

Submissions

Organisation	Submission Type	Code Clause	NZUAG Code Review Submissions October 2022 Issue Description	Proposed New Wording/ Change	Impact on Code	Impact on CM's or UO's	Any other Comments	Review Team Commentary	Effect on Code	Accept/Reject/Modify
Waipa District Council	amendment		While undertaking works to the requirements of the code is generally fine on local authority roads, works on state highways have a higher standard that is not reflected in the code and which is instead found across several other documents. The code should be the one stop shop for the requirements of working in the transport corridor and should detail the different requirements for working on different types of roads. NOC contractors set additional requirements for works in state highways and they are generally not accepting of the reinstatement methodologies detailed in the code, though I am not sure if this is because the reinstatement standards in the code are deficient in some way or if the NOC contractors are just unfamiliar with the code. Reinstatement guidelines in the code should include a standard for works on state highways that will be acceptable. This may mean that there are different levels of reinstatement requirements, depending on the level of importance of a road that is being worked on, both on state highways and local authority roads. Depth requirements are another area where Waka Kotahi has different requirements to the code. The highway manual states that the minimum depth is 1.5m under the carriageway and shoulder and 1m under the berm, while the code requires that the depth of cover be decided by agreement between the utility provider and RCA. If Waka Kotahi is unwilling to bring their requirements in line with the code then their requirements should be included in the code, along with guidance on what to do where their requirements are impracticable (such as when new services are required to be connected to existing services that do not meet their requirements).	Issue addressed to provide certainty and clarity to all parties. Should also the One Network Framework be incorporated into the code to allow for the road function/criticality to be appropriately considered irrespective of who is managing it?	Greater clarity for all parties	Reduce conflict, reduce delays on processing, increase transparency of requirements (further background on specific situation available if required - refer James McKinnon (Waipa DC) or Danielle Ogle (Waka Kotahi NOC Contract Corridor Manager))		WK needs to be clear with its agents that their behaviours should be consistent with the Code in accordance with Section 2.2.5.	no change	Accept
Orion Networks	amendment	Fig 4.3	Process for Railway Corridor Access Orion would like the timeframes for Kiwirail to complete a Deed of Grant application and access permit to be added and reflected in the flow chart currently within the Code	Deed of Grant processing and approving timeframe. Access permit processing and approving timeframe.	It would provide clarity throughout NZ and define expectation to all users of the Code	Under 4.9.6 it references response time of 30 days but this leads to delays as you don't know the processing time. Having a clear timeframe will help Utility operators to plan more accurately and not incur delay costs		While there is a statutory response timeframe, the Code cannot mandate the ability of the applicant to seek a definite timeframe to do work or override the requirements of the Railways Act re access to rail.	no change	Accept
Manawatu & Rangitikei District Councils	amendment	5.6.4	Specific Requirements for Different Surface Types	4. Chip seal Carriageways must: a) be specifically designed and constructed to restore the structural integrity of the original pavement, a 2 coat chip seal is often insufficient; and b) have reinstatement details approved by the Corridor Manager	immediate	90% request this standard now		Make amendment in line with pt 4 in commentary Make clear that issue is around improving the process to seek improved outcomes, rather than dealing with matters at end of construction	change	Accept
Manawatu & Rangitikei District Councils	addition	8.2.2	Key Performance Data - Utility Damage Develop an app that can take a photo immediately and send to Utility owner & NZUAG of strikes or hits that have occur		ASAP	Data collected as damage occurs Some now but a sewer lateral many months later		Would be good to have, but development of an app not on NZUAG work programme. Wider issue of reporting 3 rd party damage important. Not an issue for the Code itself	no change	Outside scope
Manawatu & Rangitikei District Councils	amendment	4.9.7	Fees and charges imposed by the Railway Corridor Manager are subject to any relevant historical agreements which establish an existing charge for access, and section 35(5) of the NZCA and section 75(7) of the Railways Act which provide that rights granted to public bodies at level crossings must be at nominal rental.	Too messy. An easy form for Road Controlling Authorities to fill out and be approved immediately with the local Rail Engineer at no costs. Road Controlling Authorities do not charge Kiwirail	Easier for us to work in the Road Corridor			Not a code issue, as would require other legislative change that is beyond our mandate	no change	Outside scope
Manawatu & Rangitikei District Councils	addition		Car Manager & Traffic Management Coordinator Same person with two important roles - This requires training & workshops Both Thinkjet - SUBMITICA & BeforeUdig - are huge players here that must agree to joint WORKSHOPS					Note a Code issue. The Code is clear as to duties of parties and it is a matter of the CM following the requirements and delivering required outcomes. NZUAG currently looking to develop an on-line training course that may assist in some of these matters.	no change	Outside scope
Manawatu & Rangitikei District Councils	comment						Great work Ian & Nick. Please stay on lan we need you. RIMs was a dead lost this year for UTILITIES & Road Controlling Authorities - Only one person Dawn Inglis. Tracy Bell was there but not now on your Board but a great person for us. As the same time there was a Traffic Management Conference in Rotorua Dawn was brilliant through - she was superb	Not a Code issue. RIMS needs to be effective if we are to continue to use it as part of our Code education.	no change	Outside scope
Hamilton City Council	amendment		The code currently says assets are to be future proofed but also says "must" be as small as possible. The problem here is in case's like in Auckland were the zoning changes, what was future proofed waste water, is now not enough. I think it should have an allowance range like 10-20% to allow for zone changes and growth, E.g apartments being built over an existing house etc.					Current statement is little blunt. What is trying to be achieved is limiting footprint to maximise availability of space for all parties. Could provide greater clarity in Code wording around future proofing	change	modify
NZTA	legislation		I was on the NZUAG Board in 2014. We were discussing enforcement issues back then, and I noted during the webinar today comments such as "Behaviours that led to poor location data are little changed 10 years later". Therefore I strongly urge the NZUAG Board: * To arrange for the legislation behind the Code to be changed to become enforceable, and, * For some asset owners to be made examples of by being taken to court and prosecuted for not having accurate as-built and data available. As discussed, all asset owners have had 10 years to improve locational data. Any asset owners that have a data improvement plan that is in progress (e.g. stormwater owners such as Councils) should not be made examples of. However, fibre and energy companies have no excuse. They are full commercial entities and should be able to fund the provision of good asset data as part of the cost of providing their services					Not a Code issue. Requires education leading to a change in culture. Note that if all the data that is provided to the UO is a "point in space" it is not always a useful outcome for recording purposes. Allowing another UO to have site access to do further investigations can be problematical within tight time frames.	no change	reject
Christchurch City Council	amendment	5.	Requirement to bandage minimum 100mm width, waterproof joints, seal and/or fill cracks needs to be reinstated into Chapter 5 of the National Code. It should be requirement and not introduced as any condition					The comment in section 5 was at a generic level. This is covered by section 5.6.4.3b of the Code which provides commentary on the process to be followed.	no change	reject
