

NZTA Waka Kotahi: 2024 - IAG MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Name:	NZTA Industry Advisory Group Meeting		
Date of Meeting:	22 February 2024	Time:	9:00am-4:00pm
Meeting Chair:	Pete Connors (NZTA)	Location:	NZTA Waka Kotahi Room BOW 2.14 Tangaroa; bow 2.14 44 Bowen Street, Wellington 6140
Meeting Objective:	The key objective of the Industry Advisory Group (IAG) is to optimise and improve sustainable system management within New Zealand.		
Attendees:			
Name	Organisation	Email Address	
Mark Stewart	Downer	Mark.Stewart@downer.co.nz in person	
Kieron Ingram	FH	kieron.ingram@fultonhogan.com (ALTERNATE)	
Adam Humphries	FH	Adam.humphries@fultonhogan.com in person	
Gary Porteous	WSP	gary.porteous@wsp.com in person	
Michael Darnell	WSP	mike.darnell@wsp.com (ALTERNATE)	
Andre Langeveld	Higgins	A.Langeveld@higgins.co.nz	
Tracy Ten Hove	Higgins	t.tenhove@higgins.co.nz (ALTERNATE) in person	
Chris Kerr	HEB	chris.kerr@heb.co.nz apologies	
Carol Ma	HEB	Carol.Ma@heb.co.nz (ALTERNATE) in person	
Michelle Farrell	Civil Contractors	michelle@civilcontractors.co.nz in person	
Cara Lauder	Ventia	cara.lauder@ventia.com online	
Robert Tutty	Beca	Robert.Tutty@beca.com apologies	
Mike Tapper	Beca	michael.tapper@beca.com	
Stuart MacLeod	Southroads	stuart.macleod@southroads.co.nz online	
Dean Elder	Southroads	dean.elder@southroads.co.nz	
David Larsen	GHD	David.larsen@ghd.com (ALTERNATE)	
Simon Bird	GHD	Simon.Bird@ghd.com in person	
Craig Pitchford	Aecom	Craig.pitchford@aecom.com	
Jack Hansby	NZTA	Jack.hansby@nzta.govt.nz apologies	
Rochelle Leach	NZTA	Rochelle.leach@nzta.govt.nz apologies	
Phil Wall	NZTA	Phil.Wall@nzta.govt.nz (ALTERNATE)	
Peter Connors (chair)	NZTA	Peter.connors@nzta.govt.nz in person	
Ross I'Anson	NZTA	Ross.ianson@nzta.govt.nz online	
Mike Manion	NZTA	Mike.manion@nzta.govt.nz in person	
Karen Kiriona	KSK Consultancy	Karen@kskconsultancy.nz in person	
Raymond Edwards	NZTA	Ray.edwards@nzta.govt.nz online	
Mark O'Connor	NZTA	Mark.O'Connor@nzta.govt.nz in person	

