AMDS Network Model Implementation Insights from Groups 0 – 4

November 2024

Communications and Engagement

- CAs appreciated the frequent and useful communication, which included clear instructions and opportunities to ask questions.
- The team was prompt in responding to emails, and there was effective initial engagement and awareness-building about the project goals.
- Stakeholders appreciated the ability to revisit meeting recordings, which facilitated better understanding and follow-up discussions.
- The team effort and guidance were highlighted as positive aspects, with meetings being informative and guidelines clear.
- Additional support was desired, as some participants felt they could have benefited from more assistance during the process.
- The team was responsive and supportive, addressing queries effectively and maintaining great communication.
- CAs appreciated the clarity in communication, including well-defined timelines and updates, which facilitated a smooth process.
- Internal holdups prevented stakeholders from reviewing as much as desired. There was also a lack of clarity on why and what to explain to others in the organisation.
- Stakeholders appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback after scheduled sessions, allowing for continuous improvement.
- The overall move was easy, with straightforward and smooth communication and implementation processes. Stakeholders found the team approachable and appreciated the productive and relaxed project vibe, enhanced by good music choices.
- There was a need for a centralised area to report common issues to reduce repetitive emails and streamline problem-solving.

Team Dynamics

- The NZTA team was seen as knowledgeable and cohesive, which was comforting to stakeholders. The team's ability to work well together was noted positively.
- The constructive collaboration between the project team and Thinkproject was highlighted as a positive aspect, ensuring that staff were knowledgeable and well-prepared.
- The network team was commended for their heavy lifting, which minimized the impact on day-to-day operations. The collaborative effort of the team was crucial in achieving project milestones.

Learning and Discovery

- CAs learned more about their datasets and assets, which prompted thoughts on integration with other asset systems. The process was less onerous than expected, and stakeholders found it easy to check data quality.
- Participants learned more about relevant datasets, which was beneficial for the programme.
- Participants appreciated the opportunity to see others' work, which helped improve their own efforts. The process encouraged sharing and learning.

- The process was generally seen as easy to understand and not overly time-consuming.
- Some tasks were not fully understood due to unfamiliarity with certain concepts (e.g., CM), and some section directions were incorrect.
- Clear instructions provided to stakeholders contributed to the overall success of the implementation.
- There was a lack of sufficient training on how to add network attributes to new assets, leading to confusion.
- There was effective sharing of lessons learned and experiences among Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs) and councils. This collaborative approach helped in refining processes and achieving milestones.

Time and Resources

- A significant issue was the lack of time and resources, which hindered the ability to conduct thorough reviews, especially for larger networks.
- The timing of the programme was not ideal, as participants were busy with other commitments.
- More time was needed for data review, and some issues were not resolved during testing. Conflicting demands overtime affected the process.
- Keeping an eye on the end goal helped maintain focus and direction throughout the project.
- A lack of staff with the required knowledge and experience was a significant issue, leading to an increased workload to address problems.

Access and Technical

- There were access issues and a lack of coordination between the project team and Thinkproject. Access was not granted on time, causing anxiety about the go-live process.
- Access was not granted on time and differed between users within the same team, leading to delays and confusion.
- Problems with functionalities affected Business as Usual (BAU) operations, requiring extra work to update the database, and impacting system performance.

Tools and Processes

- The spreadsheet tool was self-explanatory and easy to use, aiding in the understanding and review of required attributes.
- Attribute mapping was straightforward, and the Webmap was effective for quick reviews.
- The web tool was particularly helpful for visualization, making the review process quicker and simpler.
- The spreadsheet was not well-received by all, with some questioning its value.
- While the web tool was generally appreciated, an update midway required relearning, which was inconvenient.
- The implementation process was noted to be straightforward, with minimal impact on day-to-day operations.
- The ability to perform most functions within the Content Management (CM) system was highlighted as beneficial. The overall process was described as super easy and reasonably efficient.
- While the gap analysis tool was eventually useful, it took time for users to become accustomed to it.
- Unlike previous rollouts, this implementation did not cause significant disruptions, such as database issues.
- It was suggested to avoid Network Management (NM) upgrades during inventory migration to prevent compounding issues.

Review Process

- CAs faced difficulties with the volume of data to review, with some finding it hard to keep track of reviewed locations. There was also a lack of resources to review geometry and uncertainty around delegated state highways.
- Some CAs experienced issues with imports not coming through correctly, although these were easily identified.
- There was a noted lag in the system, which affected the review process.
- The vastness of the network made it difficult to focus on the entire system, leading to a focus only on potentially incorrect assets.
- The large network size and complexity made detailed reviews challenging.
- Stakeholders were advised to delay entering new subdivisions until after the go-live date, causing a temporary hold-up.
- The change freeze lasted longer than expected, and the team did not follow up on how the UAT test went.
- Some CAs felt there was too much to review, although it was manageable for their network.

Third Parties and Suppliers

- There was a lack of information about road changes, local road status, and instructions for sharing data with third parties. The email to contractors lacked details about pocket RAMM resync.
- Contractors were not fully aware of the data they would encounter, leading to confusion and inefficiencies.

Data

- Included issues with carriageway mapping, incorrect link/crossing locations, and difficulty syncing data with RAMM Tablet.
- The centreline did not match the carriageway direction.
- CAs had the opportunity to review the data, with not too many issues encountered.
- Challenges were noted with centrelines, including import errors, inability to split or reverse them, and a desire for more control over visibility in the Centreline Manager.
- Problems with Pocket RAMM users and synching were noted, affecting the user experience.
- Despite changes, new assets were still defaulting to Christchurch City Council, causing data entry errors.
- Significant improvements were noted in footpath connections and centrelines, particularly after feedback from previous councils. This facilitated better accessibility and connectivity.
- The database/system performance was negatively affected by huge data volumes. Defaults, such as "bus=yes" on narrow, steep streets, posed additional challenges.

Testing

- The scenarios provided a focused approach, enabling stakeholders to concentrate on specific actions. They were clearly updated, facilitating effective discussions on data and processes.
- The process helped in identifying common issues and provided a preview of the live model's functionality.
- The RAMM software was user-friendly and familiar to many, with clear instructions making the process straightforward.
- There were challenges in reporting issues, with duplicate lines/assets causing confusion. More testers were needed, and it was not easy to flag/report issues.
- The test environment did not identify all issues, and some access issues persisted.
- Not all team members had access, and there was a need for more testers from across the organization. It would have been beneficial to hear about tests conducted by other CAs.

- Some issues identified during User Acceptance Testing (UAT) remained unresolved, indicating a need for more thorough testing and resolution processes.
- The sample size for testing was considered too small, potentially overlooking broader issues.