

## **PROPOSED TRAINING AND COMPETENCY MODEL**

In the lead up to this project there was general concern from the TTM industry that:

- There was no apparent career path for workers within the TTM industry
- Some of the CoPTTM Trainers did not have enough practical experience
- The CoPTTM training was considered theoretical and not practically based
- There was a lack of experienced TTM staff at worksites
- Some labour hire companies are training TCs who have no practical experience of working on the road

NZTA also received a Coroners Court recommendation that a test of competence be included as part of training for TTM personnel.

### **Development process**

CGG set as a priority project the development of a new way of delivering the TTM training incorporating a test on competence (the Training and Competency model).

A working party of 11 industry representatives (including 6 CGG members) was established to develop the Training and Competency model.

Four industry consultation workshops were conducted in Dunedin, Christchurch, Palmerston and Auckland.

339 submissions were received for amendments/improvements to the Training and Competency model.

The general consensus from those attending the workshops was that the model outlined the right way to proceed.

NZTA would like to thank all those people who have contributed to the development of the Proposed Training and Competency model.

Set out on the following pages is the consolidated feedback received during the 4 Industry workshops and the actions taken on each item of feedback.

## CONSOLIDATED FEEDBACK ON DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

### Main decision list

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
1.	PN	Group feedback	Amend learning blocks to show clearer definition of path ways and whether assessment is included in each block Consider developing a matrix showing pathways to competence for key roles	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Leave map of learning blocks as is. Create a matrix of roles across the top, workshop down left side and indicate whether it is a knowledge or competency for each one	No change to map Added matrix showing requirement for knowledge (Cert) or warrant of overall competence ( <b>W</b> ) NFA
2.	PN	Group feedback	Amend profiles to align terminology e.g. verifier	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Agreed	Profiles reviewed and aligned NFA
3.		Group feedback	Consider renaming TC to deputy STMS <i>Refer to Roles requiring some form of CoPTTM knowledge – TC for submissions on this item</i>	There was a lot of support for renaming the TC warrant	Retain the use of TC as the title of the role.  This will keep the role clear and avoid confusion, we don't want to devalue the STMS role or blur the lines.	NFA
4.		Group feedback	Consider change to TC role – no longer setup or remove TTM <i>Refer to Roles requiring some form of CoPTTM knowledge – Change to TC role for submissions on this item</i>	There was general acceptance that TC role needs to be reduced to maintainer of worksite.  This however will create difficulties for smaller companies especially in rural areas.  It was suggested that TC be allowed to set up, maintain,	TC role to be revised to maintainer of TTM, if you are expecting the TC to do the job, which includes setup, they are really acting as an STMS and should attend STMS training.	The working group is no longer supporting the TC setting up and removing TTM off carriageway  Deleted following wording from the TC profile  <del>Once the TC has been assessed as competent they can setup and remove TTM as well as</del>

**Commented [HS1]:** Unclear if this is meaning practical skill/ability or overall competency. Need to ensure clarity throughout material.

**Commented [HS2]:** We may need to help the industry understand the change to TC role to only being a maintainer of site, and let go of the 'Deputy STMS' idea.

Two unclear elements to me:  
(i) Is the working group still supporting the TC setting up and removing TTM off carriageway? (This slightly contradicts the point above).

Follow-on query: Could a 'Competent TC' set up and remove on any level of road? Or would other elements of learning / competency be required? Would speed environment be a factor to consider? Eg <65kph vs >65kph.

(ii) Am I correct in understanding that a 'Competent TC' can work on all road levels? Ie there is only one TC qualification that enables the individual to work on all road levels. Same question for 'TTM worker' role.

**Commented [TS3R2]:** Profile limits TC to level 1 and LV roads only.

**Commented [TS4R2]:** The working group is no longer supporting the TC setting up and removing TTM off carriageway

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				<p>and remove when activity not on live lane</p> <p>Also allow exceptions (e.g. grading or work on LV roads)</p>	<p>We need to get the level of TTM up to raise the bar and manage the risk.</p> <p>If we start allowing all these variations, we are introducing uncertainty and risk</p>	<p><del>maintaining a worksite off carriageway (not on trafficable area i.e. outside sealed shoulder)</del></p> <p><del>Knowledge and skills to setup, maintain and remove TTM for a worksite off the carriageway (not on trafficable area i.e. sealed shoulder)</del></p> <p><b>SETUP, MAINTAIN AND REMOVE 2 verified worksites OFF CARRIAGEWAY (not on trafficable area i.e. outside sealed shoulder) eg Mowing, Edge marker cleaning, Utility activities, Drainage, Hedge/shelter belt trimming, Other approved low risk activities.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <del>Minimum of 2 verified closures covering a range of situations signed off by TTM verifier</del></li> <li>● <del>On job experience with own company</del></li> <li>● <del>Record of practice and experience</del></li> </ul> <p>NFA</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
5.	Group Feedback	Split of STMS level 2 and level 3 <i>Refer to Blocks of learning – STMS for submissions on this item</i>	There was general support for changing the split in the STMS level 2 and STMS level 3 learning blocks. Most popular split was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 2 under 65km/h</li> <li>Level 2 over 65km/h and level 3</li> </ul>	STMS level 1 profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include knowledge and assessment for closure on live lane over 65km</li> </ul> We will have an STMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 2 under 65km/h</li> <li>Level 2 over 65km/h will be integrated into Level 3 (level2/3)</li> </ul> Note: All assessments to deal with simple and complex environments The assessments need to reflect the complex and non complex situations at all levels	Added the following to STMS Level 1 profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Live lane closure (under 65km/h)</li> <li>Live lane closure (over 65km/h)</li> </ul> Amended STMS Level 2 profile to show (under 65km/h) Amended STMS Level 3 profile to show <b>level 2 (over 65km/h) and level 3</b> Added to all STMS profiles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment to deal with simple and complex environments</li> </ul> NFA
6.	ChCh	Stuart Fraser	We need to discuss whether we have a theory refresher for each learning block especially if a person has been away for some period	We will retain a requirement for refreshment if the qualification has lapsed over 12 months Refresher must include a verification that they are practicing correctly Participant submits verification to trainer at refresher workshop	<b>The following learning blocks will be refreshed by briefing from STMS:</b> General worker TTM worker Inspector Use of specialist TTM Other specialist activities

**Commented [H55]:** This assumes that the Trainer is also a Verifier (or acting as one). Recommend details are clearly articulated.

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
						<p><b>The following learning blocks get 3 yearly Refresher:</b>                      TC                      STMS LV and L1                      L2 under 65km/h                      L2 over 65km/h and L3</p> <p><b>Universal refresher included in these refreshers:</b>                      All other later learning blocks add statement that refresher must be completed for STMS workshops for level of TTM</p> <p>Actioned                      NFA</p>
7.	Auck	Elise Freeman	TTM mentor/trainer vs. TTM verifier vs. CoPTTM assessor vs. CoPTTM trainer. Needs clarification, very blurry <i>Refer to Blocks of learning – TTM Trainers/Mentors for submissions on this item</i>	There was general support for changing TTM trainer/mentor to TTM mentor TTM verifier can assess competence of a candidate or provide evidence to a CoPTTM assessor that the candidate has completed work competently CoPTTM assessors are specialists selected by NZTA to undertake specific assessments.	Change TTM Mentor/trainer to TTM Mentor TTM verifier (Amend profile): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to STMS Level 1 (includes TTM worker, TC &amp; STMS) a verifier determines the candidate is competent</li> <li>Level 2/3 the verifier furnishes the statement of competence to a CoPTTM assessor</li> </ul>	Amended TTM Trainer/Mentor profile to show TTM Mentor Amended other references throughout the document Amended General worker, TTM worker, Inspector, TC and STMS level 1 profiles to show TTM verifier determines if the candidate is competent Amended TTM Verifier profile to show:

**Commented [HS7]:** Related to my feedback/query in item 3 above: Under current profile wording, both TTM Worker and TC can be trained and verified by internal company staff. If individuals are working on L2/3 roads (obviously under STMS supervision), are we still comfortable with internal company training and verification assurance?

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
			Recommend changing name from CoPTTM assessor to NZTA assessor	<p>CoPTTM Assessor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain name</li> <li>A CoPTTM Assessor is invited by NZTA to complete CoPTTM assessments in specialist areas of activity which currently include L2/3 practical assessments, ATMP assessment, Barriers assessments</li> </ul> <p>CoPTTM trainer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain name</li> <li>Person who wants to become a trainer for selected CoPTTM workshops</li> </ul>	<p>Up to STMS level 1 (includes TTM worker, TC &amp; STMS) a verifier determines whether the candidate is competent</p> <p>At level 2/3, the verifier furnishes a statement of competence to a CoPTTM Assessor</p> <p>Amended CoPTTM Assessor profile to show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A CoPTTM Assessor is invited by NZTA to complete CoPTTM assessments in specialist areas of activity which currently include L2/3 practical assessments, ATMP assessment, Barriers assessments</li> </ul> <p>NFA</p>
8.	Group feedback	Does a TTM verifier or a NZTA assessor confirm competence for level 1 (STMS and TC) <i>Refer to STMS level 1 – Does a TTM verifier or a NZTA assessor confirm competence for level 1 for submissions on this item</i>	<b>Recommend TTM verifier confirms competence for level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to STMS Level 1 (includes TTM worker, TC &amp; STMS) a verifier determines the candidate is competent</li> </ul>	See above NFA

**Commented [H56]:** Probably need to check profiles and wording for consistency and clarity. Many roles involve both Mentor / Verifier actions followed by an Assessor final check. Could be confusing if Verifiers are also stated to be 'Assessing'.

**Commented [H58]:** Recommend reword to: ...is authorised by NZTA to confirm competency standards satisfied ...

Also recommend that Assessor nomination process be reviewed. Selection / invitation by NZTA may not be producing the desired or robust outcomes.

**Commented [H59]:** Recommend reword to: ...is authorised by NZTA to train the attendees of COPTTM workshops.

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
9.	PN	Kerry Drake	Construct safe as part of general worker	General support for this <b>Recommend add to profile</b>	Decision: Construct safe would be optional. Not included as not required by all participants	Added the following to the General worker profile <b>Note: It is not intended that this briefing replace site induction, Construct Safe etc courses, but offers a complimentary component.</b> NFA
10.	ChCh	Stuart Fraser	In the TTM worker and possibly other profiles we need to acknowledge that much of the leaning will be informal while on the road. Also, reader/writer if required	Agreed <b>Recommend add note to profile to reflect this. Check other profiles as well</b>	Add to the profile: In the General worker and TTM worker we need to acknowledge that much of the leaning will be informal while on the road. Also, reader/writer if required	Added note to General worker and TTM worker profiles <b>Note about learning: Much of the leaning will be informal while on the road. Also, a reader/writer needs to be supplied if required</b> NFA
11.	Auck	Stuart Fraser	We need to prepare an example of a minimum standard for the standards for practical skills	Agreed. <b>Recommend develop example of minimum standards</b>	Prepare an example of minimum standards and practical skills	Actioned by Neil Present to CGG
12.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Is 100% going to be achievable as a pass mark on tests?	Agreed. <b>Consider amending pass mark to 80% correct answers for all profiles</b>	Leave it at a 100% because tolerance is built into your learning standards and answers for questions	NFA
13.	Auck	Dave Tilton	TTM knowledge – should include public	This was a common thought. It will be included as part of the NZQA certificate.	Yes under the knowledge section, include a basic interaction with people	Added the following to the TTM worker profile

**Commented [HS10]:** Also, my understanding is that the General Worker briefing is intended to be offered for those workers who require a basic understanding of COPTTM. It was not intended that this briefing replaces site induction, Construct Safe etc courses, but offers a complimentary component.

**Commented [HS11]:** Is this meaning one generic example, or specific minimum standards per profile? I was expecting the latter, with the detail to be worked out during detailed design phase.

**Commented [TS12R11]:** Stuart wanted one generic example to show CGG

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
			interaction. Good/bad practises and conflicts	<b>Recommend this be included at a practical level in TTM worker briefing</b>	within the knowledge component	Interaction with people (good/bad practises and dealing with conflict) Assessment method: Real-life situational experiences and scenarios NFA
14.	Auck	Dave Tilton	Prerequisite should be 'general worker' so no double up	General worker could be a prerequisite to TTM worker rather than showing the TTM worker including general worker briefing. <b>To be considered</b>	Make General worker a prerequisite to TTM worker Remove wording from TTM worker profile '(includes General worker content)' Draw a line from learning block 'General worker' to learning block 'TTM worker' <b>Include a note:</b> you may you cover General worker components as the first part of the TTM worker learning block	Amended TTM worker profile to show General worker as prerequisite Removed the following info from TTM worker profile: <b>Includes the following general worker information (unless participant has completed general worker training):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Entry/Exit points</del></li> <li>• <del>Roles and responsibilities of TTM personnel</del></li> <li>• <del>Emergency procedures</del></li> <li>• <del>Who to report to</del></li> <li>• <del>Briefings</del></li> <li>• <del>TMP process/ fundamentals</del></li> <li>• <del>Slips, trips and falls (hazard ID)</del></li> </ul>

**Commented [HS13]:** Industry recognises that interpersonal skills are critical for competency. I'm not sure this skill element is adequately covered yet.

Knowledge testing or worker briefing are really an artificial measure that don't provide direct practical verification. Possible better options: public feedback, real-life situational experiences, scenario testing, demonstrate skill in front of verifier etc

**Commented [HS14]:** This would be a duplication of earlier (General Worker) content. Feels excessive to me. Recommend omit, or limit to absolute minimum duplication.

**Commented [TS15R14]:** I think the intention was to allow the training to be combined rather than repeated



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p><del>Working around plant and machinery</del></p> <p><del>No go zones</del></p> <p><b>General worker practical</b></p> <p><del>Complete practical exercises as per general worker training</del></p> <p>Drew a line from learning block 'General worker' to learning block 'TTM worker'</p> <p>Added note to TTM worker profile:</p> <p><i>May complete the General worker training as the first part of the TTM worker training</i></p> <p>NFA</p>
15.	Group Feedback	Split mobile operation driver into two separate levels <i>Refer to Mobile operation driver – Split mobile operation driver into two separate levels for submissions on this item</i>	There was general support for separating the training into mobile driver level 1 and mobile driver level 2 and 3. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Split practical assessment into level 1 (including level 2LS) and level 2/3. Certificate available for each level.	Amended Mobile operation driver profile to show: <b>Assessment for level LV, level 1 and level 2 (under 65km/h)</b> <b>Assessment for level 2 (over 65km/h) and level 3</b> Added following statement to Mobile operation driver profile <b>• Certificate/warrant issued for:</b>

**Commented [HS16]:** Do you mean warrant? I understand the Certificates of achievement are intended to recognise knowledge attainment only.

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level LV, level 1 and level 2 (under 65km/h)</li> <li>- level 2 (over 65km/h) and level 3</li> </ul> <p>NFA</p>
16.	PN	John Reid	Practical assessments on TC level 1, it will be hard to verify closures as it could take months to sign off due to limited sorts of closures	Need to discuss this further	<p>Remove 'setup maintain and remove 2 verified worksites' from the on job practical assessment in the TC profile.</p> <p>Complete a minimum of 1 closure from each activity type listed in the TC OJP profile, 1 closure must include footpath or cyclist control.</p>	<p>Amended TC profile as follows:</p> <p><b>Must MAINTAIN at least 1 closure from each activity type listed below. One of the closures must include footpath or cyclist control</b></p> <p>NFA</p>
17.		Group feedback	<p><b>Do surveyors, staff working on their own, and people doing simple shoulder closures need to be assessed over the full range of closures?</b></p> <p><i>Refer to STMS level 1</i></p> <p><b>– Do surveyors, staff working on their own, and people doing simple shoulder closures</b></p>		<p>Either go through the TC Inspector learning path or be fully qualified for the activity</p>	<p>Added following note to Inspector profile</p> <p><b>Note: This may include surveyors, staff working on their own, and people doing simple shoulder closures provided their work fits within the range of inspection activities</b></p> <p>NFA</p>

**Commented [HS17]:** Recommend TC terminology be deleted from the Inspector profile.

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
			<b>need to be assessed over the full range of closures? for submissions on this item</b>			
18.	PN	Leanne McAdams	I would like to see this one as compulsory for all going through for L2/3. Ensure solid background	<b>To be discussed – do we make level 1 a prerequisite to level 2/3</b>	No Level 1 STMS will not be a prerequisite to Level 2 STMS Universal STMS is a prerequisite to all further levels of STMS	NFA
19.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	What happened to the current L2/3 STMS-NP? This allows shoulder closures and capital projects etc	STMS NP is still there as a knowledge qualified person. <b>To be discussed – do we have NP and P at each level?</b>	No change – clarification: Retain the use of the words knowledge, practical and competency. Certificate will be issued once knowledge component awarded, warrant and card issued once practical competencies have been achieved	Notes on this already included in proposed training and competency model NFA
20.	Auck	Paul Merson	For the assessment of TMP designer, CoPTTM assessor will direct any rework. But this will be on 10 already approved, completed and reviewed TMPs.	<b>This is tricky point that needs to be discussed – do we review TMPs before submission or after submission or do we require a made-up project?</b>	The TMP that goes to the CoPTTM assessor is to be the submission version – the plan that was originally submitted to the approver (not after amendments have been made at the request of the approver) Amend the profile to show 3 TMPs submitted for assessment	<b>Note from Neil</b> Number of TMPs in assessment The assessment is of the structure and proposed content of the TMP therefore it does not matter if the TMP has been approved One of the TMPs submitted for assessment must have had a site review as detailed

**Commented [HS18]:** I assume this is meaning 'overall competency', not proficiency in one sub-element, which would be a knowledge or practical skill but insufficient in itself to demonstrate full competency.

