



PPR2062



Well Managed Highways Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP) Update

Commissioning and delivery options


Authors

D Peeling, A Boath

May 2025

Report details

Report prepared for:	Department for Transport
Project/customer reference:	GFA023
Copyright:	© TRL Limited
Report date:	9 th May 2025
Report status/version:	1.0

Quality approval by:	Signature:	Date:
Cathy Booth (Project Manager)		9 th May 2025
Alex Boath (Technical Reviewer)	A Boath	5 th April 2025

Disclaimer

This report has been produced by TRL Limited (TRL) under a contract with Department for Transport. Any views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of Department for Transport.

The information contained herein is the property of TRL Limited and does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the customer for whom this report was prepared. While every effort has been made to ensure that the matter presented in this report is relevant, accurate and up to date, TRL Limited cannot accept any liability for any error or omission, or reliance on part or all of the content in another context.

Contents

Executive summary	3
Part one: Gap analysis	5
1 Introduction	6
2 Stakeholder engagement	7
2.1 Steering Group	7
2.2 Stakeholder meetings	8
2.3 Stakeholder survey	9
3 Document review	23
4 Recommendations	24
Summary	26
Appendix A Virtual whiteboard example	27
Appendix B Stakeholder survey questions	28
Part two: Commissioning options	32
5 Introduction	33
6 Delivery options	34
6.1 Preferred delivery option	34
6.2 Other delivery options considered	36
7 Commissioning options	37
7.1 Preferred commissioning option: single commission (integrated contract)	37
7.2 Other commissioning options considered	38
8 Project scope	39
8.1 Purpose of the service	39
8.2 Description of the service	40
Appendix C Deliverables by priority of work package	49
Appendix D Roadmap visuals	51
Part three: Delivery plan	52

Executive summary

The Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP), originally published in 2016, provides a risk-based framework to guide local authorities in managing highway networks. While not legally binding, it supports authorities in meeting statutory duties and evidencing best practice. Given the rapid evolution of technology, policy and operational practice since its publication, the Department for Transport (DfT) commissioned TRL to undertake a scoping exercise to assess whether and how the CoP should be updated.

The gap analysis in Part One combines stakeholder engagement, a comprehensive survey and a review of the current CoP and its references. Feedback was gathered from UK Roads Liaison Group (UKRLG) boards and sub-boards, via a virtual whiteboard and meetings, and from a national online survey that received 164 responses, 65 of which were completed in full.

The findings highlight that the CoP remains a valuable and respected document, particularly for its flexibility and support of risk-based approaches. However, it faces challenges including inconsistent implementation, limited engagement from senior leaders, lack of up-to-date references and insufficient support materials for practitioners.

Stakeholders strongly advocated for a modernised, digitally accessible CoP, enhanced with interactive tools, case studies and template resources. Emerging themes such as carbon management, artificial intelligence (AI) in inspections, active travel infrastructure and climate resilience were identified as essential additions. Improvements to usability, structure and communication of the CoP were also consistently requested.

The analysis concludes with a set of high-level recommendations:

- Establish a mechanism for continuously updating reference links and related materials.
- Enhance the CoP's usability through digital formats and practical resources.
- Address technological, environmental and social challenges with new guidance on AI, carbon, climate adaptation and inclusion.
- Develop competency frameworks and promote training to support implementation.
- Maintain a meaningful risk-based approach while considering hybrid models with minimum standards.
- Continue stakeholder engagement throughout the update process, including focused working groups.

These recommendations form the basis for a future update to ensure the CoP remains relevant, accessible and aligned with the needs of a modern, sustainable and resilient highways network.

In Part Two, this report outlines a recommended approach for delivering and commissioning the next phase(s) of work.

The preferred delivery model is a collaborative approach in which:

- The DfT provides funding and policy direction.
- UKRLG retains ownership and stewardship of the updated CoP.
- A lead consultant is appointed as integrator and delivery manager.
- Working groups including UKRLG sub-board members and industry experts co-author content.

To support this delivery model, the recommended commissioning route is a single integrated contract. This approach ensures strategic continuity, simplifies management and procurement, and enables better coordination of thematic inputs, training, digital platform development and stakeholder engagement.

The proposed scope includes:

- Development of a governance framework.
- Technical updates to the CoP and its structure.
- Inclusion of new content areas such as carbon management, AI and climate resilience.
- Creation of executive summaries and training materials.
- Launch of a live, searchable digital platform.
- Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework.

This model balances strategic oversight with sector ownership and practical delivery. It will help ensure the refreshed WMHI CoP is both implementable and future-facing.

Part Three of this report proposes a delivery plan. Eight work packages are scheduled across three phases. The work to update the WMHI CoP is estimated to take approximately 18 months.



Part One

Gap analysis



1 Introduction

The latest version of the Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP) was published in October 2016 by the UK Roads Liaison Group¹ (UKRLG), to provide guidance for local authorities on managing highway networks. It emphasises a risk-based approach, encouraging authorities to tailor their policies to local circumstances rather than adhering to prescriptive standards. Though not legally binding, compliance demonstrates best practice and helps authorities manage risks and meet statutory duties.

Given the time since publication, the current CoP is now in need of updating to meet the needs of the modern highway network. This will help shape a version of the CoP that reflects current best practices, technological advancements, legislative changes and stakeholder needs, ensuring effective and sustainable highway infrastructure management.

TRL has carried out an initial scoping exercise on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT) to identify how the current CoP should be updated. This is a short-term commission, prior to a separate project to update the CoP, to provide a more informed view of the scope of the work needed to update the CoP.

TRL has conducted a series of stakeholder engagement sessions to seek the views of the industry to assess what in the current CoP works well, what doesn't work well and what changes or additions might be needed to ensure the CoP meets the requirements of the industry now and into the future. This stakeholder engagement included meetings with a Steering Group, UKRLG boards and sub-boards and a stakeholder survey disseminated to key stakeholders and users of the CoP. TRL also carried out a document review.

This part of the document describes the outputs and findings from the stakeholder engagement and document review.

¹ Now named the UK Roads Leadership Group

2 Stakeholder engagement

2.1 Steering Group

The Steering Group will provide oversight, technical leadership and decision-making to the project. It is expected that the Steering Group will remain in place for the full update project so they will also advise on the changes needed to ensure that the revised WMHI CoP is fit for purpose and can be kept updated in the future.

2.1.1 Terms of reference

The terms of reference are as follows:

- Oversee the project's progress and ensure alignment with the project objectives.
- Support decision-making during all stages of the project.
- Bring to the project the views of the groups they represent.
- Ensure the groups they represent are engaging with the project activities as required.
- Ensure the groups they represent are kept informed throughout the project lifecycle.
- Attend meetings of the Steering Group and address project requirements for the duration of the project.
- Advise on consultation with the wider sector, including the scope and distribution group for an online survey.
- Advise on identification of suitable attendees at project-focused workshops.
- Represent the Steering Group in project-focused workshops or other consultation exercises.
- Address risks and issues that may arise and escalate them as appropriate.

The following terms are anticipated to be required in future phases of the project.

- Review (with the groups they represent) draft text for the WMHI CoP and ensure feedback is provided to the project team.
- Identify and share with the project team potential risks, issues and opportunities associated with the review and update of the WMHI CoP.
- Advise on and support the dissemination of the revised WMHI CoP.