Chorus	addition	4.5.	Understanding the difference of General, Local and Special conditions Many councils create local conditions where they are duplicates of General or special conditions which are not CAR specific but rather utilised across a region or township. When local conditions duplicate what are already in general, and Specials never change from site to site, it creates misunderstandings of what can be done. Additional guidance or training will generate a better understanding of when to apply conditions, will reduce the amount of conditions and will be easier for contractors to follow	NZUAG undertake some training to educate the intent of the conditions (online?)				Improving Code education is a major focus for NZUAG, with work taking place on development of an on-line training course.	no change	Outside scope
Chorus	amendment	4.3.1.3	Global CAR's - limitations and impacts of not having one Over time RCA's are reducing the scope of works allowed in a Global CAR. While the Code currently excludes Project and Major works, suggesting Minor works would be included where works are broadly similar in nature and scope, for Utilities this is not being applied as we understood it was intended. Globals provide a benefit to all parties by reducing the amount of work in the CAR process and allowing Utilities to undertake work without undue delay.	Change wording from may agree to must agree allowing Utilities to undertake the minor work scope as intended by the incorporation of Globals in the Code. Addition in 4.3.1 (3) d) fit the definition and scope of minor works. We also recommend in line with this enhancing the Minor Works scope to more than the current description				Global CARs seen as useful and beneficial. Problems arise where TMP provisions cannot be easily transferred between sites.	no change	Reject
Chorus	amendment	6.4d	Understanding of betterment Differing interpretations of betterment between Utilities and RCAs creates a challenge to the completion of works	Either adding a definition of betterment E.G. Betterment: where works would be considered an improvement to an asset to the benefit of one party over another or; in 6.4 (d) provide guidance on what would be considered undue benefit to an asset.				In some cases improvements are required where existing materials can not be sourced, and improved ones are the only ones available. This is allowed for in some of the legislation. Could look to introducing a definition of betterment - incorporate in dictionary definition. On balance the review team thought it better to not add a definition at this stage, as not clear what would be most appropriate.	no change	Reject
Chorus	amendment	4.3.1	Kiwi Rail processing times Processing times from Kiwirail for Permits and Grants range from 2 to 6 months as an average	Utilities would benefit from a review of the ability to work near the rail corridor. Currently there is an issue of needing permits to work within 100 metres of the tracks themselves and while it is understandable there is a priority to safety and certain criteria must be met, it would be considered reasonable to allow a closer area of work where we have existing network				We understand the problem and are sympathetic about it, but cannot deal with it through the Code. It should be noted that these issues have been raised directly with Kiwirail for their consideration.	no change	Outside scope
Chorus	Issues Paper		Utility Strikes Utility strikes greatly concern Chorus, the impact of a strike on our network has little if no effect on the users, however the effect on those affected (the users of the Utility) could be significant. Chorus supports the findings of the recent Strike reduction working Group and would like to see more focus here from the NZUAG					Note the comment and agree with the sentiment. Will look for more definite ways to approach that might be able to be used by the review.	no change	Accept
Chorus	Issues Paper		Code Reporting Chorus does not believe the current reporting metrics provide any value to the industry and recommend, in regards to Utility metrics, that alignment with the Utility Strike Avoidance Group or similar					Agree with the approach and look at the recommendations from the Working Group.	no change	Accept
Chorus	Issues Paper		Conflict of Interest Statements Conflict of Interest management should be reported on a regular basis, not through a one off statement					Suggest a change in line with the NZUAG issues paper.	change	Accept
Chorus	Issues Paper		Accuracy of As-built Data Chorus supports the principle of introducing minimum standards in accordance with LINZ Utility Location Standard					Improvements in technology could now allow for the introduction of a mandatory standard for consideration.	change	Accept
Chorus	Issues Paper		Code Effectiveness Chorus supports the priorities of education, but believes that the board should look to progress more of these recommendations, including the service strike reduction					Point noted.	no change	Outside scope

Organisation	Submission Type	Code Clause	NZUAG Code Review Submissions October 2022 Issue Description	Proposed New Wording/ Change	Impact on Code	Impact on CM's or UO's	Any other Comments	Review Team Commentary	Effect on Code	Accept/ Reject/ Modify
Chorus	Issues Paper		Improving the Value of NZUAG The NZUAG does provide value, however this value does not show any recognisable difference between members and non-members. To increase value mandatory membership could be introduced and this could be based on customer base					There is an issue with making this change to the Code without provisions in other controlling documentation for enforcement in particular.	no change	Outside scope
Chorus	Issues Paper		Changes to CoPTTM A mechanism for recognises NZGTTM needs to be introduced into the Code, while NZGTTM is not yet been introduced completely, it will have been before the next Code review	Where CoPTTM is add NZGTTM 4.3.3.1.a.i, iv, 4.3.3.2, 5.6.3.3.f, Schedule D				Agree to confirm references and make appropriate Code changes	change	Accept
Chorus	comment						In general the code provides good guidance for working in the road corridor and for ensuring all parties have a point of reference for clarifying any issue which may arise. Examples: 5.5: Trenching procedures have good details giving good guidance 5.6: Improved diagrams have assisted with better understanding of requirement	Thank you	no change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	Definitions	Priority 1: defining what a strike is and including an aspirational goal or target for reductions	Service Strike impacting an Underground asset which may or may not meet the definition of Third Party Damage.	Add a definition for Service Strikes			Accept the proposed definition, but may need tweaking. Could be extended to include above ground assets.	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8.1	Priority 1: defining what a strike is and including an aspirational goal or target for reductions	2.8.1 Maintaining and Providing Information on Utility Structures ... Poor data on location of Utility Structures in Transport Corridors is contributing to an unnecessary level of Service Strikes and Third Party Damage, additional costs and la...	Add wording in relation to Service Strikes			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	8.2.2	Priority 1: defining what a strike is and including an aspirational goal or target for reductions	8.2.2 Key Performance Data The following key performance measures for the Code must be recorded and certified as correct by Corridor Managers as at 30 June of each year and reported to NZUAG: a) The number of CARs submitted each year. b) The number of completed Works Completion Notices received each year. c) The number of non-contact notices issued each year. Utility Operators and Corridor Managers must record and certify as correct the number of known Service Strikes as well as Utility Operators recording Third Party Damages on their asset incidents identified as at 30 June each year and report this information to the NZUAG. The format for recording Service Strikes is noted in Schedule A Forms, A16	Add wording to support Service Strike definition and ensure all parties to the Code had a requirement to report on them, also provide a format for reporting			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	8.2.3	Priority 1: defining what a strike is and including an aspirational goal or target for reductions	8.2.3 Information Reporting NZUAG must: a) aggregate performance information on a national basis and report this to the NZUAG members, the industry sectors and to the Government; and b) analyse the performance on an ongoing basis, to identify whether Code compliance, operational understanding or the quality control process needs attention and whether any amendments to the Code are necessary. c) provide reporting on how the industry in tracking towards Zero Service Strikes in 2050	Add wording to ensure NZUAG focus on Service Strikes			agree with minor change from commentary replacing "...in tracking..." to "...is tracking..."	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	2.8 Sharing Information 2.8.1 Maintaining and Providing Information on Utility Structures Each Party should must try to manage its documents in an electronic format capable of being exchanged with other Utility Operators and Corridor Managers, or set out in its Data Improvement Plan how it will transition to this.	