**Commented [TS19R18]:** Agreed

**Commented [HS20]:** Need to be careful with wording to avoid confusing people. 'Practical Skills/Abilities' are not full competency. Under our system only achievement of the full suite of attributes can result in a competent person. Recommend reword to 'Practical Skills'.

Terminology needs to be made consistent or corrected throughout all profiles and associated material. Eg the 'Pathways to NZTA warranted positions' also refers to 'competencies' when what is actually meant is practical skills.

**Commented [HS21]:** I strongly disagree with this. The intent for the on job practical skill assessment is for the TMP Designer to demonstrate that they can design viable TMPs in a real-world context. For the Assessor to have full awareness of the designer's ability, they need to see any changes required by the Engineer/TMC, and know how the TMP worked onsite. Lessons learned insight from real-world operations is crucial.

Further it is the role of the Engineer / TMC to direct any rework to submitted TMPs not the COPTTM Assessor, and it would be risky inserting another step and approver into a TMP approvals sequence.

I suspect this question was a result of the profile saying: "TMPs assessed as per agreed conditions by CoPTTM Assessor who directs any rework" – this comment about directing rework is incorrect.

Draft profile was also confusing whether 5 or 10 examples are expected.

With the exception of the two clarifications above I support the bulk of the draft profile remaining unchanged, as I think a relatively high bar needs to be set to provide assurance of competent TMP designers (poor designs are the cause of too many problems onsite). Evidence of 10 deployed TMPs should be

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>(TMP for each of the categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ped/cyclist closure [vulnerable road users]</li> <li>• Lane reduction/capacity reduction</li> <li>• Multi day, multi phase)</li> </ul> <p>Supply evidence for one approved TMP plan that they have designed under supervision which has had a site review addressing what went well, what could have been improved and changes for next time (including onsite record if available).</p>	<p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>Most people doing this workshop will take a while to do 10 TMPs. Also, it will take too long to mark 10 TMPs by the CoPTTM Assessor</p> <p>Overseas competency requirements show that 3 is a suitable number</p> <p>Amend profile to show 3 TMPs submitted for assessment</p> <p>They must be approved TMPs meeting CoPTTM requirements</p> <p><b>Actioned</b></p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
21.	Dun	Michael Tannock/ Dean Hurford	Develop strategy for implementation in terms of recognition of prior experience. Include an implementation timeframe		<p>This needs a group to look into it as the roll out progresses.</p> <p>A recognition of prior learning approach was discussed</p> <p>Suggested allowing grandfathering of qualifications (to be linked to the next refresher with a minimum roll in period of 6 months?)</p>	<p><b>Tony's note</b></p> <p>Propose the following to CGG as part of implementation</p> <p>Link to refresher – must have verification of competence before warrant is renewed (to be linked to the next refresher with a minimum roll in period of 6 months)</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>Develop implementation strategy roll over of</p>

**Commented [HS22]:** Needs to be discussed further. Given risk of grandfathering some people who may fail to meet the competency standards, I could support this concept with some conditions.

Recommend alternative options also be considered eg  
 (i) 'acting' roles during the transition period, with competency verification / proof / training etc within a certain timeframe.  
 (ii) all staff undergo assessment / verification as per scheduled next qualification refreshment.

	Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
						existing warrants with competence assessment at next refresher  <b>Actioned</b> <b>NFA</b>
22.	ChCh	Ray Edwards  Shawn Maxwell	Records and qualifications - Will there be an online portal to capture "warrant" and "certificate" qualifications?  How can people on site show they are competent? Current is warrant card, but with all new roles this may need to be electronic. Has this been thought about?		Have a warrant to be issued once all competencies for any particular qualification have been achieved. This is because administration nightmare and risk associated with lack of clarity	Amended T&C model as follows  Candidate receives a certificate of achievement when they complete the knowledge component of a learning block. The warrant is awarded after achieving the pass criteria for all knowledge and skill elements within learning block. There will be no partial warrant issued – the person will either be warranted or not warranted.  NFA

**Commented [HS23]:** I support submission that records should go electronic and ideally into a viewable online database. Physical cards will probably become redundant.

View of an individual's profile within database would be ideal mechanism eg via smartphone / tablet. The individual, their manager, auditors, RCA, Police etc could all view real-time, current competencies.

**Commented [HS24]:** Again, need to be careful with terminology not to confuse knowledge/skill/other attributes, with full competency. Recommend reward to: ...once all knowledge / skill elements for any ....

**Commented [HS25]:** Missing from this Main Decisions list is mention of "it will be hard for small companies, or ones with limited types of work, to meet x, y, z requirements".

My view continues to be: All companies need to find a way to complete the training / verifying requirements.

A company being small or only undertaking certain types of work is insufficient justification to compromise the level of quality we are seeking.

## Roles requiring some form of CoPTTM knowledge

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
23.	Auckland	Neil Greaves	Role descriptions require a tidy up in certain areas	Agreed – Tidy up based on feedback. Align what they do – broad description to the profile statements	Support Actioned NFA	
			<b>MTC (stop/go)</b>			
24.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	What about role/group for manual traffic controller (MTC)? Need own group?	MTC included in the TTM worker learning block. There was no general support for having a separate MTC learning block <b>Recommend no further action (NFA)</b>	MTC training to remain as part of the TTM worker package including an on job assessment of Stop Go. Beef up the MTC training component of the STMS L1 and STMS L2 training to comprehensively cover MTC training and stop go setout	Amended STMS level 1 and STMS level 2 (under 65km/h profiles to show assessments include • Static operations (including stop/go) Also added MTC as a compulsory closure for these profiles <b>Compulsory operation – MTC</b> NFA
25.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Ensure MTCs all trained minimum TC	This is the current approach and ends up with MTCs receiving a full days training covering information they are not likely to use again <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA NFA	
			<b>General worker</b>			

**Commented [HS26]:** STMS training their less experienced staff is broader subject than MTC and stop/go. I support a broader item be added around training, but recommend against overly-focusing on MTC at risk of overlooking other activities. Fine to list as an example.

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
26.	PN	Leanne McAdams	General worker - Agree general info construct safe. Combine with general worker. Good idea to be package that could be run in house or by external trainer. Unlike construct safe, ensure reading material provided	Already addressed in learning blocks <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA  NFA
27.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Difference between general worker and TTM worker? Can they be combined?	Already addressed in learning blocks <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA  NFA
28.	PN	Darrin Humphries	General worker - Minimum entry level TTM knowledge is required for this role	Already addressed in profiles <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA  NFA
			<b>TC</b>		
29.		Overall decision	<b>Consider renaming TC to deputy STMS</b>	<b>There was a lot of support for renaming the TC warrant</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above  See item 3 Already actioned NFA
30.	PN	Andrew McIntosh	<i>Roles - Delete TC name and replace with "Deputy STMS"</i>	<i>Refer decision above</i>	NFA
31.	PN	David Arrowsmith	<i>Complex set of roles with some overlaps. Potential for some people to hold multiple roles. Potential for confusion if TC terminology is retained but role changes</i>	<i>Agreed. Some people will hold multiple roles. They key is they need training/briefing for each of the roles they perform</i>	<i>Refer decision above</i>  NFA
32.	ChCh	Chris White	<i>Title confusing. Should be TC only. Some people get confused and think it is STMS level 1</i>	<i>Refer decision above</i>	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
33.	PN	Leanne McAdams	<i>I like the term TC as I think the industry generally understands the TC term may maintain a level 1 site. Keeps with current and will move with new framework</i>		Refer decision above	NFA
34.	PN	Joseph Rosendaal	<i>Remove TC. This has been trained incorrectly for years and needs refresh of name to drop the past</i>		Refer decision above	NFA
35.	PN	Dominic DeGiorgio	<i>TC course - Would it be better to make this a more stringent qualification rather than add a lesser qualification to the mix?</i>		Refer decision above	NFA
36.	PN	Leanne McAdams	<i>TC - Keep term well known. Good generic prerequisite for all TTM concepts.</i>		Refer decision above	NFA
37.	PN	John Reid	TC - Split roles: TC L1 NP, TC L1 practising, STMS L1 NP, STMS L1 P		I do not support making TC more complicated by splitting. Though if we keep it as one block of learning, we need to ensure TC can maintain worksites at all road levels.	Refer to item 19 Already decided to stick with Certificate on completion of knowledge component and warrant on completion of all knowledge and skill components Also TC limited to level LV and level 1 NFA
			<b>Inspector</b>			



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
38.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Inspector - Is this still similar to the TC? Basic generic CoPTTM overviews for an inspector (likely consultant).	Yes, similar to TC but cut down to focus only on essential information that an inspector needs to know, plus information about inspections on L2/3 roads <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
39.			Can it be used still as prerequisite to STMS?	No longer a prerequisite to STMS <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
			<b>Change to TC role</b>			
40.			<b>Consider change to TC role – no longer setup or remove TTM</b>	There was general acceptance that TC role needs to be reduced to maintainer of worksite. This however will create difficulties for smaller companies especially in rural areas. It was suggested that TC be allowed to set up, maintain, and remove when activity not on live lane Also allow exceptions (e.g. grading or work on LV roads)	Small company concern is not supported as justification for expanding TC role. TC and STMS roles have been intentionally distinguished to assure of competency, and all PCBUs are expected to have competent, appropriately qualified staff onsite. My view on the grading operation (and any other exceptions): If the operator is acting as the supervisor	<b>Tony's Note</b> Option for TC to remove worksites on shoulder or partial lane closures where delineated lanes are not required (eg alternating flow, contraflow or lane merge) <b>Stuart's decision</b> Propose to CGG the following: Option for TC to remove worksites on shoulder or partial lane closures where delineated lanes are not required

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				<p>of the operation then they either should be STMS qualified (ie verified to be able to perform the role competently), or a departure be approved by the RCA within the Contractor's TMP. In other words: all parties consciously sharing responsibility if endorsing use of a lesser qualified supervisor.</p> <p>Option for TC to setup and remove worksites off-live lane / carriageway - to be discussed per item 3 above.</p>	<p>(eg alternating flow)</p> <p><b>Actioned</b></p> <p><b>Await decision</b></p>
41.	PN	Darrin Humphries	We rely heavily on TC qualified temp workers. Under the new model/learning blocks those TCs will now need to be STMS L1 endorsed. More cost and more training	Refer decision above	
42.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Agree remove TC ability to setup/remove TTM. Except for minor activities moving site to site i.e. Fault repairs.	Refer decision above	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
43.	Auckland Elise Freeman	Theory TC – Maintainers only Practical TC – Set-up, maintain and remove Theory STMS – Ready for all of the above plus responsibilities		Refer decision above	
44.	ChCh Simon Hodges	Should be allowed to do non-capacity reduction to allow small contractors to undertake bread and butter works that are low risk		Refer decision above	
45.	ChCh Steven Haughin	If the TC cannot set up then what is the difference from TTM worker? TTM worker good enough to help but not maintain seems an additional step for no reason?		Refer decision above	
46.	ChCh Dean Hurford	Allow TC to setup. Run and maintain on LV roads. This would allow for graders, mowers, weed sprayers in the lower risk situations		Refer decision above	
47.	PN Stuart Fraser	TC - we need to consider what we allow. Should a TC (competent) be able to work off the shoulder but not on the lane or sealed shoulder?		Refer decision above	
48.	PN Ray Edwards	TC needs to be able to break down (maybe setup) sites. This role may need a name change		Refer decision above	
49.	PN Stuart Fraser	Passed knowledge component - can only mind the site		Refer decision above	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
50.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Passed competency - can set up/take down the site Support restriction of their scope. Improvement of qualification as proposed		
51.	PN	Darrin Humphries	Remove the TC role. This role becomes the STMS role	Refer decision above	
52.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	TC restriction – will this have an impact on multiple sites on a daily basis?	Refer decision above	
53.	PN	Ray Edwards	Review role of TC (deputy STMS) to allow removal of TM on LV and low speed roads	Refer decision above	
54.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	TC – set-up and removal as well? Keep it but keep it only is practical component is signed off (warranted)	Refer decision above	
55.	PN	Darrin Humphries	Maybe we allow a TC with the mobile competency the authority to set up/break down sites without the STMS	Refer decision above	
56.	ChCh	No Name	2 levels of risk for shoulder work. <65 TC and >65 STMS	Refer decision above	
57.	PN	Kerry Drake	Prequalify, TC in this format has more ability than current knowledge	Refer decision above	
58.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Agree maintain site. However, would be good to have relaxation for minor activities i.e. one person undertaking fault repairs in cabinet. Note	Refer decision above	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
59.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	<i>this is covered in off carriage way</i> TC role being reduced with a higher rate. Rural maintenance contractors may struggle - grader drivers moving, spraying etc. These staff may not be able to achieve a STMS qualification yet are safe in their roles. Allow on LV roads TC to run		
60.	PN	Leanne McAdams	STMS - Agree STMS take on site responsibility for setup and removal site. I think the universal STMS should include TMP and audit exercise, very good knowledge for all		
			<b>Traffic operation manager</b>		
61.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Draft profile 'Traffic operation manager' vs roles list on page 10. Extra 's' in operation(s)	Added <b>s</b> to Traffic Operations Manager in profile 11 <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA
62.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Traffic operations manager: consider 'manager of traffic operations'	Industry commonly refers to this role as Traffic Operations Manager <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA
			<b>Miscellaneous</b>		
63.	ChCh	Damien Houlahan	Need to ensure learning blocks address differences between the two-lanes, two-way environment vs. the multiple lane, one-way environment. L3 STMS working on one-way		
				Note for inclusion in learning block material	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		motorways may struggle on two-lane, two-way roads L2 0 - 65 kms			
64.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	<p>Not happy with exclusions on L3 (mwy/expressway) e.g. incident responders: hvy haul, towies, volunteer fire.</p> <p>Relevant training required, should roll over to L1, L2</p>	<p>NFA. Option to train Emergency Services first responders on COPTTM basics for their consideration during emergency response. Note Emergency Services applying control under their Acts are <u>not</u> required to comply with COPTTM.</p> <p>For non-emergency responses, the parties listed should either be applying approved TMP response plans or be waiting for the TTM response from the maintenance contractor to make the site safe. So they should either be qualified to be the supervisor onsite (ie STMS),</p>	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				or be waiting for an STMS to arrive.	
65.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Risk that competency can be lost if not in frequent use or not abreast of changes. Content of refreshers to ensure changes are bought up. Feeding changes through STMS's as well as TMP designers	<p>Refresher content to be further discussed.</p> <p>We may need to highlight (in COPTTM?) that there is an onus on individuals to ensure they remain competent. ie self-responsibility to stay/retrain to be current, and not operate outside their level of competence.</p>	<p>Also connected with item 6</p> <p>It is the responsibility of each organisation to keep their STMSs up to date with relevant CoPTTM changes</p> <p>These are posted to the NZTA website and will also be notified to interested parties via the new email system being established</p> <p>NFA at this stage</p>
66.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	<p>Is there a need for a separate role of moderator for all or each of the trainer/verifier/mentor/assessor roles?</p> <p>Where is the check/balance here?</p>	<p>Not for Mentor because expectation is that role will hold the equivalent or higher qual (ie have already been assured to be competent), plus individuals and companies will approach differently.</p> <p>Verifier – TBC. May depend</p>	<p>Added note to CoPTTM Assessor profile</p> <p><b>Moderation</b></p> <p><b>NZTA will undertake moderation of CoPTTM Assessor</b></p> <p>Added note to CoPTTM Trainer profile</p> <p><b>Moderation</b></p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				whether internal or external to a company. Trainer and Assessor – Yes, there needs to be NZTA moderation to ensure consistency.	NZTA will undertake moderation of CoPTTM Trainer  Added note to TTM Verifier profile <b>Moderation</b> NZTA will undertake moderation of TTM Verifier NFA
67.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Remove optional from engineer, page 11	Agreed. Still covered as option in the text next to Approving Engineer. Amend discussion document	Support  Removed <del>Optional</del> from Engineer section of <b>Roles requiring some form of CoPTTM knowledge</b> NFA
68.	PN	Andrew McIntosh	Roles - On the money	<b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA
69.	PN	David Arrowsmith	Good to make distinction between types of roles i.e. Trainer, TMP designer, TMP approver etc. Not too many in the proposal	<b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA



