

North Yorkshire County Council**Business and Environmental Services****Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee****27 July 2016****Ringway Performance – 2015/16****Report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services****1.0 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of Ringway's performance under the Highways Maintenance Contract (HMC) 2012 during the period 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016 and of the outcome of the Evaluation Panel held on 25 May 2016.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 Following a lengthy and robust procurement exercise, HMC 2012 was awarded to Ringway (RIS) and the contract commenced on 1 April 2012.
- 2.2 As part of the Contract, an Evaluation Panel is held annually in May to determine the Term of the Contract, which is informed by the Contract Performance Indicators (CPIs). The CPIs comprise Primary Performance indicators (PPIs) and Secondary Performance Indicators (SPIs). It is the PPIs which directly affect the Term of the Contract, although the SPIs can also be taken into consideration. The Evaluation Panel is also asked to support the implementation of the rolling 3rd year CPI targets, together with any interim amendments.
- 2.3 The maximum term of the Contract is 10 years; the minimum term is 6 years. The contract has a 'Claw Back' and a 'Win Back' mechanism, whereby any years clawed back for poor performance can subsequently be won back for good performance.
- 2.4 The contract period was reduced by one year at the Evaluation Panel meeting held on the 22nd May 2014.
- 2.5 At the Evaluation Panel held on 29 June 2015, the decision was taken to keep the term of the Contract at 9 years with a Contract completion date of 31 March 2021.

Evaluation Panel – 25 May 2016

- 2.6 The 2016 Evaluation Panel considered the performance of RIS for the period 1 April 2015-31 March 2016. The performance for this period was that the required targets for 14 out of 15 Primary Performance Indicators (PPIs) and 9 out of 11 Secondary Performance Indicators (SPIs) were met. This compares with the same period in 2014/15 where 19 out of 23 Primary Performance Indicators (PPIs) and 11 out of 19 Secondary Performance Indicators (SPIs) were met.
- 2.7 It should be noted that Ringway's performance for 2015/16 has been measured against the new Performance Management Framework which has a reduced number of indicators.

- 2.8 Based on the improved performance, the Panel took the decision to retain the Term of the contract as 9 years, until 31 March 2021.

Challenge/Scrutiny

- 2.9 Through the HMC 2012 Governance arrangements, Ringway's performance is scrutinised throughout the year at the monthly Operational Management Group (OMG), quarterly Strategic Management Group (SMG) and 6 – monthly Partnering Steering Group (PSG) meetings.
- 2.10 Since the first HMC 2012 Evaluation Panel, Ringway's performance has been further scrutinised by Members at:
- Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee (TEE OSC) – 17 July 2013
 - BES Executive Members (with County Councillor David Jeffels in attendance as Chairman of TEE OSC) – 27 November 2013
 - TEE OSC – 22 January 2014
 - TEE OSC – 16 July 2014
 - TEE OSC – 21 January 2015
 - TEE OSC – 14 October 2015

3.0 Consideration

- 3.1 The performance of RIS has improved since the last report. Appendix A details the overall performance for the financial year 2015/16 compared to the previous year. This improvement was recognised by the Evaluation Panel when they reached their decision on 25 May 2016.
- 3.2 As noted in the previous report and referenced in 2.7, a revised Performance Management Framework has been adopted and implemented by the Partnership. Included in this revised framework are measures relating to 'Completion in time of option B (minor works) (OB7, OB30 & OB90). It is noted at this point that performance in these areas was not formally measured or considered by the Evaluation Panel as the revised working arrangements were still in the trial phase and the available data was not sufficient to allow a full assessment to be carried out.
- 3.3 Appendix B details the 'Rectification Action Plans' presented to the Panel relating to those indicators where the required Target was not met.

4.0 Legal Implications

- 4.1 The requirement for an Annual Review of HMC 2012 is stipulated in the contract documents and shall be completed before 1 June in each Contract Year.
- 4.2 The Key Decisions associated with the Evaluation Panels held in this and in previous years have been published on the County Council's Statutory Forward Plan in accordance with its Constitution.

