

TfL 2017-18 Quarter 1 Performance Report (April-June 2017)

September 2017



London TravelWatch is the official body set up by Parliament to provide a voice for London's travelling public.

Our role is to:

- Speak up for transport users in discussions with policy-makers and the media,
- Consult with the transport industry, its regulators and funders on matters affecting users,
- Investigate complaints users have been unable to resolve with service providers,
- Monitor trends in service quality.

Our aim is to press in all that we do for a better travel experience for all those living, working or visiting London and its surrounding region.

Table of issue dates for London TravelWatch's Transport for London (TfL) Performance Reports

TfL financial periods	Issue dates for London TravelWatch report for the corresponding Quarter
Quarter 3 – Oct to Dec 2014	19 May 2014
Quarter 4 – Jan to Mar 2014	16 September 2014
Quarter 1 – Apr to Jun 2014	November 2014
Quarter 2 – Jul to Sept 2014	February 2015
Quarter 3 – Oct to Dec 2014	June 2015
Quarter 4 – Jan to Mar 2015	September 2015
Quarter 1 – Apr to Jun 2015	October 2015
Quarter 2 – Jul to Sept 2015	January 2016
Quarter 3 – Oct to Dec 2015	May 2016
Quarter 4 – Jan to Mar 2016	June 2016
Quarter 1 – Apr to Jun 2016	October 2016
Quarter 2 – Jul to Sept 2016	February 2017
Quarter 3 – Oct to Dec 2016	April 2017
Quarter 4 – Jan to Mar 2017	June 2017
Quarter 1 – Apr to Jun 2017	September 2017

Published by:

London TravelWatch
169 Union Street
London SE1 0LL

Phone: 020 3176 2999

Contents

Executive summary.....	4
1 Travel in London.....	8
2 London Streets.....	9
3 London Buses.....	20
4 London Underground.....	27
5 Docklands Light Railway.....	31
6 London Tramlink.....	34
7 London Overground.....	37
8 TfL Rail.....	40
9 Dial-a-Ride.....	43
10 Cycle hire.....	45
11 Customer satisfaction and value for money scores – modes comparison..	47
Appendix – Glossary & source references.....	48



Where appropriate, for each performance graph, arrows have been included to show the direction of positive and negative performance trends.

London TravelWatch would like to acknowledge TfL's help and assistance in producing this report by supplying performance data and operational commentaries to accompany the performance statistics.

Executive summary

This report summarises the performance of all the Transport for London (TfL) modes of transport for the first quarter of the 2017-18 financial year (April to June 2017).

The aim of the report is to provide information about the performance of TfL's transport network from the perspective of users. The information has been gathered from a number of sources (see the appendix for source references).

There are some changes to TfL's reporting. For instance there has been some reductions in the frequency of some customer satisfaction surveys.

Overall, TfL are delivering well against their own targets and customer satisfaction is high.

This report now includes a measure of performance for TfL Rail and London Overground, 'Cancellations and Significant Lateness'. Both of these TOCs generally perform well compared to other London and South East TOCs.

However, we remain concerned about the performance of London Streets. Given rising traffic levels, there is serious concern about the impact of increased congestion now and in the future. Increased congestion is significantly impacting on bus service performance and passengers. Working with other interested parties and policy-makers, TfL needs to develop a substantive response to rising population, economic activity and other trends that are translating into increasing traffic volumes, longer journeys and less reliable bus services.

This report now includes a new measure of cycling volumes in central London, but is a quarter behind, i.e. quarter 4 is reported in this quarter 1 report.

London Streets

TfL are managing their network better in terms of interventions to manage planned and unplanned events, computer controlled signals and works to improve the through-flow of junctions etc. There has been a reversal in the long term trend of reducing traffic volume in London which, if it continues, will mean increased congestion levels and the problems this will bring.

JTR in Q1 2017-18, was 88.4%, which was 0.4 percentage higher than target and 0.9 points higher than the same quarter in 2016-17.

To improve JTR to its pre- Roads Modernisation Plan target of 90% will mean a comprehensive set of policy responses.

TfL's carriageway condition target is met. But London TravelWatch is concerned to see improvements in this area as the condition of the carriageway affects the journey experience of all the users of London's roads.

Traffic signal availability is below target.

This is the fifth quarter in which London TravelWatch is reporting road safety statistics. Because of the volatility of road safety statistics from year to year the trend is the most important statistic. The trend in killed and serious injury is downwards over the long term.

We are pleased that TfL are now starting to enforce properly against those who obstruct the pavement. London TravelWatch has been campaigning for a number of years for TfL and the London boroughs to keep their pavements clear of illegal obstructions.

Only a small handful of London boroughs do this as they should. Obstruction of the pavement is a nuisance for all pedestrians and a particular hazard for disabled users. We hope that publishing borough performance will spur them to undertake this important role properly.

London Buses

Customer satisfaction score is higher than previous quarter (Q4 2016-17), and the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17).

[Note: Bus stations evaluation changed from quarterly to annual for 2015-16, with the survey running in Q4 only.]

High frequency bus route performance in quarter 1 is better than previously reported (Q4 2016-17), and the same period in Q1 2016-17.

Bus speeds across the network are now being reported by TfL. The all London average is shown as a graph in this report. The trend indicates that over the last two years bus speeds have declined resulting in large numbers of passengers no longer using services.

