

**FINANCE COMMITTEE (No 35)**  
**OPEN Session to be held on Thursday 7 June 2007**  
**In the Boardroom, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Windsor House,**  
**42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL**  
**Commencing at 0900 hours**

**AGENDA**

- 09.00
1. Apologies for Absence
  2. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 16 May 2007
  3. Matters Arising and Outstanding Items

<b>Business Items</b>	<b>Report Sponsor</b>
4. Project Monitoring and Approvals	Stephen Critchley
5. Best Value Performance Plan	Stephen Critchley
6. Any Other Business	

**Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 14 September 2007**

## TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

**MINUTES** of the Finance Committee Meeting (No. 34) held in the Boardroom, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Windsor House, Victoria Street, London at 0900hrs on Wednesday 16 May 2007

**Present:** Sir Mike Hodgkinson      Chair  
Honor Chapman  
Stephen Glaister  
Judith Hunt  
Rana Roy

Peter Anderson      Special Adviser

**In Attendance:**

Stephen Allen	Managing Director, Finance
Howard Carter	General Counsel
Naomi Connell	Director of Finance and Support Offices (LUL)
Stephen Critchley	Chief Finance Officer
Mary Hardy	Director of Internal Audit
Ellen Howard	Director of Corporate Governance
Stuart Munro	Director of Finance, London Rail
Peter Regan	Director of Corporate Finance (Interim)
Richard Webster	Director of Finance, Surface Transport

**Secretary:** James Varley      Secretary

---

**ACTION:**

**07/05/07    Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Eva Lindholm.

**Declaration of Interests**

No interests were declared.

**08/05/07    Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 March 2007**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2007 were **APPROVED** as a correct record of the meeting and were signed by the Chair.

**Matters Arising from the minutes:**

There were no matters arising.

The Chair congratulated Steve Allen on his appointment as Managing Director, Finance and welcomed Rana Roy and

Peter Anderson to the Committee.

Outstanding Items:

All the Outstanding Items were on the agenda or due for presentation at a future meeting.

**09/05/07 TfL's Operational and Financial Report**

Stephen Critchley introduced the item.

The Committee noted TfL's operational and financial performance over the fourth quarter 2006/07.

**10/05/07 Investment Programme Report**

Stephen Critchley introduced the report.

Judith Hunt commented that anecdotal evidence suggested a significant improvement in the standards of service from London Underground and London Buses. In response to a question from the Committee, Steve Allen undertook to provide an explanation of how targets are set by TfL as significant work is underway to develop a more coherent framework for their application.

Steve Allen

Following a question from Rana Roy, the Chair explained that full funding for the West London Tram (WLT) had never been part of the TfL's Business Plan and that the outcome of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review was awaited. Steve Allen also commented that further work was being done to understand alternatives to the WLT.

The Committee noted TfL's investment programme performance over the fourth quarter 2006/07.

**11/05/07 Project Monitoring and Approvals**

Stephen Critchley introduced the item.

The Committee noted the report.

**12/05/07 Appointment to Transport Trading Limited**

Howard Carter introduced the item.

The Committee agreed to advise the Board to approve the appointment of Steve Allen a Director of Transport Trading Limited.

**13/05/07    Any Other Business**

There being no further business the meeting closed.

Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

### TfL FINANCE COMMITTEE – OPEN SESSION

#### OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Target Date	Description	Action By:	Minute No.	Status/ note:
<b>TBA</b>	Continue work on understanding economics issues of use of renewable energy	Naomi Connell	37/10/06	<b>Ongoing – LU to brief a future meeting</b>

#### PAPERS DUE TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Target Date	Description	Action By:	Minute No.	Status/ note:
<b>10.05.07</b>	TfL Operational and Financial Report	Stephen Critchley	Quarterly Standing Item	<b>On agenda</b>
<b>10.05.07</b>	Investment Programme Report	Stephen Critchley /Richard Browning	Quarterly Standing Item	<b>On agenda</b>
<b>14.09.07</b>	Prudential Indicators 2006/7 Final Outturn	Stephen Allen	Annual Standing Item	
<b>TBA</b>	Hybrid Bus Project	Richard Webster	03/03/07	

**TRANSPORT FOR LONDON**

**STAFF SUMMARY**

**FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT : PROJECT MONITORING – PROJECT APPROVALS**

**MEETING DATE : 7 JUNE 2007**

---

**1. PURPOSE**

To inform the Finance Committee of approvals given by the Commissioner (and in his absence the Managing Director, Finance) in accordance with delegated authority under the TfL Standing Orders.

**2. BACKGROUND**

The Commissioner has the delegated authority to approve project submissions between £25m and £100m for budgeted projects (£10m and £25m for unbudgeted projects), and in his absence the Managing Director of Finance.

**3. PROJECT APPROVALS**

Since the last Finance Committee on 16 May 2007, there have been two approvals, namely, Connect Type 3 Train Radio and Low Emission Zone. Further details are set out in Appendix 1.

Set out in the attached Appendix 2 is a list of planned projects which are expected to seek formal approval under delegated limits in the current financial year.

**4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Finance Committee is recommended to NOTE the contents of this report.

## APPENDIX 1

Summary of the projects approved by Commissioner.

