

INTERNAL AUDIT FOLLOW UP FORM

AUDIT	Highways Asset Management	PREPARED BY	Steve Hayward	DATE	December 2013
REPORT DATED	October 2013	REVIEWED BY		PAGE	

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
1	Risk: Business relationship management not in place				
1.1	<p>Highways and Transport and StreetSmart should agree a way forward and implement an appropriate governance arrangement. This should then be encapsulated in a Service Level Agreement.</p> <p>The arrangements should cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coverage and split of types of work expected from SCS. • How SCS's performance should be measured, as the current key performance indicators don't reflect fully highway maintenance requirements e.g. nothing on undertaking condition surveys. • Management information required e.g. in what circumstances SCS should report, via StreetSmart, issues to Transport and Highways that may affect the long term condition of a road or a where a larger piece of maintenance work is required. • Meetings between Highways and Transport and StreetSmart, meeting frequencies, employees involved and their roles and responsibilities. • The policies expected to be followed e.g. balance between safety inspections and routine inspections, reactive versus routine maintenance and how they should be reported. 	Head of Highways and Transport in conjunction with the Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	March 2014	2	<p>Issue has been impacted by the reintegration of SCS Streetsmart Services Highway Maintenance team into Highway and Transport as part of the SCS reintegration process.</p> <p>Following the e-integration of SCS into SBC, Highways and Transport are developing a new structure. This will see the highways work previously undertaken by SCS, being directly managed within Highways and Transport. This will provide the opportunity to develop stronger performance and financial monitoring and reporting through appropriate SMART service delivery objectives, supported by key responsibilities being identified and managed.</p> <p>Proposed Revised timeline for this recommendation to be actioned by Sept 14</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
1	Risk: Business relationship management not in place				
1.1 (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence StreetSmart would be expected to see as verification that SCS were carrying out the tasks. <p>Priority: High</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit Recommendations to be included in Swindon Commercial Services (SCS) Re-integration work-streams.</p>				
1.2	<p>All the experienced Highways Inspectors that were transferred to SCS have left and been replaced by less experienced personnel. Guidance should be provided on the training and education needed by Highways Inspectors.</p> <p>Evaluate Inspectors taking the City and Guilds 6033 qualifications, which covers Highways Inspection and Monitoring.</p> <p>Priority: High</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit Recommendations to be included in SCS Re-integration work-streams.</p>	Service Manager, Highway Infrastructure Management.	March 2014	2	<p>Issue has been impacted by the reintegration of SCS Streetsmart Services Highway Maintenance team into Highway and Transport as part of the SCS reintegration process.</p> <p>Highway Maintenance Operations Manager is developing a training plan for Highway Inspectors that provides for the required on-going training of inspectors. The plan will be in place by the end of April 2014. Training will start following the launch of the plan.</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2	Risk: Asset management				
2.1	<p>An issue was identified by Corporate Health and safety, where about 150 bridges/structures had not been properly maintained and inspected. These structures were not the responsibility of Highways, rather other service delivery areas within the Council e.g. StreetSmart were responsible for a bridge in the Town Gardens. When this bridge was inspected, it was immediately closed to the public due to it being 'unsafe'.</p> <p>All non-Highways structure assets which were identified as not being appropriately managed should be added to the Highways asset register. This is to ensure they are regularly surveyed. The results of the surveys should be forwarded to the appropriate service area to take any necessary decisions over future action required, based on the results/recommendations arising from the survey.</p> <p>Priority: High</p>	Service Manager, Highway Infrastructure Management.	December 2013	2	<p>Awaiting budgetary provision via the capital bid process to support the integration of non-highway assets into the Highways asset register.</p> <p>A briefing session was prepared for Corporate Board on this issue and included an outline strategy which was developed to address this matter. This will involve Highways and Transport managing the structures going forward.</p> <p>Preliminary inspections of known structures undertaken by H2CMHill as part of investigation of issues with these structures</p> <p>Revised completion date April 2014.</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2	Risk: Asset management				