## Blocks of learning

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
			<b>Consolidation of learning blocks</b>		
70.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	<p>Too many classes – potentially taking too long to achieve or too costly. Could lead to loss of control of the process.</p> <p>Solution: combine similar roles competencies e.g. TTM designer + TTM auditor, i.e. same competencies so could do either role?</p>	<p>I think the Universal STMS training time could be reduced to 1 day rather than 2, noting that each Level is estimated to require another full day of training.</p> <p>I do not agree that auditor and designer involve the same competency, so do not support combining.</p>	<p><b>Tony's Note</b></p> <p>Do we shorten timeframe of Universal STMS to 1 day?</p> <p>Gut feel is it could be squeezed into 1 day but I believe we will undermine the learning.</p> <p>STMS level 2 (under 65km/h), level 2 (over 65km/h) and level 3 each have an additional 1 day workshop but the STMS level 1 is only scheduled for the 2 day universal training and a workbook that is completed on return to work</p> <p>Recommend adding following text to STMS L1 profile</p> <p>Completed as part of a 1-day</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>workshop with back at work practical</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>Add basic leadership to the STMS universal</p> <p>Anticipation, planning, maintaining standards, delegation, safety for the team, supervision</p> <p>Leave STMS Universal workshop at 2 days</p> <p>Add following text to STMS L1 profile</p> <p>Completed as part of a 1-day workshop with back at work practical</p> <p><b>Actioned</b></p> <p>Added following wording to STMS L1 profile:</p> <p>Completed as part of a 1-day workshop with back at work practical</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>Added the following to the STMS Universal profile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STMS role</li> <li>• Basic leadership (anticipation, planning, maintaining standards, delegation, safety for the team, supervision)</li> </ul> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
71.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	<p>Aren't we compartmentalising our industry people? How's this translate into hiring staff and trying to book staff on jobs when they are coming through the levels. If they are currently in the mobile driver phase I cannot book/use this person as a TC on other jobs?</p> <p>Trying to get staff hours acceptable is a real struggle in the industry too</p>	<p>NFA. I expect proposed system to make it easier to understand staff competency levels, and ensure competent staff are hired and assigned to site.</p> <p>People are not compartmentalised – they can hold multiple qualifications.</p>	NFA
			<b>Revise map of learning blocks</b>		
72.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Map of learning block diagrams. Can this be simplified for each role (i.e.	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	<p>Support. Recommend grey out.</p> <p>Added Matrix of certificate of knowledge or</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
			remove blocks not relevant to the level)? Also show knowledge and practical components for each role.		warrant. this replaces the repeated learning maps showing learning path for selected roles Removed the repeated maps of learning showing the different learning blocks that need to be completed NFA	
73.	ChCh	No Name	TTM Trainer Mentor doesn't indicate STMS L1 practical knowledge is a prerequisite. Consider altering diagram to better show this.	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Standing expectation. It could be clarified in the diagram if appropriate.	Amended learning map to show STMS L1, L2 under 65km/h or L2 over 65km/h & L3 as prerequisites to TTM Mentor, TTM Verifier, CoPTTM Assessor and CoPTTM Trainer NFA
74.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Revise layout of blocks of learning to make it easier to understand	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Support.	Revised NFA
75.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Better represent NP vs. P (theory vs. practical). Split for L1, L2, L3 STMS in chart	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Support.	This is now addressed in the Matrix of Warrant of overall competence

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
					or Certificate of knowledge NFA	
76.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Amend note towards bottom of learning blocks to read for following learning blocks must be qualified to knowledge level (have Certificate of achievement) but does not require the practical assessment	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	NFA. Not convinced this is needed. Prerequisites are noted in following learning blocks.	Amended wording to read For these learning blocks the person only needs to be STMS qualified to knowledge level (certificate of knowledge) for the level of TTM (ie they do not need to be warranted as competent in earlier blocks of learning) NFA
			<b>STMS</b>			
77.			<b>Split of STMS level 2 and level 3</b>	<b>There was general support for changing the split in the STMS level 2 and STMS level 3 learning blocks.</b> <b>Most popular split was:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 2 under 65km/h</li> <li>• Level 2 over 65km/h and level 3</li> </ul>	On expectation that there are not (currently or potentially in future) substantial differences for L3 roads, I could support this.	Actioned Refer to item 5 NFA
78.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	<i>STMS L2 and L3 I think this would almost be a better split under the 65 km/h over 65 km/h. Currently a lot of STMS' work in urban</i>	<i>Refer above</i>	NFA	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
79.	ChCh	Shaun Maxwell	<i>environments and struggle to achieve "practising" as can't produce the over 65 km/h experience. Maybe split under L2 65/ over L2+L3 65</i> L1 L2/3 under 65 km/h L2/3 over 65 km/h	Refer above	NFA
80.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	<i>under 65/over 65 split seems a better fit for L2/L3 from experience post EQ</i>	Refer above	NFA
81.	ChCh	Kevin Westening	<i>Level 2 needs expanding for speed and environment &lt;65 &gt;65 km/h and two-way lane two lanes. 2+ lanes one-way</i>	Refer above	NFA
82.	ChCh	No Name	<i>Split level 2/3 to over 65km/h and under 65km/h</i>	Refer above	NFA
83.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Universal STMS - Looks good. Would not the usual path of progression be: level 1 STMS before L2 STMS. Most build up knowledge L1 first sets foundation. In lower risk environment	NFA	NFA
84.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Needs to be clear: L1 STMS, L2 STMS, L3 STMS. Are different for different roles i.e. audit/design	NFA	NFA
85.	PN	Andrew McIntosh	STMS L1 is a good training ground for L2. Competencies are the same, just bigger signs and longer on L2	NFA	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
86.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Level 2 and 3 STMS - Where is the theory? Currently L1 STMS is likely to be similar to what would be universal SMTS. We currently have 2 days theory looking at difference between L1 and L2/3	Learning profiles for level 2 and level 3 show a one day workshop for each block No difference in learning time <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
87.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Level 1 STMS - Most roads in NZ are level 1. I believe level 1 should be first step for all STMS	The plan was for STMS to only complete level 1 if they are working on level 1 roads. If they are working on level 1 roads then they should do STMS level 1	NFA	NFA
			<b>Split between theory and practical</b>			
88.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Traffic op man, TMP designer, TTM audit, TMC etc, TMP approver: All have a prerequisite of STMS L1 etc, which have practical competency assessment. Is it intended that these roles need that assessment? Or should it only be a knowledge block?	It was intended that the person only needs the knowledge qualification for all the prerequisite blocks This needs to be shown clearer on the map of learning blocks	Support recommendation. Knowledge only required.	Actioned as per items 74, 75 and 76 NFA
89.	PN	David Arrowsmith	More clarity on the split between knowledge and practise in the STMS learning blocks. More elasticity on roles that need STMS knowledge but not practical	Revision of learning block map will help to show the knowledge and practical components	Support	Actioned as per items 74, 75 and 76 NFA
			<b>Specialist activities</b>			

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
90.	PN	John Reid	L1 specialist activities. TTM is based on fundamental principles so why split out events. Specialist activities should be barriers/mobile/traffic signals		NFA
91.	PN	Darrin Humphries	We need to incorporate specific endorsements for activity design i.e. events, road marking, sealing		NFA. Already covered, though perhaps need to clarify that designer and other roles are expected to acquire endorsements for specialist activities / equipment if utilised within the TTM plan.
					Amended Designer profile to show additional prerequisite <b>Designer expected to acquire endorsements for specialist activities / specialist TTM equipment if utilising within a TMP</b> <b>Amended STMS profiles show additional prerequisite:</b> <b>STMS is required to have endorsements for specialist activities / specialist TTM equipment (eg portable traffic signals, VMS) if in charge of operations using these and there is no other worker on site with the</b>



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
					required endorsements NFA	
		<b>TTM Trainer/mentors</b>				
92.	PN	Leanne McAdams	TTM trainer/mentor for L1 roads - For those in small business need to have ability to engage a trainer/verifier to sign them off	Agreed	All companies need to find a way to complete training / verifying requirements. NZTA could support peer support / centre of excellence options.	Part of implementation of revised model NFA at this stage
93.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	TTM mentor/trainer vs. TTM verifier vs. CoPTTM assessor vs. CoPTTM trainer. Needs clarification, very blurry	There was general support for changing TTM trainer/mentor to TTM mentor TTM verifier can assess competence of a candidate or provide evidence to a CoPTTM assessor that the candidate has competed work competently CoPTTM assessors are specialists selected by NZTA to undertake specific assessments. Recommend changing name from CoPTTM assessor to NZTA assessor	Name change decisions already made per item 7.	Actioned as per item 7 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
94.	PN	Joseph Rosendaal	How does a small company get to STMS if they do not have TTM trainer/mentor etc	This will be an issue for smaller companies. It is also an opportunity for trainers and others to provide this service	All companies need to find a way to complete training / verifying requirements.	Part of implementation of revised model NFA at this stage
95.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Manager of activities requiring TTM, this could include project managers	Agreed. Recommend amending profile to reflect this	This is the intention. Agree could clarify, perhaps by simply adding "eg Project Managers" into 'Who is it for:' part of profile.	Amended profile for Manager of activities requiring TTM as follows People who are managing activities requiring TTM resources (eg Project Managers) and do not require more detailed TTM qualifications - these people would generally employ others to undertake TTM. NFA
			<b>Miscellaneous</b>			
96.	Auckland	Andrea Williamson	Communication skills considered at an early stage	Communication skills will be covered as part of the NZQA certificate. <b>Recommend these be included at a practical level in specific training e.g. TTM worker</b>	As per item 13 above.	Actioned as per item 13 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
97.	PN	Andrew McIntosh	The one month stand down between TC and STMS knowledge training could be removed	The one month stand down is no longer required in the revised model	NFA	NFA
98.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	There needs to be a process to provide tension on compliance, e.g. threat of losing competency certificate for dangerous* non-compliances. *As witnessed by risk – time, traffic, SD, consequences, etc.	Currently warrant can be removed if there are two non-conformances within a three-month period. This would continue under the revised model <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Consequences for non-compliant behaviour NFA here, however I agree that current COPTTM process needs improvement as a separate action.	NFA
99.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	How do we expect a TMP designer to write out the installation/removal procedure if they have no practical knowledge of how it works out on the network?  They can draw and comply with CoPTTM but the approval of the TMP includes these methodology procedures so it needs to be removed and added to the traffic operations manager or they need to have the practical knowledge	General consensus that TMP designers need practical knowledge. It was felt that this could be gained by observing TTM crews operating rather than having to become a practising STMS. <b>Recommend amend learning profile to include observing TTM crews</b>	I agree that TMP designers should draft Implementation Plans for complex static site deployments eg temporary traffic facilities (temp lanes, carriageways, intersection controls, barrier systems, VMS phases etc), and these drafts should be run past the STMS for viability, however I do not think that designers should design mobile op installation /	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				<p>removal plans, unless they are significantly unique situations that require departure from standard COPTTM procedures. I think competent STMSs should be trusted to have the knowledge and skills to manage installation and removal procedures that follow COPTTM norms.</p> <p>I support designers observing TTM crews, and would actually go further than this and recommend that a close working relationship, frequent communications, and a collaborative approach be expected between both roles.</p> <p>I do not think TMP Designers need</p>	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				STMS Practical skills.	
100.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	Not needing to complete the practical parts of the learning blocks, I feel, would mean missing out on fundamental knowledge in regard to real logistics of TTM		NFA for reasons explained above.
					NFA

### General comments on profiles

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
101.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	In the profiles, it needs to state clearly who does the training, especially the theory. On some of the profiles it's hard to see who trains who	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Support
					Amended profiles to show who is required to complete briefing/workshop <b>TTM mentor</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General worker</li> <li>• TTM worker</li> <li>• Mobile driver</li> </ul> <b>All other profiles</b> show either CoPTTM Trainer or NZTA approved Trainer NFA
102.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	On all levels - detail who actually does the training i.e. who trains TTM Auditor.	Agreed. To be completed as part of finalising the model	Support
					Actioned as per item 101

Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

						NFA
103.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Refreshers at every profile need to be established		TBC. Some profiles were not proposed to require refreshers.	Actioned as per item 6 NFA
104.	ChCh	Damien Houlahan	All learning blocks: Should HSAW be covered in all roles as this has an influence on each? i.e. obligations, potential consequences - relate to CoPTTM		Support	<p><b>Stuart's decision</b> Add reference to HSWA in each profile</p> <p><b>Actioned</b> Added the following to each profile that currently does not have a specific Health and Safety reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and safety processes relevant for the role</li> </ul> <p><b>NFA</b></p>

## 1 - General worker

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
105.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	This will be quite a large course potentially. How far will this go in terms of health and safety? Trenches, overhead hazards, cable location?	It was intended that the briefing would be 1-hour theory/knowledge (plus on-site practical) Not intended to cover every hazard on site but the main common hazards for a site (e.g. slips, trips and falls)	NFA	NFA
106.	PN	Kerry Drake	Construct safe as part of general worker	General support for this <b>Recommend add to profile</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 9 NFA
107.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	2 hours theory is more realistic	<b>Recommend amend profile to show between 1 and 2 hours of theory</b>	Support if briefing turns out to require this long. I would expect 1 hour to be sufficient.	Amended General worker profile to show <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 to 2 hours theory/ knowledge (plus on-site practical)</li> </ul> NFA
108.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	US 20877 fits here	Agreed. Add to profile	Unsure what this means.	Added US 20877 to profile

## 2 - Manager of activities requiring TTM

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
109.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Under "the process" add in CAR/WAP process	Agreed. Amend profile	Support. Note that NZUAG currently	Added explanation of CAR/WAP to the

Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

					assumes that TMP is a sub-element of a CAR. I don't support this assumption.	profile under <b>Knowledge of basic CoPTTM elements covered</b> <b>NFA</b>
110.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Manager of TTM designers need to be included in this qual. Issue is designers often kept in dark or forced to design from the desk	Agreed. Amend profile	I don't agree change is critical, however this example could be noted as an example. We do not need to list every possible manager type.	Amended profile to show People who are managing activities requiring TTM resources (eg Project Managers, <b>managers of TMP Designers</b> ) and do not require more detailed TTM qualifications - these people would generally employ others to undertake TTM. <b>NFA</b>
111.	Auckland	No Name	Include training on NNCs and requirements and how they come about	Agreed. Include in profile	Support. Manager should know about potential consequences of NNCs.	Added <b>Explanation of NNC</b> to the profile <b>NFA</b>



### 3 - TTM worker

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
112.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	TTM worker Need to include an overview of TMPs	Can include statement that there is a TMP for each site. Also explain text and diagram of TMP	Support  Added the following to the profile  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>About TMP (TMP for each site, includes text and diagram. Worksite set out as per TMP)</li> </ul> NFA
113.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	“Communication skills” should replace radio comms as a large part of workers need radios	Not many others supported this change. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Support that TTM workers, particularly MTC staff who will be interacting with public, need to be able to communicate adequately in English. Recommend that profile is amended slightly to verify that staff can communicate adequately.  Actioned as per item 13 NFA
114.	ChCh	Kevin Westeneng	Do we already cover this under company inductions? Construct safe, site safe. To say this is not TOR but the industry will see this as	Profile shows internal trainer (TTM trainer/mentor) to deliver this briefing. Most companies do something similar at the moment.	Support recommendation.  Added the following note to the profile

**Commented [HS27]:** We seem to have missed the ‘Spotter’ for vehicle movements activity from the TC and TTM Worker profiles. Recommend it goes into the TTM Worker profile and then wouldn’t need to be repeated in TC.

