



# **Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Plan 2025**

## **Section 7 – Performance Monitoring & Strategic Objectives**

## Document Control

Version	Description	Date	Officer	Role	Approval
1.0	Minor general updates	August 2016	DCR	Asset Management Engineer	-
1.1	Minor general updates	June 2019	DCR	Asset Management Engineer	Cabinet
2.0	Minor general updates	May 2025	AC	Asset Management Engineer	Strategic Lead for Highway Operations & Delivery
	Re-sectioning/accessibility update				

## **7. Performance Monitoring and Strategic Objectives**

### **7.1. Introduction**

Good performance monitoring is essential in managing the success of any asset management processes implemented. Performance measures generally need to be:

- Relatively easy to collect: if large amounts of time are present collecting/processing the data the costs (monetary and in terms of time) may outweigh the benefits
- Relevant: a large amount of data can be good but if over-collected, the time in compiling/comparing data sets may become way too much
- Comparable/benchmarkable: comparing performance against other authorities can aide in providing context for performance on a regional and/or national level
  - For example from NHT (National Highways & Transportation Network) survey results may look poor in isolation, but when compared to national averages; the majority of authorities are performing at a similar level

### **7.2. Levels of Service**

A level of service (LoS) differs from a target as it's now always a set figure/target, but can also be variable dependent on other factors. E.g. the NHT satisfaction survey results are given as a percentage of residents satisfied with particular areas. The results vary year-by-year so it's more accurate to measure performance vs national or regional averages.

It's also essential to ensure LoS are realistic with current and predicted future resource. For example, a target of a significant improvement in carriageway condition is only achievable with significantly more investment (for every 1% of carriageway network improved via resurfacing an investment of just under £3m is required without accounting for deterioration). A commitment can not be made to improve this unless we can be confident that funding can be secured.

#### **7.2.1. Changes from Previous HIAMP**

The previous (2019) version of the HIAMP set out vague LoS without set actions on how these were to be measured verging more on statements of intent as opposed to measurable performance targets. Measures for non-asset management/highway maintenance activities (such as road safety) have also been removed as these are not directly related to highway maintenance.

## 7.2.2. Current Levels of Service (Corporately Reported)

**Table 7.1 – Current Levels of Service**

Measure	Value	Benchmark	LoS	Notes
Principal roads (A roads) in a good/acceptable condition	Whole %	National Average	>= National Average	Collected by the DfT (inverse) and published in Council corporate performance reports
Non-principal classified roads (B and C roads) in a good/acceptable condition	Whole %	National Average	>= National Average	Collected by the DfT (inverse) and published in Council corporate performance reports
Unclassified roads in a good/acceptable condition	Whole %	National Average	>= National Average	Collected by the DfT (inverse) and published in Council corporate performance reports
Pavements in a good/acceptable condition	Whole %	N/A <sup>1</sup>	70%	Published in Council corporate performance reports
Ensure resident Satisfaction for Carriageway, Footway, Cycleway and Drainage maintenances achieves or exceeds National average	Yes/No	National Average	>= National Average	Published in Council corporate performance reports
Maintain a robust & effective asset management database for all Carriageway and Footway Assets	Whole %	N/A	95% data completeness	Published in Council corporate performance reports

<sup>1</sup>No national reporting requirements are present for Footway condition, CCC methodology is % requiring treatment according to data-driven treatment set rules

### **7.2.3. Principal roads (A roads) and non-principal, classified roads (B and C roads) in a good/acceptable condition**

Both of these indicators are inverse of national reporting requirements (130-01 and 130-02 respectively). The data is derived from SCANNER data performed biennially (one direction each year). Raw SCANNER survey data is loaded into the PMS system and the indicator is derived using a national standard methodology then inversed for the sake of reporting (e.g. 2% red becomes 98% 'good/acceptable').

### **7.2.4. Unclassified roads in a good/acceptable condition**

This indicator is derived/inversed from the national standard BV224b indicator. Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI) data is processed via the Pavement Management System (PMS) to produce the figure.

