

Instructions for completing this spreadsheet

This spreadsheet is designed to be used alongside the guidance '*Local Highways Maintenance Capital Funding: self-assessment questionnaire for the incentive fund*'.

There are 22 questions to be answered, in 5 sections. Using the drop down box for each question in column E in each of the 5 worksheets, please place your local authority into one of the three bands based on the available evidence.

Your self-assessed answers to the 22 questions will feed into the summary sheet and produce the final banding for your authority. **Note:** you do not need to enter any markings into the 'summary' spreadsheet directly.

Your final band (as outlined in the guidance) will be calculated as follows:

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.

Also if an authority scores 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.

Section 1: Asset Management Policy questions

There are 8 questions in this section

Q1. Does your local authority have an asset management policy and strategy for its highway infrastructure?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	No asset management policy and strategy is in place but there is an awareness that it should be developed. or A commitment to producing an asset management policy and strategy has been given, but it has not been approved.	None
2	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.	Evidence that the asset management policy and strategy has been completed, signed off by the Executive and published.
3	In addition: 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.	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.

Q2. Has your local authority communicated its approach to highway infrastructure asset management?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	No approach to communication has been developed. or 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.	None
2	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.	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.
3	In addition: 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.	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.

Q3. 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	No reference to performance measures and monitoring linked to asset management. or 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.	None
2	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.	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.
3	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. 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.	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. Investment level required to achieve the targets and acceptance by the Executive over at least the next 3 years.

Q4. Does your local authority have an effective regime to manage its highway infrastructure asset data?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	There is no asset register. or Inventory data is held for major assets in an asset register, but is incomplete and not updated regularly.	None
2	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.	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.
3	In addition: 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.	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.

Q5. Is your local authority undertaking lifecycle planning as part of its highway infrastructure asset management?

Level	Specific description	Evidence
1	There is an awareness of the need for an investment plan for major assets that can be achieved through lifecycle planning. or An approach to lifecycle planning is commencing but has not yet been implemented and adopted to support investment planning.	None
2	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.	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.
3	In addition: The requirements of Level 2 for all major assets (not just carriageways). 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.	The requirements of Level 2 for all major assets (not just carriageways). 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.

Q6. 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	Senior decision-makers are not involved in the decisions to develop or implement asset management. or 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.	None
2	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. 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.	Agreed policy, strategy and programme of works. Confirmation of the person leading asset management, including job description.
3	In addition: 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.	Terms of Reference for regular meetings, minutes, action plans.

Q7. 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	The need for asset management competencies has not been identified. or The need to identify competencies has been understood but no positive actions or training undertaken.	None
2	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.	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.
3	In addition: 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.	Individual development and training records, knowledge sharing, implementation of a relevant competency framework.

Q8. 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	Risks associated with asset management are not considered. or There is an understanding amongst key staff that risk must be managed but there is no approach developed.	None
2	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.	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.
3	In addition: 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.	Lessons learnt register; risk based asset management plans exist for critical infrastructure.

Section 2: Resilience questions

There are 3 questions in this section

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>	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.
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>	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.

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. 	Ongoing improvements in the performance of repairing potholes.

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. · All relevant flooding incidents investigated appropriately. 	Improvements in the performance of measures related to flooding.

Section 3: Customer questions

There are 3 questions in this section

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.	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.

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.	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. Ensures that updates are posted with regard to the progress on the individual faults/defects reported by members of the public. It is acceptable for the response to be 'no action', if this follows the authority's asset management strategy.

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:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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>

Section 4: Benchmarking and efficiency questions

There are 2 questions in this section

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	A member of a "benchmarking club" that measures and compares service delivery 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.	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	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. The methods to calculate the performance data used for benchmarking are robust and transparent, based on reliable data.	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. 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.

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.	There is a consistent and comparable basis for assessing efficiency, which allows comparisons over time and benchmarking with other authorities. Efficiency performance is compared between years and is benchmarked to identify potential for improvement and examples of improved performance.

Section 5: Operation service delivery questions

There are 6 questions in this section

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	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. 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.	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: <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.

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.

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.

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	There is no programme of works. Work that is undertaken is on a reactive basis and addresses problems on the network as they arise. or The intention to produce a multi-year works programme has been stated but no timetable for production is in place.	None
2	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.	One to two-year full programme, with prioritisation criteria.
3	In addition: 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.	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.

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.

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.