 

***Main Roads WA***

*2013-14 Key Performance Indicators Manual*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*August 2014*

***Main Roads WA***

*2013-14 Key Performance Indicators Manual*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Contents***

[Summary of Main Roads Outcome Based Management Matrix 2013-14 3](#_Toc395595761)

[1. Community Satisfaction of Road Safety 1](#_Toc395595762)

[2. Blackspot location index 2](#_Toc395595763)

[3. Community Satisfaction 4](#_Toc395595764)

[4. Road Network Permitted for use by Heavy Freight Vehicles 5](#_Toc395595765)

[5. Network Configuration – Roads 6](#_Toc395595766)

[6. Network Configuration – Bridges 7](#_Toc395595767)

[7. Unplanned road closure on the state road network 9](#_Toc395595768)

[8. Community Satisfaction with Cycleways and Pedestrian Facilities 11](#_Toc395595769)

[10. Smooth Travel Exposure 12](#_Toc395595770)

[11. Community Satisfaction of Road Maintenance 13](#_Toc395595771)

[12. Preventative Maintenance Indicator 14](#_Toc395595772)

[13. Return on Construction Expenditure 15](#_Toc395595773)

[14. Effectiveness of road safety Campaigns 16](#_Toc395595774)

[15. Percentage of contracts completed on time and budget 17](#_Toc395595775)

[16. Average Cost of network management per million vehicle kilometres travelled 19](#_Toc395595776)

[17. Average Cost of road network maintenance per lane kilometre of network 20](#_Toc395595777)

[18. Percentage of ORS Projects completed on budget and on time 21](#_Toc395595778)

NOTES:

* Approval was granted by the Under Treasurer to remove the calculation of availability of traffic signals, lighting and emergency phones due to a change in delivery practices for the 2013-14 period onwards.
* The Government has requested that Main Roads, along with several other larger general government agencies, undertake a review of their outcome Based Management reporting in consultation with the Department of Treasury. The aim of the review is to seek greater transparency and alignment with individual programs and areas of activity. We are due to report through our Minister by November 2014 with a view to agreed changes being reflected in the 2015-16 State Government Budget Statements

# Summary of Main Roads Outcome Based Management Matrix 2013-14

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Government | | Main Roads | | | |
| **Goals** | **Outcomes** | **Programs** | **Outcomes** | **Effectiveness Indicators** | **Efficiency Indicators** |
| **State Building - Major Projects** | Building strategic infrastructure that will create jobs and underpin WA's long term economic development | Infrastructure for State Development | Facilitate economic and regional development | 1. Return on Construction Expenditure (as an average) | 1. % of contracts completed on time 2. % of contracts completed on budget |
| **Outcomes Based Service Delivery** | Greater focus on achieving results in key service delivery areas for the benefit of all Western Australians | Road System Management | Reliable and efficient movement of people and goods | Community Satisfaction  Road network permitted for use by heavy vehicles   1. Network configuration (% of travel that occurs on roads meeting MRWA) Investigatory Criteria for Roads and Bridges | 1. Average cost of network management per million vehicle kms travelled |
| Road Efficiency improvements | 1. % of contracts completed on time 2. % of contracts completed on budget |
| Road Safety | A safe road environment | 1. Community Satisfaction of Road Safety 2. Blackpsot location indicator | 1. % of contracts completed on time 2. % of contracts completed on budget |
| Office of Road Safety | Improved coord and community awareness of road safety in WA | 1. Effectiveness of road safety campaigns | 1. % of projects completed on time 2. % of projects completed on budget |
| **Stronger Focus on the Regions** | greater focus on service delivery, infrastructure investment and economic development to improve the overall quality of life in remote and regional areas | Road Network Maintenance | A well maintained road network | 1. Smooth Travel Exposure (biennial) 2. Community Satisfaction with road maintenance 3. Preventative maintenance indicator | 1. Average cost of network maintenance per lane kilometre of road network |
| **Social and Environmental Responsibility** | ensuring that economic activity is managed in a socially and environmentally responsible manner for the long term benefit of the State | Infrastructure for community access | Improved community access and roadside amenity | 1. % of the year that 100% of the Main Roads’ state road network is available 2. Community satisfaction with cycleways and pedestrian facilities | 1. % of contracts completed on time 2. % of contracts completed on budget |

# 1. Community Satisfaction of Road Safety

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | A safe road environment |
| *Associated Program* | Road Safety |
| *TRIM Ref:* | 02/1422 |
| *Owner* | EDRNS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRS |
| *Methodology Owner* | MRUCS |
| *Description* | The Community Satisfaction of Road Safety Indicator represents how satisfied the community is with the overall performance in the safety of the State road network.  This indicator is obtained through the Community Perceptions Survey and reflects the satisfaction level of customers in both metropolitan and rural WA. |
| *Purpose* | The results of the Community Perceptions Survey are used to ensure Main Roads’ projects and customer service initiatives are targeted at the areas of greatest need in relation to road safety. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Methodology* | *Note: The complete methodology adopted for the survey is included as part of the final report which will be provided to the Auditors.*  An external research company is commissioned to undertake the Community Perceptions Survey and report on the findings on an annual basis. The data is collected by way of telephone interviewing using a developed structured questionnaire.  The population for the purpose of the research is all Western Australian residents 17 years of age and over who possess an Australian driver’s license. A sample of 900 residents from rural areas (100 respondents from each region) and 250 residents from the Perth metropolitan area are surveyed. A stratified random sample is taken from the population ensuring that each person is given equal opportunity of being selected.  The total sample of 1,150 produces a sampling precision of +/- 2.9% at the 95% confidence interval. That is to say that we would be 95% confident that the results would be within +/-2.9% should a census of the population be undertaken.  The collected data is weighted to reflect the actual population distribution based on ABS statistics*.* When combining response codes, such as excellent and good to make excellent plus good, it is not unusual for rounding to produce results that don’t appear to add up. Weighting can magnify this issue. The reported % is taken directly from the survey report. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A common target of 90% has been established for all of the Community Perception Satisfaction measures. The target was selected based on reviewing the results over the last five years. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 90% |

