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**Capability Agreement and Action Plan**

# Capability Agreement and Action Plan

The *Capability Agreement and Action Plan* is a self-assessment tool for RRTGs to plan and measure their capability levels and performance to identify opportunities for upskilling. The Alliance encourages RRTGs to think about where they would like to position themselves and develop actions accordingly.

The steps below are a guideline for setting out an RRTG's activities and actions for capability development and improvement.

## Step 1 – Capability level

* For each functional area identify the current and desired level of capability of the RRTG, noting there is no requirement for RRTGs to progress through the capability levels - refer **Attachment 1 Core Function Descriptors**.

## Step 2 – Training opportunities

* Where appropriate, identify actions, projects and/or training opportunities the RRTG would like to implement to improve staff capability.
* Nominate an individual person responsible for ensuring training opportunities are undertaken/completed in a timely manner.

## Step 3 – Approval

* Have the Technical Committee Chair and the RRTG Chair approve the Capability Agreement and Action Plan.
* Provide a copy of the endorsed Action Plan to your RTAPT representative.

## Step 4 – Review

* Regularly review progress at each RRTG and TC meeting, or as required.
* Annually assess the capability levels and update the Capability Agreement and Action Plan using the steps above.

**Capability Agreement and Action Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RRTG** |  | **Date of Review** |  |
| **RRTG Chair** |  | **Technical Committee Chair** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Asset Management** | | | | | | |
| **Current Capability Level** | **Desired Capability Level** | | **Action to improve capability** | **Responsible Officer** | **Timeframe** | **Progress/Review** |
|  |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Program Development** | | | | | | |
| **Current Capability Level** | | **Desired Capability Level** | **Action to improve capability** | **Responsible Officer** | **Timeframe** | **Progress/Review** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Safety** | | | | | | |
| **Current Capability Level** | | **Desired Capability Level** | **Action to improve capability** | **Responsible Officer** | **Timeframe** | **Progress/Review** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Joint Purchasing and Resource Sharing** | | | | | | |
| **Current Capability Level** | | **Desired Capability Level** | **Action to improve capability** | **Responsible Officer** | **Timeframe** | **Progress/Review** |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Attachment 1: Core function descriptors**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Asset management**  Consistency in asset management practices using minimum common datasets as described by Austroads, including:   * asset management systems and processes * condition, inspection and risk assessment data. | | |
| Level of Competence | Description for Level of competence | Suggested actions/training opportunities to improve capability |
| Low | * Councils are unable to upload AM data and produce reports * Asset data is outdated or of inadequate quality. * Not able to produce outputs for Program Development process * Not able to produce data reports | * Training in AM systems and data management * Bureau services to collect and manage data for councils * Restricted Access Vehicle Route Assessment Tool * ARRB Structures Information System (to enable more efficient and detailed data storage and assistance with management and maintenance of infrastructure) * Lab101 for Engineers Construction Materials testing workshop * Working Safely with Bitumen training * IPWEA Professional Certificate in Asset Management Planning * Road Pavement (Visual Assessment) Workshop * IPWEAQ Erosion and Sediment Control Training * AAPA Asphalt and Bitumen Training * Urban Stormwater training * Specification alignment/adaptation projects |
| Basic | * Most RRTG member councils can input and manage data * Road asset data is of adequate quality. * AM is occasionally discussed at Technical Committee meetings * Able to produce basic outputs for Program Development process * Able to produce data reports |
| Moderate | * All RRTG member councils have up-to-date and good quality AM data * AM data links to corporate and operational plans * RRTG regularly uses AM outputs in decision making * Technical Committee regularly discusses AM at meetings * Able to produce necessary outputs for Program Development process * Able to produce good quality data reports |
| High | * All RRTG member councils have well developed and comprehensive AM systems * AM is well linked in with corporate and operational plans * Data is collected for all asset classes * Asset data is high quality and regular data collections are scheduled * RRTG is planning to develop a regional AM strategy * RRTG consistently uses outputs for Program Development process * Able to produce high quality data reports |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program development**  Development of investment strategies based on the vision for the transport network and regional objectives.  Generating and prioritising projects for the RRTG’s regional works program, including strategic investment objectives, regional investment strategy, regional program prioritisation, four-year regional works program, strategies for delivery of the regional works program and risk management. | | |
| Level of Competence | Description for Level of competence | Suggested actions to improve capability |
