valuable functionality, they are typically designed to support specific workflows or organizations rather than persistent asset identity.

As a result, asset data is often tied to individual software environments. When organizations change software systems or assets transfer between owners, documentation continuity may be disrupted.

Persistent infrastructure identity requires a neutral registry layer capable of existing independently from individual software platforms, a capability that historically has not been available.

Absence of a Universal Infrastructure Identifier

Many major industries rely on standardized identity systems to enable lifecycle traceability and coordination across multiple stakeholders.

Examples include:

Industry	Identity Framework
Automotive	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
Aviation	Aircraft Registration Number
Finance	ISIN and SWIFT identifiers
Telecommunications	IP and MAC address systems

These identity systems provide a shared reference point that allows multiple organizations to coordinate around a common asset identity.

The built environment has historically lacked an equivalent identity framework for infrastructure assets.

Without a persistent identifier, documentation continuity becomes difficult to maintain across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Lifecycle Focus on Project Delivery

Historically, innovation within the construction industry has focused heavily on improving project delivery efficiency.

Examples include:

• construction scheduling optimization
• building information modeling
• digital collaboration platforms
• supply chain coordination

While these technologies have improved project delivery workflows, less attention has historically been given to long-term infrastructure identity continuity after project completion.

As a result, infrastructure documentation frequently becomes fragmented after construction concludes and operational responsibility transfers to asset owners or operators.

Technological Limitations of Earlier Systems

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks require capabilities that have only recently become widely accessible through modern digital infrastructure.

These capabilities include:

• cloud-scale registry systems
• deterministic identifier generation
• append-only data architecture
• cross-platform API connectivity
• distributed identity verification

Historically, the infrastructure industry lacked the scalable digital architecture required to support a global infrastructure identity registry.

Recent advances in cloud computing and distributed system design have made such frameworks more feasible.

The Structural Gap in Infrastructure Data

These industry characteristics have collectively created a structural gap in the built environment:

Infrastructure assets have historically lacked a neutral identity layer capable of preserving lifecycle documentation continuity across ownership transitions and technology systems.

As infrastructure systems become increasingly digitized, the absence of such a framework becomes more visible and economically significant.

The Opportunity for Persistent Infrastructure Identity

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks are designed to address this structural gap by introducing a neutral identity layer that allows infrastructure assets to maintain a **continuous, verifiable identity across their lifecycle**.

Such frameworks could enable improved lifecycle coordination across stakeholders including construction firms, facility operators, insurers, lenders, and regulators.

Key Insight

The absence of persistent infrastructure identity has not been due to lack of demand or economic value.

Rather, it reflects the historical fragmentation of the infrastructure ecosystem and the absence of a neutral identity infrastructure layer capable of supporting lifecycle documentation continuity.

Recent technological developments now make the creation of such a layer possible.

Transition to Next Section

The previous sections explored the economic impact of fragmented infrastructure identity and the structural factors that have historically prevented the development of a persistent identity system.

The following section introduces the **UMIP framework** and examines how persistent infrastructure identity could function as a foundational layer supporting infrastructure lifecycle transparency.

Next Section

7. The UMIP Framework

The preceding sections of this report examined the economic and operational challenges associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation and the absence of a persistent identity framework within the built environment.

Persistent infrastructure identity systems aim to address these challenges by introducing a **neutral identity layer for infrastructure assets**, enabling documentation continuity and lifecycle transparency across stakeholders, ownership changes, and software environments.

The **Unified Modular Infrastructure Platform (UMIP)** is one example of a framework designed to support persistent infrastructure identity within the built environment.

UMIP is intended to function as a registry and lifecycle data coordination layer capable of assigning and maintaining unique infrastructure identifiers for physical assets.

Core Concept: Persistent Infrastructure Identity

Persistent infrastructure identity refers to the ability of a physical infrastructure asset to maintain a **continuous, verifiable identity throughout its lifecycle**, independent of ownership, operational responsibility, or software systems.

Within a persistent identity framework, infrastructure assets receive a unique identifier that remains associated with the asset across its lifecycle stages.

Lifecycle stages may include:

• design and construction
• inspection and commissioning
• operational maintenance
• ownership transfer
• financing and refinancing
• renovation or redevelopment

By anchoring lifecycle documentation to a persistent identifier, infrastructure records can maintain continuity even as the asset moves between organizations or software environments.