2.1.2 Membership

The membership of the Steering Group is formulated to ensure proportionate views across the sector are shared with the DfT and the project team:

- TRL project team
- Department for Transport (DfT)
- UK Roads Board
- UK Bridges Board
- UK Lighting and Technology Board

- The Scottish Collaboration of Transportation Specialists (SCOTS)
- County Surveyors' Society (CSS) Wales
- Department for Infrastructure (DfI) Northern Ireland
- UK Network Management Board
- UK Adaptation, Biodiversity, and Climate (ABC) Board
- UK Asset Management Board

2.2 Stakeholder meetings

TRL created a virtual whiteboard (an example is shown in Appendix A) designed for UKRLG and associated sub-boards to collaborate and share feedback on the current CoP and the options for the update to the document. The whiteboard focused on the following topics.

Feedback on the current CoP

- What aspects of the current CoP do you think work well and why?
- Which areas of the current CoP do you think need improvement or updating? Why?
- High-level approach of the CoP – risk based vs prescriptive level of condition. Comments on preferred approach.

Updates and changes

- What new subject areas, technologies or practices should be included in the updated CoP?
- Comment on sections or documents that are no longer needed and should be deleted.
- Any new references that should be included in an updated CoP.

Implementation and adoption

- What challenges do you think organisations face when implementing the current CoP?
- What prevents a wider implementation of the CoP?
- What would make it easier to adopt and implement the CoP?
- How could the CoP's content be presented to increase adoption?
- What tools and resources (e.g. case studies, toolkits) should be included in an updated CoP?

Anything else?

- Any further comments or suggestions regarding the update of the CoP.

TRL joined meetings of the boards and sub-boards of UKRLG and facilitated sessions to support completion of the whiteboard. Attendees were able to add sticky notes under each question with their thoughts and feedback. There was then discussion on some of the topics raised. The whiteboards remained open after the session for attendees to add additional thoughts later. TRL facilitated sessions with the following boards and sub-boards and their views are summarised below.

UK Roads Board

- Desire for ongoing training and simplified, digital presentation of the CoP.
- Need to address emerging technology and customer expectation management.
- Call for better support for new practitioners and non-engineering stakeholders.

UK Bridges Board

- Concern about the compact nature of the current CoP – too little detail for structures.
- Need for guidance on resource capacity and communicating risk to senior leadership.
- Improve guidance on carbon assessment and green materials.

UK Asset Management Board

- Request for better tools to increase adoption: toolkits, templates, digital format.
- Feedback supports maintaining the risk-based approach but with clearer governance.
- Call for simplified summary versions of the CoP parts to aid internal advocacy and decision-making.

Road Condition Management Group (RCMG)

- Strong feedback on modernising condition surveys and integrating AI.
- Risk-based approach needs refinement to avoid misuse or under-delivery.
- Introduce minimum service levels (MSLs) or fallback standards.

Footways and Cycletrack Management Group (FCMG)

- Need for more focus on active travel infrastructure – better hierarchy, usage-based design.
- Call to reflect diverse user needs including vulnerable and disabled users.
- Wider reflection of emerging practice (e.g. behaviour change, climate and resilience).

ADEPT Bridges Board

- Include examples of risk-based cross-asset prioritisation.
- Include use of AI.
- Include a section on carbon management.

The completed whiteboards will be shared with the DfT separately. At the time of writing it has not been possible to meet with the UK Lighting and Technology Board or the UK Adaptation, Biodiversity, and Climate Board.

2.3 Stakeholder survey

The WMHI CoP is used across the industry by many stakeholders. To seek the views of such a wide range of people it was agreed to conduct an online survey. The survey was disseminated through UKRLG boards and sub-boards, the Chartered Institution of Highways

and Transportation (CIHT) website and social media, and the TRL website and social media to ensure as wide a reach as possible. To maximise the response rate, the original survey deadline was extended by two weeks.

The survey was accessed by a total of 164 individuals, 65 of whom completed the survey in full. The remaining 99 gave partial responses. An analysis of the partial responses indicated that most respondents were completing the initial consent questions and simple job description questions (e.g. Who do you work for? Where are you based?) before dropping out of the survey when the more detailed open-response questions were presented.

It is possible that, on seeing the questions that required a free-text response, some respondents determined that they did not have time to complete the survey and then returned to complete it later. As the survey did not allow respondents to return to a partially complete survey, it is possible that the number of partial responses is an overestimate as some respondents may have submitted a complete response later (meaning one respondent could have submitted both a partial and a complete response).

The survey questions can be found in Appendix B.

2.3.1 The respondents

The survey opened with questions designed to understand the sample of respondents; specifically, the nature of their work, where they are based, and their familiarity and use of the CoP.




Figure 1: Responses to the question “Who do you work for?”

Figure 1 gives an overview of the organisations where respondents are currently employed. The vast majority (N=51) reported working for local authorities. A small portion (N=4) work for a professional body or group. Two respondents work for National Highways and Transport for London respectively. The remaining eight respondents stated other employers not presented within the question options. These included: supply chain partners, charity organisations (including the Canal and River Trust, and Plantlife), service providers, asset-owning and managing non-governmental organisations, and consultants partnered with local authorities. It should be noted that the DfT was included as a response option to this question, but no respondents reported being employed by this organisation.

What best describes your job title?




Figure 2: Responses to the question “What best describes your job title?”

To further understand the respondent sample, individuals were asked to state their job title. Figure 2 shows that 44 respondents indicated that they are in a management role, ten engineering, five directorial and one technician. Five respondents stated other roles, which included two chief executive officers, two asset management roles and an advisor.




Figure 3: Responses to the question “Which best describes your area of interest?”

Figure 3 shows respondents’ specific areas of interest. Asset management was by far the most common response, with 52 respondents reporting this as their area of interest. Three participants specified contract management as their primary area. Several individuals reported other areas, such as structures management, sustainability and transport planning. A further three individuals responded with “All of the above”; it is worth noting that this wasn’t a specific option in the question, but it shows that a small selection of respondents felt that all listed options (as shown in the figure above) fell under their area of interest.




Figure 4: Breakdown of respondents based on stated location

Figure 4 gives an overview of the various locations where respondents are based. This figure has been colour-coded, with blue sections representing the regions of Scotland, green sections representing the regions of Wales and orange sections representing the regions of England. It can be seen that nine respondents are based across Scotland, most being in North East Scotland. A further nine respondents are based in Wales, most being based either in South Wales East or South Wales West. The remaining 47 respondents are based across England. The largest respondent group reported being based in the South East, with the smallest group among the English regions being based in the North East. There were no responses from Northern Ireland.

Familiarity with the Code of Practice




Figure 5: Respondents' familiarity with the Code of Practice

As can be seen in Figure 5, over half of the respondents (N=37) reported being "Very familiar" with the CoP. Only three respondents said that they are "Not at all familiar" with the CoP. Exploring the job roles and locations of these respondents offers no insight as to why they reported having no familiarity with the document. That is, there is nothing specific about their reported job role that would suggest they would have no need to be familiar with the CoP, as other respondents in similar jobs reported having at least some familiarity. All other respondents (N=25) stated being "Somewhat familiar" with the CoP. It should be noted that interpretation of this question was left to the respondents and does not reflect a specific level of familiarity with the document. For example, one respondent may have reported being "Somewhat familiar" because they know only one part of the CoP very well (e.g. Highways) but are not familiar with other parts (e.g. Lighting), while another may have reported being "Somewhat familiar" because they have looked at the document on only a few occasions. It is assumed that those who reported being "Very familiar" with the CoP have a reasonably good understanding of at least one part of the document.




Figure 6: Responses to the question “How often do you use the Code of Practice for each asset type?”

Figure 6 shows how often respondents use each main section of the CoP. The sections that cover Highways and Structures appear to see a similar amount of use, with around ten respondents reporting that they never use the CoP in relation to each asset type. Close to half of the sample reported rarely using the document in both cases. The most notable difference is regarding the section on Lighting. Half of respondents reported never using the CoP, with a further third stating that they rarely use it for this specific section. Only 13 respondents stated they use the Lighting section of the CoP regularly.

