Asset Management Maturity Assessment

Otago Regional Council

Toitū Te Hakapupu: The Pleasant Catchment River Restoration Project (Source ORC)

Maturity Assessment Approach

Process:

- Workshops with key AM staff from Engineering, Environmental Monitoring, Fleet & Facilities, and IT.

- Applied the AM Maturity Assessment Tool available from Āpōpō, utilises targeted questions for evaluation each assessed on a 0-100 scale aligning to five levels of maturity:

Aware 0-20	Basic 21-40	Core 41-60	Intermediate 61-80	Advanced 81-100

Transition from informal people-based practices toward more formal and consistent policy, plans, data, systems, and processes. Governance and leadership are involved in establishing policy / objectives, resourcing, communicating, monitoring, supporting cross-functional collaboration and promoting continual improvement

Outcomes:

- Benchmark ORC's current asset management maturity and identify the desired future state.

- Recommend improvements appropriate to ORC's asset scale and complexity.

- Enable ORC to prepare action plans for improvement, and to monitor and report on asset management improvement over time.

Key Findings & Conclusions

ORC's current maturity is assessed as **'Basic'**, below the target **'Intermediate'** maturity we recommend is appropriate given the scale, scope and complexity of the ORC organisation, its assets, and the services it provides.

This level of maturity is not uncommon for organisations like ORC who are just commencing an asset management improvement journey. The gap in maturity does not necessarily drive an immediate asset / engineering risk, but does risk blind spots in ORC's knowledge and understanding of its portfolios.

Key areas of concern that are driving the gap between ORC's current and target maturity are:

- **Reliance on individuals**, lacking organisation policy, plans, data, systems and processes.

- **Finance-led approach** limits ability to be strategic and plan through an asset-led approach.

- **Forward programmes are short-term** in nature, lacking a comprehensive response to long-term risk, resilience, and demand.

- **Lack of strong governance leadership** involvement to set expectations and purpose.

- **Asset data and information** is not fit-for-purpose to support AM planning, forecasting, monitoring and reporting, to inform robust and confident decision making.

Recommendations

1. **Express governance and leadership expectations** of the AM system through an approved organisational Asset Management Policy and asset management objectives.

2. **Develop Asset Management Improvement Plans** with actions agreed and prioritised with input from relevant staff and leadership.

3. **Agree the improvement plan implementation** timeframes, deliverables, resources and responsibilities, and ensure monitoring and reporting of progress to appropriate levels of the organisation.

ORC's progress to date has been generally confined to Engineering with little improvement made by the wider organisation, especially where actions are required across multiple teams and / or with involvement and direction from ORC leadership.

Many of these improvements will benefit more than just the Engineering Department and may serve as a basis for a wider organisational AM improvement journey, so the organisation is well placed to successfully deliver the outcomes sought from this assessment.