<b>LU-PJ249</b>	<b>Connect Type 3 Train Radio Total Cost = £16M</b>
<b>Outcomes and Business Case</b>	<p>A new type of radio needs to be developed because the existing radios are not compatible with the new stock being ordered for the Victoria line and SSL. Existing radios are incompatible because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• space constraints on the new train designs;</li><li>• different voltage supply on the new trains; and</li><li>• the need to comply with new recycling legislation.</li></ul> <p>Benefits of the new radios will be that they will interact with the Train Management System to automatically send diagnostics back to the depot to aid fault finding. This should enable problems to resolved quicker, improving stock reliability and availability. The radios will also provide live feeds to the Customer Information Systems to improve real time information.</p>
<b>Outputs and Schedule</b>	<p>This proposal is to design, develop and deliver 498 Type 3 radios for the Metronet BCV Victoria Line and Metronet SSL new stock programmes.</p> <p>Project completion is scheduled for 28 August 2009.</p>
<b>Approval</b>	<p>The project is seeking additional authority of £14.2m, taking total authority to £16.2m.</p> <p>£7m is budgeted and the unbudgeted £9m is to be funded from the Connect Transmissions Options budget.</p>

<b>ST-PJ15</b>	<b>Low Emission Zone</b>	<b>Total Approval = £59M</b>
<b>Outcomes and Business Case</b>	<p>This authority seeks to proceed with the Low Emission Zone through to the go-live of LEZ for lighter HGVs, buses and coaches.</p> <p>The business case has a benefit cost ratio of around 0.4:1 to 0.6 :1 using the DEFRA methodology (the cost does not include fine income). Nevertheless, the LEZ will be a key contribution towards the Mayor's statutory duty to take steps towards achieving national air quality objectives in London.</p>	
<b>Outputs and Schedule</b>	<p>The LEZ seeks to ensure compliance, by subjecting operators of non-compliant vehicles to a daily charge, with Euro III standard for PM<sub>10</sub>S, for HGVs over 12 tonnes as from February 2008 and lighter HGVs, buses and coaches as from July 2008.</p> <p>This authority will expire on 30 September 2008.</p>	
<b>Approval</b>	<p>The total authority granted so far for this project is £21.85m. The total costs seeking authority are £58.698m (comprising £42.414m capital and £16.284m revenue expenditure).</p> <p>The project seeks an increase of £37.848m resulting in a total funding authority of £58.698m to allow delivery of the scheme.</p>	



## APPENDIX 2

Projects expected to seek authority from the Commissioner during 2007/8

	Investment Programme Number	Current Approval £m	Expected Approval £m
<b>Corporate</b>			
West London Tram	FP-PJ11	26	38
<b>London Underground</b>			
Tunnel Cooling	LU-PJ49	33	64
Waterloo Station: W&C Line Step Free Access	LU-PJ18	13	17
Victoria Station Upgrade	LU-PJ111	29	59
Shepherds Bush Re-Alignment of Works	LU-PJ35	66	78
Central Line Station Modernisations Under Specified Rights- Marble Arch	LU-PJ266	2	24
Central Line Station Modernisations under Specified Rights – Notting Hill Gate	LU-PJ267	2	28
Bank - W&C line Congestion Relief	LU-PC171	3	35
<b>London Rail</b>			
North London Railway Infrastructure Project	LR-PJ32	3	30
<b>Surface</b>			
Low Emission Zone	ST-PJ15	22	59
Blackwall Tunnel Northbound	ST-PJ08	2	42
West Ham Bus Garage	ST-PJ179	0	29
Hangar Lane A406	ST-PJ07	25	29

## Transport for London

### FINANCE COMMITTEE

**SUBJECT:** Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP)

**MEETING DATE:** 7 June 2007

---

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper provides the Finance Committee with an overview of the best value legislation and requirements, and seeks approval of TfL's Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) prior to publication by 30 June 2007.

#### 2. Overview of Best Value legislation and requirements

- 2.1 Government introduced Best Value via the Local Government Act 1999 and TfL is specified as a 'Best Value' authority under that Act. As such, TfL has a duty to secure continuous improvement in the way that its functions are exercised having regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness.
- 2.2 In practical terms, Best Value legislation requires TfL to:
- Carry out reviews of its services having regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The previous requirement to review all of its services was relaxed in March 2002 and the number and scope of reviews are no longer prescribed.
  - Monitor and compare performance across a range of statutory best value performance indicators (BVPI's) and report on such annually.
  - Publish summary performance data by 31 March each year, although Best Value authorities have discretion as to the content and method of communication.
  - Produce annually by 30 June each year a BVPP in accordance with the guidance published by Government. For Best Value authorities such as TfL who have achieved either a 'good' or 'excellent' rating from its Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA)<sup>1</sup> the detailed requirements have been relaxed.
- 2.3 TfL's compliance with Best Value legislation is subject to annual audit by external auditors, KPMG. The annual audit includes a review of the BVPP both for general compliance with legislation, and also specifically

---

<sup>1</sup> TfL achieved an 'excellent' rating from its Initial Performance Assessment the Audit Commission equivalent of CPA as applied to Local Authorities

in relation to the content and accuracy of the performance indicators. The outcome is reported to TfL's Audit Committee by KPMG as part of the annual Data Quality Review.

### **3. Detailed requirements for the BVPP**

3.1 TfL is required to publish a Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) by 30 June each year. Detailed guidance for the requirements of the BVPP is contained within government circulars published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)<sup>2</sup>; the current circular applicable is 05/2006 which sets out TfL's statutory obligations.

3.2 The required content of the BVPP is:

- A brief summary of TfL's strategic objectives and priorities for improvement,
- Arrangements for addressing TfL's improvement priorities,
- The out-turn Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) for 2006/07 with associated commentary, and targets for the following year, and
- A brief statement on contracts. TfL is required to certify either that there were no contracts awarded during the year which involved a transfer of staff, or that those let, where applicable, complied with the Code of Practice on Workforce Matters in Local Authority Service Contracts.

### **4. 2007 BVPP**

4.1 In common with previous years, and in accordance with best practice, TfL has integrated the production of the BVPP with its business and corporate planning process and resultant publications. Hence the abbreviated BVPP (see appendix 1) is published as an annex to the 2007/08 – 2009/10 business plan, published in November 2006.

4.2 The contents of this Annex are:

- The out-turn Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) for 2006/07 with associated commentary and comparison,
- A statement on contracts, and
- A small amount of additional information relating to business improvement processes that is not contained in the main business plan text.