# 2. Blackspot location index

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | A safe road environment |
| *Associated Program* | Road Safety |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/358 |
| *Owner* | EDRNS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRS |
| *Methodology Owner* | RSA |
| *Description* | The Annual Key Performance Indicator for Road Safety (AKPIRS) is defined as the number of the Black Spot Qualifying Locations on the State Road Network per 100 MVKT for the entire road network in the state.  The number of Black Spot qualifying locations is comprised of:   1. Number of Black Spot Qualifying Intersections 2. Number of Black Spot Qualifying Short Road Sections, <= 3 km 3. Number of Black Spot Qualifying Road Lengths > 3 km   The Black Spot Qualifying Locations are defined according to the State Black Spot Program criteria as the locations satisfying the following crash frequencies:  **Intersections** Metro State Road 10 crashes over 5 years  Rural State Road 3 crashes over 5 years      **Short Sections** Metro State Road 10 crashes over 5 years  **(< 3 km)** Rural State Road 3 crashes over 5 years      **Road Length** Metro State Road 3 crashes/km  **(> 3 km)** Rural State Road 1 crash/km  For the purpose of the determination of the AKPIRS index, the Short Section and the Road Length are defined as sections/lengths of a road that do not overlap with any other sections/lengths satisfying the Black spot criteria. |
| *Purpose* | To assess and compare road safety performance on the State road network against previous years. The change in trend of the black spot indices is an indicator of the road safety performance over the observation period. The current relative index can be used as a guide for formulation and implementation of future road safety strategies and network improvement programs. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | Perform annual extraction of all police reported crashes stored in the MRWA IRIS data base for the period of 5 calendar years.  Determine the unique number of the Black Spot Qualifying Locations for the current 5-year period satisfying the criteria stated above comprised of:   * + the number of intersections,   + the number of non-overlapping short sections (< 3 km); and   + the number of non-overlapping road lengths (> 3km).   Use ABS 2008-2012 or MRWA vehicle travel estimates (in MVKT) to determine Average travel for the 5-year crash data period for which the number of qualifying locations is calculated.  *e.g.*  *Mean MVKT2012 = (MVKT2008 + ….+ MVKT 2012 ) /5*  *Calculate the BSLI for the current 5-year period as follows:*  *Total No. of Qualifying Black Spot Locations*  *BSLI = --------------------------------------------------------------*  *5-year MVKT average*  *Eg. For the crash data period 2008 – 2012*  *No. of Qualifying locations 2008 to 2012*  *BSLI2012 = ---------------------------------------------------------*  *Average MVKT (2008 to 2012)*  If required, calculate the predicted BSLI index for the following 5-year period as follows:  *Estimate the expected number of Qualifying locations as follows:*  *Exp. No. of Qual. Loc. (QL) for the following year =*  *Obs. no. of QL in the current 5-year period*  *(-------------------------------------------------------) x Obs. No. of QL in the*  *Obs. no. of QL in the preceding period current period*  *Estimate MVKT for the following year using the linear trend based on the last 4 years of ABS published MVKT estimates and calculate the 5-year average for the year.*  *Calculate Predicted BSLI as follows:*  *Exp. No. of QL*  *BSLI predicted = ------------------------------------------------------*  *Average MVKT for the 5-year period* |
| *Data sources* | ***Crash Data***  *Number of Crashes*  *Main Roads IRIS Crash Database which contains all road crashes that are reported to the police*  ***MVKT***  *Australian Bureau of Statistics publication: Survey of Motor Vehicle Use Australia, 12 months ended 30 June 2012, Report 9208.0, 23 Apr 2013, p12. (or the most recent publication) and Corporate MVKT estimates for the missing years. NOTE: MVKT has been forecast for 09/10, 11/12 and 13/14 via linear interpolation/extrapolation of 4 years of ABS SMVU data.* |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target is established based on the anticipated outcome based on the proposed future work program. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 10 |

# 3. Community Satisfaction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Stakeholder* | Road Users |
| *Strategy* | Community & Relationships |
| *Outcome* | Reliable and efficient movement of people and goods |
| *Associated Program* | Road System Management, Road Efficiency Improvements |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 06/2908 |
| *Owner* | DSR |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRUCS |
| *Methodology owner* | MRUCS |
| *Description* | The Community Satisfaction Indicator represents how satisfied the community is with Main Roads’ overall performance in the construction, maintenance and management of the State road network. This indicator is obtained through the Community Perceptions Survey and reflects the satisfaction level of customers in both metropolitan and rural WA. |
| *Purpose* | The results of the Community Perceptions Survey are used to ensure Main Roads projects and customer service initiatives are targeted at the areas of greatest need. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | *Note: The complete methodology adopted for the survey is included as part of the final report which will be provided to the Auditors.* An external research company is commissioned to undertake the Community Perceptions Survey and report on the findings on an annual basis. The data is collected by way of telephone interviewing using a developed structured questionnaire.  The population for the purpose of the research is all Western Australian residents 17 years of age and over. A sample of 900 residents from rural areas (100 respondents from each region) and 250 residents from the Perth metropolitan area are surveyed. A stratified random sample is taken from the population ensuring that each person is given equal opportunity of being selected. The total sample of 1,150 produces a sampling precision of +/- 2.9% at the 95% confidence interval. That is to say that we would be 95% confident that the results would be within +/-2.9% should a census of the population be undertaken.  The collected data is weighted to reflect the actual population distribution based on ABS statistics*.* The weightings are applied in SPSS (specific research statistical software) and all statistical analysis is run in the SPSS environment. The weights applied are based ABS stats and applied individually to each case based on age, gender and region to ensure the data is representative of the state’s population. The results reported are based on the weighted data from SPSS. **The reported % is taken directly from the survey report.** |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A common target of 90% has been established for all of the Community Perception Satisfaction measures. The target was selected based on reviewing the results over the last five years. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 90% |