Add wording to introduce concept of Data Improvement Plan - to improve records			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8.1 f	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	1. Each Utility Operator must, in respect of existing Utility Structures: a) hold records of the nature and location of its existing Utility Structures in each Transport Corridor, where known; b) advise the Corridor Manager of the presence (not detailed location) of its Utility Structures in each Transport Corridor within the Corridor Manager's territory as soon as practicable from the commencement of the Code; c) provide to a requesting Party such level of detail as to location as is available to the Utility Operator; d) ensure the information supplied is as accurate as reasonably possible; and e) supply technical assistance, to a Party planning Works, for locating Utility Structures where reasonable and appropriate. f) maintain a Data Improvement Plan aligned with: • supporting industry Service Strike aspirations set out in clause 8.2.3.c; • describing in a quantifiable way how legacy information will be upgraded to Utility Location Standard 2022; • providing mitigation strategies where it is not practicable to meet Utility Location Standard 2022; and shared at Liaison meetings.	Further define Data Improvement Plan			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8.1.2d	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	2. Corridor Managers must: a) provide an appropriate process for capturing the information from Section 2.8.1.1(b); b) provide, on request by any Utility Operator, advice as to what Transport Corridor, Utility Structures and Works notified under Sections 2.7 and 4.3 are likely to be in the area of, and affected by, proposed Works; and c) provide, on request by any Utility Operator, advice on usage patterns in the Transport Corridor and on nearby Roads (to the extent known); d) maintain a Data Improvement Plan aligned with: • supporting industry Service Strike aspirations set out in clause 8.2.3.c; • how legacy information will be upgraded to Utility Location Standard 2022 • providing mitigation strategies where it is not practicable to meet Utility Location Standard 2022 and shared at Liaison meetings.	Ensure requirements are aligned with Utilities			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	amendment	2.8.1.4	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	Removed 4 to enable introduction of location standard	Removed 4 to enable introduction of location standard			agree	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8.1.4	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	4. Information that the Utility Operator captures on the location of new and exposed Utility Structures should be accurate enough to enable future location and identification of the Utility Structures. The Utility Operator must ensure accuracy for new location data to meet Utility Locations Standard 2022.	Introduced Location standard			agree, with the proposed amendment	change	Accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.8.2c	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	2.8.2 Verifying Asset Information during Works Where a Utility Operator finds a new or changed location for its own Utility Structures, it must: a) confirm or amend the location of its own existing Utility Structures in its records; and b) add any previously unknown Utility Structures to its own records. If a Utility Operator finds a Utility Structure is not shown, or shown inaccurately on the plan, the requirements of Section 5.2.2 apply. c) where it is not practicable to amend its records, contribute to the management of a publicly available GIS database which allows the recording of this information and subsequent retrieval at no cost to the users, this should be set out in the Utility Operator's data improvement plan. 2.8.1.1, and done in conjunction with Corridor Managers obligations set out in 2.8.7 (no this is 2.8.2 and it doesn't mention the CM so does it mean 2.2.2)	Provided a platform for a shared platform of information and funding		This is aspirational, and so may be to early to introduce into the Code at this point in time. Suggest that should be introduced to industry as a future direction to consider, but such a change would require industry to be brought fully on board.	no change	Reject	
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	5.2.2b	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	5.2.2 Finding Unmarked Assets owned by Others Where a Party or its agent locates or exposes assets not shown (or shown inaccurately) on any plan: a) the Party must notify the owner of that asset of the true location, and the owner of that asset must amend its records and notify the Corridor Manager accordingly; or b) upload the information to a publicly available GIS database which allows the recording of this information and subsequent retrieval at not cost to the users; or c) if the Utility Operator is unidentified, the Party must notify the Corridor Manager and the Corridor Manager must promptly try to identify and notify the Utility Structure's existence and location to the owner; and d) the Party that owns that Utility Structure must promptly provide any assistance reasonably required.	Put a requirement to upload information to the shared platform			This is aspirational, and so may be to early to introduce into the Code at this point in time. Suggest that should be introduced to industry as a future direction to consider, but such a change would require industry to be brought fully on board.	no change	Reject
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	5.2.2	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	During underground Work, the Utility Operator should and Corridor Manager must: a) make allowance for unforeseen delays due to the discovery of unmarked or unknown Utility Structures; and b) assume that there is a field (subsoil) drain located under all kerbs or water channels, at a depth of up to 1 m (these are not normally marked on plans).	Replicated requirement onto the Corridor Manager and changed it to mandatory			This is aspirational, and so may be to early to introduce into the Code at this point in time. Suggest that should be introduced to industry as a future direction to consider, but such a change would require industry to be brought fully on board. Might also cut across the contract provisions for change.	no change	Reject
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	6.4	Priority 2: transparency and access to data	6.4 Guidance for Arriving at Agreements outside the Legislative Provisions This Section applies to Road Corridors to assist the Parties in reaching their own cost share agreements. The principle applied in s 6.2.1.1 should also apply to the protection of assets and the supervision of work around existing assets. In most cases where Utility Structures are located in the Road Corridor, the principle of 'Causar Pays' applies in that the costs arising from an action should generally be met by the Party causing that cost to be incurred. However, there are legislated exceptions as noted in Section 6.2 above. Moreover, sometimes the legislative prescription may not be sufficiently comprehensive or refined to deal adequately with the ongoing relationship between a Utility Operator and a Corridor Manager, or a specific project. Sometimes the legislation (see section 33(5) of the Electricity Act, section 34(5) of the Gas Act and section 147(6)(5) of the Telecommunications Act) allows for parties to reach other agreements. While the provisions set out in the legislation prevail, the principles and ideas in this Section might be helpful in developing any agreements between Corridor Managers and Utility Operators. Also, where existing cost allocation arrangements conflict with legislative provisions or there are historical issues relating to cost allocation, parties are encouraged to use the principles and approaches described in this Section (in addition to the overarching principles in Section 6.2) to find a path forward. Nothing in this Section prevents any parties (after the commencement of the Code) from agreeing to cost allocation arrangements that are different from the principles set out in this Section. Cost allocation agreements should give consideration to the following principles: a) non-discrimination: all Utility Operators should be treated the same, even where Utility operations (e.g. water services, fibre optic cables) are owned and managed by the Corridor Managers. b) direct costs only: costs should be measurable and material. Indirect costs such as the delays and inconvenience caused by Road Works to road users, or the effect on adjoining property values or business trading while Road Works are underway are difficult to quantify accurately and are better dealt with by way of appropriate Reasonable Conditions when the Works are being consented. c) efficiency and contestability: cost allocation agreements should reflect the concept of economic efficiency. Accordingly, the direct costs will be founded on contestability. d) betterment: this issue arises with the replacement of assets owned by the other Party. If Parties choose to arrive at an arrangement regarding betterment that is different from that set out in legislation, a good rule of thumb is that neither Party should unduly benefit from Work carried out on their asset by the other Party without contributing to it and existing materials should be re-used to the maximum practicable extent. Where a true betterment situation exists then the Parties will need to reach a mutually agreeable means of valuing the agreed betterment and sharing that value. e) wrongly located Utility Structures: the Utility Operator should, under the 'Causar Pays' principle, meet the cost of relocating a wrongly located Utility Structure to the correct location, if necessary for another Party's Works. However, if the cost of relocating a wrongly located Utility Structure is no greater than would have been the case if the Utility Structure had been located correctly, then principle f) applies.	