Whilst speeds are decreasing, EWT is being maintained across London. However, there are concerns, not reflected in the figures that bus services have performed poorly in central London. TfL have added a substantial number of buses to maintain reliability. This is welcome, but costly. Poor performance means significant number of passengers have stopped using the buses in central London. This decline may have levelled off, but is of serious concern. More has to be done by TfL to address this.

London TravelWatch is concerned that not enough is being done to deliver bus priority on the streets used by London's bus services. Indeed some bus priority continues to be lost to cycle, town centre and other schemes. Where such losses occur there should be complementary improvement to bus priority elsewhere along the routes affected. TfL have established a bus priority team and budget to deliver additional bus priority on both their and borough controlled roads which is welcome providing it delivers real improvement.

The trend for bus complaints is rising steadily, but the number of bus complaints has declined steadily over the last two quarters.

London Underground

Customer satisfaction scores have been above target this quarter.

There has been a significant drop in the % of scheduled services operated.

Network Excess Journey Time is below target.

Docklands Light Railway (DLR)

DLR performance is up this quarter. Departures within 3 minutes is above target this quarter.

Customer satisfactions scores are above target.

Customer complaints rate was lower this quarter compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17). The lowest complaints received since the records began.

Tramlink

Tramlink performance was above target.

Customer satisfaction is above target

Complaints were lower than quarter Q1 2016-17.

London Overground

London Overground has achieved its targets. RTA was higher than previous quarter and the same period a year ago. Its performance is towards the upper end of TOC performance in terms of cancellations and significant lateness.

London Overground receives one of the lowest rates of complaints when compared to other London & South East train operators

TfL Rail

TfL Rail achieved its targets. TfL Rail performed very well compared to other L&SE TOCs, but had a poorer performance compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago.

TfL Rail performance is not as high in terms of cancellations and significant lateness, when compared to other TOCs.

Dial-a-Ride

Customer satisfaction overall is on target. Dial-a-Ride members are usually very satisfied with driver helpfulness-courtesy. There was a reduction in complaints in Q1 2017-18, when compared to the same period in Q1 2016-17. The main source of

complaint this quarter is ease of getting through on the telephone and the booking process.

Cycle hire

Customer satisfaction measure is reported bi-annually. The latest customer satisfaction score (80), is the same since the previous wave (wave 11), just below the peak score of 81 (in wave 9). The different elements of the survey suggest increasing satisfaction with the use of members' keys and with the service from the contact centre

Complaints decreased compared to the same period a year ago.

1 Travel in London

TfL's annual '*Travel in London*' report records the way Londoners travelled in 2015. This report was published in December 2016¹.

There were 26.7 million daily trips in, to, and from, Greater London, an increase of 0.4% over the previous year. This is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: How Londoners travel (millions of daily trips and percentage of all trips), 2015

Mode	No. of trips (millions) 2015	No. of trips (millions) 2014	Percentage change	Percentage of total 2015
Rail	2.9	2.8	+3.6	10.9
Underground-DLR	2.8	2.6	+7.7	10.5
Bus-Tram	3.9	4.1	-4.9	14.6
Taxi-PHV	0.3	0.3	0	1.1
Car (driver & passenger)	9.5	9.6	-1.0	35.6
Motorcycle	0.2	0.2	0	0.7
Cycle	0.6	0.6	0	2.2
Walk	6.5	6.4	1.6	24.3
All modes	26.7	26.6	+0.4	

¹ Travel in London, Report 9, Table 2.2
www.londontravelwatch.org.uk

2 London Streets


This section of the TfL Performance Report focuses on the performance of the Transport for London road network (TLRN) also known as the Red Routes, which are the major arterial roads operated by TfL.

Journey Time Reliability (JTR) is a measure of the performance of the road network. The JTR measure is defined as the proportion of traffic which, for a 'typical' 30 minute journey, takes less than 35 minutes (a representative average London journey time of 30 minutes plus a five-minute 'allowance').

JTR is a measure of how congestion impacts on journeys. A major influence will be traffic volume, which as can be seen from graph 5 below, has fallen for many years, but has increased in recent quarters. TfL have also undertaken much activity to improve JTR, for example altering traffic signal timing, managing events and charging the utilities etc. for some street works. TfL actively managed the volumes of traffic entering the central area so as to reduce the impact of the major road works associated with building the cycle superhighways. This has continued after the completion of those works.


The JTR across the whole of the TLRN in the AM peak for quarter 1 was 88.4%, which was 0.4 percentage point higher than target and 0.9 percentage point higher than the same quarter in 2016-17.

Graph 1a - Journey Time Reliability on the TLRN in the AM peak by financial quarters, Q1 2014-15 to Q1 2017-18




The statistics in graph 1a are represented as a line graph in graph 1b. Please note there is no figure for the quarter 2 2012-13 due to the Olympic Games.

Graph 1b - Journey Time Reliability on the TLRN in the AM peak since financial Q3 2009-10 (Business Plan 2016-17 targets)




An equivalent JTR figure for the central area is also reported by TfL. This quarter's figure is 85.0%; this is 0.6 percentage point lower than target and 0.1 percentage point lower than the same period in 2016-17.

Graph 2 - Journey Time Reliability on the TLRN in central London in the AM peak by financial quarter, Q1 2013-14 to Q1 2017-18




Serious and severe disruption on the TLRN fell in quarter 1 compared to Q1 2016-17 last year.