5.0 Equalities Impact Assessment

- 5.1 Consideration has been given to the relevance of equality and diversity issues in each of the Evaluation Panels. It was the view of officers that the recommendations had no impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010.

5.2 An EIA for HMC 2012 has been developed jointly with Ringway and was reviewed and updated in May 2014. The next review is due to take place this financial year (2016/17).

6.0 Finance Implications

6.1 Over the first four years of HMC 2012, approximately £191 million of work has been delivered to date.

6.2 As part of HMC 2012, there is one specific CPI directly relating to finance:

- SPI S06 Value of Gain Achieved

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 It is recommended that Members:

- i) Note the contents of this report and attached appendices

DAVID BOWE
Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services

Author of Report: Andrew Binner

Background Documents: None

Primary Performance Indicators (PPIs)

| Reference No. | PPI | 2015/16 Performance | | | 2014/15 Performance | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|------------|
| | | Target | Actual | Pass/Fail | | |
| WINTER MAINTENANCE: | | | | | | |
| PPI WM01 | Client Satisfaction - Winter Maintenance Gritting Routes | 10 | 0.00 | Pass | Pass | 3.00 |
| | | 9.6 | 10.00 | Pass | Pass | 9.81 |
| | | 56 | 0.00 | Pass | Pass | 8.00 |
| | | 10 | 0.00 | Pass | Pass | 2.00 |
| | | 7 | 0.00 | Pass | Pass | 2.00 |
| | | 4 | 0.00 | Pass | Pass | 0.00 |
| | | Overall Performance | | | Pass | Pass |
| SCHEMES | | | | | | |
| PPI S01 | Start on Time | 90% | 95.11% | Pass | Pass | 92.56% |
| PPI S02 | Finish on Time | 85% | 95.54% | Pass | Pass | 91.33% |
| PPI S04 | Street works Noticing | 85% | 74.87% | Fail | Not Applicable (revised scoring methodology) | |
| | | 85% | 90.37% | Pass | Not Applicable (revised scoring methodology) | |
| | | 10% | 3.17% | Pass | Not Applicable (revised scoring methodology) | |
| | | Overall Performance | | | Fail | Fail |
| ROUTINE MAINTENANCE | | | | | | |
| PPI RM05 | Road Markings | 80% | 86.96% | Pass | Pass | 80.00% |
| PPI RM06 | Achievement of Programme - Surface Dressing | 97% | 100% | Pass | Pass | 100% |
| PPI RM08 | Highway Dangerous Defects CAT 1 | 99% | 99.71% | Pass | Fail | 99.29% |
| PPI RM09 | Completion on Time - Emergency Call Outs | 99% | 99.96% | Pass | Fail | 99.32% |
| PPI OB7 | Completion in time option B (minor works) 7 day response | 80% | 68.68% | N/A | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| PPI OB8 | Completion in time option B (minor works) 30 day response | 85% | 76.24% | N/A | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| PPI OB9 | Completion in time option B (minor works) 3 month response | 90% | 88.32% | N/A | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| FLEET MAINTENANCE | | | | | | |
| PPI FM01 | Compliance with Servicing Schedule | 88% | 100.00% | Pass | Pass | 100.00% |
| PPI FM02 | MOT Pass Rate | 97% | 98.06% | Pass | Pass | 98.94% |
| STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE | | | | | | |
| PPI SL01 | Street Lighting Fault Repair | 96% | 99.89% | Pass | Pass | 96.02% |
| PPI SL02 | Achievement of Programme - Street Lighting Cyclical Maintenance | 8 | 1.11 | Pass | Fail | 10.29 |