A brief comparison between those who responded with “Never” was undertaken to determine whether there were some respondents that never use the CoP at all. Only three of the 65 respondents reported that they never use any sections of the CoP; all others reported using at least one section rarely or regularly. As these three individuals do not appear to have any unique job roles (sharing similar roles to others who reported using at least one of the CoP sections), there is nothing to indicate why these individuals never use the document.

2.3.2 Is a risk-based approach still appropriate?

Overall, 56% of respondents felt that a risk-based approach is still appropriate. 29% of respondents were unsure and 14% favoured a prescriptive approach. Table 1 shows the number of respondents in favour of a risk-based approach compared with a prescriptive approach by asset type.

Table 1: Risk-based vs prescriptive approach

Asset type	Risk-based approach	Prescriptive approach	Unsure
Highways	37	7	15
Structures	37	11	14
Lighting	28	7	23

It is less clear for Lighting but generally a risk-based approach is favoured and works well for most respondents. A risk-based approach provides greater flexibility for local authorities in setting their levels of service and managing risk.

Example quotes from respondents:

“A prescriptive approach would either have to adopt the lowest common denominator (and so risk being almost worthless) or risk pushing some authorities into adopting an unaffordable (for them) approach.”

“The risk-based approach works very well with the Highways, Structures and Street Lighting inspections.”

However, some respondents felt that the risk-based approach can lead to inconsistent approaches across different authorities, and there is a potential unintended consequence that driving down short-term investment leads to long-term harms.

The general consensus was that while funding is tight a risk-based approach works better than prescriptive requirements, which would only be possible if appropriate funding, both capital and revenue, was available. A prescriptive approach could incorporate risk-based elements or vice versa, such as a risk-based approach that is underpinned by prescriptive or statutory minimums.

2.3.3 How could the structure be improved and why?

69% of respondents felt that the division of the CoP into overarching principles of Highways, Structures and Lighting is still appropriate.

There were some comments regarding additional sections that would improve the structure. These are covered in section [2.3.7](#).

2.3.4 What aspects of the current Code of Practice work well and why?

92% of respondents felt that the current CoP addresses the challenges faced in managing the highway infrastructure today either “Very well” or “Somewhat well”. 69% of respondents felt that the current CoP is very or somewhat user-friendly.

General views

The general view of the document is that it is a good, rounded document, very detailed and pulls other guidance together (using links) into one place. For any future update the respondents recommended keeping it simple and not to change things that don't need changing. Furthermore, a log of sections that have and haven't changed would help users navigate the updated CoP.

Referencing work

Many felt that it was good for referencing work, in particular in dealing with legal claims and when challenged by members of the public.

Recommendations section

A number of respondents noted that the recommendations at the start of the document highlight the key points and give a quick summary of the important factors.

Example quotes:

"The recommendations summary works well."

"The recommendations summary is useful as quick synopsis of requirements."

Other comments

Those with an interest in structures noted that the CoP sets out well the principles for managing highway structures and has a unified approach. However, some said that they use *Management of Highway Structures: A Code of Practice* and the *Inspection Manual for Highway Structures* rather than the CoP.

2.3.5 What aspects of the current Code of Practice need improvement or updating?

Inconsistent implementation

Understanding of the risk-based approach varied significantly across authorities and disciplines. Some apply the CoP in name only, sticking to traditional or prescriptive approaches without genuine risk-based thinking.

Example quote:

"We need to find out ... to what extent they have implemented a true risk-based approach or have retained existing standards and rebadged."

Accessibility and complexity

Many find the document dense and hard to engage with, especially for non-specialist or new staff. Many said that the lack of executive summaries, visual aids and training materials creates a barrier to successful implementation of the CoP.

Example quote:

“The scale of it. Requires significant time investment to understand.”

Tools and resources

Several respondents noted a lack of supporting templates, case studies, toolkits and practical guidance to assist adoption. Many authorities requested “pick-up-and-play” resources.

Example quote:

“Case studies, indication of cost for different interventions, and template policies would be really useful.”

Technological and policy gaps

Emerging issues like AI in inspections, carbon reporting and electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure are either missing or outdated. See section [2.3.6](#) for more detail on new technologies.

Example quotes:

“Needs a whole new section about the use of artificial intelligence for road surveys.”

“Current CoP seems to have little guidance on carbon management. It could be much more explicit.”

2.3.6 What new subject areas, technologies or practices should be included in the updated Code of Practice?

Technology and AI in asset management

Respondents said that there is limited open-source data, which affects AI-driven predictive maintenance efforts. Many recommended use of predictive analytics, AI-driven surveys and vehicle telemetry for road condition monitoring. Others encouraged use of video-based inspections and drone technology for asset condition assessment.

PAS 2161

A number of respondents noted PAS 2161, which is an updated road condition monitoring specification for local authorities.

Carbon management

There were lots of comments regarding carbon management and the need to include carbon reduction approaches, carbon footprints, carbon measurement guidance, toolkits for calculating carbon emissions and lifecycle carbon management approaches.

Climate change adaptation

Respondents felt this needs to be a theme throughout the CoP and there should be a new section on flood risk management.

Management of soft estate

It was suggested that an approach that follows a prescriptive method in terms of mitigating risks and realising opportunities for biodiversity would be beneficial. A risk-based approach was felt appropriate for mowing regimes.

2.3.7 What new or updated sections and references should be included in the updated Code of Practice?

The following new sections were proposed by respondents:

- Innovation
- Sustainability
- Carbon management
- Climate change adaptation
- Biodiversity
- Management of Public Rights of Way (PROW)
- Flood risk management
- New asset types
 - EV charging infrastructure
 - Active travel infrastructure
 - Traffic signals
 - Electronic traffic equipment
 - Soft estate
 - Footbridges

The following documents should be included or referenced in the updated CoP:

- ISO 55000:2024 Asset management: Vocabulary, overview and principles
- PAS 2161:2024 Road condition monitoring (RCM) data: Specification
- PAS 2080:2023 Carbon Management in Infrastructure and Built Environment
- LA108 Biodiversity
- DfT Resilience review
- Updated Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) documents

- Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works (MCHW) – to be published in August 2025
- Boundary issues between local highway authorities and National Highways (strategic highways company)
- BS 9228:2021 Recycling of roads and other paved areas using bitumen
- Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010
- Guiding principles for drainage and wastewater management plans – updated 26 August 2022
- Report of a review of the arrangements for determining responsibility for surface water and drainage assets May 2020
- Ensuring the Network Remains Operational during Unprecedented Conditions: Proceedings from PIARC panel discussion at Highways UK in October 2024
- The Good Verge Guide, Plantlife
- Managing Grassland Road Verges: A best practice guide, Plantlife
- ICE Blue Green Infrastructure Handbook (2023), Chapter 10 “Blue green infrastructure on highways”
- The Gwent Green Grid Cut and Collect Report
- Greenprint Project Reports (LiveLabs2)

2.3.8 What sections and reference documents within the current Code of Practice are no longer needed and should be removed?

Very few comments were received on this question. Two comments of note are:

- 2012 Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) documents need to be updated or, if no longer relevant, removed.
- Reference to Structure Asset Management Planning Toolkit (SAMPt) should be removed and more references to Structures Asset Valuation Investment (SAVI) tool should be included.

2.3.9 What prevents a wider implementation and what challenges do organisations face when implementing the Code of Practice?

Limited awareness and engagement

Senior leaders and decision-makers are often unaware of the CoP or do not prioritise its implementation. There is some concern that the CoP is not universally known about or used to develop local plans and strategies. It is often used reactively rather than proactively. The CoP format is complex and difficult to digest, requiring significant time investment.

