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Context at a glance
LU manages & operates all assets
- Infrastructure
- Train systems
Passenger Journeys (millions)

Demand grows

An additional 26% growth by 2021
Our context means we need systemised ways of working

Number of journeys made in London in 2013/14

- Roads (Lorries, cars, motorbikes and taxis): 3.8 bn
- Buses: 2.4 bn
- London Underground: 1.26 bn
- Cycling: 205.3 m
- London Overground: 135.7 m
- DLR: 101.6 m
- Tramlink: 31.2 m
- Rivers: 8.6 m
- Santander cycles: 8.2 m
- Emirates Air Line: 1.5 m
- Dial-a-ride: 1.4 m

More than 30 million journeys on our road and public transport networks every day

Since 2000, the public transport mode share for London has increased by 10.6%

We are delivering one of the world’s largest programmes of transport capital investment

We directly manage the 580km of London’s busiest road network, 6,200 traffic signals and control the flow on all of London’s roads

We regulate taxis and private hire trade

We operate the Congestion Charging and Low Emission Zone
It's not all about documents, in fact ...
The Management System

Clear Instruction / Guidance

Support from Leadership and Management

Controlled Change

Performance Management

Training and Coaching

Verification, Audit & Measurement
Designed to pass: any reasonable yardstick
Mobilisation:
- ORR training provided
- Internal management systems awareness developed
- Methodology defined (calibration tool / smoothing the steps)
- RM3 TfL launched & used by ORR London Metro Team also

Conducted September 2013 / March 2014 (next in 2016)

Covered all Rail and Underground and all criteria

Methodology input: site visits (c100); interviews; desk tops; audit results; incident reports

Methodology output: results validated, calibrated and made consistent
c400 improvement actions identified, grouped, collated and prioritised

25 actions (R&U) taken forward into a Safety Improvement Plan covering 2014 – 2016

Governance through a specific programme board.
Observations from usage

- RM3 lends itself very well to internal assessment
  - provided participants are open to challenge
  - does not fit “inspection” type approach alone (evidence gathering needs to be extensive)
- It is easy to use – and can provide good benchmarking across the industry
  - But 2013/14 exercise resource intensive the way TfL did it!
- RM3 criteria not sufficiently granular to ensure consistency and do not all “build”
  - we adjusted criteria and developed defined question sets
- RM3 does not cover asset management comprehensively
- RM3 does not measure the suitability of metrics, targets or outcomes
- Results for London Underground accorded with ORR assessment
Integration
RM3 and EFQM COMPARED

RM3 approach to assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. “leadership”</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare your organization’s approach to leadership against RM3 descriptions using “best fit.” Identify improvement opportunities.

EFQM approach to assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>EFQM provides a list of what successful organisations do</th>
<th>Does your organisation do these (or equivalent)?</th>
<th>How well integrated are these activities / processes or are there only “islands of good practice”?</th>
<th>How well executed are the activities / processes – are they efficient for example?</th>
<th>As relevant, are activities and processes applied in all areas and is their effectiveness measured?</th>
<th>Are processes / activities subject to review and improvement?</th>
<th>Are business results consistently improving?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. “leadership”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use judgment / evidence against EFQM “tests” to identify strengths / weaknesses of approach and opportunities.
### People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RM3 equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3c. People are aligned, involved and empowered. For example:</td>
<td><strong>OP 1 worker involvement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Managers and employees are actively involved in reviewing, improving and optimising the effectiveness of the HSE processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is alignment between roles and those responsible for controlling risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Actions required to meet the HSE strategy aims are embedded in personal and team objectives appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are encouraged to promote and act as ambassadors for the organisations’ HSE reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OC3 organisational structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The alignment of the organisational; structure, safety accountability and delivery is aligned from top to bottom of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equivalence maintained in the TfL Management Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>RM3 equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5b. Products and services are developed to create optimum value for customers.</strong> For example:</td>
<td>No RM3 equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovate and create value for internal HSE customers by involving them and other stakeholders as appropriate in HSE product and service development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use research / feedback mechanisms to anticipate and identify improvements to HSE product and service portfolio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop an HSE portfolio of services in line with changing priorities and needs (long and short term).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q&A