Secondary Performance Indicators (SPIs)

| Reference No. | SPI | 2015/16 Performance | | | 2014/15 Performance | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|------------|
| | | Target | Actual | Pass/Fail | | |
| SCHEMES | | | | | | |
| PPI S03 | Defects – Impact at Handover | 85.00% | 100.00% | Pass | Pass | 99.01% |
| PPI S06 | Value of Gain Achieved | >=£0.00 | -£6,596.58 | Fail | Pass | £84,422.77 |
| ROUTINE MAINTENANCE | | | | | | |
| PPI RM01 | Achievement of Programme – Grass Cutting Urban | 96% | 99.91% | Pass | Pass | 99.95% |
| PPI RM02 | Achievement of Programme – Grass Cutting Rural | 96% | 100.00% | Pass | Pass | 100.00% |
| PPI RM03 | Achievement of Programme –Weed Spraying | 96% | 100.00% | Pass | Pass | 99.07% |
| PPI RM04 | Achievement of Programme – Gully Emptying | 96% | 96.94% | Pass | Pass | 96.27% |
| PPI RM07 | Defects | 183 | 4 | Pass | Pass | 39 |
| HEALTH AND SAFETY: | | | | | | |
| PPI HS01 | LTIFR (Lost Time Through Injury Frequency Rate) | 2.50 | 5.39 | Fail | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| PUBLIC AND CLIENT SATISFACTION | | | | | | |
| SPI PCS01 | Public Satisfaction – All Schemes | 90% | 90.99% | Pass | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| SPI PCS05 | Annual Client Survey | 66% | 60.97% | Fail | Fail | 58.99% |
| | | 66% | 89.28% | Pass | | 69.72% |
| | | Overall Performance | 75.13% | Pass | | 65.43% |
| CONTRACTOR – SELF EVALUATION AGAINST ANNUAL ACTION PLAN | | | | | | |
| SPI AAP01 | Contractor Progress against Annual Action Plan – self evaluation | 90% | 91.07% | Pass | Fail | 80.77% |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|  | ACTION REPORT FORM | | PROCESS OWNER: Group IMS Manager |
| | Issue: 5A | Date: August 2011 | Page 1 of 2 |

Section 1

Business Ref: RIS HMC2012 Division and/or Location: North Yorkshire Action Report No: RAP PPI SO4 - 16/17

Section 2

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Issued by: P Jepps | Issued to: North Yorkshire | Date: Apr 16 |
| Contract Number: MU 5382 | Works Order Number: N/A | Delivery Note Number: N/A |

Section 3 DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

Not achieving the minimum target of CPI PPI SO4 during the contract year 2015/16.

Of the 3 parts to the CPI measure part A (Number of completed works orders that require works notices as a % based on a random sample) failed to reach the 85% target. (Score 74.87)

Analysis shows that from the sample 271 failures occurred in the following work streams:

66 Failures due to not retrospectively noticing Callouts (Highways)
 77 Failures due to not noticing Street Lighting Callouts and Faults
 128 Failures due to not noticing Highways work. (33 Potholes / 22 Road Marking / 16 Patching / 10 Kerbing/ 47 Other)

Section 4 STATE THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE ISSUE

- Street Lighting Streetworks notices. Failures attributed to notices on Traffic Sensitive Streets.
- Retrospective Streetworks notices for Out of Hours Emergency calls.

Section 5 WHAT ACTION IS PLANNED TO ADDRESS THE ABOVE ROOT CAUSE?**5a CORRECTIVE ACTION (To address the issue)**

- Review People/Process/Systems with regard to noticing procedure for Highways works and identify why noticing is not compliant.
- Review Streetworks noticing procedure for Street Lighting and agree with NYCC the requirements. There is still ambiguity as to what is required and when a notice should be applied.
- Review the procedure for retrospectively noticing Emergency works and agree a new time line with NYCC to ensure the details of the incident are received and an covering order placed to allow time for the notice to be issued (2hrs from the Streetworks Office opening)

5b PREVENTIVE ACTION (To prevent recurrence)

- Review the procedure for noticing Street Lighting streetworks notices and enforce its use.
- Review the procedure for retrospectively noticing out of hours Emergency Call outs. Agree new timeline with NYCC and enforce its use.
- Instigate a Live system to monitor Street works compliance, checking each order has a notice prior to commencing the work.