Graph 3 - Duration of TLRN serious & severe unplanned and planned events (hrs) by financial quarters, Q1 2014-15 to Q1 2017-18



The average weekday traffic speed increased on London’s major roads in quarter 1 compared with the same quarter in 2016-17.


Graph 4 - Traffic speeds (mph) on London’s major roads 12 hrs average weekday between 0700-1900 by financial quarters, Q1 2014-15 to Q1 2017-18



Traffic volumes across London had been generally falling over a number of years, up to 2011/12. This trend is now reversing. In this quarter, the volume increased compared to the same quarter in the previous year. Traffic volume growth related to

population and employment growth along with reductions in motor traffic capacity are the underlying issues that are leading to increased congestion. The increased number of private hire vehicles and light goods vehicles is also adding to traffic volume.


Graph 5 - Traffic volume on London’s major roads 24hrs average weekday by financial quarter, indexed period 13 2006-07 = 100



TfL is now reporting a new cycling metric, which, they say is a representative measure of total kilometres cycled each day in **central London**. The previous TLRN index measure, covering the whole of London, was replaced because patterns of cycling have changed substantially following the provision of new facilities, which the counters on the TLRN do not adequately capture. This statistic is reported a quarter in arrears. There was a 6.3% year on year rise in cycling in central London, to Q4 2016-17


Graph 6 – Cycling levels in central London

Central Area Average Daily Cycle Kilometres Travelled per Kilometre of road



Graph 8 shows the number of road works on the TLRN since quarter 1 2014-15. This shows that road works are lower when compared to Q1 2016-17. The number of road works have been contained below TfL’s target maximum.


Graph 8 - Number of road works on the TLRN, Q1 2014-15 to Q1 2017-18



The percentage of roads not in a ‘good state of repair’ is significantly above the target (poorer) than a previous business plan target. However, this target has been relaxed and is now being met. TfL tell us this is a sustainable target. London TravelWatch would oppose any further relaxation. There has been an improvement in the condition of the TLRN pavements this year.

[Note: the green and purple lines show the percentage of carriageway and pavement that is assessed as in need of repair. The blue and red lines show business plan projections.] This is an annual survey reported at the end of the financial year.

Graph 9 – Condition of the TLRN carriageway and pavements since 2005-06 (percentage of carriageway-pavement in need of repair)



Since 2010, TfL have been conducting an annual online customer satisfaction survey amongst users of the TLRN, with the fieldwork conducted mid October to mid November, now classed as quarter 4 by TfL. Since 2014, the survey has been carried out quarterly. Below is a selection of the results. This survey will now be reported Q1 and Q3 2017/18, before reverting to an annual survey.

Table 2 – Customer satisfaction – traffic scores*

Indicator	Q3 2011	Q3 2012	Q3 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016	Q1 2017
Overall satisfaction	75	76	75	75	75	74	74	70	70	69	70	70	71	70	72
Working condition of traffic lights	77	78	77	79	79	79	78	77	78						76
Could accurately estimate how long journey would take	73	75	73	74	74	74	74	67	67	66	68	66	70		66


Indicator	Q3 2011	Q3 2012	Q3 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2017
Up to the minute info about delays and disruption	72	74	72	73	73	73	73	65	67	69	67	69	71	67
Management of road works	70	73	71	72	73	72	72	64	64	62	65	62	67	64
Traffic congestion	67	69	67	68	69	67	68	61	63	63	63	62	65	61

Table 3 – Customer satisfaction – roads scores

Indicator	Q3 2011	Q3 2012	Q3 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2017
Street lighting	77	77	76	78	78	77	77	76	76					73
Condition of road surfaces	70	73	71	69	70	72	72	61	63	62	62	63	65	72

Graph 10 shows the overall customer satisfaction scores for the TLRN since Q3 2010.

Graph 10 – Overall satisfaction since Q3 2010 to Q1 2017*



* There is a break (also reduction in the overall satisfaction data) from quarter 1 2015, due to a change in way in which TfL undertakes its reporting. The format in questioning users was changed to avoid open-ended questions.

TfL has previously reported quarterly figures for the number of complaints they receive per 100,000 journeys. TfL streets received 0.13 complaints per 100,000 journeys in Q1 2017-18.

Road safety statistics


The latest (calendar year 2015) annual road safety statistics for London's roads are best displayed graphically because this shows the trend rather than figures for a single year. The trend is the important dataset to consider, as there can be great variation in casualty figures from one year to the next. The most widely used statistic is of the combined number of killed and serious injuries per year.

These are absolute numbers of casualties. A better statistic would be one for casualties per mile travelled. TfL have done some work to investigate rates of casualties, but this is at an early stage.

Bus and coach figures are for bus and coach occupants and includes all bus, and coach collisions where injury occurs in Greater London.

The population is rising and therefore there is more exposure generally. The number of trips by cycle is growing. Cycling is the second most vulnerable mode per mile travelled. Thus, while the trend in the number of cycle casualties is between level and slightly decreasing, the rate per mile cycled is declining.

Graph 11 Number of collisions resulting in killed and serious injuries, by mode, over the last 25 years



Road safety statistics Q2 2016

The Metropolitan Police Service compiles a record of all collisions in London where injury occurs. These records are collated and published by the DfT as an annual statistical release. TfL reports provisional quarterly figures, but there is always a long time lag (6 months). Quarter 2 2016 figures are tabulated below.