4.3 The Annex contains outturn performance information against the BVPIs. These are specific indicators prescribed by Government – TfL has no control over the areas to be measured or their methodology. As such, they are not representative of TfL's activities, but where

---

<sup>2</sup> ODPM became the Department for Communities and Local Government in May 2006

appropriate are integrated into the wider performance monitoring and reporting framework. There are significant changes in some of the BVPI figures when comparing 2006/07 performance against target or prior year outturn and an explanation for such is given in the commentary for that indicator.

- 4.4 Final year outturn information has been provided for all of the prescribed performance indicators and has been signed-off by the responsible Director.
- 4.5 The BVPP will be audited by KPMG, TfL's appointed external auditors. As in previous years, the BVPP will be published on the TfL website by the end of June.

## **5. Future Developments**

- 5.1 Government are currently working on the new national set of performance indicators as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review process, the result of which they expect to announce in Autumn 2007. The proposal is to reduce the number of national indicators from the current level (600-1200) to a single set of around 200 which will be designed to measure national priority outcomes.
- 5.2 Under the Government's current plans, the new performance framework and single set of national set of performance indicators will be phased in from 1 April 2008 with full implementation from 2009/10. Therefore, 2007/08 will be the last year of Best Value Performance Indicators.

## **6. Recommendation**

The Committee is asked to recommend that the TfL Board

- APPROVE the contents of this Annex to the 2007/08 – 2009/10 business plan to form the overall 2006/07 BVPP
- DELEGATE authority to the Managing Director, Finance to make any changes prior to publication

## Annex to the 2007/08 – 2009/10 Business Plan (Best Value Performance Plan)

### Introduction

TfL is required, as part of the Local Government Act 1999 and supplemented by ODPM circular 05/2006 to publish a Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP). TfL, in line with good practice, integrates its improvement planning with its business plan process. The 2007 BVPP is integrated into its 2007/08 - 2009/10 business plan, which was published in November 2006. This Annex to that plan contains supplementary outturn performance information and other statements that TfL is required to publish.

### Strategic objectives and priorities for improvement

TfL's strategic objectives and overall priorities for improvement are outlined in both the summary and main text of the business plan.

TfL and other functional bodies of the GLA group underwent an Initial Performance Assessment (IPA), carried out by the Audit Commission which concluded in November 2004. IPA is a version of Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) which has been concluded for all top tier Local Authorities and district councils in England. The aim of the process was to assess the Authority's capability to deliver excellent outcomes for local people. TfL was awarded the top rating of '**Excellent**' - a copy of the Audit Commission inspection report can be found on their website at

<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk>

Whilst TfL is rated as 'excellent' overall, there were a number of areas for improvement identified in the report, which TfL recognises. As an 'excellent' organisation, TfL was not required to develop a formal improvement plan but nevertheless, has developed a work programme which pulls together the various initiatives being undertaken to address these issues. The 'areas for improvement' are grouped around five broad themes:

- Partnership working and shared priorities, such as developing our relationship with stakeholders and having greater clarity in respect of the decision making process.
- Achieving the benefits of 'one TfL', for example implementing shared services for corporate activities and realising associated benefits.
- Service quality improvements, such as improving the capacity of transport systems and infrastructure.
- Challenge through scrutiny, transparency and learning, such as developing greater opportunities for shared learning across the GLA Group.
- Reducing travel demand and PPP issues, an example being that our plans give comparatively less weight to reducing the need to travel.

The Audit Commission have, through the Direction of Travel process, assessed TfL's progress against these areas for improvement and concluded that 'good progress has been made in completing the actions in the improvement plan. To date of the previously agreed 49 actions included in the original improvement plan 42 have been completed, the remaining 7 actions are ongoing, and in addition 4 new ones have been added to the plan.'<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Audit Commission 2006 Annual Audit and Inspection Letter

## **Arrangement for addressing TfL's improvement priorities**

TfL has a number of arrangements in place for addressing improvement priorities.

TfL's Business Planning Guidelines are distributed throughout the organisation in April each year. Each business unit is required to identify improvement opportunities and efficiencies not only for the coming year, but for the life of the Plan. This bottom up approach ensures that improvement planning is fully integrated into the overall business planning process. The business units are also required to review their programme of improvements and reviews, to ensure it is the most relevant and appropriate at that time. This approach allows flexibility to meet the business units' needs.

Internal Audit has an established programme of reviews which is agreed by the Audit Committee, but additional reviews can be added by the Director of Internal Audit if necessary.

TfL's future business improvement programme has been influenced by the:

- Outcomes of the IPA review in response to the 'areas for improvement',
- Need to support the business plan in relation to key decisions which need to be made in respect of existing arrangements for service delivery, and
- Ongoing identification and realisation of efficiency gains.

The anticipated outcomes of this process will be a scheme of improvements, the adoption of best practice throughout the business, and continued attention to maximise efficiencies at all levels.

## **Statement on contracts**

TfL confirms that during 2006/07, three contracts were awarded which involved a staff transfer and certifies that it complied with the requirements in the Code of Practice on Workforce matters in Local Authority Service Contracts.

## **Best Value Performance Indicators**

This section sets out the Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) that have been prescribed by Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for TfL in 2006/07. Also included are the performance out-turn figures for 2005/06 (where applicable), the target and outturn figures for 2006/07, and targets for 2007/08.

The comparisons against other authorities have been made against the most recent data available, which relates to 2005/06.