**Commented [TS28R27]:** This is covered in General worker profile which is now a prerequisite to TTM worker so will already have been covered  
NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		another "cost" which is already been given to the staff in another way	Companies that are not doing this need to start briefing workers involved with TTM <b>Recommend amend profile to show it is a briefing delivered by TTM trainer/mentor</b>		This is a briefing delivered by a TTM Mentor  NFA	
115.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Can the theory be done after the practical? Having to do theory first (even if simple questions) could exclude some people. Can the theory be visual rather than words?	There should be flexibility as to how this is delivered but ensuring the two components (knowledge and practical) are covered. <b>Recommend add note to profile to reflect this</b>	Support recommendation for this role.	Added the following to the profile The order of completing the knowledge and skill elements can be changed to suit the organisation/learning of the TTM worker, but all items in the knowledge and skill sections of the profile must be covered NFA
116.	ChCh	Stuart Fraser	In the TTM worker and possibly other profiles we need to acknowledge that much of the leaning will be informal while on the road. Also reader/writer if required	Agreed <b>Recommend add note to profile to reflect this</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 10 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
117.	PN	Darrin Humphries	I think the general worker and TTM worker should be amalgamated	<p>Good idea. That is what is intended. If a worker is starting with TTM the general worker component would be included in their training</p> <p><b>Recommend NFA</b></p>	<p>NFA. Disagree with amalgamation. TTM Worker requires a sufficiently different knowledge and skillset to be separate from General Worker. Possible source of confusion around General Worker role under this system: Some readers seem to interpret that the General Worker briefing is intended to replace the basic worksite inductions, ConstructSafe etc. I've always seen it as an optional* briefing for those general onsite workers who need to know the basics of the COPTTM system.</p> <p>* as decided by their managers.</p>	<p>Actioned as per item 9</p> <p>NFA</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				It could therefore form a component of a wider site induction session alongside other components, but not intended to replace them.	
118.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Appears the least briefing given to a worker who is permitted to MTC. Consider probationary worker must progress to TC after 3 months. Must be under wing of TC/STMS	Disagree with probationary worker proceeding to TC within 3 months. Currently the MTC only needs to be briefed by an STMS and would always be under the control of STMS or TC <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA
119.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Allow to be a bit more general. This is the type of workshop I've provided locally to council staff, 'briefing for safe practises' variety of roles but out in road reserve	Agreed. Could cover multiple roles <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA. The info briefing to council staff example sounds like an exception, and not specific to a COPTTM role.
120.	PN	David Arrowsmith	TTM worker role should include requirement for refreshers	The intention was for the STMS to provide a briefing on any CoPTTM changes. There was some other discussion about this at the workshops but no clear recommendation <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
121.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Is 100% going to be achievable? Allowance for read/writing assistance	Agreed. <b>Consider amending pass mark to 80% correct answers</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 12 NFA
122.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Agree with strengths. First step: TTM worker briefing.	Agreed. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Unclear to me what this means.	NFA
123.	Auckland	Stuart Fraser	We need to prepare an example of a minimum standard for the standards for practical skills	Agreed. <b>Develop example of minimum standards</b> <b>NFA</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	To be actioned as per item 11 NFA
124.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	TTM knowledge – set out closures could be “set out TTM equipment” instead.	Agreed.	Support	Amended profile to read <b>set out TTM equipment</b> <del>closure</del> NFA
			Internal trainer – should be mentor?	Agreed	Support	Amended to show • This is a briefing delivered by a <b>TTM Mentor</b> NFA
			TTM worker does not include acting as spotter?	Not sure. <b>To be considered</b>	As above, I think this is a gap and should be added.	This is covered in General worker profile which is now a prerequisite to TTM worker so will

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					already have been covered NFA
125.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Health and safety should include hazard identification	This is covered under the general worker section of the briefing <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA Amended profile to show • Hazard identification (Slips, trips and falls) ( <del>hazard ID</del> ) NFA
126.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	TTM knowledge – should include public interaction. Good/bad practises and conflicts	This was a common thought. It will be included as part of the NZQA certificate. <b>Recommend this be included at a practical level in TTM worker briefing</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above Actioned as per item 13 NFA
127.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Prerequisite should be 'general worker' so no double up	General worker could be a prerequisite to TTM worker rather than showing the TTM worker including general worker briefing. <b>To be considered</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above Actioned as per item 14 NFA
128.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Needs to have PPE practical (not enough just to tell them, need to make them wear it)	Agreed. <b>Recommend add wearing correct PPE to on job practical component</b>	Support Added <b>Wear correct PPE</b> to skill element of the profile NFA

#### 4 - Mobile operation driver

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
129.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Mobile driver Consider adding information on mobile drivers blocking lane and causing issues with passing traffic	Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile to reflect this</b>	Support  Amended profile by adding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues with mobile operations (eg blocking lane and causing issues with passing traffic)</li> </ul> NFA
130.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	How to operate devices: strobes, LAS, hazard lights, indicators, head lights etc	This will be included in the training	Support  Amended profile by adding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operation of devices (eg strobes, LAS, hazard lights, indicators, head lights)</li> </ul> NFA
131.	ChCh	Steven Hodges	Communication via RT rather than cell phone	Agreed. <b>Recommend adding to profile</b>	Support  Amended profile by adding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication with other members of the operation</li> </ul> NFA
132.	ChCh	Richard Fleming	Should be L1 qualified? Needs to have	Disagree that they need to be STMS level 1 qualified.	Support recommendation  Amended profile by adding

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		knowledge of work methodology	Training needs to include work methodology. <b>Recommend adding this to the profile</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work methodologies for mobile operations</li> </ul> NFA	
133.	ChCh	Steven Hodges	Need log book info i.e. hours allowed to work, breaks etc	Agreed. <b>Recommend adding this to the profile</b>	I agree this should be mentioned, however primarily an intra-company issue to ensure compliance with legislated driving requirements.	Amended profile by adding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Record keeping (onsite records, log books etc)</li> </ul> NFA
134.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	Crash report should be completed by someone more senior	Agreed. <b>Amend profile to show reporting vehicle crashes rather than completing a crash report</b>	Support. Reporting should be by STMS.	Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completing incident report (eg for vehicle crashes)</li> <li><b>Completing a crash report</b></li> </ul> NFA
135.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	Completing a crash report. Define report. Should be for vehicle crash only	Refer above	Would be more correct to refer to 'Incident Report' which includes near-misses. We all know that actual crashes are only the tip of the iceberg, so RCAs are	See item 134 NFA



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				interested in near-misses as much as actuals. Recommend NFA here, however recommend NZTA review incident reporting and analysis as a separate COPTTM improvement action.		
136.			<b>Split mobile operation driver into two separate levels</b>	There was general support for separating the training into mobile driver level 1 and mobile driver level 2 and 3. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above Actioned as per item 15 NFA	
137.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	Split level 1, level 2/3. Possible theory for practise 1 qual on L2/3 for vehicles	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
138.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Split warrant between LV/L1 and L2/L3. Also split theory	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
139.	ChCh	Chris White	Level 2/3 needs a lot more knowledge than level 1, will need to separate out	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
140.	PN	Ray Edwards	Level 1 needs separate warrant level. These guys do not need level 2 and 3 training	Refer above	Refer above	NFA

Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
141.	Auckland Ben Isdale	Needs to be segregated. Actually a lot of different operations to cover, which wouldn't be one course, broken into 3 levels	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
142.	PN Ian Satherley	Mobile driver needs to be graduated to levels	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
143.	PN Darrin Humphries	Mobile LV/L1 and mobile L2/3 should be split up. More emphasis on LV/L1 mobile setups in the training courses (standalone endorsement as part of the STMS L1 endorsement)	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
144.	PN Leanne McAdams	This is going to need to vary as to whether the TTM vehicles are L1, L2 or L3	Refer above	Refer above	NFA
145.	ChCh Dean Hurford	Vehicle checks need to include appropriate signage "Pass with Care"	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support	Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completing vehicle checks (COF, RUC, seat belts, operation arrowboard, LAS, AWVMS, appropriate signage eg</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<b>PASS WITH CARE)</b> NFA
146.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Need to add in skill of "timely and relevant and effective communication". Hugely important	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support  Amended profile as follows  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication with other members of the operation (timely, effective, using RT)</li> </ul> NFA
147.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Add in knowledge some comments about emergency vehicles passing mobile operation and what to do in those scenarios	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support  Amended profile as follows  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dealing with common situations (eg emergency vehicles passing mobile operation)</li> </ul> NFA
148.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Who is going to provide briefing on L2/3 vehicles? On job? So few people understand requirements. The workbook will need to cover all aspects very clearly, i.e. 3-point harness in shadow	Agreed. This will need to be clearly covered in the training <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Support recommendation.  NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		vehicle, distances, no go areas			
149.	PN	David Arrowsmith	Should include refresher requirement	Intention was for STMS to brief driver on any relevant CoPTTM changes. <b>To be considered</b>	Refreshers TBC Action as per item 6 NFA at this stage
150.	PN	Ray Edwards	Prerequisite "TTM worker" ok for level 1 operations. Level 2 and 3 needs higher level prerequisite i.e. min TC	<b>To be considered</b>	Not supported. TC requires different knowledge and skills, that in my opinion are not critical for a competent Mobile Op Driver to operate safely on L2/3 roads. Recommend that we check appropriate coverage in the learning block for L2/3 roads.
151.	PN	Kerry Drake	Terminology change - safely operate a work vehicle in a mobile operation	Unsure what this relates to. The profile currently includes safely operate a work vehicle in a mobile operation <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA NFA
152.	PN	Darrin Humphries	Learner endorsement - must complete a number of hours under instructions. Once these hours are completed then full endorsement.	Darrin is recommending a time-based competency assessment. <b>To be decided if we want to include this</b>	TBC. Mobile Op Driver presents similar risks from inexperience as newly licensed drivers (where <b>Stuart's decision</b> Do not have a time-based

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		Refresher is required, changes in methods/setup etc		NZTA limits progression by using time to enhance assurance of competency). This is one of the COPTTM roles where a time-limited progression may be appropriate.	competency period  <b>NFA</b>	
153.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Is this 100% achievable? Read/write?	NZTA will allow reader/writer for learning blocks up to TC but not for STMS and onwards <b>100% to be considered.</b>	Given that TC is expected to read TMP and complete paperwork, I don't support a reader/writer being provided for this level (ok at lower levels). TBC re pass mark for Mobile Op Driver.	Question re 100% - Action as per item 12  Amended the profile as follows <b>Also, a reader/writer needs to be supplied if required</b>  NFA
154.	PN	Andrew McIntosh	Setting a static site is a mobile operation, therefore needs to be compulsory for TC/STMS that deploy and retrieve sites	This training needs to be compulsory for all those driving a vehicle in a mobile operation. If the STMS is doing that then this training will be compulsory.	STMS supervising the mobile op must have (at minimum) the knowledge and skills required to direct the operation safely, however if they	Added the following to STMS universal profile as a prerequisite <b>Mobile operation driver</b>  NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				are not driving vehicles then they don't necessarily require the practical truck and equipment operation skills. Overall, I think it would be generally appropriate for a Practicing STMS to possess Mobile Op Driver qual as a prerequisite.	
155.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Mobile driver - It is very valuable for drivers of shadow vehicles and AWVMS to have some 2/3 understanding. Otherwise they do not well support the L2/3 STMS	The level 2/3 component of this training needs to include this understanding. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support recommendation  Amended profile as follows (requirements for LV, L1 and L2 under 65km/h and also requirements for L2 over 65km/h and L3) NFA
156.	Auckland	Paul Merson	AWVMS + VMS? Does VMS fall into positioning?	VMS board is not a mobile operation vehicle. If a AWVMS is used as a VMS this will be covered under <i>Use of specialist TTM equipment on site.</i> <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Support clarification around AWVMS as I understand that they can be part of a Mobile Op. If so, then drivers of AWVMS vehicles should hold  Amended profile as follows Drivers of AWVMS are already included in mobile operation driver profile VMS is the stationary (often

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				Mobile Op Driver qual.	trailer mounted) board which is covered under specialist TTM equipment NFA
157.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Putting pads up and down between sites close together e.g. 600m on a mwy. Also use of arrow boards	This will need to be covered in the training. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support recommendation  Amended profile as follows  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safely operate a shadow vehicle with TMA in a mobile operation and operation of TMA (including putting pad up and down between sites close together eg 600m)</li> </ul> NFA
158.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Position of vehicles relative to crests/curves i.e. clear SD of the pvmt up to the TMA pad	This will need to be covered in the training. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support recommendation  Amended profile as follows  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positioning of work, shadow and pilot vehicles (eg relative to crests/curves)</li> </ul> NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
159.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	2 hours is too generic, it will vary greatly	<b>To be considered – how long do we allow for the training?</b>	I agree with submission. If workbook is intended to work through as well as briefing, then 4 hours feels more appropriate to me. Suggest this should be the maximum time for knowledge component, since on job practical skills probably equally if not more important for this role.	Amended profile to show up to 4 hours training time NFA
160.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Include in skills the class of vehicle to be compliant for level of road (TMAs).		Vehicle class probably beyond remit of Driver. This would rest with Supervisor / TOM. Driver should know what type of TTM equipment they need per level eg when TMA required, but not classes of vehicles.	NFA
161.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Careful of blurring the lines between required	We need to check on the legal requirement for trainers of mobile drivers – do the trainers	TBC	We are not training a driver to gain a driver's licence. We are



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		legal driving instructor requirements	need to be registered as driving instructors		training them how to position a vehicle on the road during a mobile operation so this falls outside the legal requirement for driver training NFA
162.	Auckland	Neil Greaves	AWVM's may also be a trailer and be operated by another person in the crew	This is more of an exception rather than the rule. The training will not address this which is more of a semi static operation. The training needs to focus on the 80% of what learners require <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA
163.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Develop strategy for implementation in terms of recognition of prior experience	Agreed. <b>Recommend we develop some guidelines for implementation of the training and competency model</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above Action as per item 21 NFA at this stage

## 5 - Traffic Controller (TC)

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
164.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	Risk assessments: More specific training	Agreed. This will be included in the training pack.	<b>Support. Note for inclusion.</b> Amended profile as follows

**Commented [HS29]:** TC role currently only mentions L1 and LV roads. What happens on L2 & 3 roads? Are TCs not authorised to assist the STMS or maintain site? (I think they need to be able to). Need to clarify.

**Commented [TS30R29]:** Currently the person who can assist a L2/3 practicing is a STMS NP. They can be delegated control of a site on the shoulder. If worksite is on the lane then it must remain under the control of L2/3 STMS practicing

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
			<b>Recommend NFA</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic risk assessment</li> </ul> <p>Scenarios dealing with common working space situations - can complete multiple times if required</p> <p>NFA</p>	
165.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	Add inspections. As per current level 1 TC course	Agreed. <b>Recommend add inspections</b>	<p>TBC. Unclear what is purpose? If appropriate for TC role, what about other roles?</p> <p>Added understanding of inspection activity to TC profile</p> <p>TC is prerequisite for other roles so understanding of inspection activity does not need to be repeated in other profiles</p> <p>NFA</p>	
166.	ChCh	Stuart Fraser	We need to have a theory refresher especially if a person has been away for some period	The profile includes a three-yearly refresher of the practical component. <b>To be considered – do we also have a refresher of the knowledge as well</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Action as per item 6 NFA at this stage
167.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	How does a TC learn about and be updated on CoPTTM changes?	Refer above	-	Added following to profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-year update on CoPTTM</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					changes delivered by CoPTTM trainer NFA
168.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	No theory refresher indicated in current model. Suggest theory refresher - but maybe every 5 years or how about 2 hours every 2 years?	Refer to above	- Action as per item 167 NFA
169.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Remove hedge/shelter belt trimming as an example of a low risk activity as it's not "low risk" (not a good example).	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support That paragraph has been removed as per item 4 NFA
170.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Need to refer to sealed/unsealed roads	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Unsure why, and is this specific to TC role or to others also? Do we intend to mention every road environment factor / risk within learning blocks? Amended profile as follows • Dealing with common worksite situations NFA
171.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Current wording is flawed. Idea is good. Over 65 can work on area (potentially in from edge of seal on 100 km/hr road) yet in urban areas have to be	Need to discuss this further	I think this is referring to the draft allowance for a TC to supervise some (lower risk) setup & removal That exemption has been removed as per item 4 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		outside of sealed shoulder. So low speed further away, higher speed closer to traffic?		situations. This allowance is TBC. The example in the submission is one possible scenario but it is misleading to interpret profile wording to be endorsing TCs being exposed to higher risk in higher speed environments. If >65kph environment is seen to be too risky for a TC to supervise, one option could be to limit this allowance (if retained) to <65kph environments.		
172.	PN	John Reid	Practical assessments on TC level 1, it will be hard to verify closures as it could take months to sign off due to limited sorts of closures	Need to discuss this further	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 16 NFA
173.	PN	Ian Satherley	Pass rate needs to be 100% due to the responsibilities. TC course is not achievable	Consider pass mark – does it need to be 100%? Current TC is completed in one day. This revised course contains less	NFA. On the one hand, it seems TC remit is intended to	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		in one day. TC appears to be what now is an STMS L1	information so should be able to be completed in one day plus the onsite practical	reduce to assister / maintainer of worksite only, so the supervision responsibilities for (non-carriageway) setup/removal situations are eliminated. However the draft profile indicates a TC could be supervising incident and risk mitigation corrective actions, widening lanes, and managing MTCs. In other words, some decision-making ability and supervisory responsibility required. Overall an 80% pass mark still feels acceptable to me. Need to ensure the decision-making ability and supervisory responsibility is well covered in the learning block material.	

