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## Network Statement Template

**Introduction**

*This section should be a* ***brief*** *summary of the state of the network and contain a summary of network condition including trend of GSE, average seal age, roughness, rutting, skid resistance, texture and smooth travel exposure, all-defect inspection and how the trends compare with the maintenance strategies noted on your MMP, Corridor management plan and ONRC. Summary should include major changes to the network, and commentary around traffic* growth when triggering risk profile. *(1 page)*

**18-21 NLTP**

*Short discussion on the NLTP budget for your network* including overall funding request and outcomes expected to be delivered for this level of funding, (no more than 1/2 page)*. The below table should be completed (figures can be copied from Annual Plan template)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20/21\* | 18-21 NLTP\* |
| March 2020 Request |  |  |
| NLTP Approved funding |  |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

**Summary of Changes – 18-21 NLTP**

*Note: A change is considered any increase or decrease of $250K or a variance of 10%. The larger the change, the more evidence that will be expected to support it.*

|  |
| --- |
| *Has there been any change from that which was originally requested? – Figures should include changes covered at work category level* |
|  |  20/21\* | 18-21 NLTP\* |
| NLTP Request | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  |
| What is the impact of the change | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  |
| What is the Magnitude of the Change | **$****%** | **$****%** |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail of Change *details should include:** *$*
* *Reasons for change*
* *What need is being addressed*
* *Evidence of need*
* *alignment with MMP an Corridor Management Plan*
* *Benefit to customer*
* *Consequence of not funding / doing the works*
* *For changes listed on the work categories sections only an overview is required.*
 |  |
|  |
|  |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required* *Detail of change provided*
* *Reason for it*
* *Why (what needs are it addressing)*
* *Benefits to customer*
* *Consequences of not doing it*
 | *If funding requested or scope has changed, do you buy the story, that is;*Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *How does what's offer stack up against your network?* *(cost/km, cost per vehicle km travelled etc)?*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**Consequences of Reduced Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Have the consequences of not funding or doing the work, been adequately discussed?**Can we comfortably live with that decision?*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken | *
 |
| *Owner Overall impact of changes if any* |  |

**Outcome Expected**

*Benchmark against your network is this a credible submission*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Is it clear what outcomes will be delivered and are we confident that this can be delivered?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement detail in the Network Condition to support changes?* *Is relevant supporting evidence justifying the change requested?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement demonstrate an alignment to the Corridor Management Plan to support changes?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement demonstrate an alignment to the MMP to support changes?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Are any of the proposed projects actually "improvements" that should be funded from Minor Improvements*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If Yes, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**21-24 NLTP**

*Discussion on the 21-24 NLTP budget for your network* including overall funding request (no more than 4 pages)*. As a minimum the following topics should be covered:*

* *Detail the outcomes expected to be delivered for this level of funding and linkage them to ONRC*
* *Rationale behind the cyclic maintenance and renewal intervention strategy*
* *Detail the level of risk considered for the development of the submission*
* *The consequences of not funding to the level requested*
* *If funding request is above 18-21 NLTP level, evidence base justification for the need of an increase level of funding*

*The below table should be completed (figures can be copied from Annual Plan template).*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 21/22\* | 22/23\* | 23/24\* | 21-24 NLTP\* |
| March 2020 Request |  |  |  |  |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

***BRPQs***

How is network tracking against BRPQ (Base Renewal Preservation Quantities)? Please provide a copy of the BRPQ table for pavement surfacing and drainage renewals updated after RAPT.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *How do the quantities align with contractual Base quantities?* *Have the consequences been adequately covered?*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken | *
 |

**Outcome Expected**

*Benchmark against your network is this a credible submission*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Is it clear what outcomes will be delivered and are we confident that this can be delivered?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement detail in the Network Condition to support funding request?* *Is relevant supporting evidence justifying the funding request?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement demonstrate an alignment to the Corridor Management Plan to support funding request?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Does the Network Statement demonstrate an alignment to the MMP to support funding request?* Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Are any of the proposed projects actually "improvements" that should be funded from Minor Improvements*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If Yes, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**Consequences of Reduced Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Have the consequences of not funding or doing the work, been adequately discussed?**Can we comfortably live with that decision?*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken | *
 |
| *Owner Overall impact of changes if any* |  |

**Work Category Justification**

**18-21 NLTP**

**WC1xx**

**Has there been a change from the NLTP bid for this work category?***Note: A change is considered any increase or decrease of $50K or a variance of 10%. The larger the change, the more evidence that will be expected to support it.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20/21\* | 18/21 NLTP\*  |
| NLTP Request | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  |
| What is the impact of the change | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  |
| What is the Magnitude of the Change | **$****%** | **$****%** |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

**If yes, please use the following table to detail changes to this work category:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail of Change *details should include:** *$*
* *Reasons for change*
* *What need is being addressed*
* *Evidence of need*
* *alignment with MMP an Corridor Management Plan*
* *Benefit to customer*
* *Consequence of not funding / doing the works*
 |  |
|  |
|  |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Category***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested or scope has changed in the Work Category. Do you buy the story, that is;** *Detail of change provided*
* *Reason for it*
* *Why (what needs are it addressing)*
* *Benefits to customer*
* *Consequences of not doing it*

Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Element***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required*At Work Element Level highlight any elements* * *You consider a substantial change has occurred*

*For the work elements requiring detail schedules:** *Have the tables been completed for elements requiring*
* *Are all the details provided?*
* *Are the rates appropriate*
* *Based on the details provided in your opinion do think this is a good investment*
* *Where the tables are including works, which are underpinned by preservation quantities is there indication of alignment with the NOC*
* *Are there any additional elements added that you think should be funded elsewhere and are these appropriate?*
* *Do the unscheduled and Non-NOC prices look reasonable?*
 |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**WC212/214/215**

Has there been a change from the 18-21 NLTP bid for this work category?
*Note: A change is considered any variance from the approved programme by RAPT. The larger the change, the more evidence that will be required to support this change.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20/21\* | 18-21 NLTP\*  |
| NLTP Request | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  |
| What is the impact of the change | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  |
| What is the Magnitude of the Change | **$****%** | **$****%** |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

**If yes, please use the following table to detail changes to this work category:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail of Change *details should include:** *$*
* *Reasons for change*
* *What need is being addressed*
* *Evidence of need*
* *alignment with MMP an Corridor Management Plan*
* *Benefit to customer*
* *Consequence of not funding / doing the works*
 |  |
|  |
|  |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Category***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested or scope has changed in the Work Category. Do you buy the story, that is;**Detail of change provided**• Reason for it**• Why (what needs are it addressing)**• Benefits to customer**• Consequences of not doing it*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Element***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required* *Independent check to ensure that the site details presented accurately capture (in terms of overall length) the results of the RAPT.*
* *Some variation in costs can be expected as several sites were not costed correctly at RAPT time, new sites were added, and others needed review following discussions on treatment details. (e.g. Type of seal, chip size, or the need to use polymers etc)*
* *Are there any specific sites that appear abnormally higher or lower than average and if so, is further explanation needed?*
* *Are the rates appropriate how have they been built up? do they include the E/O items?*
* *Are the rates comparable with your network?*
* *Based on the details provided in your opinion do you think this is a good investment*
 |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**WC213**

Has there been a change from the 18/19 NLTP bid for this work category?
*Note: A change is considered any increase or decrease of $50K or a variance of 10% or a change from the programme agreed with asset integrator. The larger the change, the more evidence that will be required to support this change.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20/21\* | 18-21 NLTP bid |
| NLTP Request | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  |
| What is the impact of the change | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  |
| What is the Magnitude of the Change | **$****%** | **$****%** |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

**If yes, please use the following table to detail changes to this work category:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail of Change *details should include:** *$*
* *Reasons for change*
* *What need is being addressed*
* *Evidence of need*
* *alignment with MMP an Corridor Management Plan*
* *Benefit to customer*
* *Consequence of not funding / doing the works*
 |  |
|  |
|  |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Category***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested or scope has changed in the Work Category. Do you buy the story, that is;** *Detail of change provided*
* *Reason for it*
* *Why (what needs are it addressing)*
* *Benefits to customer*
* *Consequences of not doing it*

Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Element***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required*At Work Element Level highlight any elements* * *Lack appropriate detail*
* *You consider a substantial change has occurred*

*For the work elements requiring detail schedules:** *Have the tables been completed for elements requiring*
* *Are all the details provided?*
* *Are the rates appropriate, how they compare to your region?*
* *Based on the details provided in your opinion do think this is a good investment*
* *Where the tables are including works, which are underpinned by preservation quantities is there indication of alignment with the NOC*
* *Are there any additional elements added that you think should be funded elsewhere and are these appropriate?*
 |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**WC221/222**

Has there been a change from the 18/19 NLTP bid for this work category?
*Note: A change is considered any increase or decrease of $50K or a variance of 10% or no programme being submitted. The larger the change, the more evidence that will be required to support this change.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20/21\* | 18-21 NLTP\* |
| NLTP Request | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  | **Yes** [ ] **No** [ ]  |
| What is the impact of the change | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  | **Increase** [ ] **Decrease** [ ] **Nil** [ ]  |
| What is the Magnitude of the Change | **$****%** | **$****%** |

\* Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments. OP3 will provide NTLP figures excluding cost fluctuation.