<b>BV No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Transport Best Value Performance Indicators</b>		
BV 100	Temporary road closures	4
BV 102	Passenger journeys on buses	5
BV 165	The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people, as a proportion of all crossings in the authority area	6
BV187	Percentage of the category 1, 1a and 2 footway network (on TLRN) where structural maintenance should be considered.	7
BV215a	The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, which is under the control of the authority.	8
BV215b	The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, where the response time is under the control of a DNO.	8
BV223	Percentage of the authority principal road network where structural maintenance should be considered.	9
BV99	Road Safety – number of road accident casualties	10-11
<b>Corporate Health Best Value Performance Indicators</b>		
BV 2a	Equality standard for local government	12
BV 2b	Duty to promote race equality	12
BV 8	Percentage of invoices paid on time	13
BV 11a	Top 5% of earners : women	13
BV 11b	Top 5% of earners : ethnic minorities	14
BV 11c	Top 5% of earners : with a disability	14
BV 12	Working days lost due to sickness absence	15
BV14	Percentage of early retirements	16
BV15	Percentage of ill-health retirements	16
BV16	Percentage of employees with a disability	17
BV17	Ethnic minority representation in the workforce	17
BV156	Buildings accessibility to people with a disability	18
<b>Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys</b>		
BV103	Satisfaction with public transport information	19
BV104	Satisfaction with local bus services	19

## Transport Best Value Performance Indicators

BV100 Temporary road closures	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Number of days of temporary traffic controls or road closure on traffic sensitive roads caused by local authority road works per km of traffic sensitive roads	0.088	0.088 51 days	0.436 253 days	0.43 250 days
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>This indicator is measured for traffic sensitive roads controlled by TfL. For TfL this is the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), of which all 580 km are treated as traffic sensitive.</p> <p>TfL's policy is to programme works to avoid road closure on the TLRN during daytime hours. However, there is a balance to be struck between keeping the network open and the need to renew London's road network as part of the TfL Investment Programme, and there are occasions when a longer period of closure or traffic control (e.g. at weekends) is more effective than frequent short closures (e.g. overnight). Similarly, where diversions are available which will accommodate displaced traffic, it is often more desirable to effect closures and work for 24hr periods (or extended shifts), where residents will not be inconvenienced or disturbed.</p> <p>The 2005/06 figure of 0.088 represented 51 days of traffic control, of which only 1 day was a full closure, but excluded the closure of Battersea Bridge for 118 days for structural repair after being hit by a barge.</p> <p>The 2006/07 capital maintenance programme identified major re-waterproofing works that were required on the A40 Marylebone Flyover, which was closed for 31 days as there was a reasonable diversion route. There was a further 63 days of closure at seven locations across the network where closure was the best option. Single Alternate Lane working (SALT) was maintained for 159 days on various schemes. The total of 253 days is equivalent to a BVPI value of 0.436.</p> <p>TfL's performance is better than the 2005/06 median performance for all authorities of 0.6.</p>				



BV 102 Passenger journeys on buses	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area undertaken each year (millions)	1,816	1,844	1,880	1,897
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>The 2006/07 bus passenger journey figure shows a 3.5% growth compared to last year, and follows a period of significant growth of 40% between 1999/2000 and 2004/05. Growth is expected to continue, but at a somewhat reduced rate.</p> <p>Patronage was above target for 2006/07 despite lower than expected growth in the previous year. The original 2006/07 target of was reduced from 1,876m to 1844m to reflect the actual result for 2005/06 which at 1,816m was below the target of 1,824m for the year, and the revised modelling assumptions following new surveys of under 16 patronage.</p> <p>Further growth of just under 1% is forecast for 2007/08 in the current Business Plan. The increase in bus passenger journeys will result from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The continuing additional journeys made by 16/17 year olds in full time education from September 2006 who are eligible for free travel</li> <li>• A slight increase in journeys from the introduction of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone.</li> </ul> <p>The effects of the 2007 fares revision, the Under 16s free travel initiative and the continuing switch from bus seasons to travelcard seasons will continue to be monitored. The target for 2007/8 is based on the current methodology for capturing passenger journeys, which is being revised to take account of passengers under 5 and other groups currently not captured.</p>				

BV165 Pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people, as a proportion of all crossings in the local authority area	64.1%	67%	29%	50%

### Comment on Performance

BVPI 165 measures 'Fair Access' and the definition has been changed three times in recent years (for 2002/03, 2005/06 and again in March 2006 to revert to the 2002/03 definition). Last year's Best Value Performance Indicator report outlined the effect of these changes, and confirmed that TfL intended to continue with detailed surveys being undertaken to create a comprehensive database of all crossings on the TLRN which would be continuously updated so that not only could BVPIs be reported robustly, but areas where facilities needed to be updated to improve accessibility could also be more easily identified.

The change of definition in 2002/03 detailed more precise requirements of criteria to be met at crossings, in line with DfT Guidance on Inclusive Mobility. The current BVPI definition allows some latitude in respect of crossings installed before the revised indicator came into operation on 1 April 2002, which has been relied upon in the past to classify as 'compliant' some crossings that do not meet the strictest criteria. (The ambiguity in interpretation may also explain TfL's apparent 'low' performance figures in comparison with the national average of 83%). However, the TLRN carries relatively high volumes of traffic and, in line with Accessible London objectives, it is considered imperative that all crossing facilities should meet the highest practical standards of compliance.

By reference to the new survey/database information, it has been calculated that 29% of all crossings (either 'stand alone' or complete junctions as per BVPI definition) meet the highest criteria of provision. There are a number of crossings where only relative minor improvements are needed to bring the crossing up to compliance standards, and a programme of these has been identified for implementation in 2007/08, which in conjunction with other planned crossing work accounts for the substantial targeted increase to 50% compliance.

TfL has ongoing concerns with the methodology for measuring performance for this indicator and is planning to commission a review to clarify the requirements of those people with disabilities in a pedestrian environment in London.

TfL continues to ensure that all new crossing facilities on the TLRN and those funded by TfL through Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) now meet BV165 accessibility standards.