MEETING MINUTES

Topic	Lead
<p>Item 1 - Welcome & Safety Moment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH – FH Driver Aggression <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Serious incident Waikato driver hitting subcontractor. Swerved into coned off lane. ○ Have started traffic management breach training. All have RTs on site now. Working through communications & what everyone needs to do to protect themselves. Going through exercise means people know what to do. Good initiative to help people. Auckland specific at the moment but others are now considering. • MM – looking at de-escalation training. Investigatory phase for what best suits us in M&O. • SB – Attended FH brief to contractors & clients McKenzie District Council, around TTM & role FH were taking with it. Big change is colour change hi viz. Can get complacent so simple change of colour may make a difference. Flight or fight type scenario. TTM sea of orange is normal. Actually, need to change so something different. Yellow with an orange band outside reflective stripe. 	<p>Pete Connors</p>
<p>Item 2 – NZTA Updates</p> <p><i>2.1 SHAMP & LAMPs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Updates & implementation</i> • MOc – Major points under each LAMP. See power point. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Making sure not too far off AMDs. Creating our own data so not 100% aligned. ○ Asset data will stay the same. ○ Condition rating will apply to whole section to begin with. Eventually may be able to segment treatment lengths more. Rating will be a culmination of scores. • SMC – Drainage longitudinal not culverts.? • MOc -do have a LAMP for culverts. Using data in RAMM as it is. Separate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Video rating barriers & large signs. Will be some training. May/April workshop. ○ Working with lead advisor sustainability. Compartmentalise into asset LAMPs. Discussing a heritage LAMP. Probably a lower priority but recognised. • AH - how will this work given we have our MMPs in place etc. Do we turn off some stuff or rewrite. • MOc – be good if we could move to a National condition rating process but acknowledge it may vary. Working with suppliers on best approach. • PC – opportunity as going through IDM to look at what needs to be done. • MM – MMPs fantastic piece of work & we can see the results on the Network. Be good if Marks team could work with us to map a roll out programme so people can plan for this change. Implementation programme useful step in this process. Would like to tie this into contract extension process underway. 	<p>Mark O’Conn or</p>
<p><i>2.2 NZGTTM – trials & update of process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC – most involved one way or another. Trial areas not advancing as fast as hoped. Lots of things going on with TTM as a result of 5 NOCs doing trials. Audits against TTM going on around. Looking for a culture change out there. Different thinking that will have to go on. Have seen changes already where opportunities that wouldn’t previously have been OK are being implemented. Industry developed practice notes will eventually replace COPTTM. On us all to do better. We don’t have to wait for new guide to make change out there. Will be a long journey. Commitment to make work but all have issues under H&S that have to be worked through. RASCI has been sent out. Access to corridor function of NZTA responsibility. Can’t contract out of that. Will probably use Independent Service provider to look after RCA interests until such time that NZTA can recruit the necessary qualified personnel. Probably bigger change than changing contract form. Need to get it right. Have to take the public with us. Somehow turn behaviour around. 	<p>Peter Connors</p>
<p><i>2.3 WK Site Engagement Tool</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TTM focussed site engagements.</i> • MM – new National Manager for M&O Andrew Clark. Focussed on what we need to go and do. Firstly, take pride in our network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Power point presentation. • SMC – If someone feels unsafe should speak up. • MM – sometimes afraid to speak to someone more experienced. Need to have a culture where anyone who feels unsafe can say so. • SMC – can go through H&S representative anonymously. 	<p>Mike Manion</p>

- MM – need to encourage our leaders to be more attentive. If feel unsafe site needs to be made safe.
 - Will focus on different things then swing back to see if improvements.
- PC – any feedback?
- AH – what’s set up between delivery by NOC & third-party activities?
- MM – Third party activities are controlled by CMT. Need to coordinate to make sure their TTM meets standards. Ownership includes looking out for third parties.
- TTH – rising costs of TTM 80% increase over past 3 years. Training costs also increasing.
 - NZTA are seeing rates & thinking not right.
- MM – supply & demand thing.
- AH – plan for survey output? Can you provide summary stuff for each supplier.
- MM - Andrew will be speaking to your leaders. Will see if can get released to representatives from organisations. **Action #5**
- SMc – issue finding staff. Might be paying more but still don’t want to stay as STMs. High turnover.

2.4 TREC progress and update (postponed until next meeting)

2.5 2024/27 Pavement SPRINT status

- 24/25 Pavement rehab works
- Pavement investigations & designs
 - Workshops
 - Programming & tracking
- MM – Power point presented.
- GP – Moratoriums or 24/7 will be a challenge with resources, wellbeing etc
- MM – comes down to planning ahead.
 - Get organised & track ourselves.

Mike Manion

2.6 NLTP 2024/27 process

- Progress for funding
- Funding position for 2024
- Any updates to time frames
- Email update sent through from Rochelle Leach

Rochelle Leach

As everyone is aware we have a SHIP bid based on the draft GPS released in Oct23. Following the change in government this document is being reviewed/refreshed by Minister and we hope to see this mid-late March. We will be reviewing, at pace, the new version of GPS against the SHIP proposed bid to identify any changes in approach or direction required. This may include:

- Strategic approach
- Government priorities
- Bid value \$\$

Until then we are continuing to work on the 24-27 three-year plans with teams, based on what we know now.

As indicated in SM018, Chapter 4 Key Milestones, we are committed to providing assurance around programming and planning for 2024/25 including that “year 1 allocations can be treated with certainty”. This is why the 1st March due date is so critical so that we can collate plans across the SH Activity, engage quickly with teams if any questions arise, and adapt quickly to the GPS while still meeting milestones for provisional allocations and providing 24-27 NLTP to Board.