# 4. Road Network Permitted for use by Heavy Freight Vehicles

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Reliable and efficient movement of people and goods |
| *Associated Program* | Road System Management, Road Efficiency Improvements |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 02/1423 |
| *Owner* | DHVO |
| *Delegated Manager* | HVAPM |
| *Methodology Owner* | BSM (HVO) |
| *Description* | This indicator relates to the percentage of available state and national roads accessed by Class 10, Class 11 and Class 12 vehicles and in effect, the efficient movement of goods within Western Australia. |
| *Purpose* | The use of larger vehicles with greater payloads can increase the overall efficiency of freight transport operations, resulting in lower transport costs. However, to maintain road safety and guard against infrastructure damage, restrictions are placed on trucks that are larger than AUSTROADS Class 9. These include B-doubles (Class 10), double road trains (Class 11) and triple road trains (Class 12). Because of the relatively high efficiency of these vehicles, the proportion of roads accessible to them is an important factor in the overall efficiency of freight transport in this State. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | P10 = Percentage of classified roads available to Class 10 vehicles  P11 = Percentage of classified roads available to Class 11 vehicles  P12 = Percentage of classified roads available to Class 12 vehicles  R = Total length of all classified roads in the State  BD = Length of classified roads available to Class 10 vehicles (typically B-doubles)  DRT = Length of classified roads available to Class 11 vehicles (typically double rt)  TRT = Length of classified roads available to Class 12 vehicles (typically triple rt)  ANI Branch provides the total road length figures (R). HVO provides the information on road lengths available to various classes (BD, DRT and TRT) of vehicle by interrogation of the Vehicle Loading System (VLS) and networks built in IRIS. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | This target is based on fact and takes into account anticipated increases in the network based on changes to Govt Policy or expansions to the network. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | o B Doubles 96%  o Double Road Train (27.5m) 96%  o Double Road Train (36.5m) 78%  o Triple Road Train 44% |

# 

# 5. Network Configuration – Roads

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Reliable and efficient movement of people and goods |
| *Associated Program* | Road System Management, Road Efficiency Improvements |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/359 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRAP |
| *Methodology Owner* | RPEM |
| *Description* | The Network Configuration (roads) indicator shows the percentage of travel that occurs on roads which are within the limits defined by the Investigatory Criteria for seal width, carriageway width and curve rating\*\*. The indicator is calculated for sealed roads only. |
| *Purpose* | This indicator is a demand related measure of the effectiveness of improvement expenditure and gives an indication of Main Roads ability to plan for and maintain roads to desirable standards. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | * TRIM document D11#158606 outlines the business rules used in the calculation of this indicator. The business rules are replicated in the SAS code used to compile the KPI. * The data source for the calculation of the performance indicator is the Corporate Extract in SAS data set format. TRIM document D11#163293 contains the Instructions for creating the data in this format.   To compile the indicator:   1. Ensure that the SAS format corporate extracts are copied to c:\sas\_Data\Corpex 2. Run the SAS Program **Run\_Network\_Conditions.sas** located at [\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE EVALUATION\03 Corporate Performance Indicators\Annual Report\Master Directory\SAS code](file:///\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE%20EVALUATION\03%20Corporate%20Performance%20Indicators\Annual%20Report\Master%20Directory\SAS%20code)   The SAS code compares the seal widths, carriageway widths and curve ratings of homogenous sections of the road network against the investigatory criteria for the link subcategory that applies to that same section. The section of road is considered deficient if it fails any of the criteria.  The SAS code will compile the statistics for the KPI and will output an excel file containing the percentage of travel on roads that not meeting the investigatory criteria as well as composite statistics.   1. The Network Configuration KPI is the percentage of travel on roads that meet the criteria and is calculated as the complement (100% - value) of the percentage of travel on roads not meeting the investigatory criteria. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target based on anticipated results taking into account known works programs and the likely impact on the measure. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 89% of travel on roads meeting the investigatory criteria.. |