5c RESPONSIBILITY CHART REQUIRED (PAGE 2)? Y

Note: When you have completed this section please send copy to originator.

Section 6 CONFIRM ACTION HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED (Supply supporting evidence)

Action closed by: Richard Whitaker

Date: 27/4/16

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG



ACTION REPORT FORM

**PROCESS OWNER: Group
IMS Manager**

Issue: 5A

Date: August 2011

Page 2 of 2

Business Ref:

Division and/or Location:

**Action Report No
PPI S04-16/17**

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Date Prepared: 27/4/2016 | | Responsibility of: P Jepps | | | | | | | | | |
| Improvement/Concern Meet the CPI Targets for Streetworks noticing. | | Persons Involved | | | | | | | | | |
| Planned Completion Date: | | NYCC Street works | NYCC CSU | NYCC Operations | NYCC Street Lighting | Jill Jephson | RIS Street Lighting | Richard Whitaker | Hub Supervisor | By When | Complete |
| Task No | Task Description | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Review the requirements for Streetworks Noticing of Street Lighting works (Faults and Schemes) | I | | | I | I | I | X | | 31/5/2016 | |
| 2 | Review Process for Managing Streetworks noticing for Street Lighting works. | | | | | I | I | X | | 31/5/2016 | |
| 3 | Monthly audit of the results and feedback to RIS Street Lighting Team | | | | | I | I | X | | Monthly until 30/3/2017 | |
| 4 | Review the requirements for Retrospective Streetworks notices for Out of Hours Emergency callouts. | I | | | | | | X | | 31/5/2016 | |
| 5 | Agree a new timeline with NYCC for placing orders to cover out of Hours Emergency calls | | I | I | | I | | X | | 30/5/2016 | |
| 6 | Put checks in place to ensure works aren't started without a notice being in place. This should be "live" and undertaken by the hub supervisor. Reports produced tracking individual scheduler and Gang performance. | | | | | | | X | I | In place 30/3/2017 Ongoing reporting | |
| <p>Note ONLY ONE PERSON CAN BE RESPONSIBLE FOR AN ACTIVITY (X = RESPONSIBLE, I = INVOLVED)</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |

Distribute to: R Whitaker, Jill Jephson, SMG

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG



Highway Maintenance Contract 2012 – 22
Ringway Infrastructure Services
Contract Performance Review 2015 – 2016

Appendix 3d

Secondary Performance Indicator
Rectification Action Plans

**ACTION REPORT FORM****PROCESS OWNER: Group
IMS Manager**

Issue: 5A

Date: August 2011

Appendix 3d

Page 1 of 2

Section 1

Business Ref: RIS

Division and/or
Location: North
YorkshireAction Report No: RAP SPI HS01-
16/17**Section 2**

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Issued by: P Jepps | Issued to: North Yorkshire | Date: May 2016 |
| Contract Number: MU 5382 | Works Order Number: N/A | Delivery Note Number: N/A |

Section 3 DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

Following a number of avoidable incidents between the months of June 2015 and December 2015, Ringway failed to achieve the maximum level of 2.5 Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate

Section 4 STATE THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE ISSUE

All of the incidents that occurred during the 2nd half of 2015 were all avoidable and processes and working methods are all in place to address the causation of the incidents. The issue appears to be around the workforce either believing previous working practices are quicker and/or choosing not to take the necessary time to undertake the works in line with safe systems of work.