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
174.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Is this going to be 100% achievable? Read/write?	See above	-	Question re 100% - Action as per item 12  Amended the profile as follows Also, a reader/writer needs to be supplied if required  NFA
175.	Auckland	No Name	TC pass criteria: Use of the NZQA model in relation to a pass mark and how the candidate achieves that pass mark. Can these be a resit of a test or questions within the test?  How many resits are allowed before we say they have not achieved the pass mark?	Existing guidelines for trainers would apply to resits.	This profile (plus potentially others?) require clarity around resits.  I'm not familiar with the existing guidelines for trainers re resits, though would expect these to mitigate the risk of inappropriate people becoming certified/warranted after repeatedly resitting. Repeated resits would be a warning flag to me of an individual's	Added the following to the T&C model under <b>Considerations when developing the model</b>  The purpose of assessment is to ascertain whether or not candidates can perform activities to the required standard.  Standards will be set for each activity to be assessed (drawing on assessment

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				capability for a role.	documentation already used within the industry).  An assessor guide will also be developed (based on NZQA guidelines for assessment and reassessment). It will include the principles of assessment and guidelines for reassessment. NFA
176.	Auckland	Paul Merson	Resit allowed? Yes, add to pass criteria Should there be a maximum amount or resits?	Refer above	As above  Action as per item 175 NFA
177.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	TC needs to manage cyclist and motorcyclists as well as peds	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Partially support. Not sure the TC is 'managing' any of these users. The STMS is supervising / managing the site, while the TC is maintaining/assisting. Recommend careful selection  Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage pedestrians/cyclists</li> </ul> NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				of wording to describe TC's role and responsibilities wrt different user types.	
178.	Auckland	No Name	CoPTTM trainer for knowledge component	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Links to item 7 queries. Support.  Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 day theory/ knowledge workshop delivered by CoPTTM Trainer</li> </ul> NFA
179.	Auckland	Paul Merson	Will there be a maximum time-frame from knowledge element and practical completion? Or is this to coincide with refresher? Possibility of contractor holding process back?	To be discussed. <b>Recommend no time limit on practical assessment. Must refresh knowledge 3 yearly</b>	Support recommendation  NFA

## 6 - Traffic Controller - Inspector (TC-I)

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
180.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	Define only as inspector for pre-work, mark out measuring or TMP pre-views of site	Profile limits this to inspection activities (which is defined in section D7).  Submission did not suggest cut and past the inspections	Currently inspections are defined as per section D7

**Commented [HS31]:** Discussion Document Profile uses the title "Inspector", however other pages include 'Traffic Controller' words. Mixing Inspector up with Traffic Controller creates confusion. Recommend that this profile and all associated references eliminate the words 'Traffic Controller' from this role.

**Commented [TS32R31]:** Agreed and actioned



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
			<b>Recommend adding definition to profile</b>	<p>definition from D7, but limiting it to a purer definition of an inspection.</p> <p>I support: (i) adding a definition to the profile, but not the one from D7 due to the confusion this already creates. I support a definition similar to the submission, with minor amendments.</p> <p>(ii) NZTA undertake a separate action to amend the definition in D7 to reduce confusion and risks arising from installation, maintenance and intrusive works.</p>	<p>Changing from that definition is not part of this project</p> <p>Added a CoPTTM Consult item for this suggestion</p> <p>NFA at this stage</p>
181.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Is this just a TC course with additional info? A lot of maintenance contractors will use this	See above	See above. NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
			for signs, edge markers, pot hole patches etc			
182.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Unsure if this should be a separate role or can be incorporated into the TC or STMS roles? (dependant on road level). Need to define the scope of activities e.g. EMP cleaning, road inspection by engineers	Inspector warrant is a one-day workshop plus practical which allows inspection activities to be completed on level 1, 2 and 3 roads (with restrictions). Inspections will be incorporated into the TC and STMS training as well. <b>Activities need to be defined as above</b>	As above: (i) Mixing of Inspector and TC wording is creating confusion. (ii) I would not support the definition from D7 being used for this profile.	Action as per item 180 NFA
183.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Will this still count as a prerequisite for an STMS? Is the scope the same as the current inspector? Will it still be similar to the TC workshop?	No	-	NFA
184.	PN	David Arrowsmith	Would be useful to do the general worker learning block first as some inspection activities are carried out within a site	Agreed. <b>Recommend making general worker prerequisite to inspector learning block.</b>	NFA. Disagree with this. If inspection is occurring within a worksite then the inspector is expected to be site inducted, which should include the General Worker briefing. It would be excessive to make General Worker a	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				prerequisite for all inspectors. Some content from general worker could be included as appropriate.	
185.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	General worker should be prerequisite for inspector	See above	NFA as above. Action as per item 184 NFA
186.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Inspector practical is required for all auditors and designers for working on site	See above	I agree with submission that inspector content is a necessary component for some roles; STMS, Designer, Auditor, Approver, and TMC/CM. However I don't think Inspector qual should be a prerequisite for the above roles because TTM staff will already be competent with the bulk of the material. Easier just to insert the specific Inspector material into learning Inspection activities have been added to TC profile as per item 165. As TC is a prerequisite learning block most people with roles further on from TC will already have this training. For auditors, designers, approvers they will not have the competency of inspection If TMP designer Auditor, Approver, and TMC/CM are doing inspections they should have

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				block for other roles.	the inspection warrant NFA

## 7 - Universal STMS

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
187.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	Add in section on safety auditors of TTM & under assessment include a scenario for an audit to be undertaken	<b>To be discussed</b> Add in self audit to STMS universal package.	Support  Amended profile as follows Added following to knowledge section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete audit of worksite</li> </ul> Added following to skills section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete an audit of a worksite</li> </ul> NFA
188.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	Should skills be required as prerequisite? Staff management, first aid H & S, verbal skills/comms	These will be covered as part of the NZQA certificate. <b>To be discussed - do we add an indication of NZQA certificate skills for selected learning blocks</b>	We cannot assume what will be covered by NZQA, and should not rely on their system being effective.  Refer item 13: Industry recognises that  Where as this may have some relevance, it is outside the scope of this project. Discuss with NZQA when we trigger the review of their TTM Unit standards and the development of

Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				<p>interpersonal skills are critical for competency. In light of this I think it would be appropriate to have some assurance of an applicant's commitment to being an effective communicator as a pre-requisite for this role. eg certificate of completion from a training course in Personality Types, Effective Communications, handling stressful situations, Leadership skills etc. This is equally necessary for the knowledge-based roles going forward from here as well as for the Practicing STMSs.</p> <p>I don't support staff management, or</p>	<p>the Certificate in TTM NFA at this stage</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				<p>First Aid being required.</p> <p>A measure already exists within the profile around verbal skills / comms.</p> <p>I support mention of HSWA being added to the profile to ensure STMSs understand their obligations.</p>		
189.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	What about people skills?	See above	-	Action as per item 188 NFA
190.	ChCh	Chris White	About costs of this for small companies - extra training i.e. STMS may need to work for you 2 months before qualified and warranted - big cost	<p>Agreed that competencies may cost some companies more money. Assessing competencies was always going to cost the industry more money than previous training.</p> <p><b>To be considered – do we balance the cost for small companies?</b></p>	NFA. All companies need to find a way to complete the training / verifying requirements.	NFA
191.	ChCh	Chris White	<p>STMS role also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customer relations</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, to adding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training manual traffic controller</li> <li>Two hourly checks – paperwork</li> </ul>	Disagree that STMS necessarily needs to train MTCs. MTC element is trained within	Action as per item 188 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heathy and Safety</li> <li>• Training manual traffic controller</li> <li>• Photography of site</li> <li>• Two hourly checks - paperwork</li> <li>• Conflict resolution</li> <li>• Toolbox meets</li> </ul>	<p>Toolbox is already included in the profile</p> <p>See above for the other skills to be included in the NZQA certificate</p>	<p>TTM Worker block and TC profile includes "Managing MTC operations", so others also support and train. Perhaps more important to add a generic: "Directing and upskilling reporting TTM staff" element to STMS role, to cover all related activities that TTM team members carry out under STMS supervision.</p>		
192.	PN	Leanne McAdams	<p>Not too targeted if this is base background info and a platform for all STMS roles. I believe it needs to cover a lot of the same information as the current STMS</p>	<p>Agreed they will be similar</p> <p><b>Recommend NFA</b></p>	NFA	NFA
193.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	<p>Under "on job practical" it refers to "delivering a briefing". Delivering a briefing is not part of knowledge - should be moved to L1 STMS, L2 STMS, L3 STMS profiles. That way more</p>	<p><b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b></p>	<p>NFA. Profile actually identifies this as a skill to be demonstrated in a classroom setting.</p>	<p>Shift briefing assessment from the STMS</p> <p>Universal to each of the relevant STMS workshops</p> <p>STMS universal workshop can be</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		specific to the level of road		Option to move this check to the STMS Levels however: (i) other members of industry suggest that communication skills should be checked at Universal STMS level prior to progression, (ii) there would be benefit in checking that applicants for other roles requiring knowledge only can also communicate effectively prior to progression.	delivered by level 1 CoPTTM trainer. They should not be assessing briefing for L2/3 worksite Can do a practice briefing on the STMS universal workshop but not get signoff on this Added the following to assessment of each of the STMS learning blocks • Deliver a site safety briefing/induction NFA
194.	PN	David Arrowsmith	Universal STMS profile includes practical elements like briefing crew - is this correct if it is mainly a knowledge assessment?	See above	- Action as per item 193 NFA
195.	PN	Tony Stella	Add to prerequisite TC knowledge if going to do TMP designer, TTM audit, TMP approver, corridor verifier. TC	<b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	TBC how prerequisites and future potential progression can best be described. NFA



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
			practical if going on to STMS L1 practical		Recommend: (i) apply a consistent approach through entire system (ii) avoid making descriptions too complicated.	
196.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Universal STMS - Would like to see basic TMP design included. Very helpful group work. Aids understanding and working together	This learning block is for the onsite STMS so will not include developing a TMP. There will be other similar exercises to get people working together <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA. Comment is not 100% correct – this role is broader than just STMS. It is also base-level for knowledge qualified STMSs for Designers, Auditors, TMCs/CMs etc progression.	NFA
197.	PN	Darrin Humphries	STMS universal and STMS L1 should be amalgamated. STMS universal will lack the authority to suggest changes or audit sites if they have no practical experience	On completion of the universal STMS the person will have to complete either level 1, level 2 or level 3 (or all of these). They may do the knowledge component of one or all of these and not the practical. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
198.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Consider providing the workbook to the candidate at the workshop and explaining what is	Yes, that is how it is intended to work <b>Recommend adding a workbook briefing to the universal STMS</b>	Support recommendation but not providing workbooks for all 3 levels to the Universal STMS.	Amended profile as follows <b>Briefing on On-Job practical – skill elements</b>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		required to achieve the practical component		Some will not require all three. Also consider alternative methods to supply info (eg online – free for interested applicants to download).	(workbook) to be completed NFA
199.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	No mention of who assesses. CoPTTM trainer needs to be mentioned	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to show CoPTTM trainer delivers workshop and confirms competence</b>	Support  Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge component delivered by CoPTTM Trainer</li> <li>• Assessment complete by TTM verifier</li> </ul> NFA
200.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Ability to assess risk. Should be “identify, assess and manage risk”	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support  Amended profile as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to identify, assess and manage risk (do something about it)</li> </ul> NFA
201.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Highlight that this is theory only	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	NFA. We have intentionally moved away from using terminology NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				like that, and instead focused on defining the knowledge and skills required to be demonstrated. Even though the scenarios are theoretical, the knowledge and skills being tested are still real.		
202.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	Why is the mobile operation driver not a prerequisite of being an STMS? He/she would need to give instruction to their drivers in the operation	<b>To be discussed</b>	Overall I support this. Explained previously in item 154	Actioned as per item 155 NFA

## 8 - STMS level 1

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		<b>Practical assessments</b>			
203.		Does a TTM verifier or a NZTA assessor confirm competence for level 1	<b>Recommend TTM verifier confirms competence for level 1</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 8 NFA
204.	<i>ChCh</i>	<i>Steven Haughin</i>	<i>TTM verifier to sign off. What about CoPTTM assessor? Level 1 biggest network? How</i>	<i>Refer above</i>	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
205.	ChCh Damien Houlahan	do we stop favouritism? Who moderates?  There should be a practical assessment of sorts concentrated on L1. Arguably higher risk than L2/3 when you look at exposure to people. Number of skill sets and experience of those conducting L1 i.e. maintenance crews/construction crews whose primary role is not TTM		Refer above  NFA
206.	PN Leanne McAdams	Introduce level 1 verification. L2 LS practical assessments?		Refer above  NFA
207.	Auckland Dave Tilton	STMS 1, 2, and 3 skills must be assessed by an assessor not a verifier		Refer above  NFA
208.	ChCh Dean Hurford	Is a TTM verifier high enough to sign off the practical skills? Level 1 is high risk in terms of crash rates and also the people out there are not just pure TTM people		Refer above  NFA
209.		<b>Do surveyors, staff working on their own, and people doing simple shoulder closures need to be</b>		Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above  Actioned as per item 17 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	
		<b>assessed over the full range of closures?</b>			
210.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Practical assessments for TCs and STMSs. Say for surveyors in professional engineering companies they will require the practical component to set out signs/cones on L1 & LV sites? Who can oversee the practical assessment? Do they have to be from an independent company?	Refer above	NFA
211.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Some clarification as to practical requirement for staff working on own i.e. fault repair but will never look after at site. Can be TC? Do they need practical? Do we extend inspector?	Refer above	NFA
212.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	This seems to exclude smaller contracts (1-man bands) from being able to do simple work themselves like shoulder closures. To get verified as a warranted STMS will add layers of cost for those contractors. Most of them hire for longer set-ups	Refer above	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	
213.	Auckland	Paul Merson	<p>Refreshers</p> <p>Universal refresher to include all three levels of road. It is expected that there would be resistance from training clients to pay for all 3-level refresher for attendees.</p> <p>Also introduces possible confusion in level 1 STMS who are refreshing on information they have never learned</p>	<p><b>Recommend adopting a refresher for level 1 and level 2/3</b></p>	<p>Support recommendation, though would expect time to reduce to ½ day (max) for each. If both could be arranged for same day, than a L1,2&amp;3 STMS could complete all refreshers in 1 day.</p> <p>Added the following to Universal STMS profile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any changes to CoPTTM relating to universal STMS content will be included in the L1, L2 under 65km/h and the L2 over 65km/h and L3 refreshers</li> </ul> <p>Added the following to STMS L1, STMS L2 under 65km/h and the STMS L2 over 65km/h and L3 profiles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes – every 3 years (refreshing core knowledge and any updates)</li> <li>1 day maximum</li> </ul> <p>NFA</p>
214.	PN	Leanne McAdams	<p>Refresher - Is this a one-day workshop? Is there any practical</p>	<p>If we adopt a refresher for level 1 and level 2/3 we would not need a refresher for the</p>	<p>Agree with recommendation.</p> <p>Actioned as per item 213</p> <p>NFA</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision		
		verification tied to universal STMS expiry date? Just in house TTM verifier	universal STMS as this would be included in the other refreshers	Changes needed to profiles.		
215.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Is a theory refresher required every 3 years (or some other time frame)? Once passed a STMS universal and gained a higher level do they need to go back to the theory?	See above	-	Actioned as per item 213 NFA
216.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	How does a STMS L1 from a non-contracting company assessed for knowledge on an ongoing basis (e.g. regular refreshers) if there are no refresher assessments proposed in the new system? Therefore, there is a need for knowledge refreshers for practical	See above	Unclear what is meant. Knowledge refreshers would include any procedural updates, and expect companies to take responsibility to cascade knowledge and skill around this through their company.	Actioned as per item 213 NFA
217.	ChCh	Shaun Maxwell	Refresher courses targeted at specific road levels. Courses should be shorter and more regular. 2 hours every 2 years	<b>To be discussed – do we have more regular refreshers?</b>	TBC – frequency should be matched to pace of change. Note that interval is linked to L2/3 Practicing STMS ROPEs. Would	<b>Stuart's Decision</b> Leave at 3 years

**Commented [HS33]:** Reference to ROPEs missing from L1 STMS Profile. Intentional or oversight??

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
				STMSs support submitting ROPEs more frequently?
218.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	No need for theory refresher? A universal STMS refresher will not cover every level. Needs a refresher for each level	<b>Recommend adopting a refresher for level 1 and level 2/3</b>
				Duplicate of item 213.
				Actioned as per item 213 NFA
			<b>ROPEs</b>	
219.	PN	David Arrowsmith	STMS L1, 2, 3 - No time interval for ROPEs type refresher process	Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile</b>
				Discussion document had ROPE intervals linked to refreshers (ie every 3 years). Probably need to clarify. L1 ROPE reference missing.
				Added the following to STMS L1 profile <b>The individual can either provide an application for a ROPE, or be reassessed.</b> NFA
220.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	ROPE process could be very administratively cumbersome for RCA's	Agreed
				Unclear why this conclusion has been reached. We haven't considered or documented ROPE requirements yet.
				Cost implications will be pointed out to CGG for part of their decision-making process NFA at this stage
221.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Who analyses and signs off the practical ROPE	<b>To be discussed</b>
				TBC
				<b>Stuart's decision</b>