related it back to the Data Improvement Plan to put more responsibility on the Utility Owner		agree to change. Adding extra wording to 6.4, but look to review and clarify wording.	change	agree	

NZUAG Code Review Submissions October 2022										
Organisation	Submission Type	Code Clause	Issue Description	Proposed New Wording/ Change	Impact on Code	Impact on CM's or UO's	Any other Comments	Review Team Commentary	Effect on Code	Accept/ Reject/ Modify
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	3.7.2.2	Priority 3: recording of new assets and locating standards	<p>3.7.2 Work Unexpectedly Affects Other Utility Structures</p> <p>1. Work that will affect, or is likely to affect, another Utility Operator's Utility Structures should normally be identified in the planning stages and the Parties comply with Section 3.7.1.1.</p> <p>2. If during the course of Work it becomes apparent for the first time that the Work will affect, or is likely to affect, another Utility Operator's Utility Structures, the affecting Utility Operator must immediately give notice to, and obtain the general requirements of, the affected Utility Operator for working in proximity to their Utility Structures. The Parties should try to come to an arrangement to ensure all Parties' requirements are accommodated, in the spirit of the principles of this Code, taking particular note of 6.4, and the guidance in relation to 'wrongly located' Utility Structures.</p> <p>3. The Corridor Manager must be informed by the Utility Operator as soon as a situation under Section 3.7.2.2 is identified. This should include a discussion of the impact on the approved Works and timetable.</p> <p>A Utility Operator may also use the Dispute resolution procedures in this Code.</p>	reinforced the responsibility shift			accept the change as is	change	agree
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	2.7.2	Priority 3: recording of new assets and locating standards	<p>2.7.2 Participation in Liaison Meetings</p> <p>Liaison meetings are also an opportunity to discuss matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further simplification of processes for Works that do not require opening or breaking up a Road or that are on a low Traffic volume road; • processes for dealing with emergency situations in Transport Corridors; • consideration of opportunities to use or remove redundant or abandoned assets, and to install ducts for future use (refer Sections 3.5 and 3.6); • reporting of Data Improvement Plan as set out in 2.8.1.f) and applications of 5.2.2.b) • whether Local Conditions may be required and, if so, what these conditions should cover; 	Ensuring that the Data Improvement Plans are discussed at Liaison meetings			accept the new bullet point	change	accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	5.2.1	Priority 3: recording of new assets and locating standards	<p>5.2.1 General Procedures for Location</p> <p>1. Before commencing Work, the Party undertaking the Work must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> identify and notify the Utility Operators and Corridor Manager and obtain requirements required for Work under, adjacent to or over their Utility Structures and Road Structures; have located all affected underground Utility Structures and Road Structures, such as Traffic light loops, fibre cables etc, in accordance with best practice and the requirements of the Corridor Manager and Utility Operators responsible for their affected Utility Structures and Road Structures; where excavations are required to locate the structures, employ safe digging practices; and if the Party cannot locate an identified structure in close proximity to the identified location, notify the respective Utility Operator or Corridor Manager who is responsible for identifying or correctly locating its assets. 	Introduced the term best practice to support locating standards			agree. Concerns around a lack of definition of 'best practice' are noted. This provides a useful interim solution until agreement on what constitutes best practice are agreed.	change	accept
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	5.2.2b	Priority 3: recording of new assets and locating standards	<p>2. During underground Work, the Utility Operator and Corridor Manager must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> comply with the safe digging requirements in Department of Labour Guide for Safety with Underground Services (2002); manage the excavation risk in relation to the Survey Quality Level; allow other Utility Operators to observe Work in close proximity to their Utility Structures; and ensure that any structure location markings are of a type that will not leave residue prints in the pavements and such markings are fully removed prior to the Works Completion Notice being lodged with the Corridor Manager. <p>All Parties should always assume that underground Utility Structures are present until it is proved otherwise. Refer also to Section 3.2.</p> <p>Utility Operators with Utility Structures in proximity to the Works may assist by marking their service locations on the ground.</p> <p>If another Party affects the Work of a Utility Operator by not reasonably complying with their obligations under this Code, the affected Utility Operator may seek to recover any additional costs incurred by it from the Party that failed to comply.</p>	defined that both parties are responsible and defined a risk standard			Agree to UK standard on service quality, with view to adopting. Adopt wording in 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 to make the duty of care generic to all parties Bullet b) to remain as proposed but add to 5.2.1.2	change	accept in part
Strikes Reduction Working Group	addition	Definitions	Priority 3: recording of new assets and locating standards	<p>defined Survey Quality Level</p> <p>A series of four prescribed descriptions derived from Australian Standard AS 5488:2013 and UK Standard PAS128 that describe the confidence levels in the certainty of the depth, nature and position of any underground infrastructure identified.</p>	defined Survey Quality Level			Need a single industry standard, which has yet to be decided upon.	no change	Reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	1.1.		Add d) - the maintenance of accurate records of utility operators' assets in Transport Corridors				agree to include, but in 1.4 as its own bullet point under tools and systems	change	modified
Wellington City Council	amendment	1.4.		Add explicit narrative to the "working together" principle to create an obligation ("must") on all parties to maintain and share accurate records and to assist other parties in good faith in the ongoing improvement of records				Already covered in Code Principles	no change	Reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.2.1		Make explicit an obligation to maintain updated records of the location of existing and new assets when they interact with them in the course of works and update them promptly when they become aware of any discrepancy. Add an obligation to take reasonable steps to improve their knowledge of asset locations over time, taking account of the potential risks and impacts associated with the location of those assets and the current accuracy of the known information on them. Add an obligation to comply with a minimum data specification on the location and relevant characteristics of assets under their responsibility				Covered by previously agreement to introduce data improvement plans.	no change	Reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.2.2		Add an obligation to ensure availability of a suitable data exchange system for the timely compilation and exchange of asset information between all parties. Add an obligation to maintain records of found assets where the owner is not known until the owner can be identified or on an ongoing basis if no owner is found. Add an obligation to receive notification of found assets and discrepancies and to monitor that relevant asset records are corrected				already covered in a way we prefer for managing the flow of data between parties. no change	no change	Reject