### **7.2.5. Pavements in a good/acceptable condition**

The pavement indicator has been created in-house and currently the only national standard available is for high hierarchy (usage/importance) footways (BV187). Historically we have applied this to a network-level however it has been found to be too strict. Figure 6.1 (below) shows an example of this:



**Figure 7.1 – Footway with minor utility scarring but overall even and structurally sound. Under the old method (OCI  $\geq 20$ ) this would be classed as a substandard footway requiring maintenance.**

The current methodology is based on extents of treatment needed. It is the sum of all reconstruction required based on treatment sets derived from raw DVI defects (cracking, fretting, cracked slabs etc.), the result is then inversed to produce the % in acceptable condition as opposed to requiring reconstruction.

Unfortunately this cannot be benchmarked due to the varying level of detail and different methodologies for collection footway condition nationally.

### **7.2.6. Ensure resident Satisfaction for Carriageway, Footway, Cycleway and Drainage maintenances achieves or exceeds National average**

Results for this indicator are derived from in-house processing of the NHT survey. Out-of-the-box NHT results amalgamate multiple satisfaction scores to an overall satisfaction indicator. Vegetation maintenance and information provision on gritting are classed as 'highway maintenance' activities in the overall satisfaction indicator; from an asset management perspective these are un-related to the physical/structural condition of assets so bespoke reporting has been used instead focusing on perception/satisfaction with physical/structural conditions.

Carriageway satisfaction is the amalgamation of two indicators: condition of road surface and number of potholes.

Footway and cycleway satisfaction is also two indicators: condition of pavements and condition of cycle routes.

Drainage satisfaction is an amalgamation of: keeping drains clear and working and deals with flooding on roads and pavements.

The indicators are then compared against national average and the difference for all 3 is summed. E.g a +4% satisfaction for carriageway, a -1% satisfaction for footways and a +1% satisfaction for drainage would results in +4% satisfaction from national average overall.

### 7.2.7. Maintain a robust & effective asset management database for all Carriageway and Footway Assets

This indicator is an average of multiple categories of 'data completeness'

- Carriageway condition scores (RCI/OCI) and treatment information (derived from DVI data) – as a % of network coverage
- Footway condition scores (OCI) and treatment information (derived from DVI data) as a % of network coverage
- Georeferenced IMD (Indices of Multiple Deprivation) data as a % of network coverage
- Ability to produce footway indicator (100% for yes, 0% for no)

The results for the 4 categories are then averaged to return a percentage of 'data completeness' for data we hold on our carriageway and footway assets.

## 7.3. Performance Management Framework

In addition to the LoS previously presented Coventry City Council also hold a performance management framework (PMF) that collates all relevant stats and figures associated with highway maintenance activities. Although not all of these have set targets it's useful data to find areas of improvement and also acts as a central repository to pull facts and figures from when requested,

Examples of items recorded but without performance targets include:

- kms of treatment performed each year
  - often budgets are not 100% confirmed until a couple of months before the new financial year, it would be unrealistic to set a target for treatment length with unknown budgets
  - however the data is useful to have for business cases and general queries
- individual NHT indicators
  - for satisfaction indicators multiple are amalgamated into different categories however it is useful to have these individual figures to hand for calculating the results and seeing which individual areas may be driving the results down

The PMF is also a useful tool to see year-on-year changes for multiple datasets.

Table 6.2 (below) shows an extract from the PMF.

**Table 6.2 – Extract from the PMF (data in the live document goes back to 2016/17)**

Indicator ID	Indicator Source	Description	Value	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24
130-01	National / UKPMS	Principal Roads requiring maintenance	%	1	2	3	2
130-02	National / UKPMS	Non Principal Classified Roads requiring maintenance	%	2	2	3	3
BV224b	National / UKPMS	Unclassified Roads requiring maintenance	%	19	19	19	18

## **7.4. Benchmarking**

Benchmarking is essential in monitoring performance, where available benchmarks will be used to see how we perform versus other councils (regionally or nationally). This is of importance as it adds context to performance figures, something that at a glance looks negative could be at/above national average, showing a nation-wide struggle rather than an individual perceived failure.

