

INDEPENDENT INVESTMENT PROGRAMME ADVISORY GROUP BENCHMARKING REVIEW 2022

Status: FINAL

Date: 13 February 2023

Author: Alison Munro

Executive Summary

We continue to find that TfL has a commendably strong external focus. TfL leaders have been very supportive of international benchmarking and this has no doubt helped sustain a culture in TfL which is strongly outward looking and open to alternative ideas and approaches.

TfL continues to engage actively in the Imperial College-led international benchmarking groups for the public transport modes. The move to more virtual engagement has created increased opportunities for international benchmarking. There are good examples of how TfL has used these forums to shape and improve its performance, such as in responding to the pandemic.

TfL is making some progress on cost benchmarking, although there is still a way to go. We commend the initiative to develop internal cost intelligence and benchmarks for capital projects. We continue to believe there is greater scope for internal cost and performance benchmarking within TfL.

The scope for data led benchmarking is more constrained in some areas of TfL work, but across the business there is a lot of 'best practice' benchmarking, both internationally and within the UK. Being more ad hoc and tailored to particular issues at hand, the results of 'best practice' benchmarking are generally directly applied to TfL decisions or used to justify TfL solutions. TfL may wish to consider whether there would be benefits from a more formalised system of sharing activity and results, perhaps through a 'Community of Benchmarkers' and/or a portal such as the one for lessons learned exercises.

We have found that benchmarking is used extensively to inform the policies that support the Mayor's Transport Strategy, carbon neutrality and the Financial Sustainability Plan, and to support funding discussions with the Department for Transport. That said, TfL may wish to consider whether it can do more to ensure that the balance of its benchmarking activities is as closely aligned as possible to its needs and strategic priorities. There may be some benefit in nominating an Executive Committee or other senior lead for benchmarking (both data-led and best practice) who could be a focal point and could communicate any strategic or policy priorities to the benchmarking community.

Introduction

IIPAG's Terms of Reference require it to produce an annual report on TfL's benchmarking activities for the Audit and Assurance Committee. This is IIPAG's third report (a little delayed due to resignation of the lead IIPAG member). Our previous reports commended TfL's strong external focus and the level of effort applied to benchmarking.

In this report we had considered two types of benchmarking:

- Data based benchmarking– where data on factors such as costs and performance is collected from different organisations, analysed and compared.
- 'Best practice' benchmarking – where approaches adopted by different organisations are investigated.

Both types of benchmarking can help TfL understand how and why its performance differs from other organisations and can provide insights to inform improvements and target setting. Benchmarking can also assist in justifying TfL's performance and chosen solutions. Benchmarking does however need to be applied with care due to the difficulty sometimes of accounting for all the underlying factors contributing to performance, and hence of making valid comparisons.

Part 1 of this report follows the approach of the two previous reports in surveying the scope of TfL benchmarking activity and how the results are used. Additionally, this time we have also looked at how well aligned TfL's benchmarking activity is with its strategic priorities, as set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Financial Sustainability Plan. This is covered in Part 2. Part 3 covers the organisation and leadership of benchmarking within TfL.

I. SCOPE OF TFL BENCHMARKING AND INSIGHTS DERIVED

International and Modal Benchmarking

TfL continues to participate in the four International Benchmarking exercises that have been described in previous IIPAG Benchmarking Reviews. These cover London Underground (LU), Docklands Light Railway (DLR), London Overground (LO) and London Buses. This benchmarking work is managed by the Transport Strategy Centre at Imperial College London, which we heard is extremely supportive of and ready to engage with TfL.

LU/DLR: CoMET and Nova

TfL was a founding member of the Community of Metros Benchmarking Group (CoMET), which now includes some 45 metros across the world. From 2013 DLR was represented in a group of smaller metros known as NOVA, which has now been merged back into CoMET. The level of intensity of TfL involvement in CoMET has been largely been maintained, though on the DLR side the team is very small. With more activity now being online, there are greater opportunities to share information

both formally and informally, to access experts more easily, and to have meetings with different metros around the world (where travel previously constrained opportunities). We also heard that a degree of in-person engagement is very important in building trusted and open relationships, especially for learning from things that have not gone so successfully. Whereas before the pandemic most CoMET studies were medium term, there is now a more differentiated approach, with 'express studies' to provide quicker results. Examples have included: COVID recovery; fare evasion; drivers of demand post pandemic; and staff retirements.