Example quote:

“Senior leaders are not aware of it. Presume everything is OK until something fails.”

Resource and knowledge gaps

Many noted that smaller teams struggle to adopt the CoP (in full) due to resource constraints, and loss of experienced staff is a growing concern across the industry. The lack of ongoing training programmes leads to inconsistent application, and there is a need for competency frameworks and structured staff retention strategies.

2.3.10 What would make it easier for your organisation to adopt and implement the Code of Practice?

Clarity of funding, investment cycles and priorities

Authorities noted that a lack of clarity on funding mechanisms makes long-term planning difficult. It was noted, therefore, that improved visibility of funding and investment cycles would make it easier to adopt the CoP. The Incentive Fund previously drove adoption, but its effectiveness has diminished in recent years.

Up-to-date asset records

Up-to-date and reliable asset records documenting asset age and condition would make it easier for authorities to adopt the CoP. Previous poor workmanship, such that components do not have a reliable lifespan for lifecycle planning, means that much of the works undertaken remain reactive.

Improved guidance and training

Training, summaries and visuals that are easy to understand would help. A simplified document could show where priorities, or hierarchies, are set and then each asset in turn could be applied to one network hierarchy. Worked examples and templates would also be beneficial.

2.3.11 How should the Code of Practice's content be presented to increase adoption?

Digital transformation of the CoP

Move away from PDF documents to a live, continuously updated web-based resource. Include video tutorials, interactive tools and data-driven insights to increase adoption.

2.3.12 What tools and resources (e.g. case studies, toolkits, guidelines) should be included in an updated Code of Practice?

According to the respondents the following (web-based interactive) tools and resources should be included in an updated CoP:

- Best practice case studies
- Templates (e.g. example policies)
- Compliance checklists

- Digital training resources (e.g. video shorts)
- Toolkits (e.g. carbon management toolkit)
- Retention of recommendations summary

2.3.13 Would you welcome a short summary guidance document alongside the Code of Practice?

73% of respondents would welcome a short summary guidance alongside the CoP.

2.3.14 Any further comments or suggestions regarding the update of the Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure Code of Practice?

No additional comments not already covered in previous sections were noted.

3 Document review

The CoP contains 305 links to other documents. Of these, 81 links no longer work and therefore need to be updated. We reviewed each link and, where possible, identified updated links for each document and noted the changes made between the two versions of the document. There are also a number of links that work but they do not link to the document noted in the CoP. Figure 7 shows an example of the output produced as part of the document review. The full output will be shared with the DfT separately.

Link	Old link	Updated link	What has changed? What is the new document?
Best Practice guide for the selection of pothole repair options	transport.gov.scot/system/files/documents/tsc-basic-pages/RN44 - Best practice guide for the selection of pothole repair options.pdf	Best Practice guide for the selection of pothole repair options Transport Scotland	The updated link is correct. States that it was published in 2016, which was shortly before the publication of the CoP doc. Looking at the associated hyperlinks, I have to assume the original link no longer works as it appears an outdated file path.
The Quality Protocol for Recycled Aggregates	wrap.ngo/content/quality-protocols	LIT_8709_c60600.pdf	The updated link appears correct and shows a publication date of 2013, so assumed this was the version originally linked to in the CoP. The updated link appears to be published on the gov.uk website, whereas the original link is for the WRAP webpage. It may be that the document was moved/removed from WRAP, hence why the link no longer works.
National Winter Service Research Group (NWSRG) Practical Guide for Winter Service	Page not found - NWSRG	Practical Guidance Documents - NWSRG	Updated link seems correct. It is very difficult to determine the original and updated publication dates as they seem to vary by chapter. I believe the original date will have been in 2010, and the update date will have been in 2016 (around the same time of the CoP publication). However, I note updates as recent as 2021.

Figure 7: Example findings from document review

We recommend that a further review of all links is conducted when the CoP is updated and that a mechanism or framework is established to ensure references to other documents can be continually managed and updated.

4 Recommendations

Based on the stakeholder engagement activities and the document review, the following high-level recommendations are made.

1. Modernise the format and delivery

- Develop a digital-first CoP by creating a dynamic, web-based version, allowing for:
 - Interactive tools and calculators (e.g. carbon footprint estimators, inspection frequency models)
 - Embedded case studies and training videos
 - Searchable content, filterable by asset type or user group.
- Consider a tiered structure:
 - Executive summaries and infographics for senior leaders
 - Technical depth for engineers and asset managers
 - Quick-start guides and checklists for practitioners.

2. Enhance usability and adoption

- Introduce summary guidance documents tailored to:
 - Different organisation sizes and capacities
 - Different user groups (e.g. highway engineers, sustainability officers, elected members).
- Publish implementation toolkits with:
 - “Pick-up-and-play” templates (e.g. asset management plans, lifecycle models)
 - Best practice case studies (e.g. active travel integration)
 - Compliance self-assessment checklists.
- Establish a digital training programme to support rollout and implementation.

3. Strengthen and clarify the risk-based approach

- Clarify expectations for applying risk-based thinking across asset types.
- Define minimum service levels or statutory baselines where appropriate.
- Develop worked examples showing different ways to apply risk-based principles.

4. Expand the scope to reflect emerging priorities

- Incorporate new subject areas and assets, including:
 - Active travel infrastructure (walking, wheeling, cycling)
 - Carbon management: lifecycle carbon, carbon toolkits and alignment with PAS 2080
 - Climate adaptation and resilience: flood risk, soft estate, extreme weather
 - EV charging infrastructure
 - Technology and innovation:

- AI for inspections
- Predictive maintenance
- Data standards and open-source tools.

5. Improve structural and governance aspects

- Split the CoP by asset category, but retain unifying principles (overarching principles, Highways, Structures, Lighting, Active Travel, Technology etc.).
- Create a governance framework for:
 - Ongoing updates to linked references
 - Stakeholder engagement and future revisions
 - Ownership and accountability (e.g. DfT and UKRLG roles).

6. Support smaller authorities

- Develop a “light-touch” CoP path for smaller or resource-constrained authorities.
- Offer minimum viable implementation options for local councils with limited technical teams.
- Align recommendations with Incentive Fund metrics or equivalent mechanisms to drive uptake.
- Address workforce shortages by providing competency frameworks.

7. Enable monitoring and evaluation

- Define measurable outcomes and key performance indicators (KPIs) aligned with CoP principles (e.g. condition trends, service levels met, carbon reductions).
- Suggest auditing templates and feedback loops (internal and external).

8. Continue cross-industry engagement throughout future phases of work

- Continue engagement with the Steering Group and UKRLG boards and sub-boards.
- Where appropriate set up separate working groups to focus on requirements for specific topics (e.g. active travel).

Summary

The WMHI CoP remains highly valued but is increasingly outpaced by modern needs. The update should not only revise content but rethink its structure, format and implementation support. By addressing climate, technology, accessibility and governance gaps – while remaining risk based and practical – the new CoP can better serve both today's and tomorrow's infrastructure needs.

Appendix A Virtual whiteboard example



Stakeholder Engagement: UK Roads Board

The Well Managed Highway Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP), published in October 2016 by the UK Roads Liaison Group (UKRLG), provides guidance for local authorities on managing highway networks. It emphasises a risk-based approach, encouraging authorities to tailor their policies to local circumstances rather than adhering to prescriptive standards. Though not legally binding, compliance demonstrates best practice and helps authorities manage risks and meet statutory duties. The current CoP hasn't been updated since publication and is now in need of updating to meet the needs of the modern highway.

TRL is carrying out a piece of scoping work on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT) to identify what and how the current CoP should be updated. This is a short term commission, separate to the actual updating project, as it is recognised that a more informed view of the scope of the work to update the CoP is needed before starting to update the document. TRL has created a survey to scope out what in the CoP works well, what doesn't work well and what changes or additions might be needed to ensure the CoP meets the requirements of the industry now and into the future.