[Please note the annual 2016 statistics would normally be published in June 2017. However, the DfT have announced a delay until late September. No reason has been given for this.]

These statistics are often compared to previous months or quarters, but this is unwise as there is so much volatility in the figures from period to period. The trend is the important statistic to follow.

Table 2. Reported road casualties by severity: Q2 2016, Greater London

CASUALTIES	Q2 2016
Killed	28
Seriously injured	524
Slightly injured	6902
All casualties	7426


Managing pavement obstructions - performance of boroughs

It is a criminal offence to wilfully obstruct the pavement without lawful excuse or authority. TfL and the London boroughs have a duty, and the powers they need, to keep their pavements clear. However, very few of these authorities do this, as they should.

TfL are just starting to tackle this issue. There are a small handful of boroughs that properly enforce against pavement obstructions. Most do not. Below is a map of the London boroughs, colour coded to show the situation on each borough’s streets with respect to pavement obstructions (mostly free standing advertising boards). The colour was determined by an assessment of three significant town and district centres in each borough.

TfL are targeting a number of the streets they control. TfL would get a ‘yellow’ score. Additionally TfL are to be commended for encouraging the London boroughs to enforce against obstructions on their streets.

Figure 1: The performance of the London boroughs in keeping their pavements clear of illegal obstructions



- Green streets are clear of pavement obstructions;
- Yellow some streets are clear of pavement obstructions (targeting is undertaken);
- Pink streets have pavement obstructions, but they are located next to buildings in response to limited enforcement.
- Red streets have many pavement obstructions on them;

Table 4 shows a summary of all of the 2017-18 TfL business plan targets for streets that do not relate to safety.

Table 4 – Q1 2017-18 London Streets TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI)

KPI	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Journey Time Reliability (seasonal target)	88.0%	88.4%
TLRN cycling journeys (seasonal target and indexed 100 at March 2000)	Data no longer reported	1,132
% of road assets not in good repair (annual figure for 2009-2010)	9%*	9%
Traffic signal availability	99.1%	99.5%

*Target reduced to reflect deterioration in road condition and an acceptance that the previous target is unachievable.

London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of TfL Streets is as follows.

TfL are managing their network better in terms of interventions to manage planned and unplanned events, computer controlled signals and works to improve the through-flow of junctions etc. There has been a reversal in the long term trend of reducing traffic volume in London which, if it continues, will mean increased congestion levels and the problems this will bring.

JTR in Q1 2017-18, was 88.4%, which was 0.4 percentage point higher than target and 0.9 points higher than the same quarter in 2016-17.

To improve JTR to its pre- Roads Modernisation Plan target of 90% will mean a comprehensive set of policy responses in the new Mayor's Transport Strategy.

TfL's carriageway condition target is met. But London TravelWatch is concerned to see improvements in this area as the condition of the carriageway affects the journey experience of all the users of London's roads.

Traffic signal availability is below target.

This is the fifth quarter in which London TravelWatch is reporting road safety statistics. Because of the volatility of road safety statistics from year to year the trend is the most important statistic. The trend in killed and serious injury is downwards over the long term.

We are pleased that TfL are now starting to enforce properly against those who obstruct the pavement. London TravelWatch has been campaigning for a number of years for TfL and the London boroughs to keep their pavements clear of illegal obstructions.

Only a small handful of London boroughs do this as they should. Obstruction of the pavement is a nuisance for all pedestrians and a particular hazard for disabled users. We hope that publishing borough performance will spur them to undertake this important role properly.

3 London Buses


This section of the report outlines the performance of the London bus network in the first quarter of 2017-18

Overall bus network performance

For the overall bus network, the two most significant measures of bus performance, that reflect passengers' experience, are Excess Wait Time (EWT), and the percentage of scheduled kilometres operated. Between them, they show whether the planned frequency of bus services is being achieved. See page 22


EWT is the measure that indicates the additional minutes wait time for passengers beyond the scheduled value on high frequency bus routes. EWT was 1.0, which was lower than the figure in Q1 2016-17. See Graph 12.

Graph 12 - Q2 2008-09- Q1 2017-18, Excess Wait Time (minutes) on high frequency bus routes



Graph 13 represents the historical trend of the percentage of scheduled bus kilometres operated. Again, the graph shows seasonal targets.

Graph 13 – Q2 2008-09 – Q1 2017-18, Percentage of scheduled bus kilometres operated




Bus speeds

TfL are now reporting bus speeds for every bus route in London. It is derived from I-bus data for every bus route in London. As one would expect it is those services that serve busy areas that are the slowest. The graph below shows an average for all of London’s bus routes.

Bus speeds include time spent stationary (for example at traffic lights and at bus stops). Bus speeds are available for the entire network, by borough, and by route. Speeds are measured in miles per hour.

Graph 14 – Period 1, 2014 to Period 3 2017, ‘All London’ average bus speeds by financial period (commences 1 April 2014 as period 01)



Focus on poorly performing routes

As well as the EWT figure for all of London's high frequency bus services, TfL publishes figures for each route along with the minimum standard agreed with the operator as part of the contract.