BV187 Condition of surface footway	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of category 1, 1a and 2 footway network (TLRN) where structural maintenance should be considered.	18%	17%	20.5%	23%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>As part of the TfL Investment Programme and the 'Step Change' initiative of Street Management, TfL focused on improving the condition of footways on the TLRN in 2005/06, which resulted in a substantial reduction in footways reported as defective and a corresponding improvement in this indicator.</p> <p>This indicator is based on the collection and analysis of Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI) measurements, using the national Rules and Parameters for UKPMS. It is designed to provide the percentage length of the footway network with a Footway Condition Index greater than a defined threshold value. The threshold of 20.0 is indicative of the need for an investigation to determine whether maintenance is needed to preserve the footway serviceability.</p> <p>However, not only is this indicator relevant only for approx 60% of our network, as it only applies to category 1a, 1 and 2 footways, it is potentially misleading, as it indicates the percentage of footway <i>in need of investigation to determine whether maintenance is required</i> to preserve the footway serviceability not the <i>actual</i> condition of the footway.</p> <p>In 2006/07, RNM introduced its own local indicator measuring the percentage of all footway network with a threshold value of 50.0 or above (i.e in need of major repair). For 2006/07, this value was only 6% and investment continues to be targeted accordingly.</p> <p>TfL's performance is slightly better than the average of 24% for all authorities.</p>				

<b>BV215a</b> <b>Rectification of street lighting faults – Non DNO</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, which is under the control of the local authority	12.5	12.5	6.16	7
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>BV215a measures lighting faults that are the responsibility of TfL, whereas BV215b requires the same information for those failures which are the responsibility of the distribution network operator (DNO) i.e. the utility companies.</p> <p>The total BV 215a value includes all street lighting on the TLRN. However, TfL has adopted a risk-based approach to maintenance of street lights and focuses on lighting failures on those parts of the TLRN with relatively high pedestrian usage where lighting is (or is perceived to be) a safety issue for pedestrians and other road users (Category A-C faults). This is separated out from lighting failures in those areas where the loss of lighting represents less of a hazard, and which includes high-masted lights and those on higher speed roads where individual lamp repairs are too disruptive to traffic (Category D faults).</p> <p>The reported 2006/07 value of 6.2 days comprises Category A-C faults: 4.4 days and Category D faults: 28.6 days.</p> <p>A target of 12.5 days was set as this year's target because, as a new indicator for 2005/06, there were no comparable results available from other highway authorities nor any other trend data on which to base an alternative target. The target of 7 days for 2007/08 is in line with the requirements of the recently awarded Highways Maintenance Works Contracts.</p> <p>TfL's performance is slightly worse than the average of 5.74 days for all authorities which is the direct result of TfL's policy regarding Category D defects.</p>				

<b>BV215b</b> <b>Rectification of street lighting faults – DNO</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, where response time is under the control of a DNO.	42.4	42.4	31.49	31.49
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>BV 215b includes all street lighting faults where responsibility for time to repair is under the control of the distribution network operator (DNO).</p> <p>TfL has little influence over the DNOs to affect their performance, although discussions with them during the year have resulted in improved performance for 2006/07. However, as DNO faults represent less than 5% of all faults this figure does not represent a significant reduction in overall street lighting service – where an average of 98.5% of street lighting has been operational throughout the year.</p> <p>The target for 2007/08 has been set as the actual BV value for 2006/07.</p> <p>TfL's performance is slightly better than the lower quartile of 33.77 days for all authorities.</p>				

BV223 Condition of principal roads	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of the local authority principal road network (TLRN) where structural maintenance should be considered.	9.3%	9%	10%	8.5%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>SCANNER (surface condition assessment of the national network of roads) is machine based survey method, still in its infancy in terms of data interpretation. The indicator is not a measure of the network requiring investment, but an indication of where structural maintenance should be considered. Data is collected from the nearside lane, which is often difficult in London's environment.</p> <p>The 9% target for 2006/07 was not a target that could be informed by knowledge of the relationship between investment and SCANNER condition for which a relationship has been established using DVI (detailed visual inspection).</p> <p>In parallel, TFL continues to use the former DVI results to monitor the entire width of the carriageway and has 5 prior years of comparable results to demonstrate improvement. The latest DVI results showed an improvement from 6.7% in 2005/06 to 5.7% in 2006/07.</p>				

## BV 99 Road Safety – Number of road accident casualties London-wide

Killed and Seriously Injured	Jan-Dec 2006/07 (Based on 2005 data)		Percentage change from Jan-Dec 2005/06 (2004) to Jan-Dec 2006/07 (2005)	Percentage change from 1994-98 average to 2005/06	2007/08 Target (For the 2006 data)
	Target	Actual			
Road User Type	Target	Actual			
Pedestrians	1,290	1,224	-8%	-43%	
Pedal Cyclists	331	372	9%	-34%	
Powered two wheeler Riders or Passengers	839	845	-6%	-9%	
Car Drivers or Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	989	-23%	-61%	
Other Vehicle Drivers or Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	220	-29%	-54%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,031</b>	<b>3,650</b>	<b>-12%</b>	<b>-45%</b>	<b>3,588</b>

Killed and Seriously Injured	Jan-Dec 2006/07 (Based on 2005 data)		Percentage change from Jan-Dec 2005/06 (2004) to Jan-Dec 2006/07 (2005)	Percentage change from 1994-98 average to 2005/06	2007/08 Target (For the 2006 data)
	Target	Actual			
Road User Type	Target	Actual			
Child Pedestrians	See note* <sup>1</sup>	241	-21%	-59%	
Child Pedal Cyclists	See note* <sup>1</sup>	34	-28%	-69%	
Child Car Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	53	-40%	-73%	
Other Child Casualties	See note* <sup>1</sup>	27	-43%	-29%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>-27%</b>	<b>-62%</b>	<b>359 (see note *<sup>3</sup>)</b>

