

Highways Maintenance Capital Funding Self-Assessment Questionnaire for the Incentive Fund

1 Important information

- **What is the purpose of this questionnaire?**

In December 2014, the Secretary of State for Transport announced that £6 billion will be made available between 2015/16 and 2020/21 for local highways maintenance capital funding. Since then we have also announced in November 2015 a further £250 million for a dedicated Pothole Action Fund. From this funding, £578 million has been set aside for an Incentive Fund scheme, to reward councils who demonstrate they are delivering value for money in carrying out cost effective improvements.

Each local highway authority in England (excluding London) will be invited to complete a self-assessment questionnaire, in order to establish the share of the Incentive fund they will be eligible for in 2016/17.

Local authorities are not competing with each other for funding, but are demonstrating that efficiency measures are being pursued in order to receive their full share of the funding.

- **How will the result of the questionnaire determine the amount of funding received?**

Each authority will score themselves against 22 questions, and place themselves into one of 3 Bands on the basis of the available evidence. The Department for Transport will not necessarily want to see the supporting evidence from every local highway authority, although it does reserve the right to undertake sample audits. It will however be the responsibility of Section 151 Officer at each local authority to ensure that they are satisfied that the evidence is sufficient for him/her to sign off the overall submission and total score.

The incentive funding awarded to each local highway authority will be based on their score in this questionnaire, and will be relative to the amount received through the needs-based funding formula.

In 2016/17, only authorities in Bands 2 and 3 will receive their full share of the £578 million, whilst authorities in Band 1 will receive 90% of their share. These percentages for Bands 1 and 2 decrease in each subsequent year, with only authorities in Band 3 being awarded their full share of the funding.

Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Band 1	100%	90%	60%	30%	10%	0%
Band 2	100%	100%	90%	70%	50%	30%
Band 3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **How did the ‘dry run’ in summer 2015 work?**

The Department for Transport published a first draft of this self-assessment questionnaire in June 2015. The Department asked local highway authorities to undertake a ‘dry run’ of the questionnaire, and submit feedback on the process. Over 100 authorities responded to this, and many provided feedback.

As a result of this feedback:

- Some criteria have been revised. Whilst each question remains the same, the requirements to achieve Levels 2 and 3 have, in some cases, been revised. This follows feedback that the requirements to achieve Level 2 or 3 in some questions were stringent, given the resources required to achieve that level.
- Some wording has been clarified. This follows feedback that particular words and phrases were ambiguous.

- **When will local highway authorities be asked to complete the questionnaire for their 2016/17 funding allocation?**

Eligible local highway authorities have until 11:59pm on **31 January 2016** to submit a completed questionnaire.

Any authorities that do not submit a questionnaire by this deadline will not receive any of their Incentive Fund allocation in 2016/17 (i.e. 0%). Authorities that fall into Band 1 will receive 90% of their allocation in 2016/17.

Completed questionnaires, signed off by the Section 151 Officer, should be emailed to roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk.

2 Completing the self-assessment

- **The basis of the self-assessment questionnaire**

Over the last four years, the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) has developed a selection of products and services that promote efficient and effective working practices. These resources are founded on the good practice that many authorities are already adopting. In producing this self-assessment questionnaire, an objective has been to build on this good work and to support authorities who are on the journey towards improving their working practices.

The questions are designed to enable authorities to assess their progress on the journey to the implementation of good practice, which will create an environment for effective and efficient delivery and enable capital funding to maximise its return. Underpinning this are the needs of stakeholders and the communication of the importance of the highway service and the needs for well-maintained highways.

- **The rationale for each set of questions**

Each authority needs to complete each of the 22 questions. These questions are divided into the following sections:

- **Asset management** – these 9 questions are based on the recommendations of the UKRLG / HMEP Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance, published in 2013. Authorities should note that, in general, the implementation of these recommendations is the starting point for the implementation of asset management. Where authorities have implemented these recommendations we would expect them to be tending towards Band 2, on the basis that they can evidence improvements that have been made as a consequence. We would expect Band 3 authorities to have implemented the asset management practices recommended in the guidance for some time and as such can demonstrate the outcomes they set out to achieve, as well as progress in achieving these outcomes.
- **Resilience** – Resilience is a key component of asset management, but to recognise its importance in terms of effectively managing the highway network there are 3 specific questions relating to resilience in the questionnaire. The questions are based on reviews and guidance produced as a result of the impact on the highway network of a succession of severe events. The reviews and guidance includes the HMEP Highway Drainage Asset Management Guidance, the HMEP Potholes Review and the DfT-commissioned Review on Transport Resilience.

- **Customer** – Authorities can undertake a comprehensive approach to asset management and service delivery, but without having customer input they may not be delivering the right outcomes. A number of the questions include reference to consulting and informing customers and stakeholders, but in recognition of the importance of customer interaction there are 3 very specific questions about the customer. These are on customer satisfaction, feedback and information.
- **Benchmarking & efficiency** – Identifying and promoting good practice has been high on the HMEP agenda. One approach to sharing good practice is by undertaking benchmarking, so there is a specific question on this. As this overall process is predicated on the basis of doing more for less, it is important that highway authorities can effectively demonstrate the efficiency savings they are achieving.
- **Operational delivery** – Having effective operational service delivery mechanisms is another essential element of providing a cost-effective highway maintenance service. This questionnaire recognises this and has 5 questions on a number of aspects of service delivery. Included are questions on the need for regular service reviews, the benefits of targeted Lean reviews, the benefits of working in collaboration either through the supply chain or with adjoining authorities and finally adopting good practice in procuring external highway maintenance services. HMEP has developed a number of products to provide good practice advice in this area.

- **Self-assessment Bands**

The self-assessment Bands are based on the maturity of the authority in key areas, which are described in each question.

The principle on which the levels of maturity for each question were determined is described below:

- **Band 1** – Has a basic understanding of key areas and is in the process of taking it forward.
- **Band 2** – Can demonstrate that outputs have been produced that support the implementation of key areas that will lead towards improvement.
- **Band 3** – Can demonstrate that outcomes have been achieved in key areas as part of a continuous improvement process.

3 How will the Band be determined?

A local authority's Band will be based on their score in the self-assessment questionnaire.

- **Baseline scores for each Band**
- **Band 1** – does not reach Level 2 or Level 3 in at least 15 of the 22 questions.
- **Band 2** – must reach Level 2 or Level 3 in at least 15 of the 22 questions.
- **Band 3** – must reach Level 3 in at least 18 of the 22 questions.

- **Asset Management**

The following 3 questions are at the corner stones of the asset management assessment:

- 1 Asset Management Policy and Strategy
- 2 Communications
- 5 Lifecycle Planning

Good scores on these 3 questions are essential for authorities aiming for Bands 2 or 3.

Hence, if an authority scores as Level 1 in any or all of questions 1, 2 and 5, they will automatically be placed in Band 1 overall, regardless of their other scores.

4 The self-assessment questionnaire

The following pages contain the contents of the self-assessment questionnaire.

Each question comprises two pages:

- The first page describes the three Levels, and outlines the evidence required for each one.
- The second page provides additional notes, and details of resources to support local authorities to achieve this Level.

A glossary explaining key terms is provided after the last question.

5 Evidence

It is essential that local authorities have sufficient evidence to substantiate their answer to each question.

In all cases, where an authority scores itself as Level 3 for any question, it is essential that evidence can be provided to substantiate the criteria for both Level 2 and Level 3.