Of London's 389 high frequency bus routes in quarter 1 2017-18, 49 were below the contracted minimum standard, 25 operated at the contracted standard, and 315 performed better than the contracted standard. This is better than previously reported (Q4 2016-17), and a better performance when compared to the same period in Q1 2016-17.

Poor performance on the bus network is often because of prolonged road works that are usually outside of the control of TfL. When poor performance occurs, TfL actively tries to reduce the impact on passengers.

London TravelWatch has analysed the worst performing 20 bus services in this quarter, to see if any are consistently performing poorly routes. Of these bus routes, services 63 and 174 were of particular concern to London TravelWatch as they have had persistent poor performance. London TravelWatch will continue to monitor them. TfL informed London TravelWatch that:

During Quarter 1 2017-18 route 63 was affected by various delays that are experienced on the corridors the service passes through. There have been some utility works in Peckham High Street and Hanover Park Rye Lane that caused some disruption. As part of a review of this route a new schedule will be introduced from 22nd July 2017.

Route 174 suffered significant delays as a result of Crossrail works in Romford. Buses were unable to use Western Road because it had close during the works and the route was diverted via Victoria Road along with several other routes in the area which contributed to increased traffic congestion and delays. In addition, the route suffered delays along Main Road due to the knock on effects of works to replace Ardleigh Green bridge on the A127, as much of the displaced traffic from the A127 was using Main Road as an alternative. We are looking at a new schedule to allow more tolerance for works.

Bus stop accessibility


Based on TfL's audit of bus stops, 93.6% of all bus stops across the network meet TfL's exacting accessibility criteria. On the TfL road network, the figure is higher at 97.6%.

Graph 15 shows the accessibility on the TLRN and on borough roads along with targets for bus stop accessibility. The blue line represents the Mayor's new target to 2016. The red line (a lower target) is from the 2009-10 to 2017-18 Business Plan. The new target set by the Mayor is very welcome, but will be challenging to achieve in a relatively short time-frame.

We also understand that three boroughs, Ealing, Hammersmith & Fulham, Kingston and the City of London have reached the milestone of 100% of their stops that are accessible, which demonstrates that this is achievable in both an inner and outer London street environment.

It is disappointing that Bromley’s record on accessible bus stops is so poor. At 62%, it is far lower than other boroughs and because it has so many stops brings down the overall figure.


Graph 15 - Bus stop accessibility 2008-09 to 2017-18 target and progress to date



Customer Service


Customer satisfaction figures for the last two quarters, along with the comparison from one year ago, are shown in Graph 16. Customer satisfaction score is the same as previous quarter (Q3 2016-17), and the same period a year ago (Q4 2015-16). Please note: bus stations evaluation changed from quarterly to annual for 2015-16, with the survey running in Q4 only. The Q1 2016-17 score was taken from the end of year Q4 15-16 score and Q4 2016-17 and Q1 2017-18 scores, taken from the beginning of year Q4 16-17 score.

Graph 16 –Q1 2016-17, Q4 2016-17 and Q1 2017-18 bus customer satisfaction scores




Graph 17 shows the overall customer satisfaction scores since Q1 2010-11.

Graph 17 – Overall satisfaction since Q1 2010-11 to Q1 2017-18



Complaints to London Buses were lower than the number received in the corresponding quarter a year ago (Q1 2016-17). LUL received 2.29 complaints per 100,000 journeys. The trend for bus complaints is rising steadily, but the number of bus complaints has declined steadily over the last two quarters.

Graph 18 – Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys



Bus safety statistics

Bus companies that are contracted to TfL, report bus safety incidents to TfL. These have been reported every quarter since January 2014. They include all incidents that result in an injury, whether on the bus as a passenger or driver or on the street as a pedestrian, third party rider, driver or passenger. The reporting has changed over time. Initially only those incidents that resulted in an injury, treated at hospital, were reported. Now, all incidents are reported in these statistics.

Below is a summary of the incidents that resulted in hospital treatment of either a serious injury or where the severity of injury is unknown, During this period there were five pedestrian fatalities as a result of a collision, and 154 incidents where the casualty was taken for hospital treatment with either a serious injury or the severity is unknown. These 154 incidents are tabulated below.

Table 5: The number of incidents on TfL's contracted bus services during financial quarter 1 2017-18 that resulted in hospital treatment with either a serious injury or the severity is unknown

Q1 2017-18	Passengers	Driver or TfL staff	Pedestrian or member of the public	3rd party driver, occupant or rider	Cycle	Total
Activity Incident Event	4		1			5
Assault	3	1				4
Collision Incident	8	2	9	4	5	28
Personal Injury	19	1	1			21
Slip Trip Fall	95		1			96
Safety critical failure						
Total	129	4	12	4	5	154

Table 6 shows a summary of the 2017-18 TfL Business Plan targets for London Buses.

Table 6 – Q1 2017-18 London Buses business plan key performance indicators(KPI)

KPI	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction – overall	86	88
Excess wait time – high frequency routes	1.1 minute	1.0 minute
% of Scheduled services operated	97.6%	98.2%

London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of London Buses is as follows.

Customer satisfaction score is higher than previous quarter (Q4 2016-17), and the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17).

[Note: Bus stations evaluation changed from quarterly to annual for 2015-16, with the survey running in Q4 only.]

High frequency bus route performance in quarter 1 is better than previously reported (Q4 2016-17), and the same period in Q1 2016-17.