# 6. Network Configuration – Bridges

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Reliable and efficient movement of people and goods |
| *Associated Program* | Road Systems Management, Road Efficiency Improvements |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/360 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | SES |
| *Methodology Owner* | AMB |
| *Description* | Extent to which bridges on Main Roads and Highways satisfy bridge width and strength standards. |
| *Purpose* | This standard provides for a safe and efficient road network, and is based upon standards relating to improved access and transport efficiencies. It gives an indication of Main Roads’ ability to plan for and maintain bridges to desirable standards on the important transport routes. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | Pedestrian bridges, rail bridges and sign gantries are not included in the assessment because they cannot be crossed by vehicles.  Special purpose bus bridges in the Metropolitan area are not included in the assessment because they are not intended for use by varied network vehicles.  A full explanation of the width investigatory criterion and procedure is contained in the TRIM file 06/3622.  The required bridge width is a function of the link category which is based on the length weighted annual average daily traffic (AADT), freight and allowance for future growth. Guidelines for link categorisation are documented in the TRIM file D07#24819.  The bridge strength performance indicator uses Structure Rating Indices. This methodology compares each bridge’s calculated rating index to the required rating index for each bridge on a Main Road or Highway. The required index is set based on what vehicle the bridge should be able to carry based on the strategic role of the bridge in the network. The Structure Rating Index methodology ensures the vehicles are representative of the actual vehicles requesting access to cross each bridge. A corridor view is therefore taken.  The Required Rating Index is stored against each bridge in IRIS. These required index values (using the criterion outlined below) have been established in consultation with HVO. They represent access levels for various classes of heavy vehicles and will be continuously updated and reviewed. Meetings are held every 6 months to review any changes and new additions since the last meeting or if there are any changes required to existing data. One meeting is scheduled mid to late June just prior to end of year annual reporting.  The Actual Rating Index is calculated using the criterion outlined below and is determined using IRIS load rating data stored against each bridge. . |
|  | The strength investigatory criterion is the Bridge Rating Index defined as:  1 Load Limit  2 ≥ VSR (≥ 16.5, 20, 20, 20t for tandem, tri, quad and 484quad)  3 CLS (> 23t for tri and Y for HML)  4 ≥ Full (> 17.5, 26.25, 35, 35t, 95% for tandem, tri, quad, 484quad, T44)  5 > 95% G2V4 or >95% HLP320 for timber and timber hybrid bridges  6 > 95% SM1600  In brief, each bridge on a Main Road or Highway is compared against the investigatory criteria using a standard IRIS report, identifying those bridges not meeting the strength and/or width criteria.  The indicator is the number of bridges that meet or are above the investigatory criteria recorded as a percentage of the total number of bridges (with noted exclusions as above) on Main Roads and Highways.  Note that these criteria are ‘triggers’ for investigation. A bridge not meeting a criterion may still prove to be adequate and safe for its current traffic needs without intervention. Hence the indicators are not a direct measure of deficient structures. |
| *2013-14 target* | 87% for Bridge Strength  94% for Bridge Width |

# 7. Unplanned road closure on the state road network

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Improved community access and roadside amenity |
| *Associated Program* | Infrastructure for Community Access |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/361 |
| *Owner* | EDRS |
| *Delegated Manager* | BMRS |
| *Methodology Owner* | DRS |
| *Description* | Generally 100% of Main Roads road network responsibility is available to all road users and there will be unplanned road closures due to a number of reasons such as flooding due to cyclones, major bushfires, major road accidents, and they may be of varying durations.  There may be any number of incidents or events that may close any or a number of our roads in any one day, particularly due to flooding in our north west during the cyclone season. |
| *Purpose* | To demonstrate the degree to which the sealed State road network under Main Roads responsibility is totally (100%) available to the road user |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly with status updates provided each quarter |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | The availability of our road network will be measured as a percentage of the calendar days in the year that the whole sealed network is available to the road user.  By example, if there are 23 calendar days where the road network is not 100% available to the road users then our KPI for that year or reporting period will be (365 (or 366) – 23) / 365 (or 366). For this example in this reporting period (2007/08) that KPI would be (366-23) / 366 = 93.7%  Closure will be determined by measuring the number of whole days (24hrs) that any section of our road or road network is closed. A day will be a period of 24 hours commencing from the time the road is closed.  If the road is closed during day 1 and opened on day 2 and the duration is 24hrs or greater, the closure will apply to day 1, and day 2 will be considered to be open.  The network is deemed to be closed when the road is closed to ALL vehicles i.e. if the road is open to TRUCKS only the road is considered open. |
| *Methodology* | Examples are below:   1. Road Closed at 10:00am 11 Feb. 08 and Re-opened at 11:00pm 11 Feb. 08. The Road is considered **open** because the period of closure is less than 24hrs (or less than 1 day). 2. Road Closed at 10:00am 11 Feb. 08 and Re-opened at 2:00pm 12 Feb. 08. The Road is considered **closed** for 1 day because the period of closure is more than 24hrs (or more than 1 day). Note that the period of closure beyond 10:00am on day 2 is 4hrs which is less than 24hrs. Day 2 is considered to be open.   If there are multiple road closures, throughout the State on the same day (as determined by the above rules), then our road network is not available on that day.  Regions record all road closures in IRIS with references of supporting Road Closure Traffic Notices.  Regional Services Directorate runs the Unplanned Road Closure Summary Report direct from IRIS each quarter. The Summary Report provides a snapshot of closures of 24hours or more and calculates the network availability according to the above methodology.  Raw data is also downloaded from IRIS into a spreadsheet for cross-referencing and TRIM reference details |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target based on previous years trends given it seeks to anticipate the annual impact of weather events and bushfires on the network. Whilst considered Acts of God and generally outside of our control there are instances where we could improve the results with built solutions. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | ***85 (****100% of Main Roads sealed State road network is available 85% of the year)* |

# 8. Community Satisfaction with Cycleways and Pedestrian Facilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Improved community access and roadside amenity |
| *Associated Program* | Infrastructure for Community Access |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/362 |
| *Owner* | EDRNS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MTOS |
| *Methodology owner* | MRUCS |
| *Description* | The Community Satisfaction with Cycleways and Pedestrian Facilities Indicator represents how satisfied the community is with Main Roads’ overall performance in the construction, maintenance and management of cycleways and pedestrian facilities on the Metropolitan road network. This indicator is obtained through the Community Perceptions Survey and reflects the satisfaction level of customers from both metropolitan and rural WA. |
| *Purpose* | The results of the Community Perceptions Survey are used to ensure Main Roads projects and customer service initiatives are targeted at the areas of greatest need in relation to cycleways and pedestrian facilities. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | An external research company is commissioned to undertake the Community Perceptions Survey and report on the findings on an annual basis. The data is collected by way of telephone interviewing using a developed structured questionnaire.  The population for the purpose of the research is all Western Australian residents 17 years of age and over. A sample of 900 residents from rural areas (100 respondents from each region) and 250 residents from the Perth metropolitan area are surveyed. A stratified random sample is taken from the population ensuring that each person is given equal opportunity of being selected.  The total sample of 1,150 produces a sampling precision of +/- 2.9% at the 95% confidence interval. That is to say that we would be 95% confident that the results would be within +/-2.9% should a census of the population be undertaken.  The collected data is weighted to reflect the actual population distribution based on ABS statistics*.*  The weightings are applied in SPSS (specific research statistical software) and all statistical analysis is run in the SPSS environment. The weights applied are based ABS stats and applied individually to each case based on age, gender and region to ensure the data is representative of the states population. The results reported are based on the weighted data from SPSS.  **The reported % is taken directly from the survey report.** |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A common target of 90% has been established for all of the Community Perception Satisfaction measures. The target was selected based on reviewing the results over the last five years. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | Greater than 90% |