2024 05	Provisional Allocations are expected to be made available in late May to assist in the refinement of the 3-Year Plans. Year 1 allocations can be <u>treated with certainty</u> . If the final allocations change then only the allocations for Years 2 and 3 will be impacted.
2024 06 30	Preliminary NPVs are due for submission
2024 08 31	NLTP adopted by Waikato Board
2024 09	NLTP published
2024 09	Recommended confirmed allocations made to the Group General Manager – Transport Services
2024 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed 3-year allocation tables are made available in InfoHub & allocated in SAP (provisional estimate were made available in late May 2024) • 2024/25 (Year 1) detailed programmes are due for baseline establishment

- PC – Get on with it.
- SB – May need to reiterate OK to go ahead.
- PC – Need to get on a roll so churn not holding us up. If funding only 80% will not make a difference.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Negotiations – if negotiated deals done. If you haven't, unfunded risk out there, use current rates as escalated to June 2023. ● GP – WTA have used to Feb 2024 ● PC – Action to check with Rochelle everyone has the right message. Costs will be as in June 2023. Action #6 ● SMC – message to use from July last year & NZTA will look at any inflation adjustment. ● GP – indications from GPS that may be more maintenance funding. Uncertain still. ● PC – they want a separate activity class for renewals, rehabs & drainage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can't just use renewals as a budget balancing exercise. 	
<p><u>Ka2.7 IDM update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NW – Why are we doing this? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Network condition & massive programme ahead. How do we ensure right capacity & capability to get work done ○ Quality - how can we improve. ○ Efficiency & effectiveness – simplifying things. Contract document 1000 pages to grind through. Need to be sharper with what we are after. ○ Strategic asset management ○ Tactical asset management ○ Delivery ○ Performance & data ○ Incentives. Clear on what we want to do. ○ Corridors. ○ Standardising things. Catalogue designs – be clear on how we want them used. ○ Prioritising. Holding strategies if money issues. ○ Centralised function sharper around outputs. Produce tactical plan out to Industry to direct what we want. ○ Strong focus on delivery. ○ Simplify performance regime. Sharper performance metrics ability to influence. Look at supplier & own performance. ○ NOC boundary's no major changes. ○ Operating model recognises existing regions. More joined up conversations in regions. Suppliers & ourselves, maybe specialists. ● GP – where do consultants fit in model? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NW – Tactical plan Agency responsibility but could be opportunities there. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still designs out there. ● AH – Asset management is sitting in the NOC will that now be outside suppliers' scope? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NW- focussing on how actually plan the work. Still need expertise around designs. Opportunity for tweaking if smarter. At tactical level plan to be done with Industry, unsure how that will play out in the regions. ● GP – Efficiency regional local level involved in development of tactical plan. Right treatment at network level. How do you see that value coming back? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PC – grunt still needs to be done with optimisation. ● SB – LAMP presentation asked where that sits with MMPs. Looks like moving more & more in house. What about suppliers MMPs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NW – personal view. Probably MMP needs to be more directive from us as opposed to from Supplier. ○ MM – level of true embedment of process. MMP not performed as desired in all places. NZTA budget & asset management about us exercising our own stewardship & ownership. ● NW – detail still to work through. Heats on now to accelerate. Ramping up detail around stuff. Will have to start talking to suppliers as to how far do we go. Want Industry focussed on delivery piece. Capability build needed within NZTA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PC – Timing going quicker? ● NW – got to get collateral right. Existing contract how can we implement improvements earlier. Internally must get sharper about producing contract less than a 1000 pages long. ● SMC – Timeline. Initially we were going to talk late last year. Desire to implement via pilot contracts. ● PC – Pilots were identified but now on back burner, ● NW – Will go where we can get early wins. ● PC – still uncertainty. Negotiations still uncertain where finished up. ● NW – where we would we go first not yet decided. ● PM - thoroughly engaged by project team in performance of this new model. Feel free to use Penny as a conduit with ideas about performance. Keen to see what you would like to be done differently or better. ● AH - M&V for heavy pavement maintenance scope? 	Neil Walker