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
				ROPE at LV and L1 to be assessed by a TTM Verifier  <b>Actioned NFA</b>
		<b>Prerequisites</b>		
222.	PN	John Reid	TTM situations need to be a list of say 20 TTM closures so that you choose 6 to verify competency	<p><b>To be discussed</b></p> <p>Effectively we have done this through the identified closure types to be measured in each profile.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> Add to STMS L1 profile 3 closures from the list</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the closures must be MTC</li> <li>• One of the closures must deal with either pedestrian or cyclist management</li> <li>• Only one of the closures can be a shoulder closure</li> <li>• One closure</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
				<p>must be over 65km/h</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One closure must be under 65km/h</li> </ul> <p><b>Actioned</b> <b>NFA</b></p>
223.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Under prerequisite it says they must be TC competent. This does not apply for designers/auditors/TMC etc	<p>Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile</b></p> <p>NFA. I do not support the recommendation. A competent TC is <i>"The person who assists deployment of the operation, maintains site within existing TTM while the STMS is away from worksite"</i>. Designers/Auditors/TMCs etc do not perform this function and therefore do not have to be TC competent. They need to understand how TTM works, and they can obtain this knowledge through the</p> <p>Agreed NFA</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	
				knowledge training, communicating, collaborating & working closely with onsite crews etc.	
224.	PN	Leanne McAdams	I would like to see this one as compulsory for all going through for L2/3. Ensure solid background	<b>To be discussed – do we make level 1 a prerequisite to level 2/3</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above Actioned as per item 18 NFA
225.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	L1 STMS should be prerequisite to L2. Practically this is what will happen	See above	- Actioned as per item 18 NFA
		<b>Miscellaneous</b>			
226.	PN	Darrin Humphries	Should have mobile competency for LV/L1 roads, e.g. set up/breakdown	Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile</b>	As per item 154, I support Practicing STMS at all levels having Mobile Op Driver as a prerequisite. Actioned as per item 154 NFA
227.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Move US 5628 from STMS generic to STMS L1	Agreed <b>Recommend amend profile</b>	Unclear what this means. TBC Added US 5628 to STMS L1 profile NFA
228.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	All level STMS reassessments. Is there a requirement for contractors/organisations to record all independent audits	<b>To be discussed</b>	TBC. Practicing STMS profiles already require company to provide statement assuring of Added following wording to the assessment of each of the STMS profiles

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
		undertaken e.g. linked to their STMS (includes RCA's)		<p>competency, and to support and inform these it would sensible for companies to record all audits indicating staff performance.</p> <p>As part of ROPes process, the RCA could be asked to verify records, and/or support / decline the statement of competency.</p> <p>Profile requires company to provide statement assuring of competency, and to support and inform this it would sensible for companies to record all audits indicating staff performance</p> <p>As part of ROPes process, the RCA could be asked to verify records, and/or support / decline the statement of competency.</p> <p>NFA</p>
229.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	Change to STMS level 1 & level LV and include Level LV in assessment	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Recommend amend profile</b></p> <p>Support</p> <p>Actioned NFA</p>
230.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Level LV needs inclusion. Refresher? Time?	<p>See above</p> <p>-</p> <p>Actioned as per: Item 229 (inclusion of LV) Item 6 (Refresher) Item 70 (time) NFA</p>

## 9 - STMS level 2

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision		
231.	ChCh	Richard Fleming	Internal trainers/assessors for STMS L2 knowledge practical. Widen out training group for this course	<b>NZTA to consider expanding STMS L2/3 trainers</b>  Support, provided quality can be maintained.	To be considered as part of review of trainer requirements to deliver on the revised model for Training and competencies NFA at this stage	
232.	ChCh	Damien Houlahan	L2 vs L3. All two-lane, two-way roads should be classified L2. All designated motorways and multi-lane one-way roads should be designated L3. This is the key difference between them rather than traffic volume and speed. Each to have their own practical training/assessments	Not a lot of support for designating all multi-lane one-way roads as level 3. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	
233.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Should path start at level 1? Divided carriage way L2 over 65km/h will have very similar requirements to L3. Will the L2 focus on urban?	Good points answered by earlier submissions	-	NFA
234.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	What happened to the current L2/3 STMS-NP? This allows shoulder	STMS NP is still there as a knowledge qualified person. <b>To be discussed – do we have NP and P at each level?</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Actioned as per item 19 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision		
			closures and capital projects etc			
235.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Should we retain the non-practising qualification for specific scenarios, e.g. capital works working on the verge, inspections etc. Or do they have a specific practical assessment for the type of work they will do on site?	See above	As commented earlier, working group needs to think very carefully about TC role, L2/3 roads, and who can do what if STMS not present. (In saying this last part, I'm not endorsing that a Practising STMS is not required to be present at an active worksite).	Actioned as per items 3 and 19 NFA
236.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	The company to take responsibility for verifying and assessing	TTM verifiers could be from a company. CoPTTM (NZTA) assessors appointed by NZTA and may be external to the company	Intention is that Verifier could be from company, but Assessor would be independent. To manage conflict of interest risk, recommend that Assessors not assess inhouse company applicants. Ie they should have the integrity to	CoPTTM assessors and TTM verifiers appointed by NZTA and may be either internal or external to the company NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision		
					recuse themselves. Recommend that ethical expectations be written into the Assessor profile, and authorisation criteria.	
237.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Prerequisite must be TC competent. This is not required for auditors/designers etc	Profile states must be TC competent to complete the practical component. Auditors and designers do not have to be STMS practising so would not need to be TC practising competent. <b>Recommend make this clearer on the profile</b>	NFA	NFA
238.	PN	Kerry Drake	Could audits by NZTA representatives i.e. TMCs etc, replace the need for reassessment, especially if there are 3 or more in level two environment	To be considered as part of design of the training and refreshers	TBC	<b>Stuart's decision</b> No there is no standard audit. Audits happen for various reasons – it would be a hard one to monitor  <b>NFA</b>
239.	PN	Kerry Drake	Should mobile blocks be included in level two?	This will be included under mobile closures <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
240.	Auckland	No Name	STMS theory refreshers - now have to refresh all	Not sure	NFA	NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
		core elements for that role. Refresher content and time increases lots		

### 10 - STMS level 3

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
241.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	STMS L2 refresher, if STMS moves company hard to get copy of existing jobs for rope so have to reassess which costs. How often can we use rope?	<b>NZTA to consider</b>  NFA other than to consider ROPE requirements  Consider when deciding rope requirements NFA at this stage
242.	Auckland	Dave Allen & Dave Tilton	STMS's 2 and 3 – remove the need for ROPEs	See above  NFA. I think there still needs to be evidence that a person has performed sufficient relevant work within the refresher interval period to remain current. A ROPEs mechanism could still be appropriate (happy to consider alternative options), and for now the ROPEs concept has been



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	
				included in the profiles to meet this purpose.	
243.	ChCh	Kevin Westeneng	Level 3 is multi lane one-way traffic above 80km/h, so agree separate.	<b>Recommend NFA</b> NFA. Note intention to combine with L2 >65kph.	Actioned as per item 5 NFA
244.	ChCh	Kevin Westeneng	Looking at speed that is not as important as road environment	<b>Recommend NFA</b> NFA. Unsure what is meant.	Actioned as per item 5 NFA
245.	PN	George Boyd	Column 1. Remove level 2 roads around interchanges and detours <del>Level 2 roads around interchanges and detours</del>	<b>To be discussed</b> NFA. L3 STMSs need to be deploying around L2 interchanges. I guess in reality most L3 STMSs will also hold L2 Practicing qual, so there could be some duplication. Recommend section on L2 roads within L3 block be kept minimal.	Actioned as per item 5 Also added following to profile <b>(to be kept brief)</b> NFA
246.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Should this include over 65km/h L2? Much of this will be in keeping with level 2. Workshops are we going to be covering information twice?	See earlier submissions about split of STMS learning blocks	- Actioned as per item 5 NFA
247.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Combine level 3 and level 2 over 65km/h.	See earlier submissions about split of STMS learning blocks	- Actioned as per item 5

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	
		Very similar and would make sense in training and assessments		NFA	
248.	Auckland	Dave Allen	STMS level 1, 2 and 3 – no provision for emergencies on any network	<p>Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile to include emergencies</b></p> <p>Support intention to include emergency &amp; incident response scenarios (noting they are different). Need to word carefully to ensure STMSs are not encouraged to assume controller responsibilities on road levels they are not competent for.</p>	<p>Added the following to each of the STMS profiles (except universal) <b>Emergency &amp; incident response scenarios</b> NFA</p>
249.	Auckland	James Scully	STMS LV3 should have a practical reassessment	<p>Agreed. See revised approach for refreshers</p> <p>TBC. Where is the revised approach?</p>	<p>Profile currently states: Company to provide statement of competency (including performance monitoring issues, NNC etc) at the time of refresher. Company is responsible for maintaining</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision		
				internal staff competency The individual can either provide an application for a ROPE, or be reassessed. NFA		
250.	Auckland	Dave Allen	No mention of traffic delays or management	This will be included as part of static operations	TBC. Need to define what knowledge and skills STMSs need wrt this subject. Arguably TMP Designers and Approvers carry more responsibility to decide with what traffic impact and when a TMP can be deployed. STMS should then only need to confirm actual traffic conditions onsite match predictions.	Resolve when we go to the design phase for each of the workshops NFA at this stage
251.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	Prerequisite should include mobile driver Knowledge not always practical	<b>To be considered</b>	I support as previously noted.	Action as per items 154 and 202 NFA at this stage

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
		Crew driving under instruction of this L3 STMS		

## 11 - Traffic Operation Manager

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
252.	ChCh	Shaun Maxwell	Do they need to be knowledge qualified or practically qualified	Currently they could be STMS NP level 2/3 if their crews are working on level 2/3 roads. <b>Recommend no change to current requirement</b>	Recommend that it be clarified: (i) that this role is optional. (ii) recommend that any TOMs be (at minimum) STMS knowledge qualified to same road level company is operating on.	Amended TOM profile to show <b>(NOTE – this is an optional role – not all companies will have a TOM)</b> Must be STMS <b>knowledge</b> qualified for the level of road that their crews are operating on Traffic operations managers must ensure they are TTM <b>knowledge</b> qualified for the level of road that their crews are operating on NFA
253.	Auckland	No Name	If no formal training is provided, why do traffic operations managers need to ensure that	This is a basic CoPTTM requirement	TOMs do not have to be TTM qualified for the level of road their	Actioned as per item 252 NFA

			they are TTM qualified for the level of road that their crews are operating on?		crews are operating on because the TOM is not operating as the STMS. As the role is optional, recommend that we only recommend as per (ii) in item above.	
254.	Auckland	Paul Merson	In a separate TTM provider entity, must a manager of activities have a traffic operation manager in organisation?	No. Traffic operations manager not required	NFA	Actioned as per item 252 NFA

## 12 - Use of specialist TTM equipment on-site

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision
256.				NFA

## 13 - Other specialist activities

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
257.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Seems to only talk about events. Title doesn't match words	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect the wider range of activities</b>	Support changing some of the 'event' words to 'activity' or Expanded wording away from a solely event focus NFA

					'operation' or similar.	
258.	ChCh	Matt Wylie	Is there the need for specialist activities e.g. road marking, sealing, signal	Majority of people have regarded these as specialist activities. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	-	Action as per item 257 NFA
259.	ChCh	Jeff Kaye	Don't think sealing and road marking should be included	See above	-	Action as per item 257 NFA

#### 14 - TMP Designer

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
260.	Auckland	Paul Merson	Consider alteration of name (descriptor). Is point of qual/warrant to have effective planners of TM, then designing (filling in) TMP forms and adding TMD?	<b>Recommend changing name to advanced traffic management planner (ATMP)</b>	Needs to be discussed. Submission seems to be suggesting a potential split between TMP Design, and TTM Operations Planning (potentially including the programming/sequencing of TMP Implementations). In my experience TTM office staff usually either do both or work closely with colleagues to achieve both.	Leave name as is NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				<p>I don't think either aspect could work independently of the other as they are co-dependent, so makes sense to me to retain under one COPTTM role. We could consider tweaking the title or description to clarify.</p> <p>I do not support name change recommended. We would need a basic 'TMP Designer' role first before could consider calling anything 'Advanced'. Splitting out of planning function is TBC.</p>	
261.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	TMP designer needs to do inspection qualification	NFA. As per item 186 above.	Actioned as per 186 NFA
262.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	TMP designers to visit site before designing	I support for complex / marginal sites, but do not	TMP design workshop currently

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				support for all operations. Risk of Google streetview not being current is low in my opinion. The bigger problem is lack of ability / risk recognition, and effort to put due diligence into a design to ensure it is viable. ie the issue is designer's competence rather than not physically visiting site. A competent designer will recognise when a site visit is needed.	suggests site visit if complex site Suggest this approach continue  NFA
263.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	Specific software or still use pen/paper? Aerials to be updated more regularly.	Recommend performance based outcomes rather than specify systems. Recommend build into COPTTM in appropriate place(s).	Current ATMP workshop states what is required on TMD but does not say what software must be used Suggest this approach continue NFA



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
264.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Mentioned level 1 knowledge required, however may require L2 or 3 knowledge depending on the road level	Profile already allows for this <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA	NFA
265.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Will have universal and L1, 2, 3 knowledge but what will the refreshers cover if content is covered in above refreshers? Good to have practical review of TMPs and how they went when set out on the road. For consultants, who would the TTM verifier be?	Refresher will focus only on changes to the TMP. The person must attend the relevant STMS level 1, 2, 3 refreshers as well. <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Support the TMP Designer receiving the STMS refreshers.  This may reduce some need for TMP Designer refreshers (ie these would reduce down to design specific updates).	NFA
266.	ChCh	Shaun Maxwell	Practical element assessment method. Record of "practising" experience. Do they need practical experience or knowledge?		The ' <i>Record of practicing experience</i> ' in the Assessment Method section is technically correct – we are expecting the TMP Designer to provide a record of them practicing their design skills. However this is potentially confusing to the TTM industry	Amended profile to show <del>Record of practicing experience</del> Record of the TMPs the designer has developed. NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				because they are so accustomed to 'Practicing' being associated only with STMSs. Recommend wording be amended to clarify that what is expected is a record of the TMPs the designer has developed.		
267.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Ensure assessment covers the area that they designer usually works in e.g. road inspection on surrey activities. No use assessing an activity stipulated by NZTA for a road closure if the designer does not do those types of TMPs i.e. must be relevant to the role	<b>To be discussed – do we narrow the assessment down to the current activities they are involved in or extend it out to include common situations?</b>	NFA. If a person wants to become a qualified TMP Designer then they must demonstrate sufficient range and abilities to be deemed competent to design for the majority of TTM situations.	NFA
268.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Do they need to do 3 refreshers (level 1, 2, 3) to maintain being a designer for each level?	They will need to complete refreshers for the relevant road levels. The refreshers may be level 1 and level 2/3	As per previous.	Refresher must be completed for STMS workshops for level of TTM This may mean attending 3 different refreshers, but

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
					each will cover different information NFA	
269.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Can a person submit a TMP if they are not a qualified TMP designer? If they have to be a TMP designer this will hurt a lot of small companies financially	<b>To be discussed – does the TMP designer have to be assessed as competent before being able to submit TMPs?</b>	The submitter to Engineer/TMC must be competent. The original drafter of the TMP does not need to be and could be operating under supervision / training. The submitter takes on accountability for TMP quality at time of submission, and their name should be recorded as part of the process.  This process enables a 'certified TMP Designer' to complete their on-job practical experience under supervision, while the quality of TMP submissions into the system is maintained	Added item to CoPTTM Consult NFA at this time

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				through the submitter's QA check. Provided the TMP drafter can verify their involvement in the design development (perhaps a 'TMP Drafted by....' field within the TMP text or TMD Title Block would be useful), this enables their design involvement to be demonstrated to satisfy the on-job practical requirements. Recommend that this be documented in appropriate place(s) within COPTTM.	
270.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	TMP designer pre-approved by RCA as competent (rope system?) rather than out of office training	<b>To be discussed</b>	<p>This could be appropriate for the transition from current to new system, however wouldn't work for new designers. Recommend quality assurance</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> No there is no standard of assessment.</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				process above while designer is in training. Similar to STMS ROPEs, I think Designers should be required to demonstrate evidence of work in field upon regular intervals. Recommend consideration of a 3 yearly ROPEs, aligned with a Refresher course should NZTA determine one is required.		
271.	ChCh	Matt Wylie	Is there the need for CoPTTM assessor?	NZTA has selected CoPTTM assessors for the existing advanced TMP workshop. It is expected that this will continue	Yes, COPTTM Assessor is needed as an independent quality assurance check of competency. Recommend that the existing advanced TMP workshop be repurposed to align with and support this new competency system.	Agreed This will happen as part of the design phase of this project NFA at this stage