# 10. Smooth Travel Exposure

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Associated Program* | Road Network Maintenance |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 02/1426 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRAP |
| *Methodology Owner* | RPEM |
| *Description* | The Network Configuration (roads) indicator shows the percentage of travel on the sealed road network that occurs on roads, which are within the roughness limits defined by the Asset Management Planning Investigatory Criteria. |
| *Purpose* | The purpose of the Smooth Travel Exposure KPI is to provide a measure of the effectiveness of network maintenance. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Biennial |
| *Audited by OAG* | *Yes* |
| *Methodology* | * TRIM document D07#113021 details the Investigatory Criteria used to assess whether the road roughness is within an acceptable range. * TRIM document D11#158606 outlines the business rules used in the calculation of this indicator. The business rules are replicated in the SAS code used to compile the KPI. * The data source for the calculation of the performance indicator is the Corporate Extract in SAS data set format. TRIM document D11#163293 contains the instructions for creating the data in this format.   To compile the indicator:   1. Ensure that the SAS format corporate extracts are copied to [c:\work\corpex\SAS](file:///\\dacsrv01\rdmaintstrat\PERFORMANCE%20EVALUATION\03%20Corporate%20Performance%20Indicators\Annual%20Report\2008-2009\SAS%20Data%20Sets) 2. Run the SAS program *Run\_STE.sas* located at [\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE EVALUATION\03 Corporate Performance Indicators\Annual Report\Master Directory\SAS code](file:///\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE%20EVALUATION\03%20Corporate%20Performance%20Indicators\Annual%20Report\Master%20Directory\SAS%20code).   The SAS code compares the IRI roughness values for homogenous sections of the road network against the roughness investigatory criteria for the link subcategory that applies to that same section. The section of road is considered deficient if the roughness exceeds the criteria. The roughness figure used for the comparison are the Lane Quarter car IRI values which are calculated as:  *iri\_left = (iri\_l\_owp + iri\_l\_iwp) / 2;*  *iri\_right = (iri\_r\_iwp + iri\_r\_owp) / 2;*  The SAS code will compile the statistics for the KPI and will output an excel file for each year of calculation containing the percentage of travel and percentage of road length not meeting the investigatory criteria as well as composite statistics.   1. The Smooth Travel Exposure KPI is the percentage of travel on roads that meet the criteria and is calculated as the complement (100% - value) of the percentage of travel on roads not meeting the investigatory criteria. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target based on anticipated results taking into account known works programs and the likely impact on the measure. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | Not calculated this year, next reported result will be 2014-15 |

# 11. Community Satisfaction of Road Maintenance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | A well maintained road network |
| *Associated Program* | Road Network Maintenance |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/364 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRAP |
| *Methodology owner* | MRUCS |
| *Description* | The Community Satisfaction of Road Maintenance Indicator represents how satisfied the community is with Main Roads’ overall performance in the maintenance of the State road network. This indicator is obtained through the Community Perceptions Survey and reflects the satisfaction level of customers in both metropolitan and rural WA. |
| *Purpose* | The results of the Community Perceptions Survey are used to ensure Main Roads projects and customer service initiatives are targeted at the areas of greatest need in relation to road maintenance. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | An external research company is commissioned to undertake the Community Perceptions Survey and report on the findings on an annual basis. The data is collected by way of telephone interviewing using a developed structured questionnaire.  The population for the purpose of the research is all Western Australian residents 17 years of age and over. A sample of 900 residents from rural areas (100 respondents from each region) and 250 residents from the Perth metropolitan area are surveyed. A stratified random sample is taken from the population ensuring that each person is given equal opportunity of being selected.  The total sample of 1,150 produces a sampling precision of +/- 2.9% at the 95% confidence interval. That is to say that we would be 95% confident that the results would be within +/-2.9% should a census of the population be undertaken.  The collected data is weighted to reflect the actual population distribution based on ABS statistics*.*  The weightings are applied in SPSS (specific research statistical software) and all statistical analysis is run in the SPSS environment. The weights applied are based ABS stats and applied individually to each case based on age, gender and region to ensure the data is representative of the states population. The results reported are based on the weighted data from SPSS.  **The reported % is taken directly from the survey report.** |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A common target of 90% has been established for all of the Community Perception Satisfaction measures. The target was selected based on reviewing the results over the last five years. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 90% |