Wellington City Council	addition	2.2.		Add additional powers and duties on NZUAG, which should include: • Powers to mandate a standard data exchange system and define its minimum functionality • A duty to define a specification of the minimum data which must be held on assets				The broader issue and opportunity needs to be better understood before roles and responsibilities are allocated.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.4.1		Mandate scope of required processes to be covered by the quality plan as follows: "Utility Operators should must have procedures and processes for ensuring the works are carried out in accordance with the Code. These should generally "must, where practicable include, but not be restricted to, the following areas: ..." Include discovery of asset locations prior to work commencement and update of records post works and in response to identification or notification of discrepancies in the quality plan obligations				accept as new m) as proposed amendment, with addition of wording "as in accordance with data improvement plan". Add other comment as bullet b)	change	accept
Wellington City Council	addition	2.5.1		Consider addition of: j) Ensuring accurate records are maintained in the course of works and made available to other parties in the interests of safety k) Ensuring own and other parties records are updated where inaccuracies are identified				make change to m) in 2.4.1 Add j) to 2.5.1 Concern that proposed k) is beyond the capability and reasonableness of any reasonable party to implement.	change	accept in part
Wellington City Council	addition	2.7.1.1	Consider expansion of the scope of this section to include duties related to facilitating sharing of asset location information if this is not included elsewhere	The Corridor Manager must... c) Ensure adequate systems and processes exist for the consolidation, sharing and update of asset location information between parties in accordance with the defined minimum data specifications and system functionality requirements				Not a reasonable expectation for the CM to be in the middle of all data exchanges and discussions about asset locations and positioning, which is what the proposed change would call for.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	1.7.1.2	Consider expansion of the scope of this section to include duties related to facilitating sharing of asset location information if this is not included elsewhere	Utility Operators must... e) Supply all known information to the shared federated asset register specified by the corridor manager as reasonably requested and in accordance with the prevailing minimum data specification				Not a reasonable expectation for UOs and poses a problem for historical data networks.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1		Update preamble to "Each Party should try to must manage its documents in an electronic format capable of being exchanged with other Utility Operators and Corridor Managers."			note that even a pdf of a scanned paper document would meet this obligation at a minimum level	This is covered in row 29 above, which allows for a contingency and for a plan to achieve the outcome of this being explicitly stated as an alternative.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1.1a		Adjust to read: "a) Hold records of the nature and location of its existing Utility Structures in each Transport Corridor, where known; and take reasonable steps to ensure that data meets the minimum data specifications identified by Code"				OK with this if linked back to data improvement plan, noting that there is already a change to 2.8.1 to link it to the matters in the data improvement plan.	change	modified
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1.1b		Adjust to read: "b) On the reasonable request of the Corridor Manager, provide to the Corridor Manager all available information which 1. Falls within the currently prevailing Minimum Data Standard as identified by the Code and 2. Pertains to its Utility Structures currently existing within each Transport Corridor within the Corridor Manager's territory				The overall value of bullet b) as currently stated is questionable. Proposal is not seen as currently adding value and may in fact be inappropriately onerous.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	2.8.1.1b		add the following additional duties on Utility Operators: • Take reasonable steps to continuously improve their records of asset locations and to promptly update their records when new information becomes available to them either in the course of works or through notifications by other parties or the RCM • To update historic asset records to meet the minimum data standard in the course of their own work programs • To work in good faith with other utility operators and the RCM to secure accurate asset records are produced for areas of critical interest identified by the RCM, for example high use and congested areas.				Covered by the Strikes Reduction Group proposal for data improvement plans.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1.2a		Adjust to read: "a) Ensure that appropriate processes and systems exist to capture, maintain, combine, share and update a consolidated record of all available data which 1. Relates to the utility structures owned or operated by all utility operators within its territory and 2. Which falls within the currently prevailing Minimum Data Standard as identified by the Code				The difficulties involved in: - ensuring the data is current and reliable across UO's - liability for data accuracy - stepping on the toes of the people who do this already	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	2.8.1.2a		Add the following duties: • ensure and track that accurate plans of utility structures affected by works are received with Works Completion Notices and that Utility Operators master as built records are subsequently updated within the specified timeframes and shared in the consolidated records. Take appropriate corrective action on non-conformance. • Facilitate and track to resolution notifications of found objects and discrepancies with existing records between all parties working within its territory in support of the obligations identified in section 5.2.2 or elsewhere in this Code. • maintain an ongoing record of relevant utility structures, abandoned objects and other relevant structures (as defined by the Corridor Manager) where a current utility owner cannot be identified.				This suggestion is aspirational and potentially a future target, but the present situation is that it is difficult from a statutory point of view to implement at this point. Recommend to NZUAG to continue to develop the concept.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1.3a		Adjust to read: "a) Keep accurate records which meet the Minimum Data Specification and, within a reasonable timeframe, make them available on request to Corridor Managers and Utility Operators planning Works in those Transport Corridors; and"				Would require the existence of an approved standard, before a change could be made	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	2.8.1.3b		Consult with utility operators as to the feasibility of reducing the 3 month target to 60 or 30 days to ensure records are current				NZUAG is open to having the conversation, but engagement would be much wider than just with UO's. To change the outcomes, it would be necessary for everybody to change their contract requirements, and until we have that conversation, we won't understand if there is a reluctance to do this.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	2.8.1.4		General Comment Methods of recording depths should be specified in the Minimum Data Standard and aligned with the LINZ standards, to include the location / depth accuracy requirements discussed in the following paragraph. Data requirements should be mandated as "must where practicable"				Agree to adoption of the LINZ standard as also suggested by the Service Strikes Working Group and changed as above. Data must record depths to the standards specified	change	modified

Submissions

NZUAG Code Review Submissions October 2022										
Organisation	Submission Type	Code Clause	Issue Description	Proposed New Wording/ Change	Impact on Code	Impact on CM's or UO's	Any other Comments	Review Team Commentary	Effect on Code	Accept/Reject/Modify