Link to online survey: https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/WMHI_CoP_engagement_survey/

In addition to the online survey, this 'virtual whiteboard' is designed for UKRLG sub-boards to collaborate and share feedback on the current CoP and its upcoming update. It is recognised that seeing others views and feedback can encourage further engagement and collaboration. Use the mouse wheel to zoom and pan to explore different sections, and add your comments on the provided sticky notes. You can also react to others' notes as needed. Please [initial] your notes.

Feedback on current CoP

What aspects of the current CoP do you think work well and why do they work?

Which areas of the current CoP do you think need improvement or updating? Why?

High level approach of the CoP - risk based vs prescriptive levels of condition / maintenance practices. Comment on the preferred approach

Updates and changes

What new subject areas, technologies or practices should be included in the updated CoP?

Comment on sections / documents that are no longer needed and should be deleted

It is recognised that there are many related documents quoted in the current CoP. Please suggest any new references that should be included in an updated CoP.

Implementation and adoption

What challenges do you think organisations face when implementing the current CoP and what prevents a wider implementation of the CoP?

What would make it easier for organisations to adopt and implement the CoP?

How could the CoP's content be presented to increase adoption? What tools / resources (e.g. case studies, toolkits) should be included in an updated CoP?

Appendix B Stakeholder survey questions

About respondents

1. Who do you work for?

- Local authority
- Professional body/group
- DfT
- TfL
- National Highways
- Other (Please specify)

2. Which of these best defines your job title?

- Director
- Manager
- Engineer
- Designer
- Technician
- Early careers
- Other (Please specify)

3. Which of these best describes your area of interest?

- Asset management
- Network management
- Highway engineering
- Highway design
- Transport planning
- Road safety
- Sustainability
- Operations
- Contract management
- Other (Please specify)

4. Where (country/region) are you based?

General feedback on current CoP

5. How familiar are you with the current CoP?

- Very familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Not familiar at all

6. Do you use the CoP for all asset types?

Asset type (Highways, Structures, Lighting):

- Regularly (Daily, weekly)
- Rarely (Annually, only used it once or twice total)
- Never

7. How well do you feel the current CoP adequately addresses the challenges faced in managing the highway infrastructure today?

- Very well
- Somewhat well
- Not well at all
- Unsure

8. How user-friendly do you find the CoP?

- Very user-friendly
- Somewhat user-friendly
- Neither user-friendly nor not user-friendly
- Somewhat not user-friendly
- Very not user-friendly
- Unsure

9. Is the division of the CoP into overarching principles, Highways, Structures and Lighting, each with subsections to provide more detail, still appropriate?

- Yes
- No – How could the structure be improved? (Open-ended response)
- Not sure

10. For each asset type, would you prefer the CoP to take a risk-based or prescriptive approach to detailing working practices?

Asset type (Highways, Structures, Lighting):

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Other possible approaches – please specify (Open-ended response)

11. What aspects of the current CoP do you think work well and why do they work?

(Open-ended response)

12. Which areas of the current CoP do you think need improvement or updating and why? Please indicate which areas should be prioritised.

(Open-ended response)

13. Have you ever provided feedback on the structure and content of the CoP?

- Yes (If so, how? Open-ended response)
- No

Updates and changes

14. What new subject areas, technologies or practices should be included in the updated CoP?

(Open-ended response)

15. It is recognised that there are many related documents quoted in the current CoP. Are there new references that should be included in an updated CoP?

(Open-ended response)

16. Are there sections/quoted documents within the current CoP that you feel are no longer needed and should be removed?

(Open-ended response)

17. Would you welcome a short summary guidance document alongside the CoP?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Implementation and adoption

18. What challenges do you think organisations face when implementing the current CoP and what prevents a wider implementation of the CoP?

(Open-ended response)

19. What would make it easier for your organisation to adopt and implement the CoP?

(Open-ended response)

20. How should the CoP's content be presented to increase adoption?

(Open-ended response)

Impact and future considerations

21. What tools/resources (e.g. case studies, toolkits, guidelines) should be included in an updated CoP?

(Open-ended response)

22. Do you have any further comments or suggestions regarding the update of the WMHI CoP?

(Open-ended response)



Part Two

Commissioning options



5 Introduction

This part of the document describes the delivery and commissioning options available to the DfT for updating the WMHI CoP. It evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of each option and presents a preferred collaborative delivery and commissioning model. A scope and indicative roadmap for implementation based on this preferred model are also included.

6 Delivery options

6.1 Preferred delivery option

This model was directly informed by stakeholder feedback, which emphasised the importance of retaining UKRLG ownership to maintain legitimacy, while also calling for coordinated industry authorship and structured governance to ensure quality and relevance (see gap analysis in [Part One](#) of this report). This scenario outlines a collaborative delivery model for updating the WMHI CoP, where:

- **DfT** provides funding and strategic policy direction.
- **UKRLG** assumes ownership and stewardship of the updated CoP.
- **Lead consultant** acts as the independent integrator and delivery manager, while also providing technical support for authorship.
- **Industry experts** formed in working groups (including representation from UKRLG sub-boards, lead consultant and sub-consultants, where appropriate) contribute to content development and thematic expertise.

Table 2 describes the governance roles of key stakeholders in the WMHI CoP update. The delivery architecture in Figure 8 shows how the roles fit together to form a delivery model. The integrator will coordinate the other roles to ensure smooth delivery of the project and provide a bridge between funders, experts and users.

Table 2: Governance roles

Actor	Role in the model
DfT	Strategic funder and policy steer. Sets the overarching aims and ensures alignment with national priorities.
UKRLG	Custodian of the CoP. Provides oversight, sector endorsement and long-term stewardship.
Steering Group	Provides oversight and direction of the project, drafting support and sign-off of technical updates.
Lead consultant	Integrator. Facilitates stakeholder engagement, drafts and coordinates content, and ensures quality and consistency.
Industry experts	Draft new sections, join thematic working groups and peer review content. Represent a cross-section of authorities, consultancies and user bodies.
Sub-consultants	Appointed by the lead consultant to provide technical and drafting support.




Figure 8: Governance roles of preferred delivery modal

The pros and cons of this option are described below.

Pros:

- Balances neutrality, expertise and sector engagement.
- Retains stakeholder trust.
- Consultant acts as a bridge between funders, experts and users.
- Allows industry co-authorship with coordinated quality assurance.

Cons:

- Requires structured coordination.
- Requires buy-in and commitment from all stakeholders.
- Complexity in governance must be managed.

Benefits:

- **Sector ownership** via UKRLG.
- **Policy control** retained by DfT.
- **Technical neutrality** and continuity from the lead consultant.
- **Practical relevance** through industry authorship.
- **Scalable updates** and clear maintenance plan.

6.2 Other delivery options considered

6.2.1 In-house delivery (DfT-led project team)

Pros: Full control and policy alignment; integrates easily with wider DfT strategy; cost-effective in principle.

Cons: DfT may lack specialist expertise and delivery capacity; reduced sector trust or perceived neutrality; slow mobilisation if internal recruitment is needed.

6.2.2 UKRLG delivery

Pros: Sector-led delivery builds legitimacy and user ownership; well placed to convene experts across domains.

Cons: UKRLG has limited delivery infrastructure and capacity; may need to subcontract technical work; risks with capacity and continuity.

6.2.3 Led by large transport body (e.g. National Highways, TfL)

Pros: Strong delivery credentials and resources; can apply internal best practice; potential for innovation.

Cons: May not be seen as impartial for local authority-focused CoP; could skew priorities towards its own models or needs.