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
272.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	On job practical - sighted by CoPTTM assessor. This is a bit excessive, why not TTM verifier?	The profile states signed off by TTM verifier and then sighted by the assessor. This mirrors the approach with L2/3 practical assessment <b>Recommend NFA</b>	NFA  NFA
273.	PN	Darrin Humphries	Additional competencies for specialised TMP design i.e. Events, special activities	This is already allowed for in the profile <b>Recommend NFA</b>	Recommend that this be emphasised.  Added the following to the profile Designer expected to acquire endorsements for specialist activities / specialist TTM equipment if utilising within a TMP NFA
274.	PN	Ian Satherley	Barriers course to be included	This is already allowed for in the profile <b>Recommend NFA</b>	This is covered in the Use of Specialist equipment section but it does not stand out. Given importance of Designers having the skills to develop viable designs using specialist equipment, I  TMP designer does not need to be barrier designer Refer item 289 Amended profile to read Designer expected to acquire endorsements for specialist activities / specialist TTM

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				recommend that a few more examples of specialist equipment be specifically inserted into the TMP Designer profile. Recommend 'barrier systems, and VMSs'.	equipment (eg portable traffic signals, VMS) if utilising within a TMP NFA
275.	PN	Darrin Humphries	From my experience, the TMP designer does need to have some knowledge of how TTM is applied practically on the roads. They need to understand: CoPTTM, the physical site, the construction methodology, implementation/breakdown phases	Agreed. <b>Recommend including practical experience in the profile</b>	Support. Designer learning block needs to cover the highlighted elements. In terms of acquiring knowledge/skills – refer response in item 99. NFA
276.	Auckland	No Name	Include element of practical experience to TMP designer, i.e. they must have spent x amount of time with crew to give on the job experience	See above	See above Action as per item 99 NFA
277.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	Knowledge TMDs: knows CoPTTM requirements and can	See above	See above Action as per item 99 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		draw pretty pictures but... Practical proforma: do they know practical details that are currently required to be documented in proforma?			
278.	Auckland	No Name	Theory blocks only i.e. TMP designer. Should have some practical experience	See above	See above Action as per item 99 NFA
279.	PN	Ray Edwards	TMP Designer. Add competency: Traffic delay counts, Contingency (risk)	Agreed. <b>Recommend amend profile</b>	Support Added the following to the profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic delay counts</li> <li>• Contingency (risk)</li> </ul> NFA
280.	PN	Joseph Rosendaal	Who is CoPTTM assessor for TMPs? 10 TMPs for small companies?	<b>To be discussed – do we still require 10 TMPs for the assessment?</b>	Yes. As per response in item 20 Action as per item 20 NFA at this stage
281.	Auckland	No name	The 10 TMPs are not realistic for review in relation to time. Reviewing a TMP well will take 2 hours. 10 x 2 = 20 hours minimum	See above	See previous responses. If my approach is supported, review time risk is eliminated from TMP approval process. Time is required Action as per item 20 NFA at this stage



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				regardless for competency assessment.		
282.	Auckland	No Name	10 real life TMPs – list what conditions i.e. 8 must be more than shoulder closures	See above	Details to be fine-tuned. Evidence submitted must be sufficient to demonstrate competence to cater for the majority of TTM situations. If a wide range of practical application is not directly demonstrable, designer must be able to demonstrate that they possess enough self-awareness and principle-based understanding to be able to navigate their way through a future challenging design situation outside of their experience-base.	Action as per item 20 NFA at this stage
283.	PN	Joseph Rosendaal	Who delivers knowledge only	This is currently delivered by selected NZTA selected trainers	Note for development during learning block design (ie	To be considered as part of

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		component for TMP designer etc		repurposing of current ATMP course): Need to ensure content is very real-life focused and delivers high-value. Recommend trainer nomination process be reviewed. Selection by NZTA may not be producing the desired or robust outcomes.	implementation of revised workshop NFA at this stage	
284.	PN	Leanne McAdams	Delay calculates L2/3 where will this be covered off? At what stage does the STMS become familiar with the L2/3 requirements	This is covered as part of the TMP development procedure	NFA. Different knowledge and skills needed by TMP Designers, Approvers, and STMSs – to be detailed into the relevant learning blocks.	NFA
285.	Auckland	Paul Merson	CoPTTM assessor will direct any rework, but this will be on 10 x already approved, completed and review conducted. Both cannot be part of the same assessment	<b>This is tricky point that needs to be discussed – do we review TMPs before submission or after submission or do we require a made-up project?</b>	Transferred to <b>Main decision</b> list above	Action as per item 20 NFA

Commented [HS34]: As per response to item 20.

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
286.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	Submission of TMPs for assessment – how do we handle they information/TMP and assessment information for each party? E.g. Designer submits 10 some or all of which are applicable to approver – how should fails/passes x impact?	See above	See above	Action as per item 99 NFA
287.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Needs to know what permanent signage is needed to be maintained and how to accommodate on TMP/TMD	Agreed. This is included as part of the TMP development procedure	Support. Note for detailing into TMP Designer learning block, and supported through emphasis in COPTTM as appropriate.	NFA
288.	Auckland	Dave Allen	Maybe include TC inspector as prerequisite for site visits prior to TMP completion	TMP designer is required to be knowledge qualified to the level of road they are designing TMPs for. They can therefore complete inspections on L1, 2 and 3 roads (subject to restrictions)	NFA. As per response to item 186.	To be actioned as per 186 and 165 NFA at this stage
289.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Must have knowledge of the barrier or TTM systems being used to ensure the TMP identifies necessary installation details e.g. pinning distances on temp barrier strings,	TMP designer does not need to know details of barrier design. They need to know what TTM is required to protect road users/workers during installation, removal, and while installed	Strongly support submission and disagree with recommendation. It is fundamental to the success / failure of many continuous TMPs	Barrier designer is responsible for the barrier system design and overseeing the installation. The TMP designer requests

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
		minimum string length, overlaps, time to erect/remove etc		(and the TTM operations to install them) that TMP Designers have a good grasp of barrier and TTM device practicalities – both the theory behind how they work, and the practicalities of site installation. For TMPs where specialist equipment is being used, it must be mandatory for TMP Designers to possess the relevant specialist equipment qual. (or have this element approved by others with the qual).	information from the barrier designer to include in the TMP The TMP designer is only required to show the barrier position on a TMD NFA	
290.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Must demonstrate understanding of effective means of controlling multiple lanes in L2/3, particularly on longer term TTM layouts involving lane shifts	This is currently included as part of the TMP development procedure	Unclear to me what submission is meaning by 'controlling' – I interpret this to be a combination of design principles (eg appropriate geometric	Neil's Comment TMP designer will be knowledge qualified for STMS L2 over 65km/h and L3. They will not be required to be practically

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				design), plus speed and behaviour management through TTM applications. As not covered adequately within COPTTM currently, CTOC is currently drafting a Local Operating Procedure around temporary traffic facility design – happy to share if useful for adding to content within training material and COPTTM.	qualified for these levels of road Follow up with CTOC regarding their local procedure To be followed up as part of design of training and assessment material NFA at this stage
291.	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Multi lane TTM, especially in high speed areas, requires some understanding of geometry – curve design accommodating lane widths at lateral shifts	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support. As above Action as per item 290 NFA

## 15 - TTM Audit

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
292.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Add auditing of mobile worksites	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support	Amended profile as follows STMS qualified person who assesses worksites (static and mobile) to support continuous improvement and regulate poor performance  Completing SCR using video of sites (static and mobile)  • Buddy up with an RCA approved mentor to complete at least 10 SCRs (including static and mobile operations) and follow up actions  NFA
293.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Add dealing with personalities	This is likely to be handled at a practical level as part of audit training. More advanced communication techniques will	Support intent. As per response to item 188, I support Universal STMS	Action as per item 188 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				be covered as part of the NZQA certificate	having to verify commitment to this. TBC whether additional skills demonstration is needed to Auditor role.	
294.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	This role needs some "soft" people skills added in. Audits are causing a lot of issues with personality issues from what I am hearing	See above	As above. Action as per item 188 NFA	
295.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Amend prerequisites to show minimum knowledge level for prerequisites	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to clarify which learning blocks the auditor needs knowledge only and which ones they need to be practically competent in</b>	Support recommendation. Content requires discussion ie TBC. I'm not convinced that Auditors need STMS Practical skills. Potentially some of the lower practical quals would be appropriate.	Amended profile as follows <b>Knowledge qualified to level of road auditing on (TTM worker, TC, Universal STMS and STMS for level of road they are auditing on)</b> Now aligns to map of learning blocks NFA
296.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Suggest 5 SCRs in on job practical with at least 1 mobile and at least 50% on the lane	<b>To be discussed - do we reduce from 10 SCRs in assessment to 5 SCRs</b>	NFA	Amended profile to show 5 SCRs required for assessment NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
297.	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Add to pass criteria Must identify all critical issues onsite and at least 80% of the other issues	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Support. Is there a definition of 'critical issues'?  Amended profile as follows: <del>• Identify 80% critical issues onsite</del> • Must identify all critical issues onsite and at least 80% of the other issues  Definition of critical issues to be clarified as part of design of the workshop NFA
298.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	For approving engineers think that an auditor should have the TMP design training. For the STMS onsite they don't need the TMP design training	TMP designer is not a prerequisite to TTM audit	NFA  TMP designer is only desirable not a prerequisite NFA
299.	ChCh	No Name	Auditor needs to have practical STMS experience otherwise just technical audit. Practical experience is essential	Agreed. Practical experience is helpful but does the person need to be practically qualified? <b>Recommend adding work experience/observation as a requirement for auditors</b>	TBC. I do not support submission – practicing STMS attributes helpful but not essential. TBC whether a lower qual practical may be appropriate.  Action as per item 295 Prerequisite for auditor is knowledge qualified for level of road NFA



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				I do not support recommendation – the purpose of the prerequisite qualifications and on-job practical components, are to assure of adequate work experience.		
300.	PN	David Arrowsmith	Auditor should be required to have held a practical qualification at some point but not need to be current	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate.	Action as per item 295 NFA
301.	PN	Joseph Rosendaal	Audit should have practical experience	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate.	Action as per item 295 NFA
302.	PN	Dominic DeGiorgio	How can we bridge the gap between “auditor” and “STMS” i.e. more respect for the auditor’s opinion	See above	Recommend build techniques into Auditor learning block as appropriate. Also STMS behaviour / attitude may need to be addressed somehow - eg STMS learning block. NZTA to support both roles	Profile currently includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication with and feedback to the warranted person on-site (including how to provide constructive feedback, how to defuse anger, how to deal with conflict)</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
				through COPTTM and ongoing behavioural sustenance campaigns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Know the audit strategies</li> </ul> This will be further expanded on in the NZQA certificate of TTM Approach to auditors will change over time as new audit processes are introduced and competent staff are on sites NFA	
303.	ChCh	Damien Houlahan	Should have practical experience/qualification before becoming a TTM auditor. An auditor would have the ability to provide constructive feedback and use the audit as a learning tool. This is more productive than using the audit as an enticement tool. This aligns with HSAW act also, PCBU communication and collaboration.	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate.	Action as per item 295 NFA
304.	ChCh	Simon Hodges	Important to have both practical and theory combined for good outcomes, mobile ops/static/people skills	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate.	Action as per item 295 NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
305.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Question on practical training and scope required. If one is a consultant acting as an approving engineer, TTM audits is usually part of the role. Do we need to do the full practical component for say Level 2 road to be able to undertake an audit? Happy to discuss further	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate.	Action as per item 295 NFA
306.	ChCh	No name	TTM auditor to do inspection block	TTM auditor is required to be knowledge qualified to the level of road they are auditing. They can therefore complete inspections on L1, 2 and 3 roads (subject to restrictions)	Support intention - Auditor is likely to require Inspector knowledge and skills. However given prerequisites, perhaps easier to assimilate specific inspector content into Auditor learning block.	Added the following to the audit profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Know how to complete an inspection (cover relevant parts of inspection as they relate to audits)</li> </ul> NFA
307.	Auckland	Paul Merson	Do I need to have specialist knowledge blocks i.e. event, KCTL, road markers in order to conduct an audit (SCR)?	NZTA believes that you do not need to be specialist qualified in order to complete an audit. You will certainly be more aware of the difficulties and differences in the specialist activities if you have experience	Support intention of submission – Auditor needs to possess knowledge of specialist activity, equipment etc if auditing them.	Added the following to the audit profile Knowledge of specialist activities/equipment (eg event, KCTL, road markers,

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				Probably doesn't need practicing attributes. Recommend that profile be enhanced to refer to specialist knowledge.	portable traffic signals) NFA
308.	Auckland	Neil Greaves	TTM audit role – Mechanics of carrying out the audit in relation to holding a warrant. Practical requirements for all levels of road	See above	TBC whether a qual practical may be appropriate. Action as per item 295 NFA
309.	Auckland	Tom Kiddle	If auditing barriers, would need specialist activity of barriers in order to complete the audit. Is TMP CoPTTM compliant?	If the audit is on the integrity of the barrier system then would need to be barrier qualified. If inspection is on a worksite which includes a barrier then would not need to be barriers qualified as the auditor is only checking the TTM	Support first part of submission. My opinion is: 'Yes – if an Auditor is auditing a site, they need to have knowledge sufficient to reasonably audit the full site not only some parts of it.' Otherwise fundamental problems may be missed. Refer responses to items 289 and 307 above. Re second query in submission: It Auditor is not required to be qualified in barrier design. They are checking that barrier has been placed as per the TMP (location, length etc) NFA Neil's Comment As the barrier is included in TTM the auditor would be expected to check the inclusion of a barrier checklist for the STMS to follow and confirm the detail therein has

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
				is my understanding that it is not the Auditors role to check if the TMP is COPTTM compliant – this is the Approvers & TMC/CM's responsibility. Though I can see value in Auditors independent to the approval process, providing quality assurance checks of the design and approval process.	been followed on site. <b>Stuart's decision</b> TTM Auditor is not required to be barrier trained. Would only need barrier qualification if doing an inspection on the barrier system  <b>NFA</b>

## 16 - TMP Approver

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
310	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Knowledge requirements seem appropriate. Note these will be a 1-day course but no refresher. I believe that regular refreshers will be required and	Refreshers of changes to CoPTTM will be covered as part of the STMS L1 L2 L3 refreshers. Any specific TMP related changes would be included in the refresher for TMP	<b>Support recommendation.</b>  Action as per item 6 NFA <b>Neil's Comment</b> This role would expect regular/ongoing contact and revision of local requirements,

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		might be targeted for geographic areas to be familiar with the local operating procedures e.g. CTOC for greater Christchurch	designers which is prerequisite for this qualification		<p>CoPTTM and posted updates on the CoPTTM web page.</p> <p>Approvers should not be only reliant on attending a refresher course.</p> <p><b>Stuarts decision</b></p> <p>Attend STMS refresher for changes to CoPTTM Approvers should not be only reliant on attending a refresher course.</p> <p>Expect regular/ongoing contact and revision of local requirements, CoPTTM and posted updates on the website</p> <p>Amended Auditor and Approver profiles as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auditors/Approvers should not be only reliant on attending a refresher course. Expect regular/ongoing contact and revision of local requirements, CoPTTM and posted</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					updates on the website <b>NFA</b>
311	ChCh	Dean Hurford	If a RCA loses their approver does that mean they have to train someone up prior to being able to approve TMPs again?	<b>To be discussed – can a person without this qualification approve TMPs?</b>  NFA. Under HSWA, officers are required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure the business has <b>appropriate resources and processes</b> to eliminate or minimise risk</li> </ul> <p>I recall there is also a definition in the Act around competency and/or experience required.</p> <p>So I expect that RCAs should either never not have an appropriately competent person, or would be expected to appropriately manage any gaps.</p>	<b>Neil’s Comment</b> A similar situation would arise for all roles if a company or organisation ‘lost’ a qualified person in a particular role. The importance of the role, if not recognised prior, would be reinforced by the loss of ability to complete associated functions.  Suggest an arrangement could be made for the role to be covered by an adjacent RCAs approver I this case.  Any costs incurred would reinforce the importance of managing the circumstance of possibly ‘losing’ the incumbent.  <b>Stuart’s decision</b> This is a business matter for the RCA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<b>NFA</b>
312	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Can they approve TMPs showing barriers if they themselves are not "barrier" trained?	The barrier system designer is responsible for the approval of the barrier system. The TMP approver is only concerned with the installation, ongoing use and removal of the barrier. Key points are hazard areas, deflection area, and delineation of the barrier through chevrons	<p>I disagree with recommendation – the Approver needs to be competent to approve specialist activities / equipment detailed in the TMP. Recommendation as per item 289.</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b> An explanation of roles associated with barrier design, implementation, approvals and audit are to be included in CoPTTM which will assist with the understanding of responsibility</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> An explanation of roles associated with barrier design, implementation, approvals and audit are to be included in CoPTTM which will assist with the understanding of responsibility Approver does not need to be barriers qualified as they are not designing the barrier system</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
313	ChCh	Dean Hurford	On job practical - last bullet point "must have 10 TMP approvals rated as	<b>To be discussed – do we stick with 10 TMP approvals for the assessment?</b>	<p>I think: (i) prerequisite of Competent TMP</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b> 10 TMP approvals seem excessive. Costs involved in</p>