It is **not** necessary to include this evidence in the questionnaire you submit, or to email evidence to the Department for Transport. All that is required is the completed Excel spreadsheet, with your authority's Level for each question.

However, the Department plans to undertake some spot checks to verify that authorities are able to substantiate their answers. If you are selected for this, you will be contacted and evidence will be requested.

Should the Department not be satisfied that the evidence provided meets the requirements for a particular Level, further evidence may be requested, and the authority's overall score will be revised if necessary.

1. Does your local authority have an asset management policy and strategy for its highway infrastructure?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>No asset management policy and strategy is in place but there is an awareness that it should be developed.</p> <p>or</p> <p>A commitment to producing an asset management policy and strategy has been given, but it has not been approved.</p>	None
2	<p>An asset management policy and strategy has been developed, clearly documenting the links with corporate vision and other policy documents providing the “line of sight” for the asset management strategy. It has been endorsed by the Executive and published on the authority’s website. This document must have been published or reviewed in the past 24 months.</p>	<p>Evidence that the asset management policy and strategy has been completed, signed off by the Executive and published.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>Outcomes from investment in the asset are clearly identified in the strategy. Demonstration that the strategy has been used to develop the level of service for setting and measuring performance, and the outcomes from the strategy can be demonstrated. All staff and stakeholders can demonstrate knowledge and alignment to this policy and strategy. Regular asset management briefings with the senior decision-makers, and relevant staff.</p>	<p>Evidence that the implementation of the asset management strategy and its objectives have been monitored through appropriate measures and that outcomes have been achieved. Evidence that the asset management policy is visible and accessible to all staff. Senior decision-makers and all relevant staff have been briefed on the asset management policy and strategy.</p>

Does your local authority have an asset management policy and strategy for its highway infrastructure?

The objectives of an asset management policy and strategy are set out below:

- Demonstrate the commitment to adopting the principles of highway infrastructure asset management by senior decision-makers.
- Document the principles, concepts and approach adopted in delivering highway infrastructure asset management.
- Link with the local authority's policies and strategic objectives and demonstrate the contribution of the highway service in meeting these.
- Set out the desired levels of service from implementing asset management.
- Facilitate communication with stakeholders of the approach adopted to managing highway infrastructure assets.

The asset management strategy should set out the objectives that the authority aspires to achieve from the management of its assets. It should clearly link to the corporate vision and demonstrate how the highway maintenance service will support that vision over the medium to long term. It should also set out the major assets the authority has and how it intends to manage them over the medium to long term. Ideally the objectives in the strategy should be described as outcomes.

An authority which does not have an asset management policy and strategy or which does not have it signed off by its Executive will be considered to be in Level 1. As a consequence, it cannot demonstrate it has agreed with the Executive the medium to long term strategy for implementing the outcomes it aspires to achieve, with its capital investment.

Where an authority has it signed off by its Executive it can demonstrate it has agreement (Level 2).

It is only after the strategy has been implemented for some time that an authority will be able to demonstrate, through performance measurement amongst other aspects, that it is achieving these outcomes or putting improvement plans in place in order to achieve these outcomes. Such authorities are likely to achieve Level 3 on the basis that they can demonstrate that they have a strategy aligned to corporate policy that has been in place for a sufficient time to make a difference.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

2. Has your local authority communicated its approach to highway infrastructure asset management?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>No approach to communication has been developed.</p> <p>or</p> <p>The need for communication with key stakeholders is understood, however no relevant action has been undertaken. There is an intent to improve the organisation's ability to communicate asset management activities that affect stakeholders.</p>	None
2	<p>All key stakeholders have been identified. Progress has been made in communicating with them around the benefits of and the reasons behind decisions that affect them. This should be supported by a procedure for communicating and, where appropriate, consulting on relevant issues on a regular basis that is transparent and understood.</p>	<p>A list of all key stakeholders. Demonstration that a process is in place to support communication with them, together with records of communication. Evidence of consultation, where appropriate, regarding the decision making process. This should include publishing relevant information on the authority's website or making it accessible to stakeholders. It could also include periodic surveys of asset condition and demonstration of how that feedback is being used.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>Communication strategy is in place, its implementation is monitored and "lessons learnt" are incorporated. Stakeholder consultation information is used to develop levels of service. There is a transparent process for decision-making available to the public.</p>	<p>A communication strategy that is signed off by senior decision-makers and evidence that it is reviewed regularly and "lessons learnt" incorporated. Levels of service have been developed using stakeholder information. All relevant documentation is on the authority's website or is accessible to the stakeholders, there is opportunity for the public to comment and these comments are considered.</p>

Has your local authority communicated its approach to highway infrastructure asset management?

The objective for this question is to ensure that key stakeholders identified in the asset management strategy have been consulted regarding the authority's approach to asset management and that their requirements have been managed appropriately.

Authorities that have no formal documented approach to consultation are likely to be Level 1. This would also include those circumstances where authorities are undertaking ad-hoc surveys.

Where authorities have identified key stakeholders, these have been documented and there is a communication process in place, then they are likely to be Level 2. It is important that they can also demonstrate that they are managing decision-making using this process.

An authority that is Level 3 will have a communication process in place and be able to demonstrate its approach to asset management to the public through its website.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

3. Does your local authority have a performance management framework and maintenance regime that supports its highway infrastructure asset management strategy and continuous improvement?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>No reference to performance measures and monitoring linked to asset management.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Historical measures are being used as the only point of measuring and monitoring asset management performance. These are not being used to support asset management decisions or continuous improvement.</p>	None
2	<p>A set of performance measures and a monitoring regime have been developed to support the implementation of the asset management strategy, the works programmes and other aspects that will support continuous improvement. This includes measures of stakeholder satisfaction, safety, serviceability and sustainability of the network. These are measured and reported on a regular basis and the approach is clearly documented, together with relevant action plans.</p>	<p>A suite of performance measures that demonstrates support for the objectives are set out in the asset management strategy. It can be demonstrated that these are monitored on a regular basis and they are used to inform business decisions and action plans to support continuous improvement.</p>
3	<p>A complete performance management framework is in place. Performance targets are in place and link to investment levels. Stakeholders including road users, other groups and senior decision-makers have been liaised with in the development of customer focused measures and levels of service.</p> <p>Performance targets are aligned to financial requirements over the next 3 years and the funding required has been identified. Regular reviews by senior management are undertaken and improvement actions developed as a consequence. These have been aligned with senior decision-makers and the service delivery.</p>	<p>A performance management framework with levels of service, performance measures and targets, which supports the implementation of the strategy, forward programme and continuous improvement. Results from performance monitoring with action plans to improve performance if needed, including changing strategy as a consequence. Evidence of a regular review with senior decision-makers a minimum of every quarter.</p> <p>Investment level required to achieve the targets and acceptance by the Executive over at least the next 3 years.</p>

Does your local authority have a performance management framework and maintenance regime that supports its highway infrastructure asset management strategy and continuous improvement?

The objectives of setting out the performance management framework are to:

- Provide a systematic approach to measure progress in the implementation of asset management.
- Set levels of service and performance targets to enable auditing and monitoring of the delivery of the asset management strategy.
- Demonstrate how funding is being used effectively to meet the levels of service and performance targets.
- Provide the link between corporate vision, asset management strategy, levels of service and maintenance operations.
- Facilitate effective communications with stakeholders by demonstrating performance against their requirements.
- Demonstrate any shortfalls in funding.