Slightly Injured	Jan-Dec 2006/07 (Based on 2005 data)		Percentage change from Jan-Dec 2005/06 (2004) to Jan-Dec 2006/07 (2005)	Percentage change from 1994-98 average to 2005/06	2007/08 Target (For the 2006 data)
	Target	Actual			
Road User Type	Target	Actual			
Pedestrians	See note* <sup>1</sup>	4,799	-5%	-33%	
Pedal Cyclists	See note* <sup>1</sup>	2,523	-4%	-34%	
Powered two wheeler Riders or Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	4,297	-8%	-16%	
Car Drivers or Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	13,790	-7%	-29%	
Other Vehicle Drivers or Passengers	See note* <sup>1</sup>	2,771	-13%	-22%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>See note*<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>28,180</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>28,394 (see note *<sup>3</sup>)</b>

## **BV 99 Road Safety – Number of road accident casualties London-wide**

Comment on performance

### **Total Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI)**

The full year results for 2006/07 show that the reduction in the total number of those Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) London-wide was better than target. The total number of KSI London-wide recorded at 3,650 is 12% less than the 2005/06 total and 45% less than the 1994-98 average. It should be noted that KSIs in the first three months of the reporting year were considerably below expectations. There is a concern that this was due to under reporting by the police although there is no evidence to confirm this. The reported reduction may therefore be slightly overstated.

The target for reduction in KSI casualties across all groups by 2010 compared to the 1994-98 base average was set at 40%. However, owing to the exceptional success of road casualty reduction up to 2004, the end point targets had nearly been met six years in advance. New end point targets for 2010 were agreed. These set out reduction targets of 50% in killed and seriously injured (KSI) casualties by 2010 against the 1994-98 average across all modes both London-wide and on the TLRN. Within the modes the vulnerable road user groups, pedestrian and pedal cyclists, have a 50% reduction target, while powered two-wheelers retain a 40% reduction target. The results for 2006/07 (2005) onwards are being monitored against these new targets.

### **Children Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI)**

The full year results for 2006/07 show that the reduction in the total numbers of Children Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) London-wide was better than the annual target. The total number of Children KSI London-wide recorded at 355 is 27% less than the 2005/06 total and 62% less than the 1994-98 average.

The target for reduction in Child KSI casualties across all groups by 2010 compared to the 1994-98 base average was set at 50%. Exceptional success of road casualty reduction up to 2004 means a new end point target of a 60% reduction has been agreed. The results for 2006/07 (2005) onwards are being monitored against these new targets.

### **Slightly Injured**

The full year results for 2006/07 show that the total number of slightly injured London-wide recorded at 28,180 is 7% less than the 2005/06 total and 28% less than the 1994-98 average.

The London-wide 2010 target in slightly injured across all groups was previously a 10% reduction compared to the 1994-98 base average. A new target of a 25% reduction has now been agreed. The results for 2006/07 (2005) are being monitored against these new targets.

**Note \*1** : The Londonwide targets to be achieved by 2010, compared with the average for 1994-98 (which are tighter than the national targets), are for a 50% reduction in total KSI casualties, a 60% reduction in child KSI casualties, and a 25% reduction in the total slight casualty rate (expressed as number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle kilometres). The 25% reduction target for slight casualties applies only to the total since there are no national targets for individual categories. However, TfL retains this information for internal guidance. In addition, TfL adopted the London-wide target of a 50% reduction in KSI casualties for pedestrians and pedal cyclists and a 40% reduction for powered two wheelers to ensure attention is focused on these vulnerable user groups.

**Note \*2** : The 2007/08 targets actually apply to the calendar year 2006 as casualty figures are reported 15 months in arrears for BV 99.

**Note \*3** : The 2007/08 targets for total child KSI casualties and for total slight casualties have already been exceeded by the 2006/07 results.

## Corporate Health Best Value Performance Indicators

BV 2a Equality standard for local government	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
The level of the Equality Standard for local government to which the authority conforms in respect of gender, race and disability	Level 4	Level 5	Level 4	Level 5
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL did not achieve Level 5 as originally targeted as the organisation could not fully demonstrate that it has met the required criteria as part of the assessment process. The assessment process identified gaps in the evidence provided by TfL in response to which TfL has organised a number of activities to demonstrate that it meets the required criteria to be assessed at Level 5. It is anticipated that the external assessment of TfL will be completed by Summer 2007.</p>				

BV 2b Duty to promote race equality	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
The quality of an Authority's Race Equality Scheme (RES) and improvements resulting from its application	55%	62.5%	68.4%	79%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL has a well established programme of activity to promote race equality and is making good progress in achieving positive outcomes for BAME people as employees and service users. Improving the safety and security of passengers on the network through the establishment of the Transport Operations Control Unit and the increase in CCTV coverage has addressed a major concern for BAME people.</p> <p>Affordability of transport has been enhanced through the introduction of free travel schemes for children and young people and further developments to help the poorest households have benefited BAME families who are over-represented in these groups.</p> <p>The 2006/07 target was exceeded as TfL meet one of the assessment criteria a year earlier than anticipated. TfL embedded the supplier diversity requirement into major contracts and can now see the evidence of the supplier diversity agenda through contractor action plans.</p> <p>During 2007 TfL will review its RES and publish a new RES and action plan in March 2008 and plans for the involvement of BAME people in its development are already in place which will require TfL to consult with both staff and external stakeholders. As a result, TfL has set its 2007/08 target at 79%.</p>				