Typically, CoMET has around six main case studies underway, plus two to four express studies. Members are asked to put forward topics for consideration, and ideas are put to a voting system. TfL plays an active part in this process, and in past years TfL has been successful in securing its suggested study on Cleaning Efficiency and Practices and has used this to develop its own practices. Other areas which have benefited from learning from CoMET have been timetabling (with lessons from New York and Hong Kong), measures to tackle fare evasion, and modernisation programmes. CoMET studies are also used to validate what TfL currently does or proposes to do.

The centrepiece of CoMET is the production each year of a report on KPIs and customer satisfaction.

London Underground continues to be amongst the metros with the highest service frequency. London has the highest fare levels per passenger km where the DLR and Underground are both more than double the global median level. While wage data is somewhat limited it is clear that when compared to wage levels, fares in the UK are still high.

Before COVID, the majority of metros globally were experiencing strong and ongoing growth in passenger demand. From 2010 to 2019 London Underground saw a change in passenger journeys of approx. +2.15% per year in line with the median annual rate. On average, COMET metros had 61.3% of 2019 demand in 2021 with London having 54% (DLR 66.1%) and like the majority of metros London maintained high service levels (approx. 90%) during 2021.

London is at the bottom end of metros for step free access (below 50%), along with three other metros that are also more than 100 years old.

London is now at the average capacity levels despite historically low levels of capacity following many years of major train and signalling capacity upgrades and thanks to the operation of very high service frequencies.

Overall London continues to compare well to other European metros of a similar age but remains behind the newer Asian metros.

'2022 KPI Summary Report (2021 Data)' Transport Strategy Centre (TSC), The Community of Metros (CoMET)

Buses: International Bus Benchmarking Group (IBBG)

IBBG operates in a similar way to CoMET, with 15 member cities. It has provided TfL with insights in a number of areas including electric and hydrogen buses, safety issues such as slips and falls, and customer satisfaction. TfL's Bus Safety Programme was partly informed by lessons learned through IBBG.

IBBG produces a suite of bus KPIs each year. These were used to help demonstrate to the Department for Transport the relatively strong financial performance of London's buses pre-COVID. The IBBG data also contributed to identification of a relative drop in London's bus speeds, which stimulated development of a range of policies to improve bus speeds.

The London bus network is the largest of all member cities. TfL provides a more even service distribution throughout the day than most cities, which are weighted more towards morning and evening peak periods. This contributes to overall capacity utilisation being slightly lower in London. Trip lengths are typically lower in London as are the average fares per trip. Financially London compares well, with operating costs reasonably low given the high wage environment and recovery of costs through fares being in the upper quartile.

TfL has been an active participant in IBBG since 2004. The TfL team is not as strongly resourced as the equivalent LU team, and it is recognised that activity has fallen off a bit since COVID. While TfL bus teams are active participants in IBBG studies, there is not as much capacity to engage in the 'shaping' of the IBBG programme.

Aside from IBBG, TfL also seeks to learn from what other UK bus operators are doing. The current trial on Bus Route 63 is testing some of the best examples of what TfL has seen elsewhere in Britain.

Suburban Rail: International Suburban Rail Benchmarking Group (ISEBeRG)

This group was established in 2009 and within TfL is the least resourced of the Imperial groups. The London Overground (LO) team engage in ISEBeRG's seminars and workshops, but their ability to participate fully in ISEBeRG's data collection is constrained not only by internal resources but because LO operations are contracted out, with the contractor holding the data. There is a plan to increase resources a bit to allow LO to be a better member and to maximise the benefits of participation. In time it is expected that the Elizabeth Line will increase its participation in ISEBeRG.

Again we heard that participation had brought benefits, especially through learning what other operators were doing during COVID. Other examples of beneficial learning were practices for dealing with luggage and storage, revenue protection, rolling stock specification, and the use of digital information screens in carriages for safety messages. The LO team also use the KPI data to challenge the LO operator's performance.

All railways saw a drop in passenger journeys in 2020 due to the pandemic. London Overground experienced the most significant increases / recovery from 2020 – 2021, although still below 2019 levels. Service levels and capacity have remained consistent.

London Overground is one of the smaller networks in the group with shorter average journeys at lower speeds between closer stations, but at relatively high capacity utilisation. The average fare per passenger km is higher in London Overground than the other participants.