The performance management framework is important because it supports the implementation of the asset management strategy and can be used to measure its performance and continuous improvement in general. It should also be used to demonstrate that investment is being used in an efficient and effective way that will deliver value for money.

An authority that is Level 1 will not have a performance management framework in place. It may undertake performance monitoring but this cannot be demonstrably linked to its asset management strategy.

A Level 2 authority will have a performance management framework in place that supports its asset management strategy and will have a systematic approach to measuring performance to support the implementation of its strategy and continuous improvement in general.

A Level 3 authority will have a fully functional performance management framework together with levels of service and performance targets. These will be reviewed at regular intervals with senior decision-makers.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

4. Does your local authority have an effective regime to manage its highway infrastructure asset data?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>There is no asset register.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Inventory data is held for major assets in an asset register, but is incomplete and not updated regularly.</p>	None
2	<p>Major assets have been identified and data is collected at specified frequencies. (This data is the minimum required to support asset valuation). Gaps in data are documented and action plans are in place to collect this data. An asset register is in place and accessible to all relevant asset management staff. There is evidence of regular documented audits of data coverage and quality.</p>	<p>Asset register for all prescribed major assets is available and demonstration that data is accessible to relevant staff. Demonstration that the data collection regime is being achieved together with an action plan to fill documented gaps in data, if appropriate, or evidence there are no gaps and the asset register is complete. Demonstration that the systems are available to support the management of this information.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>An information strategy has been developed and implemented that supports the asset management strategy and the performance management framework. The strategy should be appropriate for the authority and proportionate to the funding allocated for asset management. The information required to support performance management is documented, auditable and used to inform decisions.</p>	<p>A funded information strategy for collection of information. Demonstration that it supports the performance management framework. Demonstration that the value and risks associated with each item of information have been assessed. Explanation of how this information is used to support investment decisions and manage risk can be clearly demonstrated.</p>

Does your local authority have an effective regime to manage its highway infrastructure asset data?

Reliable and robust data is required to support the right investment decisions and to ensure that stakeholder requirements, value for money and efficiency can be delivered. The following should be considered as important in developing and implementing a data collection regime:

- Describe the asset and its performance.
- Provide the data required to support the approach to asset management.
- Provide the basis for informed decision-making.
- Facilitate communications with stakeholders.
- Inform the assessment and management of risk.
- Support the management of statutory requirements.
- Support continuous improvement.

Where authorities do not have an asset register or have one but with gaps in its data, and where there is not an action plan in place and evidence of this plan being implemented, it is likely to be Level 1.

A Level 2 authority will have an asset register in place, and where there are gaps in data this is documented and action plans are in place to collect this data. The asset register is accessible to all relevant staff and regular audits of data coverage and quality are undertaken.

To be considered a Level 3 authority, an information strategy has been developed that supports the asset management strategy and the performance management framework.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

5. Is your local authority undertaking lifecycle planning as part of its highway infrastructure asset management?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>There is an awareness of the need for an investment plan for major assets that can be achieved through lifecycle planning.</p> <p>or</p> <p>An approach to lifecycle planning is commencing but has not yet been implemented and adopted to support investment planning.</p>	None
2	<p>An approach to lifecycle planning for carriageways has been adopted and investment is managed on this basis. Processes to apply appropriate analyses to determine the investment needed are in place, such as the HMEP Lifecycle Toolkit. Investment for future funding has been developed using scenarios in order to identify best return from investment. Lifecycle plans are used to support investment decisions, audited and checked.</p>	<p>Investment plans for carriageways based on lifecycle planning principles, with demonstration that a number of different options have been considered in their development in order to provide a value for money solution. There are evidence based documented assumptions on the performance of major assets.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>The requirements of Level 2 for all major assets (not just carriageways).</p> <p>For carriageways: Performance targets link to the performance management framework. Lifecycle planning decisions are based on documented evidence of the performance of the asset. Deterioration profiles have been developed and are continuously improved. There is a fully optimised approach to lifecycle planning that can be demonstrated, together with the benefits of that optimal approach.</p>	<p>The requirements of Level 2 for all major assets (not just carriageways).</p> <p>For carriageways: Achieving the outcomes in the asset management strategy can be demonstrated through meeting the performance targets in the framework. Recording of historical performance of the asset and developing of decisions based on this data.</p>

Is your local authority undertaking lifecycle planning as part of its highway infrastructure asset management?

The objectives of lifecycle plans for major assets are set out below:

- Identify long-term investment for highway infrastructure assets and develop an appropriate maintenance strategy.
- Predict future performance of highway infrastructure assets for different levels of investment and different maintenance strategies.
- Determine the level of investment required to achieve the required performance.
- Determine the performance that will be achieved for available funding and/or future investment.
- Support decision-making, the case for investing in maintenance activities, and demonstrate the impact of different funding scenarios.
- Minimise costs over the lifecycle, whilst maintaining the required performance.

The authority should have lifecycle plans to demonstrate what investment is required to achieve its performance targets and where this investment is not available, the likely shortfall. It is aimed specifically at major assets, which would generally include carriageways, footways and cycleways, structures, lighting and traffic signals. The authority will however have to define this in its asset management strategy. The HMEP Lifecycle Planning Toolkit is available to support highway authorities to undertake lifecycle planning for each of these assets. It is accepted that an authority may be more advanced in undertaking lifecycle planning in one asset type such as carriageways compared to other assets types such as signals or lighting. For example where an authority has undertaken lifecycle planning for carriageways but has only done so for its key routes, the reasons for such an approach would need to be defined in the asset management strategy.

Authorities that have not undertaken any lifecycle planning, particularly for carriageways, or who have started to implement lifecycle planning but not yet used it to set budgets would be considered to be Level 1.

An authority that has lifecycle plans for all its carriageways would be considered Level 2 as a minimum. The authority should also have documented its performance targets. The method of developing the lifecycle plans is the responsibility of the authority and therefore the approach is not important, albeit it must be recognised and auditable, but alternatives to the HMEP Lifecycle Toolkit are acceptable as are more simple approaches where assets require less capital funding for maintenance. The important aspect is to demonstrate that these have been used for budget setting.

Level 3 authorities will have adopted lifecycle planning principles for all major assets, and be able to demonstrate the above Level 2 requirements for each of these. For structures, the UKRLG Structures Toolkit is an acceptable approach to determining maintenance need.

In addition, to achieve Level 3, the following is required for carriageways. An authority should be able to demonstrate that, through adopting these principles, it has set performance targets and achieved them with the investment provided. Where it has not achieved these targets, it can demonstrate that it has reviewed its targets and these have been reset. In addition, it should be monitoring the performance of all its major assets and, through a heuristic approach, understanding the performance of its major assets and using this as the basis for lifecycle modelling.

Where an authority has a street lighting PFI project, street lighting is excluded from these requirements, as it is expected that appropriate arrangements are in place for this through the contract.

Resource: [HMEP Lifecycle Planning Toolkit \(Incorporating Default Carriageway Deterioration Models\)](#)

Resource: [UKRLG Structures Toolkit](#)

6. Is your authority able to demonstrate leadership and commitment from senior decision-makers in taking forward its highway infrastructure asset management approach?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>Senior decision-makers are not involved in the decisions to develop or implement asset management.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Senior decision-makers have stated they are aware of the need to provide leadership in order to implement asset management but no credible plan is in place.</p>	None
2	<p>The Executive has communicated its commitment to the implementation of asset management and endorsed the policy and strategy. They have provided resources, including finances, to deliver the programme of works.</p> <p>Senior decision-makers have identified and appointed the person responsible for leading asset management and developed a plan of action for the implementation of asset management.</p>	<p>Agreed policy, strategy and programme of works. Confirmation of the person leading asset management, including job description.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>Senior decision-makers are involved in providing direction to asset management and are consulted on an appropriate basis through reviews. These reviews include all parties involved in the delivery of asset management, such as contractors, service providers and in-house teams.</p>	<p>Terms of Reference for regular meetings, minutes, action plans.</p>

Is your authority able to demonstrate leadership and commitment from senior decision-makers in taking forward its highway infrastructure asset management approach?