Key Components of the UMIP Framework

The UMIP framework is designed around several foundational components intended to support persistent infrastructure identity.

Persistent Infrastructure Identifier

Infrastructure assets receive a unique identifier designed to remain associated with the asset throughout its lifecycle.

This identifier functions as the anchor for documentation, lifecycle events, and asset verification

Registry Layer

A registry layer maintains the relationship between the persistent identifier and associated lifecycle documentation.

This registry is intended to function independently of individual software platforms, enabling multiple stakeholders to reference the same asset identity.

Lifecycle Documentation Continuity

Infrastructure documentation may include records such as:

• engineering documentation
• inspection reports
• asset installation records
• maintenance documentation
• warranty information
• insurance claims records

Within a persistent identity framework, these records may be associated with the infrastructure identifier to maintain a continuous documentation history.

Ownership-Independent Identity

Infrastructure assets frequently change ownership over their lifecycle.

Persistent identity frameworks are designed so that the asset identifier remains consistent regardless of ownership changes, enabling continuity of documentation across asset transfers.

Cross-System Integration

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may enable integration with a variety of infrastructure software systems, including:

• building information modeling platforms
• project management systems
• facility management platforms
• digital twin environments
• insurance and underwriting systems

Through integration interfaces, these systems may reference the same underlying infrastructure identity.

Potential Ecosystem Applications

Persistent infrastructure identity may support improved coordination across several infrastructure ecosystem participants.

These may include:

Construction Stakeholders

Persistent identifiers may improve documentation continuity between project delivery and operational handover.

Infrastructure Owners and Operators

Facility managers may benefit from improved access to lifecycle documentation associated with equipment and infrastructure systems.

Insurance and Risk Management

Persistent infrastructure identity may support improved access to asset documentation during insurance underwriting and claims evaluation processes.

Infrastructure Finance

Lenders and investors evaluating infrastructure assets may benefit from improved lifecycle documentation transparency during financing and refinancing events.

Digital Infrastructure Platforms

Digital twin platforms and asset analytics systems may use persistent identifiers as a reference layer for infrastructure data integration.

Infrastructure Identity as a Foundational Layer

Persistent infrastructure identity may function as a foundational layer within the digital infrastructure ecosystem.

Rather than replacing existing software platforms, identity frameworks may enable coordination across platforms by providing a **shared reference identity for infrastructure assets**.

This model is conceptually similar to identity frameworks used in other industries, where multiple systems coordinate around a shared identity standard.

Key Insight

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks introduce a potential mechanism for enabling long-term documentation continuity and lifecycle transparency across infrastructure assets.

Such frameworks may support improved coordination across the diverse stakeholders that participate in infrastructure development, operation, financing, and risk management.

Transition to Next Section

The previous sections introduced the concept of persistent infrastructure identity and the UMIP framework as an example of how such a system may function.

The following section explores how infrastructure identity frameworks could support the broader **digital transformation of the built environment**, including digital twins, infrastructure analytics, insurance modernization, and infrastructure finance.

Next Section

8. The Future Infrastructure Identity Layer

Infrastructure systems are undergoing a period of rapid digital transformation. Advances in data analytics, digital twins, artificial intelligence, and infrastructure lifecycle management platforms are reshaping how physical assets are designed, constructed, and operated.

Despite these advances, many digital infrastructure initiatives continue to face a common challenge: **fragmented infrastructure identity and documentation.**

Without a persistent identity layer, digital systems often struggle to maintain continuity of asset data across multiple lifecycle stages, software environments, and organizational stakeholders.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may serve as a foundational layer enabling these digital systems to coordinate around a shared asset identity.

Infrastructure Data Interoperability

Modern infrastructure ecosystems increasingly rely on multiple digital platforms.

Examples include:

• building information modeling systems
• construction project management platforms
• facility management software
• asset monitoring systems
• digital twin environments
• insurance and underwriting platforms

These platforms frequently operate independently and may maintain separate representations of infrastructure assets.

Persistent identity frameworks may enable these systems to reference a common infrastructure identifier, improving data interoperability across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Digital Twin Ecosystems

Digital twins represent one of the fastest growing areas of infrastructure technology.

Digital twins create dynamic digital representations of physical infrastructure assets that can be used to simulate performance, monitor operations, and support maintenance planning.