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
		acceptable in a row before being declared competent		Designer must be maintained (ii) 10 on-job practical examples still feels appropriate.	<p>assessing competence to this level for all TMP writers would likely outweigh the benefits to many potential writers of minor works type TMPs</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>3 assessments as in line with overseas experience</p> <p><b>Actioned</b></p> <p>Amended profile to read:</p> <p>Must have 3 TMP approvals rated as acceptable before being declared competent</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
314	PN	David Arrowsmith	<p>TMP approver should have held a practising STMS qualification in the past but it does not need to be current</p> <p>Agreed. Practical experience is helpful but does the person need to be practically qualified?</p> <p><b>Recommend adding work experience/observation as a requirement for TMP approvers</b></p>	<p>NFA. I think TMP Approver must have held a Competent TMP Designer qual previously, but I do not support Practising STMS qual being required.</p>	<p>Action as per item 295</p> <p>NFA</p> <p>Neil's Comment</p> <p>Add TTM experience/observation at each level of TTM as a requirement for TMP approvers</p> <p>Added the following wording</p> <p>Experience in (or observation of)</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					installation, maintenance and removal of TTM for level of TTM NFA
315	Auckland	Grant Gordon	Multi-lane TTM (especially high speed) requires understanding of geometry, curve design, and accommodating lane widths at lateral shift	We have recommended this be covered in the TMP designer learning block which is a prerequisite to this learning block	As per item 290.  Action as per item 290 NFA Neil's Comment Include as learning block as recommended. Added the following to the profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Multi-lane TTM (especially high speed) - understanding of geometry, curve design, and accommodating lane widths at lateral shift</li></ul> NFA
316	Auckland	James Scully	Refresher not required, what about moderation?	<b>To be discussed – we need to develop some guidelines for moderation</b>	TBC  Neil's Comment Moderation guidelines required to be developed to prove whether refresher required. Added the following to the profile <b>Moderation</b>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					NZTA will undertake moderation of TMP Approvers NFA

### 17 - TMC and Corridor Manager

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
317.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	Prerequisite-add in TMP approver. This should be a major thing	Corridor managers do not need to be TMP approvers	<p><b>Support submission.</b> TMC/CMs directly approve TMPs where AE not involved, plus they need to be as competent as AEs wrt technical standards to perform double-check.</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b> If corridor managers are assisted by understanding the process of TMP approval, then add as a prerequisite.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> Corridor managers only need to complete approver training if they are required to approve TMPs (or their work would be improved with the knowledge of approving)</p> <p>Amended profile under prerequisites to read</p>

**Commented [HS35]:** I think various elements of this profile need further development. Eg:

- (i) Clarification within prerequisite quals whether knowledge or practicing expected.
- (ii) Risk assessment abilities.
- (iii) Traffic impact assessment abilities. Including awareness of intersection capacities, signal operation basics, temporary control options etc.
- (iv) Network performance / journey management abilities.
- (v) Statutory obligations, including Transport Rules, HSWA, NZUAG Code etc.
- (vi) Incident Response.
- (vii) Emergency / CDEM Response
- (viii) On job practical elements too vague currently.

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TMP Approver (if required to approve TMPs)</li> <li>• Desirable to complete the Audit and TMP Approver training as their work would be improved with this knowledge</li> </ul> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
318.	ChCh	Melanie Muirson	Does the TMC require the approving engineers training (or vice versa) since the sign off on the TMP can be interchangeable between the TMC and AE? Could these roles be combined as the approving engineer should understand the TMC's role	TMC has final approval of TMP approved by AE. This is because they need to ensure any disruption to the network is taken into account (coordination of the network)	<p>As above.</p> <p>I do not support second part of submission around possible combination of roles, as TMC/CMs bring a wider network perspective, and more developed transport impact and corridor performance awareness to their part of the process than AEs do.</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b> TMC has final approval for use of a TMP approved by AE. Coordination role is the point of difference.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> If engineer is approving TMP then they will need to complete the TMP approver learning block</p> <p><b>Actioned</b> Amended profile to read Approvers of TMPs on behalf of an RCA (including</p>



## 18 - TTM Trainer/Mentor

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
320	Dunedin	Michael Tannock	Need to clarify difference between TTM Trainer/mentor and TTM verifier and TTM Assessor	<p><b>TTM trainer/mentor</b> trains staff on the practical aspects of their role, may be an in-house person.</p> <p><b>TTM verifier</b> confirms competence of a person in a specific activity, may be an in-house person.</p> <p><b>CoPTTM assessor</b> is selected by NZTA to assess competence in a specific specialist activity (e.g. L2/3 practical assessment)</p>	NFA	<p>Action as per item 7 NFA Neil's Comment</p> <p>Changes made in Comment/recommendation column to better fit descriptions of roles. Added the following to the profiles</p> <p><b>TTM Mentor</b> Person who mentors/trains staff on the practical aspects of their role, may be an in-house person.</p> <p><b>TTM verifier</b> Person who confirms competence of a person in a specific activity, may be an in-house person.</p> <p><b>CoPTTM assessor</b> is selected by NZTA to assess competence in a specific specialist activity (eg L2/3 practical assessment, TMP design</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					assessment, Barriers assessment) NFA
321	ChCh	No Name	TTM verifier, TTM trainer/mentor same role	See above	NFA Action as per item 7 NFA
322	ChCh	Steven Haughin	TTM Trainer/mentor should be qualified to level (include mobile driver)	Agreed. <b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b>	Unclear what this means. TBC Action as per item 7 NFA
323	ChCh	Simon Hodges	Mentor/trainer needs practical for what they are mentoring/training	Agreed. Must be practically qualified in the activity they are training	Support Amended profile as follows Must be <b>practically</b> qualified in the mentoring they will be undertaking NFA Neil's Comment Where practical elements are included a trainer/mentor must hold the associated qualifications Added the following to the profile <b>Where practical elements are included a trainer/mentor must hold the associated qualifications</b> NFA

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
324	PN	Andrew McIntosh	Trainer implies classroom - consider deleting	In an earlier submission, we recommended changing to TTM mentor	Support recommendation	Action as per item 7 NFA Neil's Comment Disagree. A trainer may have different ways to impart knowledge other than in a classroom. NFA
325	PN	Darrin Humphries	Our first group selected out those with evidence of prior learning and competency i.e. has been an STMS L2/3 P in the past	??	NFA. Unclear what is meant.	NFA Neil's Comment If using NZQA based model. Unit standard accreditation can assist with confirming existing qualifications. Otherwise ROPE or practical assessment is in place at level 2-3 for STMS. This can also be introduced at level 1.  Actioned by adding concepts to the implementation section of the T&C model NFA
326	PN	John Reid	Is there going to be a ROPE system in place for already attained training qualifications	<b>To be discussed – we need to consider guidelines for implementation of the model</b>	TBC	<b>Neil's Comment</b> If using NZQA based model. Unit standard accreditation can assist



Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>with confirming existing qualifications.</p> <p><b>Stuarts decision</b></p> <p>As per implementation strategy for the model (to be developed)</p> <p>Await CGG decision on implementation strategy</p> <p><b>NFA at this stage</b></p>
327	PN	Kerry Drake	Who starts, how do we start, who trains the trainer first	See above	<p>-</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b></p> <p>If using NZQA based model. Unit standard accreditation can confirm suitability as a trainer.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>Part of implementation strategy</p> <p>TTM Mentors and TTM Verifiers will need to be trained/warranted early on</p> <p>Await CGG decision on implementation strategy</p> <p><b>NFA at this stage</b></p>
328	PN	Andrew McIntosh	International best practise - do assessment 3 times before signing off	This seems to be a good guideline	<p>TBC</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b></p> <p>The level 2-3 practical assessment process includes 3 verification closures thus following the suggested 'international best practise'. We are</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>already using this process for confirming competency.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b></p> <p>Agreed – Generally 3 assessments to determine competence</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
329	PN	Leanne McAdams	Work place based? If no one in workplace can the CoPTTM trainer do this? What material do they have to set them up?	Anyone with the required training and qualifications can complete this role	<p>NFA</p> <p>NFA</p> <p>Neil's Comment</p> <p>If CoPTTM trainer has the required qualifications then yes.</p> <p>Would have to be confirmed to the employers' satisfaction. Possibly through certification or process similar to ROPE.</p> <p>NFA</p>
330	Auckland	Paul Merson	Internal trainer = TTM trainer/mentor. Correct in profiles	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Recommend amending profile to reflect this</b></p>	<p>Covered previously. Should be noted the TTM Mentor <u>could</u> be internal, not required to be.</p> <p>Action as per item 7</p> <p>NFA</p>

## 19 - TTM Verifier

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
331.	ChCh	Steven Haughin	TTM verifier must be practising but assessor not	Both must be TTM qualified to the level they are assessing	<p>Recommend Verifier profile (plus any other profiles as necessary) be clarified to confirm type of competency expected (ie knowledge vs practicing skills): eg for this role: Prerequisite: Must be TTM Practicing qualified to the level they are assessing</p> <p>Amended profile as follows Must be <del>TTM</del> practicing qualified to the level they are assessing</p> <p><b>Neil's Comment</b> The Level 2-3 verifier is confirming all items in the verification closures have been carried out competently by the candidate as a probationary STMS. Also during this process a Level 2-3 STMS is required to take control of the closure if required. It is therefore prudent for the verifier to be a Level 2-3 STMS enabling them to carry out both roles as required by the assessment process.</p> <p>During the practical assessment there is a requirement for a backup Level 2-3 STMS to be part of the crew to take control if required therefore the assessor does not have to be a current Level 2-3 STMS.</p> <p>Also, assessors' are appointed recognising their in depth knowledge of the</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>expectations of the CoPTTM and the assessment process therefore it would be an added skill to be a Level 2-3 STMS though not imperative to the role of assessor.</p> <p><b>Stuart's decision</b> Actions as per Neil's comment</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
332.	ChCh	Dean Hurford	In terms of moderation could this be managed by the local "centres of excellence"? Contractors could help each other	This is a good idea for implementation	<p>This is a good idea for implementation NFA at this stage Neil's Comment COE concept was to assist CoPTTM trainers in their role. The expectation of COE being expanded to include 'management' of others is not conducive with that original concept. Also to indicate management of others introduces responsibilities that may not be advisable where there is not a direct worker/employer arrangement.</p>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken	
					Further discussion would be necessary with 'contractors' and 'management' providers before any suggested arrangement is entered into. Action NFA at this stage	
333.	PN	Tony Stella	Who is it for? Consider removing second paragraph	<b>Recommend amending profile to remove second para in the who is it for section</b>	Support recommendation. Also recommend that first paragraph be reworded, as currently somewhat confused with COPTTM Assessor role.	Actioned as per item 7 NFA
334.	PN	Ray Edwards	Records and qualifications - Will there be an online portal to capture "warrant" and "certificate" qualifications?	This is a good idea for implementation	Transferred to <b>Main decision list</b> above	Partially addressed in item 22 <b>Stuart's decision</b> We will investigate this – it sounds a good idea  <b>Actioned</b> Added the following to the model under <b>Considerations when developing the model</b> <b>Record of warrant and certificate qualifications</b> NZTA is to investigate the option of having an online

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>portal to allow for recording of candidate qualifications (warrants and certificates).</p> <p>There would still be a photo identification card (with a unique ID number) with an online record of the actual qualifications the candidate holds.</p> <p>This would reduce the need to reissue warrant cards as n every time a new warrant is gained.</p> <p><b>NFA</b></p>
335.	Auckland	Dave Tilton	Sort out this terminology – ‘verifier’ collects evidence but doesn’t assess. An assessor signs off. Match this to NZQA	Currently we use the term verifier to assess competence in level 2/3 practical assessment and the CoPTTM assessor checks this as well as completing an assessment of the person as well. We have used this as our model	<p><b>Support submission. Refer above. This profile (plus all) need to be sense-checked for inconsistencies / terminology that could cause confusion with other roles. As an example, in the Pass criteria section of this profile it says: Must meet assessor standards...</b></p> <p><b>Neil’s Comment</b> Existing system works. Verifier is not assessing but confirming process has been followed / completed prior to the practical assessment. Assessor assesses competence at the practical assessment time.</p> <p><b>Tony’s comment</b> Profile has been amended by Item 7 to read</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to STMS level 1 (includes TTM worker, TC &amp; STMS) a verifier</li> </ul>

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
					<p>determines whether the candidate is competent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At level 2/3, the verifier furnishes a statement of competence to a CoPTTM Assessor</li> </ul> <p><b>Stuart's Decision</b> Action as above notes <b>NFA</b></p>

## 20 - CoPTTM Assessor

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
336.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	No requirement to be a CoPTTM trainer first?	Agreed. Currently we have level 2/3 practical assessors who are not trainers	<p>NFA</p> <p>NFA Existing system works. Assessor is appointed recognising their in depth knowledge of the 'system' and as such would have similar skill sets to a trainer NFA</p>

## 21 - CoPTTM Trainer

Session	Submitter	Submission	Comment/recommendation	Working party decision	Action taken
337.	PN	Dominic DeGiorgio	Does this open the doors up to more level 2/3 trainers?	Possibly in the future	<p>Submission question is within scope of this project if it relates to competency within the system. ie is a lack of L2/3 trainers limiting competency? If so, then working group should consider how to enable a sufficient quantity of trainers to meet the need.</p> <p>Neil's Comment As the new model evolves there may be a requirement for more level 2/3 workshops. Where available courses do not meet demand existing trainers will be approached to increase their service provision to meet demand. Where this is not feasible there may be a requirement to appoint another trainer. NFA at this stage</p>
338.	Auckland	Elise Freeman	Flow chart: on the flow chart CoPTTM assessor is a prerequisite of a CoPTTM trainer	No. STMS is the prerequisite to the CoPTTM trainer. Agree that this could be made clearer on the map	<p>Support that flowchart should be clarified.</p> <p>Map of learning blocks revised Also added Matrix showing requirement for Warrant of overall competence (W) or Certificate of knowledge (Cert) NFA</p>



Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

339.		Simon Harty			Additional comments on the 'Pathways to NZTA warranted positions':	
					(i) 'Pathways to NZTA warranted positions' refers to 'competencies' in some places when what is actually meant is practical skills/abilities. Needs to be corrected to avoid confusion with overall competency, that is recognised by issue of warrant.	Pathways removed as replaced with Matrix showing requirement for Warrant of overall competence (W) or Certificate of knowledge (Cert) NFA
					(ii) Recommend that a note be added to most roles around specialist activity/equipment endorsements. In the base-level warrant is expected to be supplemented with specialist activity/equipment quals if specialist activity/equipment is utilised within the TTM plan.	Actioned NFA

Proposed Training and competency model - Consolidated feedback on discussion document

					<p>(iii) The Mentor profile says "Be a warranted STMS for the level of road", however this overlooks non-STMS roles eg TMP Designer. Recommend broadening wording to enable non-STMS Mentors.</p>	<p>Amended the profile as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Must be STMS qualified to the level of road they will be training for</del></li> </ul> <p>NFA</p>
					<p>(iv) Auditor profile says "Be a warranted STMS for the level of road", however requirement for practical skills component is TBC. Refer item 223 and others above.</p>	<p>Pathways removed as replaced with Matrix showing requirement for Warrant of overall competence (W) or Certificate of knowledge (Cert)</p> <p>NFA</p>

## Process to finalise model before submitting to CGG

- Training and competency model needs to be available 6 December (a week before CGG sees it)
- CGG meeting 13 Dec (Tom to present, Tom and Tony to work on CGG presentation)

Date	Action
25/9/17	Issue decisions from meeting (Tony)
26/9/17	Consolidated feedback sheet and action plan to working party
before 26/10/17	All consolidated feedback sheets completed by working party members to Tony by the 26 <sup>th</sup> October
26/10/17	Stuart/Neil/Tony - make decisions on feedback from working party and send out decisions for response by email
30/11/17	Revised Training and Competency model to working party members by 30 <sup>th</sup> November
4/12/17	Working party members final feedback on Revised Training and Competency model to working party members by 4 <sup>th</sup> December
6/12/17	Training and competency model finalised and sent to CGG members
13/12/17	CGG meeting (Tom to present training and competency model, Tony to support with preparing presentation)
14/12/17	CGG decision on training and competency model sent to working party members