Good leadership both political and managerial is essential for the implementation of asset management.

A Level 1 authority has not got the involvement at a political level in supporting the decisions to develop asset management, or there is a political awareness but there is no credible plan in place.

A Level 2 authority has the Executive endorsement of the asset management policy and strategy, and has received approval for the financial resources to deliver the programme of works. It is clear, both politically and managerially, who the identified people to provide the leadership for implementing asset management are.

A Level 3 authority has their senior decision-makers regularly involved in providing the direction to asset management, and there is consultation with them on an appropriate basis through reviews.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

7. Has your local authority identified the appropriate competencies required for highway infrastructure asset management and what training may be required?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>The need for asset management competencies has not been identified.</p> <p>or</p> <p>The need to identify competencies has been understood but no positive actions or training undertaken.</p>	None
2	<p>The competencies for key asset management roles have been identified, individual competency has been assessed against these roles and development action plans developed accordingly. This includes an assessment of the need for training of key individuals. Staff competencies are reviewed on an annual basis.</p>	<p>Staff development action plans, any relevant training undertaken, and annual reviews. All relevant staff have undertaken the HMEP e-learning Toolkit for Highway Infrastructure Asset Management.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>Vocational, educational and professional training identified in the staff development action plans has been funded and is underway for all key staff involved in asset management. Regular communication between those undertaking key roles including sharing knowledge and “lessons learnt” is undertaken. A competency framework, such as that used in PAS55/ISO 5500 or the Institute of Asset Management, has been rolled out and individuals undertaking key roles in asset management have participated. Competencies are regularly reviewed as part of individual development action plans.</p>	<p>Individual development and training records, knowledge sharing, implementation of a relevant competency framework.</p>

Has your local authority identified the appropriate competencies required for highway infrastructure asset management and what training may be required?

A competent and motivated staff team will support the delivery of asset management. Where the primary role of staff is related to asset management it is important that their individual development in asset management is reflected in their training and personal development plans. This should be led by the most competent person in asset management in the authority. For this question, only staff whose primary role is related to asset management need to meet the criteria.

It is recognised that there are limited opportunities in respect of training. In order to support training, HMEP has made available the e-learning Toolkit for Highway Infrastructure Asset Management. It is recognised that this is not aimed at expert practitioners but will give those undertaking asset management a grounding in its principles. As a minimum all authorities at Level 2 would be expected to have completed this training. Where authorities wish to develop their expertise further, and resources are not available, they should consider working in collaboration with other authorities.

Authorities who are at Level 3 will have staff with up-to-date knowledge and experience, commensurate with professional training related to asset management. Key staff's skills and knowledge are monitored against a competency framework, and they share the lessons they have learnt with their peers.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

Resource: [HMEP e-learning for Highway Infrastructure Asset Management](#)

8. Does your local authority have a comprehensive approach to managing current and future risks associated with the highway infrastructure assets?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>Risks associated with asset management are not considered.</p> <p>or</p> <p>There is an understanding amongst key staff that risk must be managed but there is no approach developed.</p>	None
2	<p>A documented process to assess risk associated with the management of assets is in place for all activities of the highways service and communicated to relevant stakeholders consistent with the corporate approach to risk. This includes regular assessment of risks, communication of those risks and their management. Risk is also considered as part of the decision-making process for investment and programme development for maintenance schemes.</p>	<p>Documented process for the communication and management of risk, risk register and evidence updated on a regular basis, demonstrating that the implemented mitigation actions are recorded.</p>
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>Approach to management of risk is continually improved and appetite to risk is clearly documented. “Lessons learnt” around the management of risks are regularly recorded at all levels of the organisation. Documented approach to management of critical infrastructure on the network exists together with documented contingency plans.</p>	<p>Lessons learnt register; risk based asset management plans exist for critical infrastructure.</p>

Does your local authority have a comprehensive approach to managing current and future risks associated with the highway infrastructure assets?

To support asset management authorities should have an understanding of:

- Those assets that are critical to the functioning of the network.
- Things that could affect the delivery of the required performance, including meeting stakeholder expectations.
- The level of funding.
- The level of risk that is acceptable.
- Options to mitigate all those risks deemed unacceptable.

A Level 1 authority has not considered the risks associated with asset management or has an understanding amongst key staff that risk must be managed.

A Level 2 authority has a documented process to assess risks associated with the management of highway assets, including a regular assessment of risks, communication of those risks and their management.

A Level 3 authority has an approach to the management of risks that is continually improved. “Lessons learnt” around risks are regularly recorded at all levels in the organisation. There is a documented approach to the management of critical infrastructure on the network with documented contingency plans.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

Resource: [Alarm Guidance on managing the liability risks of the highway infrastructure asset](#)

9. Has your local authority established a resilient network as recommended by the 2014 Transport Resilience Review?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>There has been no progress in identifying the authority's roads which are a priority in terms of ensuring resilience to extreme weather events – the "resilient network".</p> <p>or</p> <p>There is recognition of the need to identify a resilient network but limited progress has been made.</p>	None
2	<p>The process for developing the resilient network has been developed and documented. Liaison has been undertaken with key business, interest groups and other key transport stakeholders (e.g. Network Rail and bus operators). The resilient network has been agreed with senior decision-makers. All risks associated with adopting the resilient network have been documented together with mitigation.</p> <p>This should cover resilience against snow, ice and flooding, as a minimum.</p>	<p>The resilient network is defined, and documented processes exist for its management in the event of snow, ice or flooding. There is documented evidence of engagement with relevant stakeholders and there has been a formal process for its approval by senior decision-makers.</p>
3	<p>In addition</p> <p>The resilient network is reviewed at least every two years as part of contingency planning and updated after any relevant events, based on lessons learnt. It is used as a basis for decision making and included in the prioritisation criteria for relevant assets. It has been communicated with the public and is on the authority's website.</p> <p>This should cover resilience against exceptional heat, industrial action, major incidents and other local risks.</p>	<p>Two-yearly review of the resilient network, including updates after any relevant events. Information is made available to the public on the authority's website.</p>

Has your authority established a resilient network as recommended by the 2014 Transport Resilience Review?

The severe winter weather of 2013/14 had a major impact on transport systems, including many local roads which were flooded for prolonged periods. As a consequence of this disruption, the Secretary of State for Transport commissioned a Transport Resilience Review, which was published in July 2014. The Department for Transport supported all 63 Recommendations. A key recommendation of the 2014 Transport Resilience Review for Local Roads is “that Local Highway Authorities identify a ‘resilient network’ to which they will give priority, in order to maintain economic activity and access to key services during extreme weather.”

A Level 1 authority has made little or no progress to identify its resilient network.

A Level 2 authority has developed its resilient network, consulted with key stakeholders and had formal approval from senior decision-makers. All risks associated with the resilient network have been documented together with mitigation in the event of snow, ice or flooding.