<b>BV 8</b> <b>Percentage of invoices paid on time</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
Percentage of undisputed invoices for commercial goods and services paid by the Authority within 30 days of receipt or within agreed payment terms.	85%	86%	89.5%	88%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL Group has achieved the cumulative result of 89.5% of undisputed invoices paid within agreed terms for financial year 2006/07. Following the implementation of a Shared Service Centre for TfL in September 2004, there has been steady progress across all modes and there have been additional process improvements implemented in 2006/07 which contributed to the improved result. The most important of these was the go-live of "Electronic Invoicing" which reduced processing time and increased accuracy. This has led to continuing improvement on last year and TfL has exceeded this year's target.</p> <p>TfL's performance is below the average of 92% for all authorities, but above the average for London Boroughs at 86.9%, a more appropriate comparator reflecting the size of TfL.</p>				

<b>BV 11a</b> <b>Top 5% of earners : women</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
Percentage of top paid 5% of authority staff who are women	16.72%	18.3%	20.22%	21.3%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>Following a third consecutive year on year improvement TfL has exceeded its target for the second year in a row. This is partly due to the overall percentage of female staff across TfL increasing to 23.3%.</p> <p>However, TfL's performance is below the average of 41.39% when compared to London boroughs, but better than the average of 18.73% for the more comparable Passenger Transport Authorities, reflecting good performance in a marketplace traditionally dominated by men.</p> <p>TfL has a number of objectives in place to improve these results going forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attract an increasing number of female applicants into operational and technical roles,</li> <li>• Improving retention by making TfL an employer of choice where women want to stay and have access to career development, and to roles in senior management,</li> <li>• Flexible working by making sure it is part of TfL's culture in helping women achieve a work-life balance,</li> <li>• Equal pay by ensuring there is no pay gap between men and women,</li> <li>• Making TfL a workplace that is free from discrimination, and</li> <li>• Continue to attract women to senior positions in the organisation.</li> </ul>				

BV 11b Top 5% of earners : ethnic minorities	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of top paid 5% of authority staff who are from an ethnic minority.	9.92%	10.9%	11.78%	12.3%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL continues to be a strong 'brand' for attracting workforce from ethnic minority communities. This and focused advertising in BAME media have led to a third year of improvement, and for the second year in a row, TfL has exceeded its target.</p> <p>Given the overall percentage of BAME staff employed at TfL is 33.6%, the organisation is taking action that will improve the balance of BAME representation at senior level within the organisation and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring appropriate representation on the TfL mentoring scheme – phase 1 had 48% BAME participation and at the end of 2006/7 phase 2 will be rolled out,</li> <li>• Coaching programme,</li> <li>• Providing for secondment opportunities, and</li> <li>• Roll out of the leadership programme across TfL.</li> </ul> <p>TfL's performance is slightly below the average of 11.86% for London boroughs.</p>				

BV 11c Top 5% of earners : with a disability	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of top paid 5% of authority staff who have a disability.	4.73%	5.0%	4.49%	5.1%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>The decline in the percentage of disabled staff was largely caused by an increase in the number of people who have provided information on their disability status. TfL is continuing to review policies and procedures associated with recruiting of disabled people and ensuring that the working environment encourages their development and retention.</p> <p>TfL's performance is not only above the average of 3.58% for London Boroughs but represents better than the upper quartile performance of 4.30%.</p>				

BV 12 Working days lost due to sickness absence	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
The number of working days/shifts lost to the Authority due to sick absence <b>All Staff</b>	13.05	11.6	11.70	11.0
<b>Operational Staff</b>	15.82	13.8	14.46	13.8
<b>Non-Operational Staff</b>	7.82	7.5	6.91	6.5

### Comment on performance

TfL's overall sickness performance at 11.70 days represents a 10% reduction on the previous year though is marginally above the 2006/07 target.

**Operational** sickness levels although worse than target have fallen for the first time since the new reporting methodology was introduced in 2003/04. In Surface Transport, Dial-A-Ride experienced attendance issues as it went through reorganisation and the implementation of a new software system. Operational attendance in London Underground improved significantly compared to the previous year and only narrowly met its target.

In the Underground there is a HR Senior Business Partner with the role of 'Attendance Champion' who reports weekly to Service Directors on attendance. In addition, a 'persistent sickness handling' project is underway that identifies those who are habitually sick and considers the measures which can be implemented to address these issues.

**Non-operational** sickness levels have fallen for the third year in a row and for the first time are better than target.

It is not easy to make comparisons for operational and non-operational results, as this split is unique to TfL and is not published by other authorities. TfL's overall performance is worse than the average of 10.47 days for the Passenger Transport Authorities but will be affected by the proportion of operational / manual roles in TfL. However, the level of non-operational absenteeism at 6.91 days represents upper quartile performance when compared to the London Boroughs.

BV 14 Percentage of early retirements	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of employees retiring early (excluding ill-health retirements) as a percentage of the total workforce	0.36%	0.50%	0.26%	0.4%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>The 2006/07 target was set at 0.5% in recognition of the level of performance sustained from 2004/05 into 2005/06 but reflected the level of planned organisational change. However, despite the level of change, TfL's performance has continued to improve. This is mainly due to TfL working pro-actively to ensure staff that are affected by organisational change are found suitable alternative work within the organisation.</p> <p>The TfL Pension Fund is an attractive scheme and allows for voluntary early retirement, however, the organisation remains optimistic it can meet the 2007/08 target although this is determined by the demographics of the workforce and their aspirations.</p> <p>TfL's overall performance is better than the average for the London Boroughs of 0.45%</p>				

BV 15 Percentage of ill health retirements	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
Percentage of employees retiring on the grounds of ill-health as a percentage of the total workforce <b>All Staff</b>	0.57%	0.6%	0.60%	0.6%
<b>Operational Staff</b>	0.67%	0.7%	0.76%	0.7%
<b>Non-Operational Staff</b>	0.38%	0.4%	0.33%	0.4%
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL's overall performance is worse than target due to higher than anticipated ill-health retirements amongst operational staff. In London Underground, better management of long term sickness cases has contributed to the increase of ill health retirements, whereas the operational areas of Surface Transport have experienced greater difficulty in redeploying staff with health problems as there is a lack of alternative operational roles and individuals often lack the skills required for non-operational posts.</p> <p>TfL's overall performance is worse than the average of 0.23% for the London Boroughs. However, it is difficult to make a true comparison due to the predominance of operational staff and safety critical roles within TfL, which does not apply to other local authorities.</p>				