# 12. Preventative Maintenance Indicator

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | A well maintained road network |
| *Associated Program* | Road Network Maintenance |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 09/365 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRAP |
| *Methodology Owner* | RPEM |
| *Description* | The Preventative Maintenance Indicator compares the surface age of the road against the target maximum surfacing age (optimum target age) for the section of road and reports on the percentage of the sealed network falling into the category of ‘Good’. |
| *Purpose* | To provide an indication of the extent that preventative (proactive) maintenance of road pavements is being adequately undertaken. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | *Yes* |
| *Methodology* | * TRIM document D11#158606 outlines the business rules used in the calculation of this indicator. The business rules are replicated in the SAS code used to compile the KPI. * The data source for the calculation of preventative maintenance indicator is the Corporate Extract in SAS data set format. TRIM document D11#163293 contains the instructions for creating the data in this format. * Detailed job instructions for calculating the indicator can be found in TRIM document D11#158609. * The target maximum surfacing age (TA) is obtained from the Oliver model (refer business rules document D11#158606 Section 3.4.1 for details).   To compile the indicator:   1. Ensure that the SAS format corporate extracts are copied to c:\SAS\_Data\Corpex 2. Confirm that the TA values used in the previous years’ calculation are applicable and edit the SAS code to reflect the new values if there are changes. 3. Run the SAS Program **Run\_Preventative Maintenance.sas** located at [\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE EVALUATION\03 Corporate Performance Indicators\Annual Report\Master Directory\SAS code](file:///\\dacsrv01\RdMaintstrat\PERFORMANCE%20EVALUATION\03%20Corporate%20Performance%20Indicators\Annual%20Report\Master%20Directory\SAS%20code) (ensuring that any changes to the Seal optimum surfacing ages have been reflected in the code).   The SAS code compares actual seal age (SA) against target age (TA) and assigns one of four categories to each homogenous section of road:  Good: SA < TA  Mediocre: SA = TA - (1.3 \* TA)  Poor: SA = (1.3 \* TA) - (1.6 \* TA)  Very Poor: SA > (1.6 \* TA)  (The indicator in not applicable if the road has concrete pavement or is unsealed).  Note that in the above description reference was made to the 2012 calculation year. For other years, corresponding subdirectories will have to be created for the current year, and files will have to be appropriately sourced relevant to the current financial year. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target based on anticipated results taking into account known works programs and the likely impact on the measure. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 84% of the sealed network where seal age falls into the ‘Good’ category. |

# 13. Return on Construction Expenditure

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Facilitate economic and regional development |
| *Associated Program* | Infrastructure for State Development |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 02/1429 |
| *Owner* | EDPTS |
| *Delegated Manager* | MRAP |
| *Methodology Owner* | RPEM |
| *Description* | The Return on Construction Expenditure (RCE) KPI summarises the expenditure in the Road Infrastructure for State Development Program. The expenditure is summarised by the Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs) of the projects upon which the expenditure was allocated. |
| *Purpose* | The RCE KPI indicates the extent which road and bridge construction will deliver future economic benefits to the community. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | *Yes* |
| *Methodology* | * TRIM document *D11#158606* outlines the business rules used in the calculation of this indicator. The business rules are replicated in the Excel worksheet used to compile the KPI. * The data is sourced from PBIS’s Analysis Services data cube.   To compile the indicator:   1. Take a copy of the worksheet: [\\dacsrv01\rdmaintstrat\PERFORMANCE EVALUATION\03 Corporate Performance Indicators\Annual Report\Master Directory\KPI Output Templates\ RCE\_template.xlsm](file:///\\dacsrv01\rdmaintstrat\PERFORMANCE%20EVALUATION\03%20Corporate%20Performance%20Indicators\Annual%20Report\Master%20Directory\KPI%20Output%20Templates\%20RCE_template.xlsm) 2. The following table describes how each worksheet works:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Tab** | **Comments** | | PBIS Budget | * Refresh the data (right click anywhere in the table and then click Refresh) | | BCR-Source RAPID | * Refresh the data (right click anywhere in the table and then click Refresh) | | BCR Latest | * A listing of BCRs from various sources including RAPID. This list is reviewed during the Budget Estimate time and updated with the latest BCRs. | | 2013\_14 Actual | * This sheet contains data retrieved from the Analysis Services cube Column A to E) and other calculated values (column G onwards). * Change the Forecast Period filter to the year you want to report on and the data will be refreshed immediately. * Update column G to O by copying or clearing out cell formulas. |      1. Perform analysis of the result, i.e., Target vs Actual and provide explanations to the variances. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | Target based on anticipated results taking into account known works programs and the likely impact on the measure. | | |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. | | |
| *2013-14 target* | Expenditure weighted average BCR of 3.3 | |

# 14. Effectiveness of road safety Campaigns

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Community Recognition of Road Safety Campaigns |
| *Associated Program* | Office of Road Safety |
| *TRIM Ref:* | 10/3107 |
| *Owner* | Director Strategic Communications |
| *Delegated Manager* | ORS Communications Manager |
| *Methodology Owner* | ORS Communications Manager |
| *Description* | This indicator represents the proportion of WA drivers who remember seeing Office of Road Safety community education campaigns.  This indicator is obtained through campaign evaluation surveys undertaken at the end of major campaign period and demonstrates the extent of penetration, or success of major advertising campaigns. |
| *Purpose* | These results measure the extent to which WA drivers remember major road safety campaigns. They are also used for subsequent stages of campaign planning. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly, however the results of each individual campaign are reviewed at their conclusion |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | An external research company is commissioned by ORS to undertake campaign evaluation surveys at the completion of major ORS campaigns, defined as campaigns with a Television Commercial (TVC) component and total budget of at least $500,000 in media scheduling.  The data is collected by way of an online survey using a structured questionnaire prepared by a professional agency. The measure is based on prompted campaign recognition (ie. percentage of people who remember seeing any of the core campaign materials for a given campaign)  The segment of population researched is Western Australian drivers 17 years of age and over. Results for each major campaign are based on a random sample of at least 400 drivers 17 years of age and over. A state wide campaign comprises:  • n=200 responses from the Perth metro area  • n=100 responses from regional WA.  • n=100 responses from remote WA.  The collected data is weighted to reflect the actual population distribution based on ABS statistics. The weightings are applied in SPSS (Specific Research Statistical Software) and all statistical analysis is run in the SPSS environment. The weights applied are based on ABS stats and applied individually to each case based on age, gender and geographic location to ensure the data is representative of the State’s population. The results reported are based on the weighted data from SPSS.  The KPI measure is calculated as the average percentage of prompted community awareness (recall/recognition), i.e. adding all percentages and divided by the number of campaigns evaluated. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A target was established following discussions with media buying company, marketing professionals (based on TARP levels) on what would be considered acceptable for penetration levels. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 65% |