| Low | * No Regional Investment Strategy in place. * LRRS network has not been reviewed in the last 12 months. * Not all LRRS roads have SOIs. * Funding allocation is divided between RRTG member councils. * There is no willingness to move resources across council boundaries. * Meetings are infrequent and there is no ongoing review of program delivery. | * Diploma of Local Government Administration (Asset Management) * IPWEA Professional Certificate in Asset Management Planning * Developing a regional transport plan for example, for airports |
| Basic | * The RRTG has a Regional Investment Strategy. * LRRS network has been reviewed in the last 12 months. * SOIs have been developed for all roads on the RRTG’s LRRS network. * The RRTG uses a prioritisation methodology to develop the works program. * Tech meeting are regular and there is some review of the works program. * Four (4) year works program is produced on time. |
| Moderate | * The RRTG has a Regional Investment Strategy in place. * RRTG is committed to determining regional priorities. * Works program is regionally prioritised. * RRTG regularly agrees to move funds and resources across boundaries. * There is a reasonable level of political ownership of the PD process. * Tech meetings are scheduled and works program is regularly reviewed. * Prioritised four (4) year works program is produced on time. |
| High | * The RRTG has a Regional Investment Strategy. * RRTG has a good knowledge of the LRRS network. * RRTG members work closely together to determine priorities – the works program is fully prioritised. * Asset data and road safety data is used to update investment strategies and to prioritise program. * Funds and resources are automatically shifted to the next agreed priority project when required. * A safety assessment has been performed on the LRRS network. * The progress of program delivery is regularly monitored. * Fully prioritised four (4) year works program is produced on time. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Safety**  Continual improvement of road safety on the Queensland road network, including:   * A comprehensive and collaborative approach to road safety * Road safety assessments * Targeting investment on roads for safety benefits * Assisting local government to meet their duty of care as a road authority. | | |
| Level of Competence | Description for Level of competence | Suggested actions to improve capability |
| Low | * There is limited understanding of road safety issues affecting the region. * There is no analysis of road crash data. * RRTG members do not use a road safety assessment tool. * There is no commitment to addressing regional road safety issues. | * Undertake a road safety audit * Training in basic road safety audits and data analysis * Developing a road safety partnership project * Traffic Management Design Course * IPWEA Supervisors Training * Traffic Signals Workshop * Road Safety Risk Manager licence renewal * Works Supervisor Training * Working Safely with Bitumen Training * IPWEAQ Supervisors and Foreman Workshop |
| Basic | * There is a basic understanding of road safety issues affecting the region and road safety is discussed at RRTG or technical meetings. * There has been some analysis of road crash data. * RRTG member councils perform road safety assessments. * The regional prioritisation processes addresses road safety issues. * There is some commitment to developing a RRTG approach to road safety. |
| Moderate | * There is a very good understanding of road safety and it is a key focus of the RRTG. * Road safety assessments are utilised to develop and prioritise the works program. * RRTG is committed to developing a road safety partnership approach. |
| High | * Road safety is fully integrated into RRTG business. * Road safety assessments are utilised in program. * There is a commitment by the RRTG to maintaining road safety data. * The RRTG works with all relevant stakeholders to develop road safety strategies based on research, analysis and community engagement. * RRTG is commitment to continuous improvement. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Joint purchasing and resource sharing**  Investigate opportunities for, and implement, joint purchasing of goods and services, including:   * sharing knowledge and experience with RRTG member councils, and other RRTGs * achieving better value for money, efficiency improvements and capability improvements for staff * reduction of risks by collaborating regionally. | | |
| Level of Competence | Description for Level of competence | Suggested actions to improve capability |
| Low | * RRTG is aware of the JP&RS framework but have not identified or investigated potential opportunities * JP&RS activities are not discussed at Tech Committee meetings * No JP&RS projects have been delivered or are planned for delivery | * Assistance to develop a JP&RS project * Native Title and Cultural Heritage Compliance training * Hire a Program Coordinator/Superintendent for Joint Bitumen Reseal Project * Hire a Joint Bitumen Reseal Asphalt Overlay Project Coordinator * Industry Workshop for Registered Engineers |
| Basic | * JP&RS is occasionally discussed at Tech Committee meetings * Some opportunities have been identified and some investigation has taken place, but no formal projects have been developed * There is some sharing of resources amongst RRTG members for example, plant or staff on an adhoc basis for special circumstances |
| Moderate | * JP&RS is regularly discussed at Tech Committee meetings. * There is a good understanding of the benefits of JP&RS. * RRTG has undertaken a formal JP&RS project. * There is commitment to investigate future projects. |
| High | * JP&RS strategy for RRTG has been developed. * RRTG is fully committed to exploring JP&RS potential. * JP&RS is standard practice. * JP&RS projects have been evaluated. * RRTG is exploring options with external councils and/or RRTGs to expand JP&RS potential. * Formal JP&RS projects have been successfully delivered and new projects are in the process of being developed. |