A Level 3 authority has a process in place for reviewing its resilient network at least every two years, and updating it after any relevant events. The resilient network is being used as a basis for decision-making and included in the prioritisation criteria for relevant assets. Plans are in place for the management of events including exceptional heat, industrial action, major incidents and other local risks.

Resource: [Transport Resilience Review](#)

10. Has your local authority implemented the relevant recommendations of the 2012 HMEP Potholes Review - Prevention and a Better Cure?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>Specific recommendations relating to local authorities (2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15) of the Potholes Review have not been implemented.</p> <p>or</p> <p>There is an intention to implement recommendations but limited progress has been made.</p>	None
2	<p>A review of the authority's current practice against the recommendations of the Potholes Review has been undertaken. Where this practice doesn't reflect the recommendations of the Potholes Review a prioritised action plan has been produced. If there is a need for changes to policy and investment a report has been produced to secure sign-off by the Executive.</p>	<p>A documented review has been undertaken of the authority's current practice against the recommendations of the Potholes Review.</p> <p>If required, a prioritised action plan.</p> <p>If required, a report to the Executive on the proposed policy changes and investment required to implement them.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 from the Potholes Review on Public Opinion Surveys relates to Question 12</p> <p>Recommendation 3 from the Potholes Review on Public Communications relates to Question 14</p> <p>Recommendation 15 from the Potholes Review on long term programming relates to Question 20</p>
3	<p>In adopting the relevant recommendations of the HMEP Potholes Review progress, has been monitored across a number of ongoing performance measures, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response standards for defects. • A reduction in the need to undertake repeat repairs. • Improvements in public satisfaction. • Cost savings. 	Ongoing improvements in the performance of repairing potholes.

Has your local authority implemented the relevant recommendations of the 2012 HMEP Potholes Review – Prevention and a Better Cure?

As result of the increasing concern of damage caused to local roads by a succession of severe winter weather events, the Government commissioned HMEP to undertake a review into potholes. Published in 2012, the Review, titled Prevention and A Better Cure, made 17 Recommendations that if implemented will provide an overall improvement into the management of highway defects.

Recognising that those authorities that have already adopted the recommendations are demonstrating measureable improvements, this question is encouraging all local authorities to do so.

There are 10 relevant recommendations to local authorities out of the 17:

- 2 Public Opinion Surveys – this also relates to question 12
- 3 Public Communications – this also relates to question 14
- 6 Prevention is Better Than Cure
- 7 Informed Choices
- 8 Guidance on Materials
- 9 Definition of Potholes
- 10 Permanent Repairs Policy
- 11 Inspection and Training
- 12 Technology
- 13 Guidance on Repair Techniques
- 15 Coordinating Street Works – this also relates to question 20

A Level 1 authority has made no progress in implementing the recommendations of the Potholes Review.

A Level 2 authority has adopted all 10 of the above recommendations and has evidence to demonstrate this.

A Level 3 authority has implemented all 10 of the above recommendations and can demonstrate year-on-year measurable improvement in performance as a consequence.

Resource: [Potholes Review: Prevention and a Better Cure](#)

11. Has your local authority implemented the relevant recommendations of the 2012 HMEP Guidance on the Management of Highway Drainage Assets?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>The 11 recommendations in the Guidance for authorities have not been implemented.</p> <p>or</p> <p>There is an intention to implement recommendations but limited progress has been made.</p>	None
2	<p>A review of current practice against the recommendations of the Guidance has been undertaken. Where the practice doesn't reflect the Guidance a prioritised action plan has been produced. As there may be a need for changes to policy and investment a report has been produced to secure sign-off by the Executive.</p>	<p>A review of current practice against the Guidance.</p> <p>An action plan if required.</p> <p>A report to the Executive on the proposed policy changes if required and the investment needed to implement them.</p>
3	<p>The Guidance has been adopted and the recommendations implemented. There are measurable improvements in managing drainage on the network, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer flooding incidents. • A reduction in accidents as a consequence of flooding. • A reduction in the number of properties flooded adjacent to the highway as a consequence of highway run-off. • An improvement in the management of delays and disruption caused by roads blocked as a result of flooding. • A significant increase in gully cleansing, specifically targeted at those gullies that have been identified as being most likely to lead to flooding if not well maintained. 	<p>Improvements in the performance of measures related to flooding.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All relevant flooding incidents investigated appropriately. 	
--	---	--

Has your local authority implemented the relevant recommendations of the 2012 HMEP Guidance on the Management of Highway Drainage Assets?

The HMEP Guidance on the management of Highway Drainage Assets was published in 2012 and was produced as a consequence of the increasing frequency of flooding events in the UK over the last 10 years. The Guidance also relates to The Flood and Water Management Act, which requires upper tier authorities to have new responsibilities in relation to flood risk management. The Drainage Guidance also supplements the HMEP/UKRLG Highway infrastructure Asset Management Guidance.

A Level 1 authority has not made any progress in adopting the 11 Recommendations in the Guidance.

A Level 2 authority has assessed its current practice against all of the 11 Recommendations relevant to local authorities, and has evidence to demonstrate this.

A Level 3 authority, has adopted and implemented all 11 Recommendations in the Guidance, and can show clear measureable improvement in performance as a consequence.

Resource: [Guidance on the Management of Highways Drainage Assets](#)

12. Does your local authority undertake customer satisfaction surveys into the condition of its highway network, and if so, how does it use this information to help drive service improvement?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognises the need to have customer and public feedback (including satisfaction) on highway condition, and might proactively generate this, but inconsistent, irregular or unsystematic methods are employed and limited value derived.	None
2	Proactively collects customer and public feedback on highway condition at least once every two years. This should be through a robust mechanism, such as a resident engagement questionnaire, the National Highways and Transport (NHT) Public Satisfaction Survey or equivalent. This information is used to support investment decisions.	The authority can demonstrate the use of a robust survey methodology, with a sufficient sample size to ensure confidence in the results. Has reports that draw conclusions about the wider customer and public perception. Can demonstrate this is used as part of the decision making process.
3	Undertakes a survey at least annually. Maximises the value of customer and public feedback collected via robust mechanisms. Tracks feedback from previous surveys and uses this information to measure, benchmark and diagnose performance. Action plan developed and “lessons learnt” captured and shared. Contextualises feedback with reference to other performance data, including benchmarking, is able to demonstrate effective use of the information and measure improvement from previous surveys.	Past surveys demonstrating consistent and comparable sampling methods and questions are used each year. Evidence of comparisons over time and benchmarking with other authorities. This should include evidence that performance data has been compared between years and benchmarked to identify potential for improvement, with an action plan. Reports and insights are disseminated effectively and used to inform decision-making.

Does your local authority undertake customer satisfaction surveys into the condition of its highway network and if so how does this information drive service improvement?

The public see road condition as a very high priority when polled against other transport priorities and other local government services. However, in terms of public satisfaction, the condition of local roads attracts more dissatisfaction than other transport or other local government services. It is therefore important that local authorities regularly monitor customer satisfaction and take this into account when developing their maintenance policy and standards. From benchmarking with other authorities there may be scope to develop action plans to improve performance.

A resident survey, such as the council's annual satisfaction survey, or the National Highways and Transport (NHT) Public Satisfaction Survey is appropriate for this.

As a general rule, and in accordance with past BVPI/Place Survey practice, a survey would ideally involve gathering a minimum of 800 to 1,000 responses or interviews to deliver statistical reliability of $\pm 3\%$ at the aggregate level, with sample sizes of this scale offering more robust disaggregation of data by sub-groups, such as younger vs older residents.