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.1	Final narrative paragraphs pp28	General commentary at the end of 2.8.1, should be codified into unambiguous obligations or removed - Code should provide clear and unambiguous mandates on participants. Working practices near assets, urgent contact, damage management etc. are covered elsewhere in Code and should not be repeated here				1 st para partially redundant and the rest turned to adoption of LINZ Standard included as 2.8.1.4 2 nd para can be removed as covered elsewhere, but left partially to mark adoption of the standard as per previous submission 3 rd para about exchanging information, not about practices themselves, and so are appropriate at this point in the Code, so should remain.	change	modified
Wellington City Council	amendment	2.8.2	General comment - consider integrating this obligation with sections 2.8.1 and 5.2.2 for clarity - overall outcome should be that: 1. All assets (owned by any party or unidentified) and uncovered by that party or any other party should be verified against the current consolidated record and discrepancies notified to the RCM and asset owner (if known) so that they are updated correctly. 2. Where expected assets are not found in the locations specified on the current record these must be notified to the RCM and the owner of the "not found" asset. The RCM should ensure that suitable corrective actions are initiated by the "not found" asset owner and tracked to completion. 3. RCMs should provide a single channel for utility notification of found assets during works 4. Where an asset owner is not known RCMs must take ownership of either identifying the relevant owner and initiating updates to that owner's master records or the RCM must act as a default responsible party for maintaining information on unidentified assets in the long term 5. RCMs should provide a closed loop process to ensure that updates to utility owner master records for found assets are tracked to completion. Exceptions should be identified and actioned by the RCM					This is aspirational, as no one is set up to adopt this at this point. That puts it beyond our ability to propose a Code change now.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	3.6.	NZUAG should consider additional powers for Corridor Managers to adjudicate on recovery of abandoned assets, particularly in the case of congested areas. Other Utility Operators should have the power to identify potentially abandoned assets and request that space be made available. A right to request audit and a corresponding duty to validate active status of assets should also be considered. Further comment on Congested Space - implementing fee structures for congested areas should also be reviewed as a means to ensure effective use of limited space in congested areas - for example the auction of the right to use space in cases where inter-party competition occurs and cannot be resolved by other means.					While it is agreed there is an issue, the Code has gone as far as it could at the time, and that is still the case. The Code is not necessarily the best place to sort these matters out. This would get into issues around private property, which the Code is not in a place to address.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	Fig 4.1		Add steps in closure process to ensure that / require utility operator to confirm that: • Updated / accurate site plans have been submitted to the Corridor Manager with the Works Completion Notice • Subsequent updates to the Utility As Built records are completed before final closeout of a CAR • Any discrepancies with existing records (for both own assets and others assets, where found in different locations or not found - "Wrongly recorded objects") and unexpected and/or unidentified objects (" Unidentified buried objects") have been reported to the Corridor Manager (in all cases) and to the owning utility operator (if known / relevant) or updated in own records if own assets				Issues with timing and clarity, and the proposed changes would not add any more clarity. Does not align with the work flow in the Code, and especially the timing requirements.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	4.2.2.1	Form A1 - Impact on other utility structures is included as a signifier of major works in the preliminary notification form A1 but not in the Code definitions (e.g., definition of "Major Works" - p9) or in section 4.2.1. Further, major and project works are not clearly delineated in the context of 4.2.2.1 and form A1. These definitions should be clarified in the relevant sections (e.g., definitions, 4.2.2.1, form A1 and elsewhere as required) and impact on other utility structures included as a circumstance where preliminary notification is required					It makes sense to have definitions aligned, and so agreement to update Code definitions to reflect wording in Form A1.	change	accept
Wellington City Council	addition	4.5.4		Add management of subsurface congestion and the minimisation of maintenance and future impact to the list of areas for consideration in the application of local or special conditions - e.g., obligations for utilities to maintain their routes in existing channels where possible, mandates to install or use shared ducts, shared chambers, multi utility crossing points etc.			General comment - there may be a case for NZUAG to develop and share a library of standard templates for local and special condition for common / repeatable circumstances - these could provide valuable national standardisation and in the first instance address the cases identified in 4.5.4.	This would better be dealt with as part of the liaison process and engagement between parties. Requiring direction to undertake particular activities could cut across commercial imperatives and property issues. There are already approaches that deal with many of these and it is not likely inclusion in the Code would add to this. If it is dealt with through the engagement process and agreed in the conditions, it is considered that this would deal with the appropriately.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	4.6.1.1	supply of accurate data should be explicitly included the in provisions for non-conformance as follows:	When, during the course of planning or undertaking the Works, the Corridor Manager is of the opinion that material, workmanship or asset information provided does not meet the required standards defined in this Code, they must advise the Utility Operator and request information to demonstrate compliance. ...				If adopted, this could introduce liability issues and so create additional costs to specific parties unreasonably.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	4.7.1	Works Completion Notices obligation 4.7.1.a should include an obligation to supply accurate information on the works completed in accordance with the Minimum Data Specification. Explicit confirmation of final locations should be required in all cases to act as a clear sign-off and warrant of information accuracy. This must extend to all impacted infrastructure, regardless of owner - for example any adjustments to existing assets and or 3rd party utility assets moved during the course of works, and a duty created to notify other asset owners (as well as the RCM) of any changes and to provide suitable information on any changes in accordance with the Minimum Data Spec. An additional duty 4.7.1.e should be created to confirm that suitable information (in accordance with the Minimum Data Spec) has been provided and/or notifications made in relation to any found assets or discrepancies (regardless of type - refer to bullets in 4.5.2 above for discussion of cases) to the RCM and / or any other relevant parties prior to submission of the Works Completion Notice.					This is a repetition of other requests above, that have been identified as being unable to be actioned.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	5.1.1d	Clarifications required:	consider including a power to the allow Corridor manager to set agreed time windows for work to take place - for example in the case of high traffic areas or multiple competing projects/clashes.				There is a need for coordination in the Code, so there isn't a need to add additional specificity around time windows, as everybody has to fit with works already agreed to in a given area.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	5.1.2b	Clarifications required:	consider including a provision to verify location of above ground assets when condition is recorded, and to submit discrepancies via 5.2.2				Not the purpose of the clause. The clause is about recording the condition of assets in the vicinity of the works for the purposes of restitution at the end of the Works and not about asset locations.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	comment	5.1.2	final paragraph: general comment: unauthorised connections are a special case of discrepancy - found objects - consider combining this narrative into the standard notification process under 5.2.2					Issue is often not related to a Code Party. If it is between 2 Code parties then the disputes process is available.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	5.1.4		make final points 5.1.4a-c "must" obligations and adjust as appropriate - eg "When using trenchless construction, the parties must: a) consider increasing clearances... b) consider increasing minimum cover - c) exercise special care to ensure that other utility structures are not damaged			General comment - NZUAG may wish to consider the issue of suitable onsite verification processes for trenchless construction, for example suitable processes for validation of asset location.	Aligns with our intention.	change	accept
