NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY LIAISON GROUP

THURSDAY 26TH FEBRUARY 2008

PRIORITY SYSTEM

1.0   PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1   The purpose of this report is to update members on progress in designing and implementing a prioritisation system for new complaints relating to the Rights of Way network.

2.0   BACKGROUND

2.1   Historically the County Council has not had a unified consistent approach to prioritising complaints. Some systems were developed with different groups but consistency has never been achieved.

2.2   The County Council recognises the need to develop a consistent method regardless of the complaint originator in order to address Issues fairly and in a justifiable manner.

2.3   This is in the context of a limited resource dealing with a potentially limitless stream of issues. Given that not all issues can be resolved immediately then a system is needed to inform the work programme.

3.0   THE APPROACH

3.1   In thinking through an approach to prioritisation it was felt prudent to take a risk management based approach, which resulted in two conclusions:

1. The prime consideration when dealing with Issues on the network must be the safety of the user

2. The secondary consideration must be the importance of the route to users and the effect of that issue on the route

4.0   THE MATRIX

4.1 In order to produce a priority score for every issue it is necessary to record the key aspects which can then be used in a calculation. It is logical to use the CAMS database, the existing record of all network issues.

4.2 Using the available functionality of the CAMS database it has been possible to produce a calculation based on the following factors:

Factor No.	Factor Description	Factor Relates To	Priority Score Range
1	Likelihood of an accident	Issue	0-5
2	Potential Severity of the accident	Issue	0-5
3	Route Priority	Route	1-5
4	Effect on route	Route	0-6

The calculation has its base in the standard risk assessment calculation (Risk = Likelihood x Severity) which is then added to the Route based factors:

Priority = Likelihood x Severity + Route Priority + Effect on Route

This calculation returns a range of possible scores between 1 and 36, allowing all issues to be ranked in priority score order.

6.0 PRIORITY TARGETS

6.1 In order to simplify the priority scores into categories easily identifiable by the public, they can be translated back into the standard Low/Medium/High categories in the following way, allowing simple targets for responding to be set.

6.2 Now that a complete network survey is in place, it is theoretically possible to score all issues within the database and rank them in order to formulate work programmes a year in advance, building in an allowance for newly arising issues year on year. It is an aspiration to work towards this Network Asset Management approach.

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRIORITY SYSTEM

7.1 All new issues are now priority scored and the issue originator is

sent a standard acknowledgement letter with the priority of their issue and an anticipated timescale to resolve it.

7.2   Rangers and officers are allocated work based on the highest priority issues. However, to ensure efficiency, all issues on a link containing a high priority issue are actioned at the same time, meaning that the spread of issues across the 3 priority categories is more even.

7.3   Currently we do not have the capability to monitor the numbers of issues resolved in each category or the time taken to resolve each issue. This is currently being investigated.

8.0   CONCLUSION

8.1   A system is in place to prioritise issues on a consistent basis. Monitoring tools for this system are in development.

<u>Contact Officer</u>
Aidan Rayner
PRoW Team Leader
01609 533077