Section 5 WHAT ACTION IS PLANNED TO ADDRESS THE ABOVE ROOT CAUSE?**5a CORRECTIVE ACTION (To address the issue)**

- Investigate and review all incidents to identify root cause and implement corrective action plans
- Use the injured party and workforce colleagues in the investigation to promote 'buy in' to working practices
- Brief out findings from investigations to promote lessons learned
- Address training needs to combat incident types

5b PREVENTIVE ACTION (To prevent recurrence)

- Increase number of safety inspections/audits and tours by all tiers of management
- Report Monthly on Near Misses and trend analysis of incidents occurring in other Divisions
- Monthly reminder when publishing statistics of risks to Health and Safety
- All incidents and key Near Misses reviewed at Monthly Workforce Health and Safety Meeting

5c RESPONSIBILITY CHART REQUIRED (PAGE 2)? Y

Note: When you have completed this section please send copy to originator.

Section 6 CONFIRM ACTION HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED (Supply supporting evidence)

Action closed by:

Date:



ACTION REPORT FORM

**PROCESS OWNER: Group
IMS Manager**

Issue: 5A

Date: August 2011

Appendix 3d

Page 2 of 2

Business Ref:


Division and/or Location:

**Action Report No:
RAP SPI HS01 – 16/17**

| Date Prepared: May 2016 | | Responsibility of: P Jepps | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|---|--|--|---------|------------------------------------------|---|
| Improvement/Concern | | Persons Involved | | | | | | | | | | By When | Complete | |
| | | Phil Jepps | Mathew Clayton | Contracts Managers | Agents | Workforce | Health and Safety | Nicola Shaw | | | | | | |
| Planned Completion Date: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task No | Task Description | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Investigate and review all incidents to identify root cause and implement corrective action plans | X | I | I | I | I | I | | | | | | As required | |
| 2 | Use the injured party and workforce colleagues in the investigation to promote 'buy in' to working practices | | X | I | I | I | I | | | | | | As required | |
| 3 | Brief out findings from investigations to promote lessons learned | I | I | X | I | | I | | | | | | As required | |
| 4 | Address training needs to combat incident types | I | X | I | I | | | | I | | | | Review following incident investigations | Y |
| 5 | Prepare, implement and review Health and Safety Strategy | X | I | I | I | I | I | | | | | | Jan 2017 | |
| 6 | Brief out Annual Safety Briefing to all personnel and selected SCP's | X | I | I | I | I | I | | | | | | April 2016 | Y |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note | | ONLY ONE PERSON CAN BE RESPONSIBLE FOR AN ACTIVITY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (X = RESPONSIBLE, I = INVOLVED) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Distribute to:

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|  | ACTION REPORT FORM | | PROCESS OWNER: Group IMS Manager |
| | Issue: 5A | Date: August 2011 | Appendix 3d Page 1 of 3 |

Section 1

Business Ref: RIS

Division and/or
Location: North
Yorkshire

Action Report No: RAP SPI S06-16/17

Section 2

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Issued by: P Jepps | Issued to: North Yorkshire | Date: 17/05/16 |
| Contract Number: MU 5382 | Works Order Number: N/A | Delivery Note Number: N/A |

Section 3 DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE

Option D Schemes delivered within the 2015/16 financial year are looking like they will be showing an overall position of Pain. The commitment to NYCC is to show a position of Gain at the end of each financial year.

Section 4 STATE THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE ISSUE

Efficiency of Working/ Time Management

RIS ensuring they work as efficiently as possible. For example getting materials delivered direct to the site and only taking full loads to tip. When the operatives leave site to collect materials the scheme is in essence paying the operative to be a delivery driver rather than a skilled worker. On the large option D schemes NYCC and RIS should work together to try and create a sufficient size compound without disturbing access for residents (If in an urban area).

Verbal Instructions given directly to RIS Operatives

NYCC Project Managers visit sites regularly, which is encouraged by RIS. Unfortunately on occasions a PM will instruct RIS operatives to undertake extra works without raising it through the formal PMI process. These types of instruction are generally of a minor nature such as a couple of extra kerbs. However as the instruction is not formally recorded, RIS operatives complete the works and RIS are not reimbursed financially or for a potential Extension of Time. No instructions should be given on site to RIS operatives by NYCC PM's as the operatives are not commercially aware of its implications.