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NW – reviewing risk allocation stuff. Start asset management make sure model right. Clear what adjustments around type of payments risk in right place. ● MF – also went through contract document. KPIs objective would be fantastic. Will you get a plain English review consistently throughout contract? How would you put restrictions on people changing special conditions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NW – looking at form of contracts. Plain English. Difficult to read. Overall, you could make changes, but not useable in its current form. Decide what’s future form to follow & what are implications for us & Industry. Has changed over time. ● MS – relationship component in document, but everyone looks at document after that section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MM – relationships aspects not in legal parts of document. Friendship is a 2-way street. We need to improve quality of what we are doing on the road. ● SMc – need clear schedule of quantities, BoP specification makes it easy to read. All the grey within black & white makes things difficult. Clear what’s required & how you get paid. ● TTH – sometimes documents are rushed out. ● NW – Change & objectives trying to reach can’t do under existing contract. Response stuff works well. Noise comes from planning process. Quality of how things done on road. Contract must support new way of what we are trying to do. ● PC – All part of solution not problem. Our problem not just yours or mine. ● SMc – When to the market? ● PC – 2025 	
<p>Item 3 – Industry Matters</p> <p><i>3.1 Current state of networks nationally</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Trends & forecasts</i> <p><i>3.2 Direction of performance management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>OPMs: We now have little consistency across the country with variations in OPMs from re-negotiated contracts to newer contracts. Are these offering value and assisting in how contracts and networks are being run?</i> ● PC – not throwing all OPMs out. ● PM – as negotiations moved away from standard definition found ways to capture data & embed whilst allowing local scores to get included. ● SB – Have you noticed any change in OPMs being measured but not scored? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PM – All-time high for pavement defects. No incentive in regions where not scored to have them mitigated out. Probably getting a truer reflection of what’s going on out there. ● MM – agree. Being done to feed data rather than trying to mitigate for commercial reasons. ● PM – Pavement deficiencies seasonal. 2 previous annual peaks step up each year. Increase may be a return to more typical levels after call to action. ● <i>KRAs: Have the revisions led to less administration load on the suppliers? Is this valuable to NZTA and the suppliers?</i> ● PM – 4 NOCs currently not participating in KRAs. BoP West on pause. Central Waikato stopped agreed out of scope in negotiations. HB & Tairawhiti stopped but not sure why. Often hear noise about KRAs being time consuming but not sure which bits. ● <i>Team: Is performance management more to do with the "team" rather than the format? Historically all NOCs were involved in the Mahi Tahī (2021). "Acquiring more skills in collaborative working practices would improve the way the contract operates" Has this happened?</i> ● SB – Having invested time in Mahi Tahī did we see anything come out from a benefit view. Did it add value. ● MM – unfortunately not seen step change hoped we would make. Collaboration means working together making each other successful. Seeing pulling apart again. How can you be more profitable by spending less of our money. ● TTH – complexity turnover ● PC – Comprehensive training regimes within regions. Established charters started well. Whatever model we are in we have to continue training & contractual understanding for all parties ● MM – MCM churn pretty stable. This group was set up to review NOC & shape what was best for Industry. Started out with good intent. People change. Other people come in. Lose skill of being able to work together. Conversations not happening where we are making each other successful. ● PM – right timing for training. Generally, individuals. Wants to be self-service. New person needs time to absorb information. Training on demand rather than cyclical. ● PC – benefit in bringing groups together & starting conversations. Getting to know people & have confidence to talk. Need to be able resolve differences in the right way. 	