A Level 1 authority recognises the need to have customer and public feedback on highway condition and might generate this but it is undertaken in an inconsistent and irregular manner.

A Level 2 authority collects public feedback annually through robust mechanisms, such as the NHT Public Satisfaction Survey or an equivalent that satisfies the above criteria on weighting and sample size.

A Level 3 authority undertakes annual surveys and analyses trends, and uses this information to measure, benchmark and diagnose performance and identify potential for improvement.

Resource: [NHT Survey](#)

13. Does your local authority have a mechanism in place to gather customer feedback on its highway maintenance service, and if so, how does it use this information?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognises the need for customer feedback but has no consistent processes or systems in place.	None
2	Provides a full range of facilities for the public to provide feedback and report defects. This includes facilities for customers to register feedback on highway-related issues by phone, on-line via the authority website and/or using proprietary or bespoke developed apps.	Processes for capturing customer feedback, and methods of reporting and actioning the feedback.
3	Captures information and makes it accessible to the wider service and stakeholders. This information is available visibly and is accessible for supporting all maintenance decisions. Publishes details of the measures taken to respond to feedback from the public.	<p>A system is in place to use customer information to inform maintenance programmes (not just reactive). Provides regular updates on the council website of the actions taken in response to feedback from the public.</p> <p>Ensures that updates are posted with regard to the progress on the individual faults/defects reported by members of the public.</p> <p>It is acceptable for the response to be 'no action', if this follows the authority's asset management strategy.</p>

Does your local authority have a mechanism in place to gather customer feedback on its highway maintenance service and if so how does it use this information?

An equally important aspect of customer engagement is managing customer feedback. This is becoming increasingly important as public expectation rises and with authorities becoming more accessible, demand is increasing. It is important to be able to effectively channel this feedback to help understand customer expectations. A number of proprietary apps exist that allow the public to report defects and provide feedback to the council. Examples include: Fix My Street, Fill That Hole, Love Clean Streets, Report It and Public Stuff.

A Level 1 authority may recognise the need for customer feedback but has no consistent process in place to effectively manage it.

A Level 2 authority has facilities in place for the public to provide feedback and report defects (this links to Question 14).

A Level 3 authority takes account of this customer feedback in configuring highway maintenance services and provides information on what actions have been taken.

14. How does your local authority ensure that customers are kept informed about their highway maintenance service?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognises the need to make highway maintenance policies, standards and service levels publically available but there is nothing in place.	None
2	Ensures that the role of the highway authority is explained and highway maintenance policies, standards and service levels are easily accessible and understandable to members of the public.	Details of policies and standards on the authority's website. Regular service updates on the authority's website, and/or via social media (e.g. updates on winter service operations via Twitter). Evidence that these standards are adhered to.
3	<p>In addition: A pro-active approach is taken to informing customers, and updating them on the authority's performance.</p> <p>Key details about programmes of work, as well as more detailed information about longer-term projects, is published.</p>	<p>In addition: Feedback on service delivery performance on the authority's website.</p> <p>Key details about programmes of work on the authority's website. More detailed information about longer-term projects on the authority's website.</p>

How does your local authority ensure that customers are kept informed about their highway maintenance service?

Another essential aspect of good customer engagement is having good quality information that is publically available. This has a significant influence on Question 12 – customer satisfaction. This was recognised in Recommendation 3 of the HMEP Potholes Review: Prevention and a Better Cure, which stated “Local highway authorities should have an effective communication process that provides clarity and transparency in their public policy and approach to repairing potholes. This should include a published policy of its implementation, including prevention, identification, reporting, tracking and repair of potholes.” This also links to Question 2 on communicating an authority’s approach to highway infrastructure asset management.

A Level 1 authority recognises the need to communicate information on policy and standards but has nothing in place.

A Level 2 authority communicates information on the role of the highway authority and highway maintenance policy, standards and service levels.

In addition, a Level 3 authority communicates information on its performance, as well as key details of programmes of work and more detailed information about longer-term projects.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

15. Does your local authority undertake benchmarking to drive improvement in its highway maintenance service?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Aware of the benefits of benchmarking performance but have no robust mechanism in place.	None
2	<p>A member of a “benchmarking club” that measures and compares service delivery performance.</p> <p>A member of a recognised “benchmarking club” as an active member, regularly attends meetings, contributes and shares performance data and/or information on practice and process for comparison.</p>	Shared data from “benchmarking club” together with action plan for the authority on potential improvements or support to other members to improve their performance.
3	<p>Actively using benchmarking data to improve service delivery on a continual basis and to support investment decision-making. Visibility of benchmarking data is available across the authority.</p> <p>The methods to calculate the performance data used for benchmarking are robust and transparent, based on reliable data.</p>	<p>Able to demonstrate an overall trend of improvement, using performance reports from the club and through the adoption of good practice as a result of engagement with the club. Can demonstrate a robust method of measurement for the performance data.</p> <p>Has developed and shared case studies and examples of alternative/efficient practice relevant to benchmarking performance with other club members and/or with the sector generally via HMEP Connect & Share, or a similar mechanism.</p>

Does your local authority undertake benchmarking to drive improvement in its highway maintenance service?

Benchmarking is a method of improving performance in a systematic and logical way by measuring and comparing an organisation's performance against others, and then using lessons learned from the best to make targeted improvements. It can be a one-off event or a continuous process where organisations continually challenge and improve their practices by analysing trends in performance.

There are different types of benchmarking including: Process Benchmarking, Performance Benchmarking and Strategic Benchmarking. Process Benchmarking evaluates a business's processes, focusing on improving critical processes and operations through comparison with best practice organisations performing similar work. Performance Benchmarking measures performance using specific indicators or metrics that can be compared to others. Strategic Benchmarking considers a business's core competencies and their options for dealing with change.

“Benchmarking clubs” comprise a group of organisations coming together to learn about how to push their boundaries of performance to new and higher levels through mutual support and peer challenge. “Benchmarking clubs” are a vehicle through which a group of likeminded organisations seek to increase their levels of performance or set benchmarks in the sector in which they operate. These clubs are driven by a desire to continuously improve, innovate and achieve greater heights in terms of performance, as well as contributing to good practice in the sector or across sectors.

A Level 1 authority may be aware of the benefits of benchmarking but has no robust mechanism in place.

A Level 2 authority is a member of a “benchmarking club” that measures and compares service delivery performance.

A Level 3 authority is able to demonstrate measurable service improvement through undertaking a benchmarking exercise.

16. Does your local authority have a process in place to measure the ongoing cashable and non-cashable efficiencies that are being delivered in the highway maintenance service?

	Specific description	Evidence
1	Aware of the need to measure efficiency but no recognised method in place.	None
2	Measuring and reporting efficiency of operations annually using Customer Quality Cost (CQC) methodology or similar established approach.	Highway maintenance activities are assessed using one or more measures of efficiency that take account of expenditure, service quality and public satisfaction. Performance reports are readily available with efficiency measures.
3	Tracks annual progress of efficiency and can demonstrate evidence of efficiency.	<p>There is a consistent and comparable basis for assessing efficiency, which allows comparisons over time and benchmarking with other authorities.</p> <p>Efficiency performance is compared between years and is benchmarked to identify potential for improvement and examples of improved performance.</p>

Does your local authority have a process in place to measure the ongoing cashable and non-cashable efficiencies that are being delivered in the highway maintenance service?