Wellington City Council	addition	5.1.4		Add a final point 5.1.4.d - "exercise special care to ensure accurate location information is maintained and submitted in accordance with the obligations of the Code"				Agree to link this back to the LINZ standards	change	modified
Wellington City Council	addition	5.2.1.1		Add a duty to validate that the locations of all underground assets uncovered match available plans and the data submitted in CAR, in support of the duty to notify discrepancies under 5.2.2				This is not a reasonable duty to impose to validate other Parties data and they may not willingly provide it. Such accuracy and liabilities remain with the asset owner as should any duties that arise. We would also need to consider as an industry how this could be funded.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	5.1.1d		when an asset is not found at the location stated on the plans: Add a duty to notify the Corridor Manager in all cases for assurance reasons and make explicit the duty on the owner of the not found asset to ensure their master as built records are updated according to Code.				This potentially a duplication, and in any case point data is not useful in updating underground records.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	amendment	5.2.1		final paragraph - make explicit that an earlier failure by a utility operator to record / submit accurate location information in accordance with the prevailing obligations is considered grounds for recovery of later costs incurred by a utility operator impacted by poorly located assets				This steps into the area of setting statute and law. This should be left to the dispute provisions, which allow parties to reach agreement themselves.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	5.2.2		Add a duty to notify the Corridor Manager in all cases of found assets or discrepancies, in order to provide for the maintenance of records where the asset owner is not identified and to provide for Corridor Manager to ensure that necessary changes are made to utility operators master asset registers. The additional duties proposed under 2.2.2 also refer.				A repetition and not a good idea in a regulation.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	addition	5.4.		Provide for appropriate duties and procedures to ensure that, as far as reasonably possible according to the circumstances, asset information is maintained and asset registers are updated in a timely manner after an emergency works situation has occurred.				Agree to add 1.e), "update asset information and asset registers in a timely manner after Emergency Works have been executed."	change	modified
Wellington City Council	amendment	6.4e		consider strengthening these provisions to cover all costs regarding the impact of wrongly located or recorded structures (subject to the exceptions specified in items a-d of the same section. This could include the impact of asset strikes or the cost of project delays for example.				It is considered that this goes too far and is not in line with the overall driver to reduce 3 rd party strikes, as it might increase rather than decrease them in some situations.	no change	reject
Wellington City Council	comment	8.2.2	General comment - once a suitable system for capture, integration and sharing of all parties asset registers and for tracking changes and discrepancies has been established, a range of additional and meaningful KPIs become possible. The following measures should be established by NZUAG accordingly. Note the use of standard systems nationally will greatly ease the production of KPIs and increase their usefulness and impact. - % of CARs rejected due to inadequate prior location information - % of Works Completion Notices rejected due to inadequate asset information - % of as-built updates received by time interval and within the required timeframes - absolute occurrence rates and % of works reporting found assets and records discrepancies					It is too early in the process for this to be accepted. Recommend that it be directed to the Code Compliance Committee for consideration for future KPI changes.	no change	reject

NZUAG Code Review Submissions October 2022										
Organisation	Submission Type	Code Clause	Issue Description	Proposed New Wording/ Change	Impact on Code	Impact on CM's or UO's	Any other Comments	Review Team Commentary	Effect on Code	Accept/Reject/Modify
Porirua City Council	amendment	Definitions	In The Code three water Utility Operators are deemed to be a TA as listed in the 2002 Local Government Act, or a person acting on behalf of the TA in relation to that infrastructure. We have experienced some issues with getting timely / proactive ownership of three waters utility reinstatement issues. In light of that a very clear up front definition in The Code itself of the three waters Utility Operator in Wellington (& possibly other regions ?) may be beneficial. If this was not considered appropriate / necessary in The Code definitions itself it may also be effected via a consistent clarification in each of the Regions TA's Local Conditions. In future with Three Waters Reform and potentially much larger UO entities this may become even more important to ensure clarity and timely ownership.					Agree to amend the Definitions to refer to the S4 of the UAA for the definition of utility operators covered by the Code. This will obviate the need to make any consequent changes post election.	change	modified
Porirua City Council	amendment	2.2.5	The Code should clearly state that it is the UO's responsibility to ensure (a must) that their Contracts / arrangements with their contractors / agents both include or cover the requirements of The Code and applicable Local Conditions. Also, that these requirements are aligned and are not ambiguous in any way i.e. The Code specifying one thing and then the Contract between the UO and its contractors / agents specifying something different or ambiguous. Although these downstream Contracts and arrangements are outside the scope of the Code I think this could be the source of some uncertainty and ambiguity for contractors / agents, and in turn be contributing to some of the real and costly issues being experienced. We don't see anything preventing this being clearly highlighted as a key requirement to UO's in The Code via a couple of extra lines under this clause.					The current provisions are deemed appropriate in the circumstances.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council		2.7.2	Participation in Liaison Meetings	Given some of the issues we have experienced and the potential source of those issues, we would like to see the following amendment to The Code requirements: • All Utility Operators must be represented at the Liaison Meetings by person/s of appropriate authority and in position/s directly managing and involved with Utility access / installs.				Amend 5.2.2.4C to remove the words 'as required', to require participation by all utility operators in the region. Any issues not resolved at the liaison meeting can be escalated as appropriate, including level of representation.	change	modified
Porirua City Council	amendment		Design Life and Warranty etc For Major Works (particularly in the road carriageway) a clear provision for the RCA to request confirmation of the design life of a proposed Utility Trench construction / reinstatement (at early planning stage) may be beneficial and effective for all. This is not the design life of the Utility service itself, as that is clearly in the UO's own best interest anyway. Rather it is about the design life of the trench and road pavement associated to a major Utility trench construction in the road carriageway. Currently the only real "outcome performance" requirement in The Code is for a trench construction to make it through the Two Year Warranty period. Sometimes this may not be the most sensible / sustainable or resilient target where the wider life span, heavy investments and performance / LOS expectations of road pavements are concerned. Importantly it would also help encourage the earlier considerations and interactions between UO's and RCA's in the planning stages that are necessary to get the resilient outcomes we all need in road pavements.					5.5.6.1.3H addresses this issue adequately, and there is no need for duplication.