6.2.4 Led by a professional body (e.g. CIHT, ICE)

Pros: Broad professional reach; neutral industry voice; strong policy-influencing role; often experienced in stakeholder engagement.

Cons: May lack delivery mechanisms or need to outsource significant work; slower decision-making; potential funding dependencies.

6.2.5 100% consultant delivery (minimal UKRLG input)

Pros: High efficiency and expertise; rapid mobilisation; innovation potential; clarity of deliverables.

Cons: Risk of limited stakeholder ownership; perceived distance from end users; reliant on quality of brief and oversight.

7 Commissioning options

7.1 Preferred commissioning option: single commission (integrated contract)

This commissioning structure responds to concerns raised by stakeholders about fragmented delivery, inconsistent content and lack of visibility on project progress. A single contract model enables the continuity and cohesion that stakeholders identified as essential.

Description: One commission to a lead integrator, responsible for programme coordination, technical assurance and subcontracting additional inputs (e.g. thematic authors).




Figure 9: Preferred commissioning option

Pros:

- Simplified procurement process, reducing administrative burden.
- Clear single point of accountability and performance management.
- Stronger alignment of programme objectives and deliverables.
- Improved continuity and integration across content areas and workstreams.
- Reduces duplication of roles, resources and reporting.
- Easier for DfT to maintain strategic oversight and policy alignment.
- Encourages a coherent approach to stakeholder engagement, consultation and communication.

Cons:

- Risk if the lead supplier underperforms.
- May reduce direct oversight of subcontracted elements.

Benefits of single commission:

- Ensures programme-wide coherence and consistency across content and deliverables.
- Reduces interface risk between suppliers.
- Enables earlier mobilisation and delivery through a streamlined contract.
- Facilitates a more agile and adaptive working relationship with DfT.
- Enhances transparency in performance tracking, allowing clear KPIs and outcomes to be monitored.
- Ideal for collaborative models where integrator plays a critical leadership and coordination role.

7.2 Other commissioning options considered**7.2.1 Multiple commissions (segmented delivery)**

Description: DfT issues individual commissions for integrator role, thematic content areas (e.g. Highways, Structures, Lighting), digital platform development, and communications and training.

Pros: Tailored expertise for each workstream; encourages innovation and specialist involvement.

Cons: Increases administrative burden on DfT, project management complexity; risk of siloed work; requires strong central coordination.

7.2.2 Hybrid model (integrator + framework call-offs)

Description: Appoint a lead integrator to manage core programme delivery, with framework-based mini competitions for specific modules.

Pros: Combines integration and flexibility; retains oversight of specialist suppliers while reducing management burden.

Cons: Requires well-defined scopes and sequencing; risk of procurement delays if not coordinated

7.2.3 Staged commissioning (phase-gated)

Description: Begin with a short-term commission for high-priority deliverables, followed by subsequent staged commissions to deliver future phases.

Pros: Reduces initial risk; allows early lessons to shape future delivery.

Cons: Introduces potential gaps between phases; may limit continuity if different suppliers win subsequent work, and increases administrative burden on DfT.

8 Project scope

8.1 Purpose of the service

8.1.1 Client's objectives

The DfT is looking to set up a contract for the provision of a range of technical consultancy services to support an update of the WMHI CoP.

The UKRLG is planning an update of the WMHI CoP. This publication is used by local highway authorities to ensure best practice in the management and maintenance of local highway networks, but it is now some eight years old and requires a refresh to bring it up to date.

The service includes:

- Development of a governance framework for the project.
- Development of executive summaries to be released ahead of the main document.
- Planning and development of the updated WMHI CoP.
- Development of training and implementation material.
- Development of a digital platform to host the CoP.
- Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework.

This project will be managed and governed by the DfT with technical oversight and support from UKRLG.

8.1.2 Background

The latest version of the WMHI CoP was published in October 2016 by the UKRLG to provide guidance for local authorities on managing highway networks. It emphasises a risk-based approach, encouraging authorities to tailor their policies to local circumstances rather than adhering to prescriptive standards. Though not legally binding, compliance demonstrates best practice and helps authorities manage risks and meet statutory duties.

Given the time since publication, the current CoP is now in need of updating to meet the needs of the modern highway network. This will help shape a version of the CoP that reflects current best practices, technological advancements, legislative changes and stakeholder needs, ensuring effective and sustainable highway infrastructure management.

TRL has carried out an initial scoping exercise on behalf of the DfT to identify how the current CoP should be updated. This is a short-term commission, prior to a separate project to update the CoP, to provide a more informed view of the scope of the work needed to update the CoP.

TRL has conducted a series of stakeholder engagement sessions to seek the views of the industry to assess what in the current CoP works well, what doesn't work well and what changes or additions might be needed to ensure the CoP meets the requirements of the

industry now and into the future. This stakeholder engagement included meetings with a Steering Group, UKRLG boards and sub-boards and a stakeholder survey disseminated to key stakeholders and users of the CoP. The outputs of this work will be made available to tenderers.

8.2 Description of the service

The overall objective of the service is to produce, launch and embed an updated Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP) through delivery of the following work packages.

8.2.1 Work package 0 – Project and technical management

Objective: To manage day-to-day project delivery, coordinate teams and maintain project governance, reporting, risks and milestones throughout the update process.

Key activities of this work package include day-to-day management of the project, coordinating meetings, progress reporting, risk log maintenance, change control, and technical governance and review.

An online (Teams) meeting will be held at project inception with the DfT project team to fully plan the work. Following the inception meeting the consultant will produce minutes and a project initiation document detailing an updated project plan, resource schedule (or similar), risk register and action log.

Each month the consultant will produce a contractor's monthly report (CMR) and provide updates on any changes to the plan, risk register or action log. Progress meetings will be held at a frequency to be agreed at the inception meeting.

8.2.2 Work package 1 – Governance and stakeholder engagement

Objective: To establish and maintain inclusive governance structures and ongoing stakeholder engagement mechanisms that guide and validate the CoP update from development through implementation.

Stakeholders emphasised the need for continuous engagement mechanisms and better representation across user groups. This work package will:

- Identify all the key stakeholders, steering and working groups (including DfT, UKRLG boards and sub-boards) and identify other working groups required to support delivery of an updated WMHI CoP.
- Define clear roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder. This includes senior leadership (e.g. DfT), project management and technical teams, and consultation groups (e.g. UKRLG).
- Maintain engagement with the existing Steering Group and thematic sub-groups throughout the project.

- Design a plan for engaging stakeholders throughout the project, including Steering Group meetings, meetings with UKRLG boards and sub-boards, other working groups and expert reviews (of text for the updated CoP).
- Create a structured feedback process to review and incorporate stakeholder input into the drafting process, ensuring the updated CoP reflects diverse perspectives, and set up mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of the updated CoP to ensure its effectiveness.

8.2.3 Work package 2 – Executive summaries

Objective:

To produce standalone, concise, user-friendly executive summaries of key sections in the CoP that enable rapid understanding and uptake by senior leaders and non-specialist users.

Many stakeholders noted the CoP's complexity and requested high-level summaries to aid engagement of resource-constrained authorities, non-specialists and senior leaders. This work package will:

- Identify key areas and the most important sections that require executive summaries.
- For each chosen area or section produce an executive summary by streamlining concepts and removing any redundant or non-essential details.
- Ensure the summary document is reviewed by subject matter experts or stakeholders (e.g. Steering Group members) to ensure that the key points are accurately represented and that the document is clear.
- Incorporate feedback into final summary documents and make them available to the intended audience through appropriate channels (e.g. email distribution and/or inclusion in a digital platform that hosts the full CoP).