**If yes, please use the following table to detail changes to this work category:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Detail of Change *details should include:** *$*
* *Reasons for change*
* *What need is being addressed*
* *Evidence of need*
* *alignment with MMP an Corridor Management Plan*
* *Benefit to customer*
* *Consequence of not funding / doing the works*
 |  |
|  |
|  |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Category***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested or scope has changed in the Work Category. Do you buy the story, that is;** *Detail of change provided*
* *Reason for it*
* *Why (what needs are it addressing)*
* *Benefits to customer*
* *Consequences of not doing it*

Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

***Funding or Scope Change at Work Element***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required*At Work Element Level highlight any elements* * *Lack appropriate detail*
* *You consider a substantial change has occurred*

*For the work elements requiring detail schedules:** *Have the tables been completed for elements requiring*
* *Are all the details provided?*
* *Are the rates appropriate*
* *Based on the details provided in your opinion do think this is a good investment*
* *Are there any additional elements added that you think should be funded elsewhere and are these appropriate*
 |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**Consequences of Reduced Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *Have the consequences of not funding or doing the work, been adequately discussed?**Can we comfortably live with that decision?*Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken | *
 |
| *Owner Overall impact of changes if any* |  |

**21-24 NLTP**

**WC1xx / 2xx**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 21/22\* | 22/23\* | 23/24 | 21-24 NLTP  |
| Funding request |  |  |  |  |

\*Figures should exclude cost fluctuation adjustments.

**Overview**

*As a minimum the following topics should be covered:*

* *Detailed justification including links to MMP and process used to determine the funding request*
* *Detail the level of risk*
* *Options for increase/ decrease level of funding*

**Work elements**

*Detailed justification for work elements with an annual request above $100K or new activities inserted into the annual plan template*

***Funding at Work Category***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested or scope has changed in the Work Category. Do you buy the story, that is;** *Scope is clear*
* *Reason for it*
* *Why (what needs are it addressing)*
* *Benefits to customer*
* *Consequences of not doing it*

Yes [ ]  No [ ] *If No, provide detail*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* | *
 |

***Funding at Work Element***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required*At Work Element Level highlight any elements* * *You consider a substantial change has occurred from the previous NLTP without detailed justification*

*For the work elements requiring detail schedules:** *Have the tables been completed for elements requiring*
* *Are all the details provided?*
* *Are the rates appropriate*
* *Based on the details provided in your opinion do think this is a good investment*
* *Where the tables are including works, which are underpinned by preservation quantities is there indication of alignment with the NOC*
* *Are there any additional elements added that you think should be funded elsewhere and are these appropriate?*
* *Do the unscheduled and Non-NOC prices look reasonable?*
 |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken / *impact of changes if any* |  |

**Consequences of Reduced Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required | *If funding requested has been increased what would you recommend be removed from the program to get funding level back to the original approved funding level?*  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken |  |
| *Owner Overall impact of changes if any* |  |

**Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer Commentary / Action Required |  |
| Owner Response to Commentary/ Action Taken |  |

***Specific items to consider for the Network Statement and peer review:***

*WC111*

* *Heavy maintenance request aligns with treatments identified in the renewal’s worksheet scheduled for heavy maintenance.*
* *Roughness and rutting do the list of sites proposed represent a value for money investment. You should apply your judgement to this based on your experience with your network.*
* *If there is a strategy to shift treatments from renewal to heavy maintenance this is cover on the network statement.*

*WC114*

* *Statement in this section which confirms the Structures Team have assessed and agree to the scope and funding requested*

*WC151*

* *Data Management Plan: does the submission align with the requirements of NOC clarification No 25*
* *Planning: statement explaining the need for this funding considering the split of planning budget listed below.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *CATS Planning Budget includes:* | *System Management budget includes:* |
| * 1. *LUDS: planning consultant input (submissions, evidence, hearings)*
	2. *LUDS: specialist advice. This includes safety and technical advice where this goes beyond the high-level advice expected to be provided by NZTA in house maintenance and safety personnel*
	3. *LUDS: legal advice and possible E court costs*
	4. *Stat planning consultants planning (submissions, evidence, hearings)*
	5. *Stat planning specialist advice (submissions, evidence, hearings). Again, this includes safety and technical advice where this goes beyond the high-level advice expected to be provided by NZTA in-house maintenance and safety personnel*
	6. *Stat planning legal advice and possible E court*

 | * 1. *Any outsourcing of initial safety or maintenance advice associated with LUDs and district or regional planning that would typically be done in-house but due to resourcing shortfalls is outsourced.*
	2. *Planning assessment reports (PARs) for LUDS undertaken by the NOC.*
	3. *Consenting costs for maintenance works:*
		+ *Assessing consent requirements*
		+ *Drafting applications (planning)*
		+ *Specialist input (ecology, etc)*
		+ *Hearing costs*
		+ *Consenting monitoring and compliance management (complex consents)*
		+ *Reporting (i.e. annual reporting for global consents*
		+ *Mitigation works: i.e. Landscape planting,*
		+ *Stormwater and erosion management control etc*
	4. *Global consents and re-consenting of expiring consents for ongoing maintenance work*
	5. *Maintenance consenting annual fees (paid to Council)*

 |

*WC213*

* *Are there any specific sites that appear abnormally higher or lower than average and if so, is further explanation needed?*
* *For Culverts (in particular) and Lined channels, are the proposed renewals justified? (Sites where the justification is “upsizing” may warrant close review as these may be improvements. Similarly, “new” channels may be improvements)*
* *If anything is proposed under “other” … is the work explained/ justified*