Bus speeds across the network are now being reported by TfL. The all London average is shown as a graph in this report. The trend indicates that over the last two years bus speeds have declined resulting in large numbers of passengers no longer using services.

Whilst speeds are decreasing, EWT is being maintained across London. However, there are concerns, not reflected in the figures that bus services have performed poorly in central London. TfL have added a substantial number of buses to maintain reliability. This is welcome, but costly. Poor performance means significant number of passengers have stopped using the buses in central London. This decline may have levelled off, but is of serious concern. More has to be done by TfL to address this.

London TravelWatch is concerned that not enough is being done to deliver bus priority on the streets used by London's bus services. Indeed some bus priority continues to be lost to cycle, town centre and other schemes. Where such losses occur there should be complementary improvement to bus priority elsewhere along the routes affected. TfL have established a bus priority team and budget to deliver additional bus priority on both their and borough controlled roads which is welcome providing it delivers real improvement.


The number of bus complaints is rising steadily.

4 London Underground

In this section, the performance of London Underground for the first quarter of the financial year 2017-18 is presented. The key indicators focused on are those for which targets are set in the TfL business plan and those, which reflect the experience of London Underground’s passengers. We are now reporting ‘lost customer hours’ (graph 21), a measure of performance that may be more meaningful for consumers.

Excess Journey Time (EJT) measures the number of additional minutes added to a total journey because of delays. Graph 19 presents the EJT for each line on the Underground network over the last three periods making up (broadly) the quarter.


Graph 19 – P1 2017-18 to P3 2017-18, Excess Journey Time by Underground line (minutes)



The network measure, shown in Graph 20, is a better estimate of EJT, as it is weighted by the passenger numbers using the different lines and recognises that 40% of Underground journeys will include two legs and therefore includes two wait times.

London Underground performed better than the network target set in the TfL 2013-14 business plan. It should be noted that this network target is somewhat tighter than the previous year’s target and will tighten further in future years. While there are occasional high profile disruption events on the underground, performance is on an improving trend.

Graph 20 – P7 2012-13 to P3 2017-18, Excess Journey Time measure for the network (minutes). The red line is the TfL target.




Lost customer hours

Lost customer hours (LCH) is the total extra journey time, measured in hours, experienced by Underground customers as a result of all service disruptions with durations of two minutes or more. For example, an incident at Oxford Circus during a Monday to Friday peak gives rise to a much higher number of lost customer hours than an incident of the same length in Zone 6 on a Sunday morning.


LCH figures since P1 2014-15 are shown in the Graph 21. The year is divided into 13 four week periods, starting on April 1st.

Graph 21 - P1 2014-15 to P3 2017-18 Lost Customer Hours




Customer satisfaction figures for the last two quarters, along with the comparison from one year ago, are shown in the Graph 22

Graph 22 – Q1 2016-17, Q4 2016-17 and Q1 2017-18 London Underground customer satisfaction scores



Graph 23 shows the overall satisfaction score with London Underground services since Q1 2010-11.

Graph 23 - Overall satisfaction, Q2 2010-11 to Q1 2017-18



Complaints to London Underground (LUL) were lower than the number received in the corresponding quarter a year ago (Q1 2016-17). LUL received 0.70 complaints per 100,000 journeys.

Graph 24 - Customer complaints received by the Underground for every 100,000 journeys




Table 7 shows a summary of all of the 2017-18 TfL business plan targets for London Underground.

Table 7 – Q1 2017-18 London Underground TfL business plan key performance indicators (KPI)


KPI	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction score – overall	85	86
Excess Journey Time (Network)	4.3 minutes	4.1 minutes
% of Scheduled services operated	98.2%	97.2%
London TravelWatch’s overall performance assessment of London Underground is as follows. Customer satisfaction score is above target this quarter. There has been a significant drop in the % of scheduled services operated. Network Excess Journey Time is below (better than) target.		

5 Docklands Light Railway

In this section, the performance of DLR is presented. The key indicators focused on are those for which targets are set in the TfL business plan and those which reflect the experience of passengers of the DLR.


DLR’s network-wide performance measure is ‘departure reliability’. This is the percentage of intervals between trains at terminal stations no more than three minutes greater than the published service intervals. Departures within 3 minutes is better than target this quarter.

Graph 25 - Q1 2010-11 to Q1 2017-18 reliability (departure within 3 minutes of published service intervals)



Customer satisfaction with the Docklands Light Railway remains high.

Graph 26 – Q1 2016-17, Q4 2016-17 and Q1 2017-18 DLR customer satisfaction scores



Graph 27 - Q1 2010-11 to Q1 2017-18 DLR overall customer satisfaction scores



Customer satisfaction scores were omitted in Q2 2012-13, due to the staging of the London Olympic & Paralympic Games.

The complaints rate was lower this quarter compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17). 0.67 complaints were received per 100,000 journeys. The lowest since the records began.

Graph 28 - Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys





Table 8 – Q1 2017-18 DLR TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI)

KPI	Q1 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction score – overall	88	89
On-time performance	98.4%	99.5%
<p>London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of Docklands Light Railway is as follows.</p> <p>DLR performance is up this quarter. Departures within 3 minutes is above target this quarter.</p> <p>Customer satisfactions score is above target.</p> <p>Customer complaints rate was lower this quarter compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17). The lowest since the records began.</p>		

6 London Tramlink


London Tramlink reports a public performance measure: the percentage of trams that arrive within five minutes of the scheduled time.