'Phase 12 KPI Report (2021 Data)' Transport Strategy Centre, International Suburban Rail Benchmarking Group

International Association for Public Transport

In addition to the Imperial College groups, TfL also participates in the International Association for Public Transport (UITP). While the Imperial College work is mainly focused on operating issues and benchmarking data, UITP is more policy focused and has a broader membership. Its Committees are organised along two lines, the first being thematic (e.g. metro, light rail, water-borne transport, transport and urban life, sustainable development, technology) and the second being entity based (e.g. organising authorities, industry groups, research bodies). TfL chairs two Committees, on organising authorities and transport economics, and there is also participation from across TfL in other groups. In the past there had been a TfL lead UITP representative from ExCo, but this has fallen away.

UITP activities are more 'best practice' focused than data focused, and were described to us as 'ultra collaborative'. The UITP groups were very active in sharing experience and solutions during COVID. The benefits are wide ranging, from learning what policies and practices work or not, through to collaboration on e.g. rolling stock specifications and cyber standards, or challenging developments that would be unhelpful to TfL. While some of these benefits may be difficult to attach hard numbers to, there is strong belief that the engagement pays off.

Roads

The Imperial College groups and UITP do not cover roads. TfL's benchmarking is less formalised for roads and is largely based on comparisons with organisations within the UK. TfL's responsibilities for roads (e.g. its own roads vs funding boroughs for their roads, traffic management and signals) are rather unique, making benchmarking more difficult and potentially of less value. KPIs are not produced in the same way, and benchmarking studies are more ad hoc, best practice comparisons.

Major Projects Benchmarking

A small team within the PMO takes the lead on benchmarking for major projects. They have led two significant benchmarking reports in the past couple of years. The first of these, on capital delivery models, benchmarked TfL's Major Projects Directorate (MPD) against a wide range of capital delivery organisations including Network Rail, National Highways, High Speed 2, a couple of overseas transport organisations and public bodies, National Grid, Sellafield, and UK Government departments with large capital programmes. The study looked at organisational structures, the design of the project management function, and the role of the PMO and similar support functions. The results have been used extensively to inform and support organisational developments within TfL such as the centralisation of capital delivery under the Chief Capital Officer and the centralised PMO.

The second study looked at driverless trains and platform protection, a topic which had increased profile in the discussions with DfT around financial sustainability. Again this looked widely, beyond transport into such areas as detection policies in the police and defence.

As part of its planning for financial sustainability, TfL established a Capital Efficiencies Plan (CEP) with targets for cashable savings. The CEP included a workstream on benchmarking, led by the team in MPD. This has reviewed TfL processes (such as Pathway) against other organisations, and benchmarked 'pounds in the ground' – the proportion of direct versus indirect costs – against internal and external comparators.

Building on the CEP, the MPD team is developing a fuller Capital Benchmarking Strategy which will identify key areas of focus for benchmarking activities - where spend is greatest, where there is scope for innovation, and recurring problem areas.

The team has also expanded the Knowledge Portal to include the outputs from benchmarking, alongside 'lessons learnt' reports. There is a feeling that this is currently a bit of an untapped resource in TfL.

Cost Benchmarking

The CEP Benchmarking workstream also included cost benchmarking, primarily relying on the external benchmarking work of Transport Industry Efficiency Strategy (TIES) (see below). Previous IIPAG reports on benchmarking have noted the scope for more internal benchmarking within TfL, but this has been slow to develop. TfL's Estimating Book has been produced by a commercial firm and would therefore draw benchmarks from a range of external capital projects. The new P&C Capital Director is now building a repository of TfL's experience of how costs have moved over the life of TfL capital projects, with a standardised work breakdown structure which will provide TfL-specific benchmarks to inform future cost estimates. This draws on his experience of cost estimating and cost intelligence at Network Rail. Over the next 15 months he intends to build the capability to benchmark the main elements of TfL project costs, such as construction, preliminaries, design and project management against similar TfL projects. The approach will also embrace benchmarking some of the recurring common items (such as laying new track, or new switches and

crossings.) This activity is currently limited to major capital projects, but the approach could also prove useful for other areas such as renewals and T&D.

Cost benchmarking is also deployed in a range of procurements, to aid the assessment and challenge of suppliers' prices. A significant benchmarking study was undertaken for the Deep Tube Upgrade Programme. Another example is in Fleet, where the internal team gathered benchmark data on energy costs to help ensure value for money in the procurement of wheel sets, which are forged and thus have a high energy component. We heard that Fleet are beginning to build a workbank of cost data, but at present this is being done manually, and more resource would be required to develop it fully.

