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# Introduction

This Issue of this handbook follows the discontinuance of the Area Performance Indicators. However we still require Service Providers to provide constructed scores for certain Aspects that sit within the MAC and ASC Performance Management Framework (PMF).

# MAC Service Provider Performance Management Framework

In 2010/11 the previous methods for monitoring our Service Provider performance were developed into a more useful performance management tool in the form of the Service Provider Performance Management Framework (PMF).

The PMF now gives us a standard approach to capturing performance data in order to achieve:

* Visibility of Service Provider performance
* Consistency in the data we capture on Service Provider performance
* Benchmarking of Service Provider performance results.

See the NDD PMF Methodology document and the MAC and ASC Performance Management Manuals for further details.

All the Constructed Provider Metrics are included in the MAC PMF and/or the ASC PMF.

# CONSTRUCTED PROVIDER METRICS (BY PMF ASPECT)

Details are now provided on the following CP Metrics, which relate to Aspects within the MAC PMF and/or ASC PMF.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metric subject** | **Contract applicable to** |
| Customer Complaints | MAC and ASC |
| Network Occupancy | ASC |
| QMS Performance and nonconformities | MAC and ASC |
| Third Party Claims | MAC and ASC |
| Response to Category 1 Defects | MAC |
| Lighting defects | MAC (Retrofit) and ASC |
| Sweeping and cleaning requirements | MAC (Retrofit) and ASC |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | | Complaints and enquiries are responded to promptly | | | | | | | | | |
| **Applies to** | | MAC and ASC | | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | | To measure the effectiveness of the Provider's response to complaints and enquiries received from the public and other stakeholders in relation to the operation of the Area Network and / or the Provider’s activities.  In particular this Aspect looks to measure whether providers are responding to enquiries and complaints within 10 working days, as described by the contract Service Information. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| C&E - Percentage | | Percent of complaints and enquiries (requiring a response within the month) responded to in writing within 10 working days | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Enquiry* | | Communication / correspondence received requesting information about the Area Network or the Provider’s services. | | | | | | | | | |
| *Complaint* | | Communication / correspondence received regarding the condition or performance of the Area Network or the Provider’s performance which is formally recorded as a dissatisfaction with the service provided. | | | | | | | | | |
| *Responded to* | | Actioning the initial complaint – must be a comprehensive reply detailing actions to be taken and timescales. | | | | | | | | | |
| *HAIL* | | Highways Agency Information Line | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | | Number of enquiries and complaints received by the Provider to include correspondence referred from HAIL and all other direct sources. Communications may be received in any form (i.e. telephone, email, letter, personal, etc.). Enquiries and complaints received that are not the responsibility of the Highways Agency or the Provider should not be reported. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | | Provider’s Customer Service logs / database | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** | | | | **Var** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | **Range** |
| Total number of complaints and enquiries requiring a written response within the month | | | | (A) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Total number of complaints and enquiries (requiring a response within the month) responded to in writing within 10 working days | | | | (B) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | **Target** | | |
| C&E - Percentage | Percentage | | (B/A) \*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | 100 | | |

| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | Network Occupancy | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies to** | | ASC | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | To ensure the Area Network is managed to secure the expeditious movement of traffic. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| Activities that adversely impact on road users | Number of Activities that caused unacceptable additional delay | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupancies that adversely impact on road users | Number of Occupancies that caused unacceptable additional delay | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Occupancy* | All works, all Abnormal Indivisible Load movements, all Incidents or all events that take place on the Area Network. | | | | | | | | | |
| *Activity* | An occurrence, including Events, off the Area Network that has the potential to adversely affect the road users of the Area Network. | | | | | | | | | |
| *Event* | A planned off Area Network event that has the potential to have an adverse effect on road users of the Strategic Road Network. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | The maximum additional delay over and above that typically expected on a given route, for a specific time of day, will be up to 15 minutes for Motorways, and up to 10 minutes for All Purpose Trunk Roads, providing that total delay does not exceed 30 minutes, and providing that the Occupancy/Activity conforms to other requirements for ‘acceptability’ contained within AMOR.  Levels of delay tolerance can be adjusted with the agreement of each Regional Operations Board to reflect their local network. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | Scheduled Road Works (SRW) system and/or Provider’s records in relation to network occupancy, incidents and Abnormal Loads. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** |  | | | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** |
| Number of Activities that caused unacceptable additional delay | (A) | | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Occupancies that caused unacceptable additional delay | (B) | | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | | **Target** | |
| Activities that adversely impact on road users | Integer | | A | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 | | 0 | |
| Occupancies that adversely impact on road users | Integer | | B | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 | | 0 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | | QMS Performance and nonconformities | | | | | | | | | |
| **Applies to** | | MAC and ASC | | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | | To measure the effectiveness of the provider’s Quality Management System and the close-out of nonconformities within the agreed timescales. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| QMS Performance | | Maximum number of Quality Management Points in last rolling three months | | | | | | | | | |
| Quality Warning Notice | | Quality Warning Notice issued or in effect in last rolling three months | | | | | | | | | |
| QMS Non Conformities | | Maximum number of Quality Management Points in last rolling three months in relation to nonconformities | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Quality Management System* | | Organisational structure, procedures, processes and resources needed to implement quality management. | | | | | | | | | |
| *Quality Management Points (QMPs)* | | If the Provider fails to comply with his quality management system (including the failure to correct nonconformities in the agreed timescales), the Provider accrues Quality Management Points in line with the Quality Table in Contract Data Section 4. | | | | | | | | | |
| *QMPs in relation to non-conformities* | | Those QMPs described in rows 3 to 6 in the MAC quality table (rows 3 to 7 in the ASC quality table). | | | | | | | | | |
| *Nonconformity* | | A nonconformity refers to a failure to comply with requirements. A requirement is a need, expectation, or obligation. It can be stated or implied by an organisation, its customers, or other interested parties. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | | Count the QMPs accrued against the Provider over the last rolling three months. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | | Provider’s QMP log. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** | | | | **Var** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | **Range** |
| Maximum number of Quality Management Points in last rolling three months | | | | (A) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Quality Warning Notice issued or in effect in last rolling three months | | | | (B) | Boolean | |  | | | - | Y/N |
| Maximum number of Quality Management Points in last rolling three months in relation to nonconformities | | | | (C) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | **Target** | | |
| QMS Performance | Integer | | A | | | 0 | | 0 - 500 | <= 25 | | |
| Quality Warning Notice | Boolean | | B | | | - | | Y/N | N | | |
| QMS Non Conformities | Integer | | C | | | 0 | | 0 - 500 | <= 15 | | |

| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | | Handling Third Party Claims | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies to** | | MAC and ASC | | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | | To measure the effectiveness of the Provider’s handling of Third Party Claims on behalf of the Secretary of State. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 1 | | Percentage of TR430s issued to SM within 28 day deadline as per Annex 23.3.3 | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 2 | | Percentage of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, for which a comprehensive estimate of cost of repair has been supplied | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 3 | | Percentage of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, where full details of the driver responsible have been provided to HA in accordance with Annex 23.3.1 | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 4 | | Percentage of claims where deviation between estimated cost of repair in the original TR430 vs. final cost submitted is within 20% | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 5 | | Percentage of claims where the estimated cost of repair is above the threshold but the final cost is below the threshold | | | | | | | | | |
| DCP Metric 6 | | Percentage of revenue from under threshold claims compared to target | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *TR430* | | This form must be used when reporting damage to Crown Property under the provisions of circular 630, Circular Roads 4/75 and TRMM 2/87 on behalf of the Secretary of State (Green Claims) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | | These measures look at the Green Claims processed by the Provider. | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number of TR430s submitted to the Service Manager (in calendar month) | | Includes all TR430s which are required to be submitted to Service Manager as per Annex 23. This metric measures the total amount of TR430s submitted to the Service Manager in the calendar month being reported. For example, TR430s submitted from 1 May - 31 May should be reported in June’s CP Spreadsheet (by COP WD7). | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number of TR430s submitted to Service Manager within 28 day deadline | | For all TR430s which are required to be submitted to Service Manager as per Annex 23. This metric details how many of the TR430s submitted in the calendar month were submitted within the 28day deadline, as per Annex 23. Any TR430s submitted after this deadline will count as a late TR430s against this metric. | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, for which a comprehensive estimate of cost of repair has been supplied | | In line with common cost control techniques, having a detailed cost estimate for a scheme is key to a strong cost control approach.  This metric measures the amount of TR430s submitted within the 28 day deadline (DCP Metric 1) which also include a comprehensive estimate of cost of repair.  A comprehensive cost estimate must be provided in a separate document to the TR430, with the precise estimated figure also appearing in the Estimated Costs section of Part 8 of the TR430. The TR430 has the capability to have a precise figure (for example £26,782.20) typed into the Estimated Costs section of Part 8, instead of using the pay bands.  If either of these two items (separate document or precise figure on TR430) are missing, this will be seen as a failure against this metric. | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, where full details of the driver responsible have been provided to HA in accordance with Annex 23.3.1 | | Having the responsible driver's details significantly aids completing a successful claim.  This metric measures the amount of TR430s submitted within the 28 day deadline (DCP Metric 1) which also include full details of the driver responsible.  Full details include providing the name, address, vehicle particulars (registration, make and model) and insurance details (name and address) of the driver responsible. This must be entered in Section 14a of the TR430. Failing to provide any of these pieces of information will be seen as a failure against this metric.  Note: If the driver does not have insurance details or is uninsured, please indicate this in Section 14a of the TR430. | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of claims where final costs have been submitted in this calendar month | | This is the total number of approved final cost packages/final accounts submitted within the calendar month. | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of claims where deviation between estimated cost of repair in the original TR430 vs. final cost submitted is within 20% | | For each calendar month, any final costs that were submitted for a claim are compared to the original estimated cost for the same claim which was received with the original TR430.  Where possible, the original TR430 estimate figure should be the precise figure; if this has not been made clear in older TR430s, or is not otherwise available, the pay band can be used. A success occurs when the deviation between final cost and original estimate is within 20% (i.e. final cost/estimated cost is between 0.8 and 1.2)  **Example 1** (original estimate was a precise figure)  If final costs were £21,785 and the original TR430 estimate was £26,000, this is within the 20% (final cost/estimate = 21,785/26,000 = 0.84 = Pass).  **Example 2** (original estimate used a pay band)  If final costs were £26,785 and the original TR430 estimate was £5,000 - £20,000, then as long as the deviation between the final cost and the closest maximum/minimum boundary is less than 20% this is a positive result (final cost/estimate = 26,785/20,000 = 1.34 = Fail).  This metric will look to move to a rolling 3 month measure once enough data is available | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of claims where the estimated cost of repair in original TR430 is above the threshold but the final cost submitted is below the threshold | | This metric uses the threshold which was in place at the time the TR430 was submitted to the Service Manager. | | | | | | | | | |
| Target DCP revenue/recovery (under threshold claims) for calendar month as per Annual Plan | | Each Service Provider should have submitted an Annual Plan as per CMM 02/11, which details their expected revenue from DCP recovery (under threshold) | | | | | | | | | |
| Actual DCP revenue/recovery (under threshold claims) achieved for the calendar month | | This is revenue which was actually received from DCP recovery (under threshold) in the calendar month.  This percentage will vary from month to month, therefore this metric will look to move to a rolling 3 month measure once enough data is available. | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of revenue from under threshold claims compared to target | | This metric is included as a form of governance and control for the newly introduced thresholds. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | | Provider’s Green Claims Records; Provider’s Annual Plan | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** | | | | **Var** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | **Range** |
| Total number of TR430s submitted to the Service Manager (in calendar month) | | | | (A) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Total number of TR430s submitted to Service Manager within 28 day deadline | | | | (B) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Number of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, for which a comprehensive estimate of cost of repair has been supplied | | | | (C) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Number of TR430s submitted in calendar month within 28 day deadline, where full details of the driver responsible have been provided to HA in accordance with Annex 23.3.1 | | | | (D) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Number of claims where final costs have been submitted in this calendar month | | | | (E) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Number of claims where deviation between estimated cost of repair in the original TR430 vs. final cost submitted is within 20% | | | | (F) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Number of claims where the estimated cost of repair in original TR430 is above the threshold but the final cost submitted is below the threshold | | | | (G) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 500 |
| Target DCP revenue/recovery (under threshold claims) for calendar month as per Annual Plan | | | | (H) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 100000 |
| Actual DCP revenue/recovery (under threshold claims) achieved for the calendar month | | | | (I) | Integer | |  | | | 0 | 0 – 100000 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | **Target** | | |
| DCP Metric 1 | Percentage | | (B/A)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | >= 95 | | |
| DCP Metric 2 | Percentage | | (C/B)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | >= 95 | | |
| DCP Metric 3 | Percentage | | (D/B)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | None at present | | |
| DCP Metric 4 | Percentage | | (F/E)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | None at present | | |
| DCP Metric 5 | Percentage | | (G/E)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | None at present | | |
| DCP Metric 6 | Percentage | | (I/H)\*100 | | | 2 | | 0 – 3000 | None at present | | |

| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | Response to Category 1 Defects | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies to** | MAC | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | To measure the efficiency of the Provider’s response to Category 1 defects. The Provider should manage resources and programme to ensure all Category 1 defects are responded to within the maximum response times defined in the Contract. In meeting these targets, danger to the public will be minimised and further deterioration of the defect will be avoided | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** |  | | | | | | | | |
| IR01(M) | Percentage of Category 1 defects made safe or repaired within the 24 hour response time | | | | | | | | |
| IR02(M) | Percentage of Category 1 defects repaired within the 7 day response time | | | | | | | | |
| IR03(M) | Percentage of Category 1 defects repaired within the 28 day response time | | | | | | | | |
| IR04(M) | Average time (in days) for repair of Category 1 defects within the 7 day response time category | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** |  | | | | | | | | |
| *Category 1 defect* | As defined in the RWSC 2.1.1. | | | | | | | | |
| *Repair(ed)* | Repair is as defined under the Area contract | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | IR04(M) is reported as the average repair time in days. This is to include only those Category 1 defects requiring a 7 day response time and applies to all in-month repairs irrespective of the required completion date. | | | | | | | | |
|  | A defect is deemed to fall within a month if its required completion date falls within the month. | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | Provider’sRMMS database / works order system. | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** |  | | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** |
| Number of Cat 1 “24 hour” defects with required completion date / time within month | (A) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Cat 1 “24 hour” defects closed by required completion date / time in month. | (B) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Cat 1 “7 Day” defects with required completion date / time within month | (C) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Cat 1 “7 Day” defects closed by required completion date / time in month. | (D) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Cat 1 “28 Day” defects with required completion date / time within month | (E) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Number of Cat 1 “28 Day” defects closed by required completion date / time in month. | (F) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Total repair time in days for Cat 1 “7 Day” defects closed in month (irrespective of required completion date). | (G) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 21000 |
| Number of Cat 1 "7 Day" defects closed in month (irrespective of required completion date). | (H) | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 3000 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | | **Target** | |
| IR01(M) | Percentage | (B/A)\*100 | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | TBC | |
| IR02(M) | Percentage | (D/C)\*100 | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | TBC | |
| IR03(M) | Percentage | (F/E)\*100 | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | TBC | |
| IR04(M) | Number | G/H | | 2 | | 0 – 25 | | TBC | |

| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | Make safe defects: Lighting | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies to** | | MAC (Retrofit) and ASC | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | To measure the Provider’s ability to provide appropriate lighting for the Area network. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting Metric 1 | Max. number of sequential lamp failures | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting Metric 2 | Max. number of failures per number of consecutive lamps | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting Metric 3 | Rectification rate within 7 days | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Defect* | A Defect to the asset is that it:  • Causes an unintended hazard, nuisance or danger to the users of the  Highway  • Represents a deterioration from the normal condition  • Prevents an item from acting in the intended manner  • Is damaged  • Is likely to increase the rate of deterioration of another item | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | AMOR Part 8 Deliverable 14 Performance Metrics under (b) During operation of Greenwich Mean Time and (c) During operation of British Summer Time should be applied | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Lamp scouts should take place the last full week of April, August, October, November, December, January and February. Therefore we expect this Aspect to be scored for each of those months; otherwise score N/A. Although 7 day rectifications may fall into the following month, the performance should be scored against the month that the lighting scout took place. Results should be available before the deadline to submit PMF scores to the AMO Performance Team. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | Provider’s inventory database and lamp scout/inspection records | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** |  | | | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** |
| Max. number of sequential lamp failures | (A) | | | Integer | |  | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 |
| Max. number of failures per number of consecutive lamps | (B) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Rectification rate within 7 days | (C) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | | **Target** | |
| Lighting Metric 1 | Integer | | A | | 0 | | 0 – 1000 | | <= 2 | |
| Lighting Metric 2 | Percentage | | B | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | <= 30 | |
| Lighting Metric 3 | Percentage | | C | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |

| **Indicator Ref. & Title** | Sweeping and cleaning requirements undertaken (Litter) | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies to** | | MAC (Retrofit) and ASC | | | | | | | | |
| **Purpose / Description** | The ensure the Area Network is predominantly free from litter, refuse and detritus; Amenity facilities are safe and serviceable; The functionality of the Area Network is not impeded by litter, debris, refuse,  detritus or animal carcasses; Offensive graffiti is managed to ensure that the adverse impact on road users of the Area Network is minimised. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measures** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 1 | Paved Areas (Carriageway, paved verges and paved central  reservations of motorways and APTRs) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade A from grade B or C within 28 days | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 2 | Paved Areas (Carriageway, paved verges and paved central  reservations of motorways and APTRs) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade A from grade D within 7 days | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 3 | Paved Areas (motorway and APTR roundabouts and lay-bys, approach  and slip roads) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade A from grade B or C within 14 days | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 4 | Paved Areas (motorway and APTR roundabouts and lay-bys, approach  and slip roads) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade A from grade D within 7 days | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 5 | Other parts of the Area Network (non paved) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade B from grade C within 28 days | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter 6 | Other parts of the Area Network (non paved) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where affected area restored to grade B from grade D within 7 days | | | | | | | | | |
| **Definitions** |  | | | | | | | | | |
| *Grades A – D* | As defined in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methodology** | Refer to AMOR Part 15 to understand what elements of sweeping and cleaning are in and out of scope. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Source / Requirements** | Provider’s inspection and sweeping and cleaning records | | | | | | | | | |
| **Data Input** (Frequency / Reporting Period: Calendar month) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Field** |  | | | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** |
| Paved Areas (Carriageway, paved verges and paved central  reservations of motorways and APTRs) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade A from grade B or C within 28 days | (A) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Paved Areas (Carriageway, paved verges and paved central  reservations of motorways and APTRs) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade A from grade D within 7 days | (B) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Paved Areas (motorway and APTR roundabouts and lay-bys, approach  and slip roads) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade A from grade B or C within 14 days | (C) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Paved Areas (motorway and APTR roundabouts and lay-bys, approach  and slip roads) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade A from grade D within 7 days | (D) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Other parts of the Area Network (non paved) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade B from grade C within 28 days | (E) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| Other parts of the Area Network (non paved) – Percentage of litter clean-ups where Area Network restored to grade B from grade D within 7 days | (F) | | | Percentage | |  | | 2 | | 0 – 100 |
| **Calculations** (Individual Monthly Performance) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measure** | **Type** | | **Calculation** | | **Decimals** | | **Range** | | **Target** | |
| Litter 1 | Percentage | | A | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |
| Litter 2 | Percentage | | B | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |
| Litter 3 | Percentage | | C | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |
| Litter 4 | Percentage | | D | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |
| Litter 5 | Percentage | | E | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |
| Litter 6 | Percentage | | F | | 2 | | 0 – 100 | | 100 | |