2.2	<p>All retaining structures, embankments, earthworks, cuttings and safety barriers that are owned by the Council, should be identified, recorded and maintained.</p> <p>A risk based plan should be developed to achieve this, including appointing an officer to manage it.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit Asset data and condition survey will be collected for all retaining walls once the recently agreed bridge inspector post is filled in circa March 14.</p> <p>A Policy should be developed for management of structural earthworks.</p> <p>Safety barrier asset has been identified along with essential repairs undertaken. Responsibility for maintenance rests with StreetSmart.</p> <p>Recommendations to be included in SCS Re-integration work-streams.</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	December 2013	2	<p>Awaiting recruitment of a Bridge Inspector. The recruitment has been impacted by the on-going consultation on the new Highways and Transport structure.</p> <p>Revised implementation date is April 2014.</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2	Risk: Asset management				
2.3	<p>Bridge condition surveys result in a score out of 100. A score in excess of 80 is considered satisfactory. A score below 80 often requires remedial work of some description. The current thinking in the Asset Management Team is that the average score for the entire bridge stock should be 85. This has not been formally agreed.</p> <p>A formal decision should be made on what the benchmark score should be for bridges before it is considered that remedial action is required / undertaken.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	February 2014	2	<p>Benchmark score to be agreed by start of 2014/15.</p> <p>Revised date for action of this recommendation April 2014</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2.5	<p>A decision should be made on what data fields should be populated in the Confirm database and which fields can be left unpopulated.</p> <p>A plan should be drawn up to ensure that agreed data fields can be populated.</p> <p>Consider the cost benefit of operating a separate Pavement Management system or switching to using the Confirm system, thus having everything on one database.</p> <p>SCS access to Confirm to update street lighting records should be resolved. When resolved it should be ensured that any data not processed should be retrospectively keyed to Confirm.</p> <p>Consider adding traffic signals to the Confirm database.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	March 2014	2	<p>Developing the use of management systems such as Confirm is an on-going process linked with wider corporate business development initiatives.</p> <p>The Business Support Unit and IT Support Team have been involved in developing an action plan for 2014/15.</p> <p>Action plan developed April 2014</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2	Risk: Asset management				
2.6	<p>Consideration should be given to introducing a budget for strategic drainage maintenance.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit Recommendations to be included in SCS Re-integration work-streams.</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	March 2014	2	<p>Awaiting budgetary provision via the capital bid process to support drainage improvements linked to LFRMS Action Plans.</p> <p>Revised implementation date is April 2014.</p>
2.7	<p>Currently, the Council is unaware of all its drainage assets. As a Local Flood Authority, the Council is required to maintain a register of structures/features which have an effect on flood risk management. The Council is starting to identify its drainage assets. It is anticipated, with current resource, this could take 15 years or more. A decision should be made as to whether this is an acceptable timescale or whether an additional resource is allocated to reduce the time frame to carry out the exercise.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit The approach to drainage data asset collection will be addressed in the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS).</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	December 2013	2	<p>The collection of asset data will be prioritised based on issues identified in the LFRMS Action Plans.</p> <p>Action plan developed post adoption of LFRM strategy in July 2014</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other

NO	RECOMMENDATIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	DATE TO BE ACTIONED BY	CURRENT STATUS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS BY DEPARTMENT
2.8	<p>Currently, insurance data on claims made against the Council, citing the state of the highway, are not routinely provided to Highways and Transport.</p> <p>To do so may help with planning maintenance work. Details of insurance claims made against the Council citing the condition of the highway should be provided at least annually to Highways and Transport and StreetSmart and SCS.</p> <p>Priority: Medium</p> <p>Auditees comment at time of audit Recommendations to be included in SCS Re-integration work-streams.</p>	Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management	December 2013	2	<p>Issue has been impacted by the reintegration of SCS Streetsmart Services into SBC. Revised process needs agreeing with reintegrated insurance team</p> <p>Insurance claims included in discussions for future meetings between Service Manager Highway Infrastructure Management and Service Manager Highway Construction Works.</p> <p>April 2014</p>

Status: 1=Implemented, 2=Being Implemented, 3=Not Implemented, 4=Superseded, 5=Other