Transport Industry Efficiency Strategy

TIES was established in 2019 and is sponsored by the Department for Transport, with client partners National Highways, Network Rail, HS2, East-West Rail and TfL. It is supported by, among others, the Infrastructure Projects Authority. TfL has been a key supporter and driver of TIES; it was originally chaired by TfL's then Transport Commissioner, and TfL provides the PMO for TIES.

The aim of TIES is to improve confidence in the projected cost of infrastructure projects, enable stronger decision making, and to drive innovation. It does this through a TIES Benchmarking Forum and the establishment of 'Communities of Practice' (COPs) to facilitate collaboration. The COPs currently cover:

1. Cost/Schedule/Productivity
2. Quality
3. Carbon
4. Circular Economy
5. Biodiversity
6. Climate Resilience
7. Social Value

TIES benchmarking activities to date have prioritised three main areas: signalling equipment; cable route management; and cooling solutions. These priorities were influenced by the needs of the Piccadilly Line Upgrade Programme (PLU). Benefits are already being realised on PLU, through the application of a more efficient cooling solution which has emerged. Historical data has been mined to build up a centralised repository in which data is measured in the same way across organisations. Data on cost and time is the most straightforward to collect, but the ambition is also to capture other data such as environmental and social value data. It is early days, and there is a long way to go before a comprehensive database could be available.

In the meantime it is felt that substantial value has been gained from the COPs, which have enabled the various organisations to evolve a common interest which is expected to deliver efficiencies. The TIES programme is currently facing a bit of a hiatus as the first phase of governance has drawn to a close and the next phase needs to be established. While it is strongly supported at working level it is lacking in strategic leadership. It may be that the programme is too wide ranging and too long

term, and that a clear focus on some quicker wins and clearer articulation of the short to medium term benefits would attract greater support.

Technology and Data (T&D)

The past few years have been very challenging for T&D, with a big delivery agenda, additional challenges coming from the pandemic and the financial situation, and shortages of resources, but if anything this has encouraged even more efforts to question whether things are being done in the best way, and to learn from other organisations.

Before the pandemic T&D had commissioned Gartner to benchmark the T&D operational model against transport companies, public sector organisations and companies leading innovation. This found that while TfL had areas of strength, it was underinvesting, that it had a lot of legacy technology, and that it was under-resourced and facing capability gaps. Changes to address these findings are being taken forward under the Our TfL Programme, again drawing on experience of other organisations facing similar challenges.

Cyber security is another area where over the past couple of years T&D has benchmarked best practice and investment levels with other organisations in the public and energy sectors. Benchmarking has helped T&D make the case for its proposed changes.

T&D's work also underpins greater internal and external benchmarking capability by providing common data standards and environments. TfL's Chief Data Officer works closely with the Government Data Office on consistent data standards and governance, though this is still a work in progress. Internally within TfL a good example is the Maximo common system for asset management, which is being increasingly adopted across the different parts of TfL. It is already up and running for surface transport, with suppliers directly inputting asset data when they carry out maintenance. LU is extending its use of Maximo asset type by asset type, with activity currently addressing signalling asset data.

In the development of Maximo T&D has looked at other organisations' asset management systems (including water and rail companies). It has looked at other sectors to challenge some of TfL's business processes – for example talking to supermarkets when developing common products and deployment approaches for SAP.

Change Programmes

The desire to learn from other organisations' experience and practice can be seen across TfL's change and transformation programmes. An example is a formal benchmarking study undertaken to inform the change to Business Services in 2020, which consolidated previously separate services into a central service.

Benchmarking has been used to compare retention and attraction rates, or the size and spend of different departments. Benchmarking has natural limitations, because of the unique nature of TfL's business, so a 'case by case' basis is taken, with sometimes quite a narrow best practice focus – such as how BP, say, has tackled a

certain business issue. The Change teams aim to keep an eye on what is going on in the wider world so that they can tap into such best practice.

Conclusions on scope and application of benchmarking

TfL continues to engage actively in the Imperial College - led international benchmarking groups for the public transport modes. The move to more virtual engagement has created increased opportunities for international benchmarking. There are good examples of how TfL has used these forums to shape and improve its performance, such as in responding to the pandemic.