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	5.5.3	We ask that the Utility Operators overarching responsibility to ensure that their Utility trenches or reinstatements do not fail prematurely is made clearer as an upfront and primary requirement. This is particularly important for the dynamic environments in road carriageways, and as a National Code it must be effective in this respect across varying conditions and materials etc in different regions and networks. We think this could be better emphasised through any or all of the Clauses identified to the left. Following from this primary overarching responsibility The National Code should still retain its existing guidelines, requirements and deliverables for utility trenches and reinstatements ie backfilling, compaction, testing etc. Our proposed clarification and emphasis here would be supported by and tie in with our suggestion above under "Design Life & Warranty etc"	We appreciate The Code does currently have a tail end note under Clause 5.5.3 stating that "The above specifications do not remove the responsibility of Utility Operators to ensure no settlement occurs". However, we think more clearly emphasising the overarching responsibility for premature trench / reinstatement failure, (whether by settlement or other mechanisms) will actually benefit all parties. It will help encourage and improve the necessary investigations, considerations and interactions in the early planning stages that help us all avoid costly downstream failures and achieve the resilient outcomes we all need in road pavements.				It is not clear what is being asked for. Porirua CC should be asked to provide clarification in the second round of consultation.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	5.5.5	Compaction Testing (specifically) There are some aspects of the section/s on Compaction Testing that we think could be improved for clarity	The aspects and conditions that jointly create the need for improved clarity are noted / described as follows: a) The Code states the Clegg Hammer cannot be used for testing of the upper Base layer/s in the Carriageway. We agree with this. b) The Codes also notes that the Clegg Hammer may not be suitable for Subbase Material (with larger stone size ie > 37.5mm). We agree with The Codes guidance here, as in isolation it may not be an effective measure of compaction or density on Subbase. However, Clause 5.5.4.3 b essentially requires that compaction must be confirmed by a Clegg Hammer for Subbase. Further, Table 5-1 Compaction Testing then calls for a Clegg IV of 35 for Subbase. So there is potential for these various clauses and guidance to be a little ambiguous or confusing. c) Also as a National Code of Practice are we confident that a Clegg IV of 35 is an effective target to achieve critical Subbase compaction and density under the various conditions, traffic loadings and trench make ups etc? d) Commonly in carriageway trenches a combination of Subbase and Basecourse material may make up the totality of the Base layers and the fill material as well ie in this case there isn't a separate fill material for which the Clegg Hammer may be an effective testing tool. e) Taking the Code statements in a) & b) above, in some cases this could effectively rule out the use of the Clegg Hammer for testing of these critical Base Layers in the Carriageway. From a purely best practice compaction testing perspective we don't have issue with that. However, by default, confusion or by way of an alternative not mentioned in The Code we do not want UO's / Contractors then turning to Scala Penetrometer for testing on granular materials, particularly Subbase in critical carriageway environments. Obviously effective compaction QA in a road carriageway is vital. Given the above notes, some of The Codes various wordings around Compaction Testing could be revised to better limit any potential ambiguity, and to best ensure we are testing for actual density wherever practicable. We think this may be particularly beneficial for any UO's and the downstream Contractor / Subcontractor chains in the Utilities trade who may be less experienced in this critical aspect of QA. To better clarify the Compaction responsibilities and requirements above, we suggest as follows: a) Maintain and emphasise that The Codes primary requirement is for proper density testing via the NDM in the road carriageway. b) Additionally, adding a requirement for on-site correlation of the NDM results to Clegg Hammer IV's. Should the UO / Contractor want to use a Clegg Hammer for further aspects of repeat testing (at the UO's / Contractor's choice and risk in terms of any settlement etc). This maintains the UO's option to utilise the Clegg Hammer (as a cheaper convenient testing tool) but would better ensure it is: • More appropriately used to measure "consistency" of surface compaction / compactive effort. • Better aligned to critical actual density on a case by case basis, which will have varying conditions, materials etc. • Less likely to be misused or relied upon as a standalone definitive measure of density / compaction. With respect to "Table 5-1 Compaction Testing" it currently sits amongst pictures for reinforced concrete pavements. Once any necessary amendments are made it could be better placed / formatted within the document so it sits clearly under the appropriate Clause and Heading "5.5.5 Compaction Testing".				The current targets are based on previous local authority consensus. The option already exists for an alternative tool, but this does require agreement on what such a tool should be. Any change would require the adoption of an alternative standard, it should be stated up-front what standard should be applied.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	4.6.3	Non Conforming Work & Remedial Actions & Cost Recovery Where Non-Conforming work is not being reasonably repaired or in a reasonable timeframe The Code states the RCA may have the work done by others and recover all costs from the responsible UO. In practice trying to recover these costs after the fact in a lot of cases is not easy or effective. We ask that there be provision in The Code whereby the RCA can require a standing Performance Bond from Utility Operator/s that, through appropriate process, can be called upon where there is proven and justified Non-Compliance / Non-performance.					This can be covered in the local conditions in the few circumstances this is likely to be necessary. The requirement for performance bonds can be onerous on all parties.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	5.6.2	Surface Layer Reinstatement and Joints Predominantly and particularly in the Carriageway we are dealing with trenches, and regularly they are quite long in length. The Code and the 1m Reinstatement Rule may be read and being interpreted such that we can end up with multiple transverse joints across a trench anything over 1m apart. In a road carriageway trench this is building in likely failure points. I think this has / is in part being triggered by high traffic volumes and some RCA requirements for daily reinstatement up to and including surfacing. Although we appreciate there is clear provision in The Code for temporary surfacing, I think The Code would benefit from further clarification on what are minimum spacing for transverse joints in the final trench surfacing reinstatement. Alternatively, The Code should include a requirement to confirm and agree this minimum interval with the RCA. Critically this may help trigger the necessary and improved early design and early operational planning by UO's and Contractors.					Porirua CC should be asked to provide clarification in the second round of consultation.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	5.6.4.3	Asphaltic Concrete	In the Carriageway the following measures to final seal AC trench edges / joints should be mandatory (a must): • Sealing (via emulsion / tack coat) of the vertical cut faces of existing surfacing at trench edges prior to final AC reinstatement ie brush or spray the vertical faces with a full coating of tack coat emulsion. • The use of rubberised / polymer bandage Sealing of all joints in the Carriageway after final AC surfacing. Conversely "Sand Sealing" as it is typically known (with plain tack coat emulsion and sand) should be excluded as a final joint sealing practice as it does not provide any longer term / resilient benefit. Also, at times it is just being used liberally in attempt to mask poor practices / workmanship.				The comment in section 5 was at a generic level. This is covered by section 5.6.4.3b of the Code which provides commentary on the process to be followed.	no change	reject
Porirua City Council	amendment	5.6.4.8	Grass Berms	Grass berm reinstatement should also include a requirement for the UO to achieve an initial and full grass strike (in line with a typical grass reinstatement standard). As part of that the UO should be responsible for any protection / temporary fencing etc of the berm reinstatement area as necessary to achieve the grass strike. In conjunction and consideration of this, we wonder if 50mm of topsoil is sufficient to effectively and efficiently achieve a reasonable grass strike in most conditions?				Agree to add "To achieve an initial and full grass strike in line with a typical grass reinstatement practice"	change	modified