Pavement condition KPI Engagement Q&A

Engagement session 1 30th January 2024

Penny Marriott
15 March 2024
V 1.0

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Questions and answers supporting Engagement session 1

Table 1: Question parked in session

Question	Answer
Is deflect and curvature data called TSD data, and will that be rolled out with the high-speed data again? I understand it hasn't been there for some time.	TSD data is the travelling speed deflectometer which is captured independently to the HSD. The North Island was completed in the 2022/23 construction season with results visible in RAMM. The South Island is hoping to be done in the 2024/25 construction season.
	Deflection and curvature are important data sets but don't impact the measures, Rather they inform the modelling and the decisions which are measured.

Table 2: Paraphrased Q&A from session 1

Topic	Question	Answer
Pavement condition outcomes based on funded FWP	Are existing National Pavement Condition reports in HIP continuing?	Yes. We're just taking a snapshot of that data and using it in another place.
	Will we get access to the network level DMS files?	Yes. Once set up we will have an agreed DMS file available.
	Will Waka Kotahi run the modelling and produce the report? Or would our local asset teams do that for each network.	We anticipate doing that modelling. Local teams can make known alternate metrics/sub-networks to build into our modelling.
	Has NZTA adopted ONF?	ONF comes into effect in the next NLTP. Our intention is to adapt at that time.





What happens when submitted funding requests eg for rutting and roughness programmes are not funded?	Focus is on funded programme. If further improvement is funded, that would then increase the expectations, and the model would be updated in terms of outcome.
Is the baseline the 22/23 High speed survey?	It might need to differ from one network to another depending what is going to be the most insightful.
Are you expecting to see a year 1 improvement? Or is there a lag? Or is this looking at one or more NLTP periods?	Meaningful measurement will be a journey requiring refinement. The value will be in the variance analysis. If we find that in a region or sub-network the expected improvement didn't happen or was better than expected – understanding the why will be the important and value add bit. We don't have targets – what we're trying to do is put our ear to the ground and understand what's happening.
If a fault is picked up and then a reseal goes over the top, does 'no action required' become 'repaired'?	We're comparing an actual inspection with an actual inspection. The fault will not be detectable in the next inspection.
Severity scale and scoring – we can end up with some quite large numbers Consider severity measure per km.	If it's useful to calculate it differently we can look at other options (including cost). The comparison year to year is what is of interest, not the absolute numbers.
What fault data is needed	Basic all faults extract, as per screenshot supplied in the indicative content slide If the initial data set doesn't provide everything needed we will engage with NOC and work through any gaps/issues.
Going back to the slides in the KRA reports – what is to be put in by contractor and what filled in for us.	 Forecast pavement condition: <u>Contractor may nominate alternate metric and/or sub-networks.</u> The data and modelling itself will be sourced centrally. Fault identification: <u>Data source is the Contractor's fault data.</u> Centrally calculated from there. Contractor may: <u>Nominate alternate metric eg incorporating length</u> <u>Define sub-networks.</u> Maintenance and renewal investment levels: Centrally produced Stability of pipeline quantities and funding decisions: Issues can be identified centrally or by Supplier Impact to be filled in by contractor (ideally column 2 and 3 of the table in the quarterly KRA report)

Fault identification and management