8.2.4 Work package 3 – Risk-based approach review

Objective:

To assess and update the application of the risk-based approach across asset types, including the definition of minimum service levels (MSLs) to support consistent and accountable delivery.

While most respondents supported retaining the risk-based model, there were consistent calls for clearer MSLs to reduce inconsistency and avoid under-delivery. This work package will:

- Conduct a thorough assessment of the current risk approach for each asset, including safety risks, structural integrity, environmental factors and the likelihood of failure or deterioration.
- Identify key risks and categorise risks based on likelihood and consequence (e.g. safety hazards, traffic disruptions, asset degradation).

- Define and validate specific MSLs for each risk category, covering condition of infrastructure, safety standards and maintenance response times.
- Update guidance and incorporate MSLs into the updated CoP.

8.2.5 Work package 4 – Document definition and scope

Objective:

To develop an updated document definition, scope and audit and update all references, hyperlinks and structural elements of the CoP, ensuring that the revised document is current, navigable and fully scoped for future use.

Many stakeholders noted that the extensive references were useful but it is important that they are kept up to date. Many links were found to no longer work or refer to an outdated document.

This work package will:

- Clearly outline the objectives of the updated CoP. This includes deciding whether the update is a complete overhaul or focused on specific sections.
- Create a clear outline for the updated CoP with sections for each topic.
- Identify and document all hyperlinks in the CoP.
- Test each link to determine which ones are broken or lead to outdated or irrelevant resources.
- Find the most current version of each referenced document, guideline, legislation or standard and replace outdated links with the updated ones.
- Review whether to add references to other documents not currently linked to in the CoP.

8.2.6 Work package 5 – CoP update

Objective:

To deliver the full technical update of the CoP, including new content development, revisions to existing sections, integration of stakeholder input, legal alignment and final publication.

This work package will:

- Where possible, identify authors in the working groups, UKRLG board or sub-boards to develop specific sections of the CoP. Where not possible, identify authors in the industry best placed to develop particular sections and establish contracting mechanisms if required.
- Identify dependencies and define processes to ensure guidance is consistent.
- Complete a first draft of updated sections and compile updated sections into a first draft of the updated CoP.
- Share the draft with stakeholders and the wider community for review. Gather their feedback on clarity, relevance and comprehensiveness.
- Ensure that the CoP aligns with the current legal framework and regulatory requirements.

- Refine the draft CoP based on the feedback received during the document review and seek approval for publication from key stakeholders.
- Review the executive summaries developed in WP2 to ensure they remain relevant and up to date.
- Publish the approved CoP through appropriate channels and disseminate it.

8.2.7 Work package 6 – Training and implementation

Objective:

To develop a comprehensive training and support package (including toolkits, case studies, FAQs and videos) that enables effective adoption of the CoP across diverse user groups.

A lack of training and guidance materials was frequently cited as a barrier to adoption, particularly by smaller authorities and newer practitioners. This work package will:

- Consult with prospective users of the CoP to understand what training is required.
- Design a programme of training based on feedback received.
- Develop training materials and programmes to help highway professionals adopt the updated practices.
- Create supporting documents, such as FAQs, implementation guides, templates, toolkits and case studies.
- Publish all training material on a digital CoP platform.

8.2.8 Work package 7 – Digital platform to host CoP

Objective:

To design, develop and launch a web-based, interactive platform for hosting the CoP, offering features such as search, collaboration, version control and user analytics. The digital platform will be hosted on a UKRLG website (domain already acquired).

Stakeholders were almost unanimous in calling for the CoP to be hosted on a live digital platform with interactive tools, training and search functionality.

This work package will:

- Identify core functionalities such as document hosting, collaboration tools, version control, search functionality, user access management, reporting and real-time updates.
- Plan the structure of the content that will be hosted on the platform. This includes documents (CoP, guidelines, reports), multimedia (videos, tutorials) and other resources (tools, templates, case studies).
- Define the technical requirements, including platform architecture, user roles, database design, security requirements, scalability, reliability, user interface and content management system.
- Create a centralised document repository where users can easily access and download the WMHI CoP and related documents.

- Implement a robust search engine that allows users to search through the CoP, documents and other resources efficiently.
- Integrate tools for collaboration, such as forums, discussion boards or comment sections where users can provide feedback or ask questions about the CoP.
- Ensure that documents on the platform are versioned, allowing users to access previous versions.
- Provide analytics tools to track user engagement and content consumption, allowing administrators to monitor the platform's usage and identify popular or under-utilised resources.
- Conduct quality assurance and user testing with a diverse set of stakeholders (e.g. engineers, highway authorities, contractors) to identify any challenges or pain points in navigating and using the platform.
- Launch the platform to users. Announce the launch through relevant channels (e.g. newsletters, social media, industry conferences).
- Provide onboarding and training resources such as tutorials, user guides and video demonstrations to help users get acquainted with the platform.

8.2.9 Work package 8 – Monitoring and evaluation framework

Objective:

To define KPIs, data collection methods and reporting mechanisms that track CoP adoption, effectiveness and impact, enabling continuous improvement and accountability.

This work package will:

- Identify the core goals of the WMHI CoP, including but not limited to enhancing safety, reducing maintenance costs, improving service delivery and ensuring the infrastructure remains in a good condition.
- Determine what metrics will best measure success in achieving the goals.
- Develop data collection methods, define targets and develop evaluation methods.
- Establish reporting mechanisms and develop systems for tracking and reporting progress, such as dashboards or regular performance reports.
- Review the framework for structured feedback set up in WP1 to ensure it remains fit for purpose.
- Set up mechanisms for monitoring the application of the CoP across highway projects and the collaboration platforms in the digital CoP.

8.2.10 Timescale for deliverables

Work package	Deliverable number	Deliverable description	Date to be delivered
WP0	PM1	The consultant shall deliver the following outputs from the inception meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A set of minutes highlighting any agreements and/or clarifications made over and above the accepted project proposal, including actions • A project initiation document including an updated project plan and resource schedule (or similar), risk register and action log 	Within two weeks of the inception meeting taking place
WP0	PM2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project plan and resource schedule (or similar) • Action log • Contractor's monthly report (CMR) including resource breakdown • Risk and opportunity register 	By the 25th of each month
WP1	D1	Governance framework including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder mapping and engagement plan • Assigned roles and responsibilities • Structured feedback process for stakeholder input into drafting process • Framework for periodic evaluation of CoP by UKRLG 	End of month 3
WP2	D2	Executive summaries for key areas and concepts	End of month 6
WP3	D3	Updated risk-based approach guidance including minimum service levels for each asset	End of month 6
WP4	D4	Document link review output	End of month 5
WP4	D5	Updated document links in CoP	End of month 6
WP5	D6	Updated CoP structure including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of new sections • List of updated sections • List of sections to be removed 	End of month 6
WP5	D7	First drafts of all updated and new sections	End of month 11
WP5	D8	Consolidated first draft of updated CoP	End of month 12

Work package	Deliverable number	Deliverable description	Date to be delivered
WP5	D9	Final drafts of all updated and new sections	End of month 15
WP5	D10	Consolidated final and approved version of updated CoP	End of month 18
WP6	D11	Training programme plan covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder engagement • Programme • Training material plan • Dissemination plan 	End of month 14
WP6	D12	Training material, which may include (but is not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance documents • FAQs • Implementation guides • Toolkits • Case studies • Compliance checklists • Tutorial videos • Templates 	End of month 16
WP7	D13	Specification for digital CoP covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functional requirements • Platform architecture • User roles • Database design • Security requirements • User interface design • Content management system 	End of month 12

Work package	Deliverable number	Deliverable description	Date to be delivered
WP7	D14	Launch digital CoP with following features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document repository • Collaboration tools • Version control • Analytics and reporting • Search functionality 	End of month 18
WP8	D15	Monitoring and evaluation framework covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KPIs definition • Data collection methods • Targets • Evaluation methods • Reporting mechanisms 	End of month 18

The completion date for this service is the end of month 18. The work can be mapped as the following phases.

Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration

Quick wins, engagement and direction setting

Mapped work packages:

- WP0 – Project and technical management (begins here and runs throughout)
- WP1 – Governance and stakeholder engagement (setup and early engagement)
- WP2 – Executive summaries and quick-start guides
- WP3 – Risk-based approach review (initial scoping of MSLs and current practice)
- WP4 – Document definition and scope (audit links, define structure and required changes)

Phase 2: Development and integration

Main update of CoP and digital design

Mapped work packages:

- WP0 – Project and technical management (throughout)
- WP1 – Governance and engagement (continued input and oversight)
- WP3 – Risk-based approach review (complete and embed into CoP)
- WP4 – Document definition and scope (complete restructuring and author allocation)
- WP5 – CoP update (drafting, legal review, refinement)
- WP6 – Training and implementation (develop tools and materials)
- WP7 – Digital platform (design, build and test core platform features)

Phase 3: Adoption and evolution

Implementation, monitoring, evaluation and improvement

Mapped work packages:

- WP0 – Project and technical management (throughout)
- WP5 – CoP update (finalisation and publication)
- WP6 – Training and implementation (rollout and onboarding)
- WP7 – Digital platform (platform launch, user support, feedback loop)
- WP8 – Monitoring and evaluation framework (KPIs definition, reporting, impact measurement)


An indicative roadmap of the phases is shown in Appendix C, with a visual representation in Appendix D.

Appendix C Deliverables by priority of work package

Phase	Work package number	Work package title	Description	Timeline
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP0	Project and technical management	Manage day-to-day project delivery, reporting, risks and milestones	Throughout
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP1	Governance and stakeholder engagement	Maintain thematic sub-groups and ongoing engagement forums	Start 0–6 months and continue
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP1	Governance and stakeholder engagement	Create a governance framework, including stakeholder engagement, continuous updates and version control of the CoP	0–3 months
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP2	Executive summaries	Create high-level executive summaries of key sections in CoP	0–6 months
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP3	Risk-based approach review	Assess and update the application of the risk-based approach across asset types	0–6 months
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP3	Risk-based approach review	Develop guidance on minimum service levels to accompany risk-based approaches	0–6 months
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP4	Document definition and scope	Review and replace broken or outdated references in the existing CoP	0–6 months
Phase 1: Foundation and acceleration	WP4	Document definition and scope	Restructure CoP into clearer asset-based modules with cross-cutting principles	0–6 months
Phase 2: Development and integration	WP5	CoP update	Create draft updated CoP, including new content development, revisions to existing sections, integration of stakeholder input and legal alignment	6–12 months
Phase 2: Development and integration	WP5	CoP update	Refine the draft CoP based on the feedback received during the document review and seek approval for publication from key stakeholders	12–18 months

Phase	Work package number	Work package title	Description	Timeline
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP6	Training and implementation	Design a training programme aligned with stakeholder requirements	12–18 months
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP6	Training and implementation	Create training materials such as FAQs, implementation guides, templates, toolkits and case studies to support CoP implementation	12–18 months
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP7	Digital platform to host CoP	Develop the concept and produce specification for a web-based, interactive platform for the CoP	6–12 months
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP7	Digital platform to host CoP	Develop a web-based, interactive platform for hosting the CoP	12–18 months
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP8	Monitoring and evaluation framework	Define KPIs, audit tools and monitoring strategies for evaluating CoP implementation	12–18 months
Phase 3: Adoption and implementation	WP8	Monitoring and evaluation framework	Embed continuous feedback and versioning process for CoP evolution	18 months and onwards

Appendix D Roadmap visuals





Part Three

Delivery plan



Delivery roadmap by work package

Priority	Project phase	Theme	Recommendation	Description	Timeline	Addresses TRL recommendation in gap analysis report	Work package	Work package title
Short-term	Scoping and governance	Governance	Establish living document governance	Create a governance framework for continuous updates and version control of the CoP	0–6 months	5	WP1	Governance and stakeholder engagement
Short-term	Scoping and governance	Stakeholder engagement	Sustain stakeholder engagement	Maintain thematic sub-groups and ongoing engagement forums	Start 0–6 months and continue	5, 8	WP1	Governance and stakeholder engagement
Long-term	Sustainment	Ongoing maintenance	Maintain governance and stakeholder process	Embed continuous feedback and versioning process for CoP evolution	18+ months	5, 8	WP1	Governance and stakeholder engagement
Short-term	Scoping and governance	Usability	Develop executive summary and quick-start guides	Create high-level summaries, checklists and user-friendly overviews	0–6 months	1, 2, 6	WP2	Quick-start guides
Short-term	Scoping and governance	Reference accuracy	Update outdated links and references	Review and replace broken or outdated references in the existing CoP	0–6 months	5	WP4	Update document
Short-term	Scoping and governance	Risk framework	Add minimum service levels	Develop guidance on minimum service levels to accompany risk-based approaches	0–6 months	3	WP3	Document structure and scope
Medium-term	Research and design	Structure	Improve structural layout	Restructure CoP into clearer asset-based modules with cross-cutting principles	6–12 months	2, 5	WP3	Define document structure and scope

(continued)

Priority	Project phase	Theme	Recommendation	Description	Timeline	Addresses TRL recommendation in gap analysis report	Work package	Work package title
Medium-term	Research and design	Scope expansion	Expand scope for emerging needs	Add sections on active travel, AI, carbon, EV infrastructure and biodiversity	6–18 months	4	WP4	Update document
Medium-term	Research and design	Inclusion and accessibility	Embed inclusion and accessibility	Ensure the CoP meets the needs of vulnerable users and diverse authority contexts	6–18 months	1, 2, 4, 6	WP4	Update document
Medium-term	Research and design	Training and capacity	Define training and competency framework	Design a training programme aligned with roles and responsibilities	6–18 months	2	WP5	Training and implementation
Medium-term	Development and drafting	Implementation tools	Develop implementation toolkits	Create templates, checklists and training resources to support CoP implementation	6–18 months	2	WP5	Training and implementation
Short-term	Digital design	Digital transition	Initiate digital CoP concept	Develop concept for a modular, web-based CoP with dynamic tools	0–6 months	1, 2	WP6	Digital CoP
Long-term	Digital delivery	Digital transformation	Create a digital-first platform	Develop a web-based, modular and searchable CoP with multimedia integration	6–24 months	1, 2	WP6	Digital CoP
Long-term	Evaluation	Monitoring and evaluation	Create performance and evaluation framework	Define KPIs, audit tools and monitoring strategies for CoP implementation	18–36 months	7	WP7	Monitoring and evaluation

Well Managed Highways Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice (CoP) Update

The Well Managed Highway Infrastructure (WMHI) Code of Practice, last published in 2016, is a cornerstone document guiding local highway authorities in the effective, risk-based management of their networks. With the emergence of new technologies, evolving policy landscapes, and shifts in stakeholder needs, it is now essential to undertake a comprehensive update of the CoP to ensure its continued relevance and effectiveness.

This report contains a gap analysis, outlines a recommended approach for commissioning the next phase(s) of work, and includes a delivery plan.

TRL Limited
Crowthorne House, Nine Mile Ride,
Wokingham, Berkshire, RG40 3GA,
United Kingdom
T: +44 (0) 1344 773131
E: enquiries@trl.co.uk
W: www.trl.co.uk

[DOI: 10.58446/umtz1497P](https://doi.org/10.58446/umtz1497P)

PPR2062

