



POLICY AND DIRECTIVES		
Asset Condition and Criticality Policy		
#CAM-POL-004	Date Approved/ Resolution #	Date Revised:

1. PURPOSE

This Policy establishes the requirement for standardized assessment of asset condition and criticality across the City of Thompson. Condition and criticality information is essential for risk assessment, lifecycle planning, maintenance prioritization, capital decision-making, and annual reporting under the Corporate Asset Management By-law.

2. POLICY STATEMENT

The City shall use standardized corporate methods to assess and record the condition and criticality of capital assets within the Asset Management System. Results shall be comparable across departments and usable in risk, Levels of Service, and capital processes. Imperfect information is acceptable when data confidence is stated; ad hoc or inconsistent departmental approaches shall be replaced over time with corporate methods.

3. SCOPE

This Policy applies to all asset classes within the Scope of the Asset Management System (CAM-GOV-SCP-001). The intensity, frequency, and method of assessment shall be proportional to asset criticality, risk, and the cost of obtaining information. Not every asset requires the same level of inspection detail at the same interval.

4. DEFINITIONS

Condition. A measure of an asset's physical state at a point in time, typically expressed on a standardized rating scale.

Criticality. The relative importance of an asset (or asset group) to service delivery, public safety, environmental protection, and financial exposure if the asset fails or underperforms.

Data Confidence. A documented assessment of the reliability of condition or criticality information, used to qualify decisions and prioritize further investigation.

Condition and Criticality Assessment Framework. The corporate Level 3/4 method that defines rating scales, scoring rules, assessment frequency guidance, and recording requirements.

5. PRINCIPLES

- One corporate language for condition and criticality so results can be compared and aggregated.
- Assessment effort proportional to criticality and risk — higher consequence assets receive more rigorous or more frequent attention.
- Condition informs likelihood of failure; criticality informs consequence — together they support risk scoring.
- Data confidence shall be recorded where required; low confidence triggers verification, not dismissal of the asset.
- Results must be used — in the Risk Register, maintenance planning, capital prioritization, and annual reporting — not filed and forgotten.
- Northern operating conditions (freeze–thaw, extreme cold, limited construction season, access constraints) shall be considered when interpreting condition and planning reassessment cycles.

6. REQUIREMENTS

6.1. Common Language

The City shall maintain corporate condition rating scales and criticality scoring methods so that results are comparable across departments and usable in risk and capital processes. Asset-class guidance may refine how ratings are applied, but shall not create conflicting corporate scales without AMSC endorsement and documented rationale.

6.2. Condition Assessment

Condition assessments shall be planned and delivered according to the Condition and Criticality Assessment Framework and related standards. High-criticality and High/Extreme-risk assets shall be prioritized for more frequent or more rigorous assessment. Condition results shall be recorded in or linked to the Capital Asset Registry.

Where full formal inspection is not yet practicable, documented interim condition estimates with stated confidence are acceptable as a step toward full coverage.

6.3. Criticality Assessment

Criticality shall reflect the importance of the asset (or asset group) to service delivery,

safety, environmental protection, and financial exposure. Factors may include, as applicable to the asset class: role in emergency response or critical services; number and type of customers affected; redundancy; environmental or regulatory consequence of failure; and replacement or outage cost exposure.

Criticality results shall inform inspection frequency, risk scoring, maintenance priority, and capital prioritization.

6.4. Use of Results

Condition and criticality results shall feed:

- The corporate Risk Register and risk scoring (likelihood and consequence)
- Maintenance and renewal planning
- Capital prioritization and business cases
- Levels of Service monitoring where technical indicators depend on asset state
- The Annual State of the Infrastructure and Asset Management Report

They are enabling controls for decision-making, not paperwork exercises.

6.5. Data Quality

Assessments shall note data confidence where the Data Quality and Confidence Framework requires it. Improvement of condition and criticality coverage shall be planned over time according to risk priority and available resources.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Council — Approves this Policy; receives summary condition and criticality information through the Annual State of the Infrastructure and Asset Management Report.
- City Manager — Ensures organizational capacity to implement corporate assessment methods.
- AMSC — Endorses methodologies; monitors corporate consistency; considers condition and criticality when reviewing risk and capital recommendations.
- Asset Management Sponsor — Maintains frameworks and standards; coordinates improvement of data quality and coverage; supports reporting. These functions may be combined in a single position.
- Department Heads — Ensure assessments are completed for assets under their responsibility according to corporate methods; ensure results are recorded and used in planning.
- Technical and supervisory staff — Conduct or support assessments as assigned; report observed deterioration that may change condition or risk status between formal cycles.

8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AMS DOCUMENTS

This Policy is implemented through the Condition and Criticality Assessment Framework, condition rating scales, criticality scoring methods, the Capital Asset Registry Policy (CAM-001), and the Capital Asset Risk Management Policy (CAM-RSK-001). It is read with the Asset Management Policy (CAM-000), the Scope of the AMS (CAM-GOV-SCP-001), and the SAMP.

Detailed rating tables, field forms, and assessment frequencies are set in Level 3/4 documents and may be refined under City Manager or Sponsor authority provided they remain consistent with this Policy.

9. REVIEW

This Policy shall be reviewed at least every four years, aligned with the Council term. Methodologies and scales may be refined under City Manager or Asset Management Sponsor authority provided they remain consistent with this Policy and are documented for AMSC awareness.

10. APPROVAL

This document is submitted for formal adoption by the Council of the City of Thompson in accordance with the Corporate Asset Management By-law (Level 2 – Strategic Directives).

Recommended for Council consideration by the Asset Management Steering Committee.

Chief Administrative Officer / City Manager

Date: _____

Adopted by Resolution of Council:

Resolution No.: _____ Date: _____

Mayor: _____