Graph 29 - Q1 2010-11 to Q1 2017-18, public performance measure (per cent). The red line is the TfL target.




Customer satisfaction scores on Tramlink are shown in graph 30.

Graph 30 – Q1 2016-17, Q4 2016-17 & Q1 2017-18 customer satisfaction scores



Graph 31 - Overall customer satisfaction scores since Q1 2010-11



In Q1 2017-18, Tramlink received 1.42 complaints per 100,000 journeys. Complaints were lower than quarter Q1 2016-17.

Graph 32 - Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys




Table 9 shows a summary of all of the 2017-18 TfL Business Plan targets for London Tramlink.

Table 9 – Q1 2017-18 London Tramlink TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI)

KPI	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction score – overall	89	90
Tram performance measure	97%	98.7%
<p>London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of London Tramlink is as follows.</p> <p>Tramlink performance was above target.</p> <p>Customer satisfaction is above target</p> <p>Complaints were lower than quarter Q1 2016-17.</p>		

7 London Overground

London Overground’s public performance measure (PPM) for the first quarter was 95.6%. This was 0.8 percentage points higher than the same quarter last year (Q1 2016-17). Please note this is a Network Rail statistic.

The National Rail Passenger Survey results are from the spring 2017 wave of surveys. Passenger satisfaction has increased since the last spring survey. The percentage of passengers satisfied was 90% compared with 88% in spring 2016. This figure is close to that of equivalent South East TOCs.


TfL’s own customer satisfaction score is above target.

Right time arrival (RTA)

RTA is an industry measure of the percentage of trains that arrive at their final destination either on time or early. Right time is defined as less than one minute late, and should not be confused with “on time”, as defined for PPM purposes.

London Overground performs well compared to most TOCs. RTA was higher than previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago Q1 2016-17.

Graph 33 - London Overground percentage of RTA




Cancellations and significant lateness (CaSL)

CaSL is an industry measure of the percentage of trains, which arrive ‘significantly’ late or do not run, expressed as a percentage of the total number of trains planned. A train is defined as significantly late if it arrives 30 or more minutes late at its planned destination or fails to complete its entire planned route, including calling at all timetabled stations.

London Overground performed well compared to most London & South East train operators and was in the top five.

Graph 34 – London Overground percentage of CaSL

London Overground Trains Cancelled & Significantly Late since Q1 2014-15



London Overground experienced a reduction in complaints compared to the same period a year ago, receiving 1.25 complaints per 100,000 journeys. London Overground receives one of the lowest rates of complaints when compared to other London & South East train operators.

Graph 35 - Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys

London Overground




Table 10 – Q1 2017-18 London Overground TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI) and National Rail performance figures

National Rail Performance measure	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction – overall (National Rail Passenger Survey bi-annual data). Percentage satisfied or good	Average of similar London and South East TOC's: 81% (Not a TfL target)	90% (spring 2017)
Public Performance Measure (Network Rail figures)	Average of London and South east TOCs is 86% (Not a TfL target)	95.6%
TfL KPIs	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Overall customer satisfaction score (TfL measure)	84	85
On time performance (A TfL measure of PPM Moving Annual Average)	Data not available	94.6%
<p>London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of London Overground is as follows.</p> <p>London Overground has achieved its targets. RTA was higher than previous quarter and the same period a year ago.</p> <p>London Overground performance is towards the upper end of TOC performance in terms of cancellations and significant lateness.</p>		

8 TfL Rail


TfL Rail’s PPM for the first quarter was 94.0%. This was 0.2 percentage points higher than Q1 2016-17. Please note this is a Network Rail statistic.

The National Rail Passenger Survey results are from the spring 2017 wave of surveys. Passenger satisfaction has increased since the last spring survey. The percentage of passengers satisfied was 87% compared with 79% in spring 2016.

Right time arrival

TfL Rail performed very well compared to other L&SE TOCs, but had a poorer performance compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago.

Graph 36 TfL Rail percentage of RTA




Cancellations and significant lateness (CaSL)

TfL Rail performed well compared to the same period in Q1 2016-17 but not as well when compared to other TOCs (was in the top eight).

Graph 37 – TfL Rail percentage of CaSL

TfL Rail Trains Cancelled & Significantly Late Trains since Q1 2014-15



In Q1 2017-18, TfL Rail received 1.72 complaints per 100,000 journeys. A reduction in complaints compared to the same period in 2016-17.

Graph 38 – Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys




Table 11 – Q1 2017-18 TfL Rail, TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI) and National Rail performance figures

National Rail Performance measure	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction – overall (National Rail Passenger Survey bi-annual data). Percentage satisfied or good	Average of similar London and South East TOC's: 81% (Not a TfL target)	87%
Public Performance Measure (Network Rail figures)	Average of London and South east TOCs is 86% (Not a TfL target)	94.0%
TfL KPIs	Q1 Target 2017-18	Current performance level
Overall customer satisfaction score (TfL measure)	83	83
On time performance (A TfL measure of PPM Moving Annual Average)	Data not available	94.1%
<p>London TravelWatch's overall performance assessment of TfL Rail is as follows</p> <p>TfL Rail achieved its targets. TfL Rail performed very well compared to other L&SE TOCs, but had a poorer performance compared to the previous quarter (Q4 2016-17) and the same period a year ago.</p> <p>TfL Rail performance is not as high in terms of cancellations and significant lateness, when compared to other TOCs.</p>		

9 Dial-a-Ride

The Dial a Ride customer satisfaction survey is now done only twice a year, Q1 and Q3. The below information, except the complaints data, relates to Q1 17-18.