# 15. Percentage of contracts completed on time and budget

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Associated Programs* | Road Efficiency Improvements  Infrastructure for Community Access  Road Safety  Infrastructure for State Development |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 08/6818 |
| *Owner* | EDRS/EDID |
| *Delegated Manager* | BM (RS) & BM (IDD) |
| *Methodology Owner* | BM (RS) & BM (IDD) |
| *Description* | The indicator identifies the percentage of works projects within each Program that achieve on time on cost delivery |
| *Purpose* | Corporate indicators identifying the delivery of the works program in line with committed timeframes. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Twice yearly. Forecast outcomes for Budget Papers and actual outcomes for Annual Reporting purposes. (Note: The KPI is also calculated on a monthly basis and reported to Corporate Executive in addition to the external reporting process) |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes – for Annual Report. |
|  | ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA:  Projects that meet the following eligibility criteria are to be used to calculate the KPI:  ⚫ Infrastructure works on highways or main roads that are delivered by Contract, Direct Management or Local Government and where the estimated works value meets the Public Tender threshold (currently $150 000 incl GST)  ⚫ Infrastructure works on Local Roads where delivery is managed by Main Roads and where the estimated works value meets the Public Tender threshold (currently $150 000 incl GST).  Note 1: The following contracts are excluded from the reporting process: MCW (via ISAs) < $150 000 (incl GST), Goods, Services, Consultancies, Plant Hire etc. All procurement less than $20 000 is considered to be a direct purchase rather than a contract and is also excluded.  GENERAL:  On award of an eligible works Contract information is entered into CAS, all information for calculation of this report is derived from an extract of CAS.  Consistent with other State Road Authorities, the On Time target will incorporate a 10 % leeway on the initial Date for Practical Completion as identified at the award of the contract. This is to be known as the Target Date and will automatically be calculated during the extract of data from CAS. Where the 10% leeway on time results in the Target Completion Date falling within the next Financial Year then the outcomes are reported as part of the following Financial Year, even though the works may have been completed during the current Financial Year. In addition a 10% leeway is included on the award value of the tender, this is known as the Target Value.  On establishment of the contract, the Program number should be entered into CAS on the Events tab – create an Event number XXX\* and enter the Program number in the notes field. |
| *Methodology* | The following are the steps to be taken on a monthly and annual basis for the calculation of the measure:   1. On the first working day after the 7th of the month Business Performance Branch request the “ARKPI\_QueryExtract” from Supply and Transport Branch. 2. Apply filters to the spreadsheet for each column and arrange date from oldest to newest. Delete any entries that have a target date beyond 30 June. 3. Sort by Program Code on the column titled to filter out all contracts coded 1, 5 or 7. This is done as the performance measure is only reporting on Program Codes 2, 3, 4 and 6. 4. Reset the filter for this column to show all remaining data including those not coded with a Program Code. 5. Recalculate the On Budget column by adding the value of any variations to the existing Target Value and recalculate the On/Over Budget to recognise the inclusion of variations (note it was agreed to add variations as a “pure” value and not incorporate a 10% leeway given that variations can only be included based on approval in accordance with the delegation of authority manual). 6. Extract information as follow:    1. No. Contracts due for completion at month end – Count the number of contracts in the target range. Enter this figure into the summary sheet    2. $ Contracts due for completion - Sum the $ value of contracts in the target range. Enter this figure into the summary sheet    3. No. Contracts due for completion at year end – Count the total number of contracts in the data extract, Enter this figure into the summary sheet    4. $ Contracts due for completion at year end - Sum the $ value of contracts in the data extract. Enter this figure into the summary sheet    5. Contracts on time YTD – Filter the column titled “Works Completed On Time” to show those projects coded “On Time”. Count the number of contracts in the target range and enter into the summary sheet. Calculate this number as a % of “contracts due for completion YTD”.    6. Contracts on budget YTD - Filter the column titled “Works Completed On Budget” to show those projects coded “On Budget”. Count the number of contracts in the target range and enter into the summary sheet. Calculate this number as a % of “contracts due for completion YTD”.    7. Contracts on Time to 30 June XX - Filter the column titled “Works Completed On Time” to show those projects coded “On Time”. Count the number of contracts to 30 June XX and enter into the summary sheet. Calculate this number as a % of “contracts due for completion 30 June XX    8. Contracts on Budget to 30 June XX - Filter the column titled “Works Completed On Budget” to show those projects coded “On Budget”. Count the number of contracts to 30 June XX and enter into the summary sheet. Calculate this number as a % of “contracts due for completion 30 June XX   Refer to the example below for references incorporated within the Summary sheet |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | The target was based on research to determine what other jurisdictional road agencies were reporting on at the time of the 2007 review. At that time Qld, Vic and NSW all used a 90% target. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequence to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 90 % |