<p>Peter Connors</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB – wanted to ask question to test. Always asking question is it valuable is it useful. • AH – good thing to discuss. If you ask people what single biggest thing they want to see change, its around KRAs & churn it makes. It has grown since the start of NOCs. Information in booklets daunting. • PC – Was on a lot of boards. Lot of time spent on KRAs. Frustrating as could focus on other things. Get right & then higher-level discussion. • MF – Interesting working together & figuring out the why of both sides. What do you need more or less of to understand those drivers. • MM – need to clearly state expectations. Intent of model always seemed to be a bit nebulous. Underlying intent not clear. • PC – new model will be measured on outputs. WK will be measured on outcomes that result. • MM – Helped team understand that delivery KPI was knowing what government hold us accountable too. We have always talked to that point but people not always ready to hear. • MS – Is WK still going to review Performance framework guidelines for exist NOCs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PM – Every year we publish a new version. There will always be an annual version but will limit change to what’s necessary. 	
<p>3.3 Quality assurance for the 2023/24 renewals season</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sharing any learnings</i> • RI – Sealing review last year. Ross’s QA people visiting sites & providing advice. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Looking at RQPs as part of KRA Q2 requirements. A lot of documents are big, follow a template process. Looking at just being quality specific so clear. Some of QA stuff not actually on site when requested. Crews have been welcoming to reviewers etc. Some sealing failures asking for testing on bitumen, coming through. Doing some testing ourselves. Hope to be able to share stuff around when able. Ray has noticed issues on patches. Reseals then patched area stripping or flushing. So, guys are now looking at pre-seal repairs, are they being done properly & on time etc. • GP – WTA quality issues with handover of sites. Pushing back. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PC – need to maintain that tension. Must push back. Make sure elevated to right people. • RI – that’s exactly what’s happened. My team aren’t doing capital projects but when this happens are having a look at what’s been going on. Assessing what needs to be done & who’s responsible for what part. SIP programme going very fast. Target to deliver Km to minister. • MM – what’s the issue for IAG. Make sure concerns come through so can deal with. More identified & passed through more chance to do something. Don’t accept rubbish. Document problem & bring to our attention in best way possible. Want to do a national review on rehab granular overlay projects. Looking for independent to lead for us. • GP – looking for site nominations? Love to nominate Mt Bruce site. • RI – found guys out on-site making decisions to seal pending rain. • AH - planned scope of review? • RI – physical construction on site. Can look at design right through as well if that’s what’s needed. • RE – found looking at reseals & flushing areas majority of it is in patches. Resealing too soon after putting patches on. Patches creating defects in reseals. Planning & processes contractors putting in place to get sealing on time. Universal across most of networks. Will be looking at next month or so while still doing patches for next year. • MM – seeing AC as part of preseal rep? • RE- have seen where patch fails & going back with AC to repair. Not the best, needed for expediency sometimes but comes at a cost to quality of reseal. Agency needs to look at what they are approving but contractor also needs to look at how its managing sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Getting patching right may eliminate problems across the network. 	<p>Ross l’Anson</p>
<p>Item 2 – NZTA updates continued</p> <p>2.8 ILM – M future focus groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KK - 3 groups now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPRINT groups to be brought together as a particular problem/project arises. ○ Policy advice group to be brought together as need arises. May require different specialist inputs. ○ IDM subgroup. Has been formed & due to start up soon. ○ If people in room interested in being part of these groups let us know. <p>2.9 PCDAR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where does NZTA want to take this process?</i> • <i>Reporting requirements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Suppliers’ ability to update completed sites lists</i> • RI – Mark Cruden still available. 	<p>Ross l’Anson</p>