TfL is making some progress on cost benchmarking, although there is still a way to go. We welcome the initiative to develop internal cost intelligence and benchmarks for capital projects. We continue to believe there is greater scope for internal cost and performance benchmarking within TfL.

Although the scope for data led benchmarking is less in some areas of TfL activity, across TfL there is a lot of 'best practice' benchmarking, and TfL continues to proactively seek to learn from external experience, both internationally and within the UK. Being more adhoc and tailored to particular issues in hand, the results of 'best practice' benchmarking are generally directly applied or used to justify TfL solutions.

II. STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT OF BENCHMARKING ACTIVITY

In this section we look at how well aligned TfL's benchmarking activities are with its strategic priorities, as reflected in the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) and the Financial Sustainability Plan.

The central vision of the MTS is reducing dependence on the car in favour of walking, cycling and public transport, with the aim of 80 per cent of all trips being made by these sustainable modes by 2040. The MTS reflects the Mayor's aim to make London a zero carbon city for 2050, though the current ambition is to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. The MTS is framed around the 'Healthy Streets' approach which has three elements:

- Healthy Streets and Healthy People (which embraces air quality)
- Good public transport experience
- New homes and new jobs – supporting good growth.

TfL's international benchmarking is focussed on individual public transport modes, so this aligns well with the MTS objective for a good public transport experience. In this section we focus instead on benchmarking activity which addresses other areas - cross-modal strategies for achieving 80 per cent sustainable travel, non-operational modes, and zero carbon emissions.

Benchmarking and the Target for 80% Sustainable Travel

The target for 80 per cent sustainable travel is highly ambitious and is not achieved anywhere in a city the size of London. Recognising the scale of the challenges the team engages actively in best practice benchmarking to learn from other countries' and cities' solutions and experiences, including through participation in groups such

as UITP. For example, the team has looked at flagship cities for Active Travel, such as Copenhagen, and has investigated what other cities do in establishing Clean Air Zones. It has surveyed overseas experience of repurposing public space for use by cafes and restaurants: for cities including Vilnius, Dallas and New York the team looked at the measures adopted and what considerations were taken into account.

Benchmarking in these areas can have limitations, since the particular characteristics of London can make direct comparisons and application difficult. Also the breadth of TfL's authority is wider than is found in most other cities. In some policy areas TfL is itself a leader, such as for Road User Charging and Ultra Low Emission Zones (ULEZ). Even here TfL continues to engage externally and has very good knowledge of all the schemes in operation or planned around the world. A recent example of this was gathering experience of a boundary, or 'city access', charge, including from schemes in Oslo, Stavanger and Stockholm. Even where TfL cannot directly apply the results of best practice exercises, benchmarking still has value as it can help TfL to evidence and justify the solutions it is proposing.

An example of best practice benchmarking - London Scrappage Scheme

The Scrappage Evaluation Report, which addresses the scrappage scheme introduced in 2019 alongside the extension of ULEZ to the North and South Circular roads, provides details of scrappage schemes launched or due to be launched by other cities to support their Clean Air Zones. It reports experience in UK cities (Bath, Birmingham, Portsmouth, Bradford, Bristol, Greater Manchester, Tyneside and Sheffield) and international cities (Barcelona, California, Milan). It compares type of vehicles targeted, funding levels, grants per vehicle, eligibility requirements and grant conditions, and number of vehicles adapted/replaced.

Benchmarking and the Target for Carbon Neutrality

TfL's Corporate Environment Plan 2021 has set out ambitious targets and plans for carbon neutrality by 2030, with a commitment to benchmark TfL's progress against other organisations in the transport sector and beyond.

TfL has a small central team (c 20 people) responsible for Sustainability and Corporate Environment. Their activities range widely from encouraging efficient energy management on the TfL estate (some 6,500 thousand buildings), through bus emissions to embedded carbon in construction. For buildings and energy management TfL recognises that it is behind the curve; the current focus is on learning from other comparable organisations who do these things better. This 'best practice' benchmarking is mainly focused on the UK public sector or utilities, which provide the most suitable comparators to TfL.

For bus emissions TfL is recognised as a leader in the field, and engages in international benchmarking - for example, through UITP it has recently shared experience on hydrogen buses.