For example resident satisfaction with the condition of pavements dropped 4% between 2019 and 2023; however satisfaction nationally dropped 9% showing that the majority of councils in the country are facing a similar challenge and with current resourced available Coventry are performing above average with a lower dip in satisfaction.

### **7.4.1. National Highways & Transportation Survey (NHT)**

The NHT Public Satisfaction Survey collects public perspectives on, and satisfaction with, Highway and Transport Services in Local Authority areas. It is a unique, standardised, collaboration between Highway Authorities across the UK enabling comparison, knowledge sharing, and the potential to improve efficiencies by the sharing of good practice. The NHT Survey helps participating authorities to answer five key questions:

- What service areas need improving most?
- Which service areas have most potential to improve?
- Who should improvements be targeted at?
- Where should improvements be made?
- How can improvements be delivered?

NHT Survey Report – This annual report provides a complete picture of Coventry's results for the Highways Maintenance Theme; it is divided into three sections:

- Overall Theme Results,
- KBI (Key Benchmark Indicator) Results
- BI (Benchmark Indicator) Results.

### **7.4.2. Regional Benchmarking Groups**

Local and national benchmarking is used to compare the performance of The Council asset management framework and to share information that supports continuous improvement.

#### **West Midlands Combined Authorities**

The Council exchange objective and subjective data on all areas of Asset Management from stakeholder satisfaction through to national road condition data. This is primarily done at regional PAM (Pavement Asset Management) meetings which are currently chaired by Coventry.

#### **Midlands Highways Alliance (MHA+)**

The Council membership of the MHA+ helps us keep abreast of industry developments and to measure where we are in terms of performance standards compared to our peers. It also allows for prudent procurement of goods and services and helps with achieving economies of scale for both of these. The MHA delivers the regional procurement and implementation of highways maintenance, professional services and capital works through framework agreements.

## **7.5. Continuous Improvement**

The Council are driving continual improvement in The Council asset management practices through:

- Regular liaison and sharing of information with other highway authorities, both formal and informal, locally and nationally.

- Encouraging both The Council own staff and supply chain to challenge practices on an on-going basis, looking for areas for improvement and efficiencies.
- Keeping abreast of latest issues, sharing information and experiences, reviewing innovations and developing and informing advice on best practice through involvement in appropriate groups and national forums.

## 7.6. Asset Management Competency

National guidance has been published by the UKRLG (UK Roads Liaison Group) around asset management competence. Coventry use a modified version of this to more suit the needs of a smaller unitary council as generally the one-size-fits-all approach used by the guidance is more suitable for larger authorities with a larger asset management team. This modified competence framework has been shared with our peers in the West-Midlands who operate under similar asset management staffing structures.

This modified framework can be used to identify potential learning gaps based on level of asset management knowledge required for each role, this is split into five categories:

- **1 – N/A**, the specific role does not require knowledge about the particular asset management competency in question.
  - E.g. admin/support staff and knowledge/experience regarding undertaking condition surveys
- **2 – Awareness**, aware what the competence is
  - E.g. cabinet members need to be aware that there is legislation that feeds into asset management and its processed but not necessarily need any full detailed knowledge of the subject
- **3 – Knowledge**, knowledge of the subject of the competence but not necessary any experience/responsibility in implementing it within the service
  - E.g. directors need to know about KPIs/what they're used for but not responsible for compiling data directly
- **4 – Experience**, experience in implementing the competency into the service with guidance from others
  - E.g. asset management technicians being able to support the review of network hierarchy by providing and analysing geographical data (such as school locations etc.) and providing input on any other locally geographically important locations
- **5 – Proficiency**, the ability to take a lead role in implementing/championing that particular competency in the authority
  - E.g. the asset management lead writing the HIAMP

This document does not cover Highway Inspector competencies in regards to undertaking safety inspections. These are covered in the Highway Inspection Policy.