- Goes back to what was originally agreed & what was the process. Slowing people up when trying to find testing information. PCDAR part of contract negotiations. Not sure if PCDAR will continue into new model.
- PC – want to tidy up PCDAR as we go through negotiations. Want to make sure anything remedied as worked through. Interested in how people see this playing out in new space.
- GP – always been 12-month defects liability but 2 years at end.
- MM – construction defects should not be tolerated. Designers looking at things & improving as go. PCDAR has mashed together. Don't want to see construction defects bought into risk conversation.
- RI - have gone to group re ability to input into JUNO.
 - AH - anything constructed can't go through PCDAR as not entered into JUNO.
 - PC – we need to tidy up JUNO issue.
- MM – tied to existing contracts hard to vary. But as part of negotiations can reduce liability.
- PC – RI can we get with one of your people to get straw man together. Worried about some extensions in limbo.
 - MM – getting people together shouldn't be hard.
- AH – specifications probably 20 years old, still using sand circles etc. May be time to think about those things.
 - P17 for surfacing. B2? Gary, Adam, Pete, Sandra King get together. **Action #7**
- AI – finding people not putting data test results in share point. Please make sure putting in right place.

Pete
Connors

2.10 Industry standards for AI fault/asset identification (question raised by Jack Hansby)

- *Discussion: With the move towards AI we need to develop industry standards for AI fault/asset identification so we can have consistency of output.*
- MM – main suppliers have made considerable investment. In parallel Agency has also been working with Longrigs. What's best way of working together in respect of IP that's already been developed.
- AH – Consistent standard, 2 parts. What is definition of fault & severity. Defined in RIMs fault guideline (in final stages of ratification) needs to align to that.
 - Second, how do you verify you are picking up all cracking or getting what's on the ground right?
- GP – shouldn't that be defined by the method of measurement used?
 - MM – finer level of detail & opportunity for consistency.
- CM – Glad this has made it onto agenda. First raised 2 or 3 years ago that client should take lead on this. Client needs to produce guide. UK has already done this. When AI introduced had to demonstrate they are conforming to the standard. Different inspectors also got different outcomes.
- AH – Depends on what you want to get out of AI application. If using AI outputs for accurate quantity of crack seal for this season that is a challenge.
- MM – Do we need to see what everyone's got then draw on what UK or other smarts have got. Working group to do what CM suggested.
- GP – Agency should have a view on what the standard looks like. Will be more data to add to what we know. Already in vehicle scans measuring as well.
- AH – industry invested a lot over several years. Wouldn't wait & resolve way to go to market wanting solution to be national consistent.
- MM – need to first know what we want before going to market. What is the purpose? Determine condition or development programmes? Need clarity of purpose.
- PC – part of IDM?
- MM – need to move quickly before IDM. Need purpose.
- PC – Jack to own & get working group together. **Action #8**
- MM – need to get smart people in room together.
- PC – need to understand what it can do. Needs to be connected & it's not now. Internally need to get together & define what we want.
- CM – Australia have put out a lot of tenders for pavement condition. Why not ask what they have done.

2.11 AMDS implementation

- *National approach for variations*
- DD - what are you wanting to achieve?
- AH – lot of tranches going on. As an industry understand what old & new world looks like. Element of training & sorting out background systems & getting tidied up. One off thing but does come at significant cost. How do we take an approach to NOCs to agree -
 - 1) is it a variation?
 - 2) is there a cost?
 - 3) how will a centralised approach work?

DD

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD – how different are back-office systems. Would a standard approach be equitable. Have rolled out in Wellington & other councils across the country already. Must have been some experience around this to inform any standard process. • AH – FH backroom systems more significant than Local authorities. • DD – does this relieve need for change when we go to other organisations. • TTH – reset for each contract or data base separately. • DD – Roll out starts middle of this year. Every State highway contract. • MM – need to understand what the actions are. Who’s going to be involved & for how long. At what stage does it get centralised to minimise back-office piece. Understand & analyse to avoid duplication of effort. • DD – Transfer planning, how much transfer of data within our system to new format. Apparent hasn’t been as many claims coming from Local authorities as has been from suppliers? • AH – they haven’t really known it’s an option. We haven’t passed costs on either. Now becoming apparent what change required. • DD – Business case expected change where fair. How much of back office is our responsibility & how much suppliers? Parameter based or some form of averaging costs. • AH – Training, needs consistent approach. Secondly, here’s parameters to recognise scope of change then individual discussions. • MM – ongoing mentoring overview need with training. Concerned with one size fits all. Needs to be properly planned out & resourced. • DD – up for investing & understanding variables. How do we do that? • MM – how much detail in implementation programme? • DD - doing all at once. Chosen to run billings through the councils. We know what its cost in the councils. • MM- programme to cover 69 RCAs. What level of detail? X number of activities mapped out? • DD – whole process mapped out for councils. • MM – could you convert tasks into a schedule? • DD – being done for State highways. • AH – 2 subtasks in programme, train & sorting out back. Assuming data transfer will be handled by NZTA. 90% being handled outside of supplier’s remit. • DD – how do we go forward? • AH – work with someone in DDs team to work out process? • MM – impact on other systems? eg RAMM contractor? • DD – that’s our side of the business • MM – RAMM contractor owned by suppliers. • AH – exactly what talking about. • PC – as RAMM contractor going forward don’t we want visibility? • DD – Links to Archimedes etc. Can find a letterbox & have a discussion to assess impact & arrive at something sensible. Work out how to make it equitable. Can you plan & have no fault in transition. Got close with Wellington City. DD ideas will come to a letter box with how to assist this. Arrive at parameters to make this work. 	
<p>Item 5 - Review previous actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KK - See updated Actions spreadsheet. 	Peter Connors
<p>Item 6 - AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC – Discussion around future IAG meetings. Should we continue with attendance in person as preference or TEAMS calls? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General agreement from group to maintain face to face option as preference. 	Peter Connors

Date of next meeting: 14 May 2024
Location: Wellington

Future Meeting dates for 2024:
20 August
12 November