# 16. Average Cost of network management per million vehicle kilometres travelled

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Outcome | Reliable and Efficient movement of people and goods |
| Associated Program | Road Systems Management |
| TRIM Ref: | 05/4802 |
| Owner | EDRNS |
| Delegated Manager | MRNOM |
| Methodology Owner | MRNOM |
| Description/Purpose | The indicator represents the financial efficiency of the Road Systems Management by showing the cost per Million Vehicle-Kilometres Travelled (MVKT) to manage the operations of the State road network (includes some operations on local roads such as traffic signals, which MRWA has responsibility for). The KPI includes some Finance and Other Costs spread over the Program. |
| Reporting Cycle | Yearly - (Note: For Budget Papers, this indicator is calculated in March, without using Deflators and using estimated expenditure figures for the current and next financial years. For Annual Report, this indicated is calculated in July, using Deflators (see methodology below) and actual expenditure figures) |
| Audited by OAG | Yes |
| Methodology | * Obtain the annual Road System Management expenditure data as at 30 June from Budget & Programming Branch. This data is extracted from the PBIS (Program Code 1) and provided by Budget and Program Mgt. * Forward the annual Road System Management expenditure data to Finance & Commercial Services Directorate to allocate Finance & Other Costs. After adding the Finance & Other Costs, this provides the total annual expenditure for the Road Network Operation Management Program (exp). * Use MVKT data calculated by RAP Branch based on ABS Stats including Experimental Estimates and Corporate MVKT estimates for missing years.   Average cost of network managed = exp / MVKT  *Comparison of previous indices with the current year:*   * Obtain the Gross State Product (GSP) Price Index for the previous years and the current year from the Business Improvement Branch, who in turn obtains this information from the Department of Treasury & Finance. This information is usually available in late June. * For year n, obtain the Deflator (Dn) by dividing the current year’s GPS Price Index (GPIcy) by the GSP Price Index for the year n (GPIn).   Deflator for year n (Dn) = GPIcy / GPIn   * For year n, historical expenditure (expn) is converted to Present Value (PVn) by multiplying the historical expenditure (expn) by Deflator (Dn).   (Note: For current year, Deflator D = 1)  Present Value (PVn) = Dn \* expn   * Use PVn and MVKT for year n to calculate Average cost of network managed for year n. |
| Target Setting Rationale | A target is established based on the anticipated expenditure against an estimate of mvkt. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | $4 256 |

# 17. Average Cost of road network maintenance per lane kilometre of network

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | A well maintained road network |
| *Associated Program* | Road Network Maintenance |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 02/1430 |
| *Owner* | EDRS |
| *Delegated Manager* | FPM |
| *Description* | *Indicator identifies the average cost of maintaining a lane kilometre of the State Freeway, Highway and Main Road network.* |
| *Purpose* | *General efficiency indicator that identifies the trend in the annual cost of maintaining the State Road Network.* |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Yearly |
| *Audited by OAG* | *Yes* |
| *Methodology* | 1) Obtain report generated by Finance/Budget and Programming identifying final expenditure by Program.  2) For Program 5 (Road Network Maintenance) sort all projects on basis of Road Class and Project.  3) Separate National & State from Local Road outcomes.  3) For National and State proposals exclude Structures (Bridge) Program from road activities. Review Work Output Unit for M2 items to ensure no bridge proposals remain in Road Maintenance output.  4) Sum the proposals that relate to road maintenance on the National and State network.  5) Obtain from Technology and Environment Directorate the length of the State network in Lane Kilometres.  6) Divide Total Cost (as determined at step 4) by Lane Kilometre length to determine raw lane kilometre rate for current financial year.  7) Multiply raw lane kilometre rate by current year Overheads rate to determine reportable outcome for current financial year (as determined by step 1).  8) Obtain State Gross State Product (GSP) index from Manager Business Performance.  9) Divide current year GSP index by previous year’s index to determine the multiplier to be applied to bring past year outcomes to current year dollars.  10) Divide the reporting year GSP index by the same year to =1  11) Obtain the reported lane kilometre outcomes used in the previous year’s report.  12) Multiply the outcomes for each of the previous years by the multiplier determined at step 9 above.  13) Graph the results. |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | A target is established based on the anticipated expenditure against the length of road network. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequences to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | $7 900 |

# 18. Percentage of ORS Projects completed on budget and on time

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome* | Improved coordination and community awareness of road safety in WA. |
| *Associated Program* | Office of Road Safety |
| *TRIM Ref*: | 10/3108 |
| *Owner* | EDORS |
| *Delegated Manager* | PFO |
| *Methodology Owner* | PFO |
| *Description* | This indicator identifies the percentage of projects within this Program that achieve delivery within a Targeted timeframe and budget (includes annual approved budget, carryover from last year and new projects initiated through Mid-Year Review approvals). |
| *Purpose* | Corporate indicator identifying the delivery of approved annual projects in line with committed timeframes and budgets. |
| *Reporting Cycle* | Quarterly |
| *Audited by OAG* | Yes |
| *Methodology* | ***Eligibility Criteria***  Each year the Minister for Road Safety approves the Road Trauma Trust Fund (RTTF) budget, which is made up of individual road safety projects (usually in the order of 40 to 50 per annum) to be completed by road safety stakeholders, including the Office of Road Safety (ORS). Each project is submitted for approval with agreed deliverables and budget. This indicator will be based on all ORS projects only approved by the Minister for Road Safety based on the budget agreed as at 1 July plus carryovers and any additional projects arising through the mid-year review process.  ***Calculating the Indicator***  A summary spreadsheet will be created each year containing the complete listing of approved projects including columns for;   * Name of Project * Name of Agency (Managing the project) * Approved budget YTD (includes Annual budget, Carryover and Midyear Review) * Actual expenditure YTD * Completed On Budget/Over Budget (including a 10% leeway) * Completed On time/Late  1. Each quarter the spreadsheet will be updated to indicate the current status of each project (On time/Late, On Budget/Over Budget, Performance Indicators) 2. Late, over budget or projects without meeting Performance Indicators will get a red colour in the respective columns with explanations. 3. The information will be summarized below the spreadsheet to indicate the:    1. Total number of projects and YTD expenditure    2. Total number of projects by Agency and YTD expenditure |
| *Target Setting Rationale* | The target was based on research to determine what other jurisdictional road agencies were reporting on at the time of the 2007 review. The same principles were adopted for this indicator. |
| *Unintended Consequences* | The issue of unintended consequence to work practices as a result of efforts by staff to achieve this target were considered and found to be not relevant. |
| *2013-14 target* | 90 % |