Public sector efficiency can be seen as the ability to translate a given level of resource into the best possible outcomes for service users, with the least possible waste.

The Customer Quality Cost (CQC) approach supported by HMEP measures an organisation's efficiency by assessing how their current costs compare with their minimum potential costs, assuming their current service quality and customer satisfaction remain constant. Comparisons are made across a number of authorities utilising bespoke data to aid valid comparison.

A Level 1 authority may recognise the need to measure efficiency but has no mechanism in place.

A Level 2 authority is using the CQC methodology or equivalent to measure and report efficiencies annually.

A Level 3 authority is using its approach on measuring efficiencies to track annual progress and benchmark with other authorities to further drive up improvement.

Resource: [HMEP / NHT Customer Quality Cost \(CQC\) Network](#)

17. Does your local authority have a mechanism in place to undertake a periodic review of its operational service delivery arrangements for the highway maintenance service?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognise the need to periodically review operational service delivery arrangements but there is no process in place.	None
2	<p>Undertaking a review of the highway service supported by the HMEP Strategic Peer Review or some other equivalent challenge process. Making use of the HMEP Procurement Route Choices Toolkit or some other equivalent appraisal mechanism to identify suitable alternative service delivery options.</p> <p>For local authorities in long-term contracts, the review may be undertaken as part of the process to determine whether to award further extensions or not.</p>	<p>A report to the Council's Executive (or an appropriate political forum) of the review, including recommendations on the future approach, which could, for example, be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue with existing arrangements. • Award an extension to a current contract. • Progress a new procurement process.
3	Implementation of the highway service review recommendations deliver a more efficient and effective service.	Measurable improvement in service, such as improvements in cost, quality and customer performance measures, as a result of the review's recommendations.

Does your authority have a mechanism in place to undertake a periodic review of its operational service delivery arrangements for the highway maintenance service?

This question is about encouraging local authorities to periodically review their operational service delivery arrangements, whatever model they are using. Without some form of review there is a risk the service may no longer be fit for purpose, particularly in relation to the need to deliver a more cost-effective service.

The timing of the review may be as a result of the following:

- An existing contract is coming to an end and there is need for a re-procurement.
- A periodic review of an existing long-term contract is necessary as part of a formal review process to determine if the contract extension should be granted.
- A review as a consequence of action following a HMEP Peer Review.
- A review as part of a corporate challenge to demonstrate value for money.
- Or some other reason.

The HMEP Procurement Route Choices Toolkit can be used in this process to assist in the process of considering alternative service delivery models.

At a Level 1 authority there is recognition of a need to undertake a service review but nothing has progressed.

At a Level 2 authority there is evidence that a periodic service review has been undertaken and the following has been assessed:

- Value for money.
- Performance against operational targets and customer service.
- Future resilience and sustainability.

A report of the outcome of the review should be reported to the appropriate political forum members.

At a Level 3 authority, following the implementation of the outcome of the review, there is evidence of measurable benefits in terms of costs, performance and/or customer satisfaction.

Resource: [HMEP Procurement Route Choices Toolkit](#)

18. Is your authority working in collaboration with your operational service provider and their supply chain in delivering the highway maintenance service or any component of it?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognises the need to collaborate but have no formal processes in place.	None
2	Has a mechanism in place, such as that recommended by the HMEP Supply Chain Collaboration Toolkit, to improve relations with the local authority's key highway maintenance suppliers, which encourages collaboration.	Mechanisms utilised to improve supply chain relations across the breadth of highways services, for example not just on winter services.
3	Formalisation of working in collaboration with the supply chain. This could include working towards accreditation through BS 11000 or an equivalent Standard.	Measurable efficiency savings, better service outcomes as a result of supply chain collaboration. Demonstration of working towards accreditation to BS11000 or an equivalent standard.

Is your authority working in collaboration with your operational service provider and their supply chain in delivering the highway maintenance service or any component of it?

This questions differs from Question 22 but is about a similar ethos of collaborative working through the provider and supply chain. The benefits of collaborative working are well documented and supported by HMEP products, including the HMEP Maximising Client / Provider Collaboration in Highways Maintenance Services toolkit and the HMEP Supply Chain Collaboration Toolkit.

This collaborative working is applicable to every type of delivery model, as even an in-house operational service will still be working with a supply chain in some form or another. It is expected that all authorities should consider taking on apprentices either directly or through their maintenance Framework Contractors. We would be looking at 1 apprentice for every £3 million provided to authorities for local highways maintenance funding. This follows the announcement made in 2015 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-unveils-plans-to-boost-apprenticeships-and-transform-training>

Level 1 authorities may be aware of the benefits but haven't made any progress.

At Level 2, evidence will be required to demonstrate there is some formal approach to collaborative working, whether that's between client and contractor or through the whole service supply chain.

At Level 3, measurable evidence will be required of ongoing outcome improvements through supply chain collaboration. These should include financial savings, and improvement in qualitative or customer satisfaction. This could be supported by evidence in working towards the principles of BS11000.

Resource: [HMEP Supply Chain Collaboration Toolkit](#)

Resource: [Maximising Client / Provider Collaboration in Highways Maintenance Services](#)

19. Has your local authority undertaken a Lean or equivalent transformational change management review of its highway maintenance service or any aspect of it?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Recognises the benefits of undertaking a documented transformation type programme of the highways service but not yet undertaken.	None
2	Undertaken a documented transformation type programme such as Lean review or systems thinking on the highway maintenance service or aspect of it.	Documented evidence of a documented transformation type programme, such as a Lean service review or some equivalent transformational change management review on the highway maintenance service or some aspect of it, together with evidence of starting to implement the recommendations.
3	Implementing the findings of any documented transformational service review and regular monitoring of the progress, to ensure a process of continuous improvement is in place.	Measurable evidence of service improvement, efficiency savings and/or improved customer satisfaction achieved through these reviews.

Has your local authority undertaken a Lean or equivalent transformation change management review of its highway maintenance service or any aspect of it?

This is about encouraging local authorities to undertake a documented transformation change review of the highway service or any aspect of it. There are numerous good practice case studies that demonstrate the benefits of undertaking Lean reviews. For example, the HMEP Lean Toolkit for Highways Services provides advice on how to undertake a Lean review. The benefits of undertaking a Lean review include that the process focuses on the customer and provides an opportunity for everyone involved in the service area under review to participate. A Lean review primarily focuses on identifying processes that don't add value and therefore can be eliminated and hence save money.

A Level 1 authority may be aware of the benefits of undertaking a targeted review of an area of service but has not made any progress.

A Level 2 authority has undertaken a transformation review into an aspect of the highway maintenance service, and has at least started to implement changes as a result.

A Level 3 authority has completed a transformation review, has implemented changes as a result and can demonstrate measurable improvements in service delivery, customer satisfaction and/or efficiency savings.

Resource: [HMEP: A LEAN Toolkit for Highways Services](#)

20. Has your local authority produced a long-term forward programme of capital maintenance works for all its highway infrastructure assets?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	<p>There is no programme of works. Work that is undertaken is on a reactive basis and addresses problems on the network as they arise.</p> <p>or</p> <p>The intention to produce a multi-year works programme has been stated but no timetable for production is in place.</p>	None
2	<p>There is a minimum of a fully costed, prioritised and approved programme of works for all major assets, for the next one to two years. The schemes have been prioritised based on an agreed set of criteria reflecting current condition. The programme is in line with the asset management strategy agreed with the Executive, with scope for programme change to reflect any accelerated deterioration of these assets.</p>	One to two-year full programme, with prioritisation criteria.
3	<p>In addition:</p> <p>All major assets, as described in the asset management strategy, have an approach to prioritisation. This approach is to align with the asset management objectives of the organisation described in its strategy. Key stakeholders have been liaised with regarding the prioritisation process and their comments considered for inclusion. There is a single one to two-year programme of work across all assets, with a three to five-year indicative programme, and works have been combined where possible.</p>	<p>Prioritisation process for all major assets, aligning to asset management strategy, liaison with key stakeholders, single programme of works for one to two years, indicative programme for three to five years.</p>

Has your local authority produced a long-term forward programme of capital maintenance for all its highway infrastructure assets?