Dial-a-Ride is a door-to-door transport service operated by TfL for people (members) with disabilities who cannot use buses, trains or the Underground in London.

Overall customer satisfaction at 92 was on target. Dial-a-Ride members are very satisfied with driver helpfulness-courtesy, which scores 95 (95 in Q1 2016-17). Satisfaction with the booking process was (79), below target (80) but obtained a higher score compared to Q1 2016-17, which was 76.

Greater demand may arise from an aging population and the cessation of other similar door-to-door services. TfL have implemented a new regime for membership, which should ensure that those that need this service are prioritised.

Complaints decreased compared to Q1 2016-17. Dial-a-ride received 93.2 complaints per 100,000 journeys, which is high compared to other modes.

Graph 39 – Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys




Table 12 – Q1 2017-18 Dial-a-Ride TfL business plan key performance Indicators (KPI)


KPI	Q1 Target 2016-17	Current performance level
Customer satisfaction score – overall	92	92
Quarterly passenger journey numbers	1,400,000(annual target)	
<p>London TravelWatch’s overall performance assessment of Dial-a-Ride is as follows.</p> <p>Customer satisfaction overall is on target. Dial-a-Ride members are usually very satisfied with driver helpfulness-courtesy. The main source of complaint this quarter is ease of getting through on the telephone and the booking process.</p>		

10 Cycle hire

In this section, the performance of the cycle hire scheme is presented. London's cycle hire scheme is a public bike-sharing scheme for shorter journeys around the capital. The bikes are available to casual users, as well as London cycle hire scheme members.

The graph below shows the usage of the cycle hire scheme since August 2010, on a monthly basis. The number of cycle hires has fluctuated for a number of reasons since it started. Initially cycle hire was only available to members. Since then one-off hires were made possible and the availability of cycles has been increased as the scheme has rolled out to new areas. In January 2013, there was a sharp increase in the 'access' fee.


Graph 40 - Cycle hire scheme usage



The latest customer satisfaction score (80), is the same since the previous wave (wave 11), just below the peak score of 81 (in wave 9). The different elements of the survey suggest increasing satisfaction with the use of members' keys and with the service from the contact centre.


Scores for the availability of spaces at docking stations has decreased and value for money have marginally increased.

Graph 41 - Satisfaction with overall experience cycle hire customer satisfaction score




Complaints decreased compared to the same period a year ago (Q1 2016-17). The cycle hire scheme received 2.07 complaints per 100,000 journeys.

Graph 42 - Customer complaints received by TfL for every 100,000 journeys




11 Customer satisfaction and value for money scores – modes comparison

Graph 43 – Q1 2017-18 overall customer satisfaction scores – modes comparison



** TLRN – Transport for London Road Network

Graph 44 – Q1 2017-18 value for money scores - modes comparison



Appendix – Glossary & source references

Glossary

Term	Definition
AWT	Average Waiting Time
BCV	Bakerloo, Central & Victoria lines
DLR	Docklands Light Railway
EJT	Excess Journey Time
EWT	Excess Waiting Time
IRR	Inner Ring Road
JNP	Jubilee, Northern & Piccadilly lines
JTR	Journey Time Reliability
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LOROL	London Overground
MAA	Moving Annual Average
Q	Quarter
PPM	Public Performance Measure
RTA	Right Time Arrival
SSL	Sub-Surfaces Lines
SWT	Scheduled Waiting Time
TfL	Transport for London
TOC	Train Operating Company
TLRN	Transport for London Road Network
WEZ	Western Extension Zone
LCH	Lost Customer Hours

References

- Streets
 - [London Streets Performance Report](#) – Q1 2017-18
 - <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/road-safety>
- London Buses
 - <https://tfl.gov.uk/forms/14144.aspx>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
 - Bus stop accessibility supplied by TfL
 - <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/bus-safety-data>
 - <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/buses-performance-data>
- London Underground
 - <http://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports-underground-services-performance>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly

- Docklands Light Railway
 - <http://tfl.gov.uk/corporate-publications-and-reports-dlr-performance-data>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
- Dial-a-Ride
 - <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/modes-dial-a-ride>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
- London Overground
 - PPM scores supplied to London TravelWatch monthly by Network Rail.
 - [London Overground performance](#)
 - <http://www.passengerfocus.org.uk/research-national-passenger-survey-introduction>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
- TfL Rail
 - PPM scores supplied to London TravelWatch monthly by Network Rail.
 - [TfL Rail performance](#)
 - <http://www.passengerfocus.org.uk/research-national-passenger-survey-introduction>
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
- London Tramlink
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores and Public Performance Measure supplied by TfL directly
 - [Tram performance](#)
 - Customer satisfaction survey scores supplied by TfL directly
- Cycle Hire
 - TfL commissioned cycle hire customer satisfaction and usage survey, Wave 12 (Quarter 2 2016/17)
 - [London data store](#)