However, digital twin systems often rely on multiple data sources originating from construction records, facility management systems, sensor networks, and operational databases.

Persistent infrastructure identity may provide a stable reference layer enabling digital twin systems to associate these diverse data sources with a single infrastructure asset.

Infrastructure Lifecycle Analytics

As infrastructure systems become more digitized, organizations increasingly seek to analyze lifecycle data in order to improve operational efficiency.

Lifecycle analytics may include:

• predictive maintenance analysis
• asset performance benchmarking
• infrastructure risk modeling
• lifecycle cost forecasting

Persistent identity frameworks may support lifecycle analytics by enabling infrastructure data from multiple sources to be associated with a consistent asset identity.

Insurance and Risk Management Modernization

Infrastructure insurance markets frequently rely on documentation related to construction quality, maintenance history, and asset condition.

Incomplete or fragmented records may increase uncertainty during underwriting and claims evaluation processes.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may enable improved documentation continuity, potentially supporting more efficient evaluation of infrastructure risk.

This capability may become increasingly relevant as insurers explore digital data sources to improve underwriting models.

Infrastructure Finance and Capital Markets

Infrastructure financing often requires detailed evaluation of asset documentation, operational performance, and maintenance history.

Incomplete documentation can increase due diligence complexity during financing or refinancing transactions.

Persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may support improved lifecycle documentation continuity, potentially enabling more efficient evaluation of infrastructure assets by lenders and investors.

Infrastructure Identity as Foundational Digital Infrastructure

Across multiple industries, persistent identity frameworks have enabled digital ecosystems to coordinate around shared reference systems.

Examples include:

Industry	Identity Infrastructure
Automotive	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
Aviation	Aircraft registration systems
Finance	SWIFT and ISIN identifiers
Internet	IP and MAC addressing systems

These identity frameworks provide foundational infrastructure enabling coordination across large digital ecosystems.

Persistent infrastructure identity may play a similar role within the built environment.

The Emergence of Infrastructure Identity Infrastructure

As digital infrastructure systems continue to evolve, the need for a persistent identity layer may become increasingly important.

Such a layer could enable infrastructure assets to maintain a **continuous, verifiable identity throughout their lifecycle**, allowing multiple stakeholders and digital platforms to coordinate around a shared reference identity.

Persistent infrastructure identity may therefore represent a foundational component supporting the continued digital transformation of the built environment.

Key Insight

Infrastructure digitization initiatives often focus on improving individual workflows or software systems.

Persistent infrastructure identity addresses a different challenge: establishing a **shared identity layer capable of maintaining asset continuity across the entire infrastructure lifecycle.**

Transition to Final Section

The preceding sections have examined the economic impact of fragmented infrastructure identity, the structural challenges that have historically prevented the development of identity frameworks, and the potential role of persistent identity in the future infrastructure ecosystem.

The final section of this report outlines the **methodology and modeling assumptions** used to develop the economic impact estimates presented in this study.

Next Section

9. Methodology and Modeling Assumptions

This report presents an economic model intended to illustrate the potential financial impact of persistent infrastructure identity on lifecycle efficiency within the built environment.

The analysis is based on publicly available industry benchmarks, conservative modeling assumptions, and simplified infrastructure lifecycle scenarios. The purpose of the model is to estimate the potential scale of lifecycle economic friction associated with fragmented infrastructure documentation and identity discontinuity.

Modeling Approach

The economic model evaluates lifecycle financial outcomes for infrastructure assets under two comparative scenarios.

Scenario A — Fragmented Infrastructure Documentation

Infrastructure assets operate within the current industry environment, where documentation is distributed across multiple organizations and systems without a persistent identity framework.

Scenario B — Persistent Infrastructure Identity

Infrastructure assets operate within a framework that assigns a persistent identifier to each asset and enables lifecycle documentation continuity across stakeholders and technology platforms.

The analysis evaluates the potential financial differences between these scenarios across key lifecycle cost categories.

Asset Model Assumptions

The representative infrastructure asset used in the financial model reflects a typical commercial development project.

Parameter	Modeled Value
Asset type	Commercial building
Construction cost	$75 million
Building size	250,000 square feet
Lifecycle period evaluated	10 years

This asset profile was selected to provide a realistic reference scenario for modeling lifecycle financial outcomes.