This question is encouraging local authorities to develop longer programmes of work, of 3 to 5 years, for highway infrastructure assets.

The programme will deliver the outcomes of the authority's highway infrastructure asset management policy and strategy.

The one to two-year programme should be fully costed and prioritised. It is good practice to communicate the programme to relevant stakeholders and the public. Having longer term information of when work is to be carried out will help avoid some of the dissatisfaction of residents when they are unclear about what work will be undertaken and when.

Finally, having an indicative three to five-year programme will enable the operational service provider and the supply chain to provide more competitive prices by having a guaranteed clear pipeline of work. There also may be scope through early contractor involvement to further optimise the delivery of the programme by aggregating the work across a geographic area.

Resource: [HMEP / UKRLG Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)

21. Is your local authority or your operational service provider working in collaboration in delivering the highway maintenance service or any component of it?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Aware of the benefits of working in collaboration but do not have any arrangements in place.	None
2	Working in collaboration or a shared service arrangement with one or more local highway authorities on any aspect of highway maintenance service delivery, or providing evidence that consideration has been given to try to work collaboratively with adjoining authorities but this has not progressed.	Some form of formal agreement for joint working, which may be a contract or agreement between one or more local highway authorities, or evidence of a process that has been undertaken to encourage collaborative working.
3	Maximising the potential of the joint working to deliver ongoing and wider long-term benefits, including financial and improvement in service delivery.	Measurement and capture of multiple service improvements and efficiency gains achieved through these joint arrangements.

Is your local authority or your operational service provider working in collaboration in delivering the highway maintenance service or any component of it?

This question is about encouraging local authorities to consider working together, on the basis that this will deliver better outcomes. HMEP has developed a number of products to support joint working, both through joint procurement – the HMEP Local Highway Authorities Collaborative Alliances Toolkit – or through some form of shared services – the HMEP Shared Services Toolkit. Both these documents provide clear case study evidence of the benefits of embracing these approaches. Another relevant and related HMEP product is the HMEP Creating the Culture to Deliver Toolkit, which helps to support the need for a change in culture by working collaboratively.

Level 1 authorities understand the benefits of collaborative working, but nothing has progressed.

Level 2 authorities have undertaken some aspect of collaboration in highway maintenance services. This should be of a reasonable level of significance, and involve more than 5% of the overall maintenance budget.

Collaborative frameworks for highway infrastructure projects that include major capital maintenance projects are relevant, as are engineering professional consultancy frameworks that include highway maintenance related activities.

Some authorities may have tried to work in collaboration by incorporating in their procurement OJEU notice the opportunity for adjoining authorities to use the contract but have not had any take-up. It would be acceptable to provide evidence of a contract notice that includes evidence of this.

To be in Level 3, specific evidence will be required to demonstrate the service outcome benefits achieved by working in collaboration. This can be through measurable efficiency gains, improvements in a relevant performance measure or an improved customer outcome.

Resource: [HMEP Shared Services Toolkit](#)

Resource: [HMEP Local Highway Authorities Collaborative Alliances Toolkit](#)

Resource: [HMEP Creating the Culture to Deliver Toolkit](#)

22. Is your local authority adopting a good practice approach in the way it procures external highway maintenance services?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	Aware of good practice in procuring external highway services but unable to implement.	None
2	Demonstration of the effective use of using good practice procurement such as an HMEP contract or a best practice equivalent	Adopting HMEP Standard Highway Maintenance Services Contract or an equivalent recognised good practice approach to secure an outsourced highway maintenance service or aspects of maintenance services from external providers.
3	By applying good practice in procurement achieving the desired outcomes through the external providers.	Measurable continuous improvements in outcome performance through use of good practice procurement.

Is your local authority adopting a good practice approach in the way it secures highway maintenance services?

It is recognised that local authorities only periodically go to market, so this evidence will be based on the most recent procurement. However, if an authority is about to or has very recently been to market, the information from the previous arrangement is equally relevant within 3 years.

There is no intention by asking this question to dictate how local authorities configure their approach to deliver highway services as it is recognised that there is a range of different delivery models. However, whatever the delivery model, all local authorities will need to procure certain goods and services from the market. These can range from commodities such as materials to specialist services both operational and technical. Some local authorities will purchase these services direct, others will use regional or even national procurement hubs using call-off framework contracts. Some authorities will periodically go to market using various delivery models, ranging from top-up term maintenance contracts, fully outsourced term maintenance contracts, integrated contracts or joint ventures. Whatever the arrangement, HMEP has identified the following good practice attributes:

- A standard form of New Engineering Contract (NEC), ideally NEC 3.
- A long-term arrangement – a minimum of 3 years but ideally 5 to 10 years.
- A mechanism that incentivises good performance and efficiency. This could be financial in terms of target pricing and offer pain/gain, or through performance based extensions.
- Encourages collaborative working, both by the client and contractor, and through the supply chain.
- It is flexible, and if there is a change of circumstance for whatever reason, there is an ability to renegotiate.
- Uses the HTMA/ADEPT indexing price fluctuation mechanism.
- Encourages innovation-evidence by quality statements.

Using the HMEP Standard Contract for Highway Services will include all these attributes but it is not necessary to use this product, so long as evidence can be demonstrated that the principles are being followed.

A Level 1 authority may be aware of the good practice approach but will not have adopted it.

A Level 2 authority will have adopted the approach and in doing so must be able to show the evidence through making reference to clauses in the contracts that cover these attributes.

A Level 3 authority will not only be required to provide the evidence for Level 2 but also evidence of the measurable improvements that are being achieved by adopting this good practice approach. This evidence must be provided by supplying performance management data demonstrating improvements in outcomes in terms of customer, quality and cost over a 3-year period.

Resource: [HMEP Standard Form of Contract for Highway Maintenance](#)

4. Glossary of terms

ADEPT	Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport
All major assets	All of the major assets, as set out in the Asset Management Plan (see detail on page 8). Any assets covered by a PFI contract are exempt for the purposes of this questionnaire, as it is assumed that appropriate arrangements are in place through that contract.
Band	The overall rating of a local authority, which will be used to determine their funding allocation
BVPI	Best Value Performance Indicator
CIPFA	Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountants
DfT	Department for Transport
Executive	The political decision making body
HMEP	Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme
HTMA	Highways Term Maintenance Association
ISO	International Organisation for Standard
Key stakeholders	Local road users, local communities, businesses, utilities, public transport operators, emergency services
Level	The rating of a local authority on an individual question, which (collectively) will be used to determine their Band
NEC	New Engineering Contract
NHT Network	National Highways & Transport Network
OJEU	Official Journal of the European Union
Senior decision-maker	The political lead member for the highway service. In instances where the chief officer responsible for the highway service has delegated authority to make decisions on their behalf, evidence should be available for this.
UKRLG	United Kingdom Roads Liaison Group