TfL's approach to benchmarking for embedded carbon is also relatively mature. TfL has been an active participant in the Infrastructure Carbon Managers Group, developed by Department for Transport from TIES to provide opportunities to share

information and best practice. Progress has been made for example in designing out carbon in steel and concrete. TfL has supported the Government's recent Shared Digital Carbon Architecture programme, a wider cross-departmental initiative focussed on developing tools and approaches to infrastructure carbon management.

Through the TIES programme TfL also engaged in quantitative benchmarking of carbon whole life assessments of transport infrastructure projects as well as other environmental benchmarking workstreams including green infrastructure and biodiversity and the circular economy.

TfL is actively engaged in sharing best practice through membership of other cross industry groups with a focus on infrastructure carbon, including the Infrastructure Client Group's carbon group and the RSSB's Infrastructure Carbon Working Group. As a member of the Supply Chain Sustainability School TfL is working with other infrastructure clients and the supply chain to develop best practice and improve consistency in the reporting of Scope 3 carbon.

TfL is less mature in its approach to climate adaptation. It engages in UITP work on adaptation, which includes surveys of what member organisations are doing. TfL also chairs a Transport Adaptation Steering Group, with membership from Network Rail, Highways England and Thames Water.

Carbon and sustainability have become topics of increasing importance in CoMET, with studies being undertaken on environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG), flooding and climate adaptation for metro systems.

Benchmarking and the Financial Sustainability Plan

TfL's benchmarking activities have supported Financial Sustainability in 2 respects: first, in making the case for Government support as a result of the pandemic; and second, in identifying potential efficiencies which will improve TfL's financial position.

As we have already noted in this report, TfL used data from its international benchmarking activities to demonstrate to the Department for Transport both its strong financial position pre-pandemic, and also its relative vulnerability to reduced demand because of the higher proportion of costs covered by revenue, compared with other comparable transport organisations. It also presented evidence to DfT on the different structural arrangements in place for other transport organisations in the UK such as Network Rail and National Highways.

Benchmarking has also supported the adoption of more efficient practices. For example, TfL has drawn on benchmarking information on balancing services against reduced demand, potential operational cost efficiencies, and harnessing technology. On the capital front, as already described, the capital efficiencies programme included benchmarking. On the organisational front, best practice from other organisations has been used to support change programmes, such as in P&C, and in considering reward.

Conclusions on Strategic Alignment

We have found that benchmarking is used extensively to inform the policies that support the MTS, carbon neutrality and the Financial Sustainability Plan, and to support funding discussions with the Department for Transport.

That said, TfL may wish to consider whether it can do more to ensure that the balance of its benchmarking activities is as closely aligned as possible to its needs and strategic priorities. Currently there is no overall coordination, plan or prioritisation process for benchmarking.

III HOW BENCHMARKING IS LED AND MANAGED IN TFL

Until 2017 there was a central benchmarking unit in TfL, which oversaw all the international benchmarking activities. Since then the lead on international benchmarking has been split modally, with the relevant Business Strategy team taking the lead for LU and buses, or the operational team for LO and DLR. Whilst this may have reduced oversight and coordination somewhat, overall we think this move is beneficial, as benchmarking now sits closer to the potential users of the results.

At the same time the level of resource for leading benchmarking has been squeezed somewhat, and we have noted that for buses, DLR and the overground resourcing for benchmarking is quite light. However, given the overall pressures that TfL has been facing it is not for us to argue that more resources should go into this area.

Best practice benchmarking is undertaken across TfL, not just as part of the international benchmarking activities. This ensures that studies are well targeted and used but raises a question about whether the benchmarking results are shared with all who might find them useful. We found, for example, that there is not much sharing of LU, LO and DLR benchmarking learnings. It perhaps also raises a risk of multiple uncoordinated requests to particular organisations like Network Rail. TfL may wish to consider whether there would be benefits from a more formalised common system for sharing 'best practice' activity and results, perhaps through a 'Community of Benchmarkers' and/or a portal such as the one for lessons learned exercises.

We heard that TfL leaders have been very supportive of International Benchmarking – for example Imperial College has made an annual presentation to the MD for LU in the past, and the Commissioner has also been engaged. This has no doubt helped sustain a culture in TfL which is strongly outward looking and open to alternative ideas and approaches. We have noted above that there is no overall prioritisation or consideration of the strategic alignment of benchmarking activities, and there may be some benefit in nominating an ExCo lead for Benchmarking who could be a focal point and could communicate any strategic or policy priorities to the benchmarking community.