Lifecycle Cost Categories Modeled

The economic model evaluates five lifecycle cost categories commonly associated with documentation fragmentation and coordination inefficiencies.

These categories include:

• construction rework
• documentation reconstruction
• insurance claims investigation friction
• maintenance inefficiency
• transaction due diligence delays

Each category reflects operational challenges that may arise when asset documentation is incomplete, inconsistent, or difficult to verify across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Baseline Industry Benchmarks

The model incorporates conservative benchmark estimates drawn from widely cited industry research across construction, facilities management, and infrastructure lifecycle operations.

Representative ranges used for modeling include:

Lifecycle Category	Industry Benchmark Range
Construction rework	5–9% of project cost
Lifecycle maintenance inefficiency	10–20% operational cost increase
Documentation loss or reconstruction	0.5–1% of project value
Claims investigation friction	5–15% of claim cost
Due diligence delays in transactions	2–8 weeks

These ranges were used to construct simplified lifecycle cost estimates within the financial model.

Efficiency Improvement Assumptions

The model applies conservative efficiency improvement estimates to represent the potential impact of persistent infrastructure identity.

These estimates are not predictions of specific outcomes but represent hypothetical reductions in lifecycle friction resulting from improved documentation continuity and asset traceability.

Lifecycle Category	Modeled Improvement
Construction rework	15% reduction
Documentation reconstruction	70% reduction
Claims investigation friction	30% reduction
Maintenance inefficiency	10% reduction
Transaction due diligence delays	40% reduction

These estimates were selected to illustrate potential economic impacts under moderate efficiency improvement scenarios.

Industry Scale Modeling

To estimate potential economic impact at the industry level, the report uses simplified infrastructure market assumptions.

U.S. Industry Model

Parameter	Value
Modeled assets constructed annually	10,000
Average asset value	$75 million
Total modeled asset value	$750 billion

Lifecycle economic friction is estimated using a conservative **3% friction assumption**, resulting in an estimated **$22.5 billion annual friction estimate**.

Global Infrastructure Model

Parameter	Value
Global infrastructure created annually	~ $12 trillion
Lifecycle friction assumption	3%

This simplified model produces an estimated **$360 billion annual global infrastructure lifecycle friction estimate**.

Limitations of the Model

The economic model presented in this report is intended to illustrate the potential scale of lifecycle inefficiencies associated with fragmented infrastructure identity.

The model has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results.

These include:

• simplified asset lifecycle assumptions
• reliance on industry benchmark ranges rather than project-specific data
• absence of empirical data from infrastructure identity pilot implementations
• variations in asset type, geographic conditions, and operational practices

Actual economic outcomes may vary significantly depending on infrastructure characteristics and implementation conditions.

Future industry pilots and empirical studies may refine the assumptions presented in this report.

Final Disclaimer

The figures presented in this report represent illustrative economic modeling based on industry benchmark data and scenario-based assumptions.

This report does not constitute a financial forecast, investment analysis, or independent third-party study. The economic estimates presented are intended solely to illustrate potential lifecycle efficiency impacts associated with persistent infrastructure identity frameworks.

UMIP Inc. makes no representations or warranties regarding the realization of the modeled efficiency improvements described in this report.

Future industry adoption, pilot implementations, and empirical data may refine the assumptions and estimates presented herein.

Conclusion

Infrastructure assets represent one of the largest concentrations of economic value within the global economy, yet the built environment has historically lacked a persistent identity system capable of maintaining documentation continuity across the infrastructure lifecycle.

Fragmented infrastructure documentation contributes to operational inefficiencies affecting construction delivery, asset maintenance, insurance evaluation, and infrastructure financing.

The economic modeling presented in this report suggests that persistent infrastructure identity frameworks may have the potential to reduce lifecycle inefficiencies and improve transparency across infrastructure ecosystems.

As infrastructure systems continue to digitize, the introduction of a persistent identity layer may represent a foundational step toward improving lifecycle coordination across stakeholders, technology platforms, and asset ownership transitions.

End of Report

The Economic Impact of Persistent Infrastructure Identity

Prepared by: Trevor Vick - Founder & Architect of Persistent Infrastructure Identity | UMIP Inc.

Media Contact

media@umipinc.com
888-336-5345
www.umipinc.com