Quality of Design Information

The design information is quite frequently unchecked for errors and/or quality prior to being uploaded on the portal. Whilst RIS would check the information to validate its accuracy we are often finding that we have to spend an unprecedented amount of time reviewing and informing NYCC of errors. This time expended by RIS staff should be spent on the day to day management of the works.

Many of the diversion drawings are old and possibly dated. I believe in some cases a revised diversion would benefit the public and reduce scheme costs for large diversions. For example we have some schemes this year that have diversions in excess of 10 miles that may be reduced following a review. This wouldn't affect the Target Value but would reduce RIS cost which would make a gain scenarios more achievable.

Weekly On site meetings

An idea which may benefit schemes successes would be for the NYCC PM and RIS Agent to hold an on-site meeting once a week to discuss any extra works and how the scheme is progressing. By undertaking this together it would be far more efficient than the parties doing it separately and then getting into a chain of emails which may not be interpreted correctly. Currently these meetings are undertaken reactively rather than proactively. Again this would only apply to the larger Option D Schemes.

Early Warning Response

From my time with the contract there seems to be the impression that an EW raised by RIS will automatically result in a CE. If NYCC could respond to EWs in more timely manner their impact may be reduced/nullified and if a CE is required it would be agreed prior to the end of the scheme (as per the contract). Because they are not agreed as the scheme progresses NYCC are then very reluctant to agree CEs due to it taking schemes over the set budget. Formal responses to EW's are not common practice within NYCC.

Cost Allocation

Ringway have in the past not been as accurate with their cost allocations for schemes, this may send one scheme into pain and another into huge amounts of gain. Neither of these scenarios is good for either party.

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG

**ACTION REPORT FORM****PROCESS OWNER: Group
IMS Manager**

Issue: 5A

Date: August 2011

Appendix 3d

Page 2 of 3

Programming of Works

In the past we haven't used the programme to it's full potential, allowing Ringway to programme together like work types to ensure that economies of scale can be achieved.

Section 5 WHAT ACTION IS PLANNED TO ADDRESS THE ABOVE ROOT CAUSE?**5a CORRECTIVE ACTION (To address the issue)**

See Responsibility Chart

5b PREVENTIVE ACTION (To prevent recurrence)

See Responsibility Chart

5c RESPONSIBILITY CHART REQUIRED (PAGE 2)? Y**Note: When you have completed this section please send copy to originator.****Section 6 CONFIRM ACTION HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED (Supply supporting evidence)**

Action closed by:

Date:

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG



ACTION REPORT FORM

**PROCESS OWNER: Group
IMS Manager**

Issue: 5A

Date: August 2011

Appendix 3d

Page 3 of 3

Business Ref:

Division and/or Location:

**Action Report No:
SPI S06-16/17**

| Date Prepared: | | Responsibility of: P Jepps | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------|----------|
| Improvement/Concern | | Persons Involved | | | | | | | | | | By When | Complete |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planned Completion Date: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task No | Task Description | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | RIS/NYCC to optimise efficiencies on site | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Any instructions on site from NYCC have to be submitted in writing (CVI/PMI) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Quality control checks of Designs/Greater involvement from RIS in EC's | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Conduct weekly on-site meetings RIS/NYCC to review works and address any issues immediately | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | RIS/NYCC – Prompt response and turnaround of EW's and CE's | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | RIS to improve cost allocation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Maximise the use of the programme, having continuation of like for like works to offer consistency and greater efficiencies | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note | | ONLY ONE PERSON CAN BE RESPONSIBLE FOR AN ACTIVITY | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (X = RESPONSIBLE, I = INVOLVED) | | | | | | | | | | | |

Distribute to:

REMEMBER TO UPDATE THE IMPROVEMENT CONFORMANCE LOG