<b>BV 16</b> <b>Percentage of employees with a disability</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
The percentage of authority employees with a disability	7.66%	8.5%	7.21%	8.0%
Compared with the percentage of the economically active population in the authorities area who have a disability. <sup>2</sup>	12.7%	-	12.7%	
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>Disability status is monitored in the organisation through self declaration by staff. In accordance with Best Value guidelines, the number of disabled people is reported as a percentage of those who have declared their status and not as a percentage of the whole organisation.</p> <p>Even though the number actual number of disabled people employed has increased the overall percentage has reduced. This is due to an increase in the number of people who have declared their status as being non-disabled.</p> <p>The TfL Disability Equality Scheme was published in December 2006 includes activities to improve access to employment for disabled people, including a review of recruitment practices and promoting opportunities to disabled applicants, through targeted advertising and working with organisations of and for disabled people. The establishment of the Independent Disability Advisory Group in 2006 has provided TfL with additional expertise in addressing some of the historic barriers faced by disabled people in employment.</p> <p>TfL's performance is above the upper quartile figure of 4.23% for London Boroughs.</p>				

<b>BV 17</b> <b>Ethnic minority representation in the workforce</b>	<b>2005/06</b> <b>Actual</b>	<b>2006/07</b>		<b>2007/08</b> <b>Target</b>
		<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
The percentage of authority employees from ethnic minority communities	32.87%	28% or above	33.62%	29% or above
Compared with the percentage of the economically active population in the authorities area who are from ethnic minority communities	27.7%	-	29% <sup>3</sup>	
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>TfL continues to maintain a workforce well above the percentage of economically active minority communities in the authority area, which currently stands at 29%, and above the average of 26.2% for London Boroughs. Recruitment performance has again been particularly strong in this area during the year.</p>				

<sup>3</sup> Source: ONS Annual Population Survey 2005 (Jan – Dec)

BV 156 Buildings accessibility to people with a disability	2005/06 Actual	2006/07		2007/08 Target
		Target	Actual	
The percentage of authority buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for, and accessible to, disabled people. <sup>4</sup>	32.5%	33.6%	33.0%	34.7%

### Comment on performance

This indicator includes TfL's portfolio of buildings within its control and includes both operational and non-operational buildings. TfL's overall performance of 33.0% against a target of 33.6% reflects a slight overrun in achieving one additional step-free access station on London Underground (Morden) which will be achieved early in 2007/08.

- London Underground which serves 275 stations has a programme of activity to increase the number of accessible stations from the current 16.7% to 25% by 2010, and to 33% by 2013.
- TfL currently uses 45 bus stations in the Greater London area and since last year has completed an upgrade on one (Finsbury Park) with plans to upgrade a further two (Hammersmith and Hounslow) in 2007/08. There are plans to construct a new bus station (Edmonton Green) in 2007.
- There are a total of 38 stations on the DLR, all of which are accessible and suitable for disabled people.
- TfL also manages 5 other properties which are open to the public. These include head office buildings, London Transport Museum (LTM), Victoria Coach Station and the Museum Archive. Of these 3 are accessible. LTM is due to re-open during 2007 and will add to the number of accessible properties.

It must be emphasised that in relation to Part 3 of the DDA, TfL has had an established practice since 1999, in any 'fit-out' and refurbishment upgrade projects, of ensuring that existing facilities, e.g. toilets, are upgraded to allow universal use and to assist in our duties under the Approved Document to Part M of the Building Regulations in force at the time (1999 and 2004 being the relevant editions). Additionally, renewals of building services and systems, e.g. fire alarms and PAs, also include the requirements of Approved Document to Part M of the Building Regulations.

In relation to emergency egress issues under BS 5588, Part 8, e.g. installation of disabled refuges, TfL adopts a risk based approach, with specific Personal Egress Emergency Plans (PEEPs) being developed on an individual basis.

TfL's performance of 33.0% is significantly below the average of 82.09% for Passenger Transport Authorities. However, this comparator is not representative since other authorities do not have operational buildings, and TfL is unique in its challenge to improve the accessibility of the London Underground system.

<sup>4</sup> The assessment was carried out using Building Regulations Approved Document M, 2004 version

## Best Value User Satisfaction Surveys

TfL is required to report on Best Value Performance Indicator surveys carried out by the London Boroughs on a three-yearly basis to collect data for satisfaction performance in relation to local transport information (BV102) and local bus services (BV103).

<b>BV103 – Satisfaction with public transport information</b>					
% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
London Boroughs	47	51	+4	60	+9
Metropolitan Boroughs	54	53	-1	57	+4
National average	47	50	+3	54	+4
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>Levels of satisfaction with public transport information have increased nationally however, performance in London has both exceeded the absolute level and is also improving at a faster rate.</p> <p>The figure for London is above the national top quartile percent of 59.5.</p>					

<b>BV104 – Satisfaction with local bus services</b>					
% satisfied	2000-01	2003-04	Change 2000-01 to 2003-04	2006-07	Change 2003-04 to 2006-07
London Boroughs	49	58	+9	69	+11
Metropolitan Boroughs	58	57	-1	61	+4
National average	50	54	+4	60	+6
<p><b>Comment on performance</b></p> <p>Customer satisfaction with bus services in London continues to improve at a rate above the Metropolitan Boroughs average and the national average. Satisfaction in London in 2006/07 was 9 points higher than that of the national average and is also above the national top quartile percent of 68.</p>					