

George Yannis, Alexandra Laiou (National Technical University of Athens-NTUA)

KPI Enforcement of Traffic Regulations

Trendline General Assembly

The Hague, 10-11 June 2025

Contents

- Definition of the KPI
- Composition of the Key Expert Group
- Activities undertaken
- Pilots and tests
- Lessons learned
- Key choices for the future methodology
- Current status of the Methodological Guidelines
- Discussion / questions

KPI Enforcement options

Suggested options based on the international literature and related to different aspects of enforcement of traffic regulations:

- 1. Number of police controls per infringement** (speeding, seat-belt use, helmet use, distraction, drink-driving, red light driving) **and per population** (effort)
- 2. Number of tickets per infringement** (speeding, seat-belt use, helmet use, distraction, drink-driving, red light driving) **and per population** (effectiveness)
- 3. Number of red light cameras on the urban network**
(per km of network OR per population OR per population/km²) (level of enforcement)
- 4. Number of fixed speed enforcement cameras or section control stretches**
(per km of rural and urban network OR per population OR per population/km²) (specific infringement – speeding)

Composition of the Key Expert Group

Expert	Organisation	Country
Alexandra Laiou	NTUA	Greece
Peter Silverans	VIAS	Belgium
Helga Mondésir	ONISR	France
Fanny Malin	VTT	Finland
Dagmara Jankowska-Karpa	ITS	Poland
Rute Calheiros / Augusto Torbay	ANSR	Portugal
Charles Goldenbeld	SWOV	Netherlands

Activities undertaken

- **Concept note** on Enforcement of Traffic Regulations (Enforcement) – January 2023
- **Setting-up** of the KEG on Enforcement – June 2023
- On-line KEG **meeting** – July 2023
- **Outline** of working document on Enforcement – November 2023
- Exploration of **interest** for a **pilot** on ASI – November 2023 up to February 2024
- Working document on Enforcement – **First draft** – February 2024
- **Review** of the working document by KEG – March 2024
- Working document on Enforcement – **Second draft** – June 2024
- One-to-one discussions – **review** by KEG – June 2024
- Working document on Enforcement – **Final draft** – July 2024
- Feedback on **progress pilot** – October 2024 / February 2025 / March 2025
- **Pilot results** – February-April 2025

Pilots and tests

KPI Option	Finland	Poland	Portugal
Number of police controls per infringement and per population	Number of police controls for drunk driving (NO other substances besides alcohol)	Number of police controls for drunk driving (OR under the influence of other substances)	-
Number of tickets per infringement and per population	Number of fines and traffic penalty fees (TPF) per infringement (speeding, seat belt, helmet, distraction, drink-driving, red lights) and per population in the last 3 years	Number of tickets per infringement (speeding, driver seat belt, helmet, distraction, drink driving, red lights) per vehicle type, day, time of the day, population, 18+ population, number of driving licenses	-
Number of red light cameras on the urban network	Not available	Red light cameras on the urban network per 1000 km of network, 1 mln total population, 1 mln population in urban areas, population/km ²	-
Number of fixed speed enforcement cameras or section control stretches	- Speed enforcement cameras/ population	- Fixed speed cameras - Section control stretches per 1000 km of network, 1 mln total population, population/km ²	- Fixed speed cameras - Speed control locations per population

Lessons learned - Finland

- Option 1 (effort): The number of **police controls** is only available for **drunk driving**.
- Option 2 (effectiveness): Two-tiered system for “tickets” i.e. **fin**es and **traffic penalty fees** given for the infringements. Fines for each infringement are clearly marked, but traffic penalty fees may appear in hundreds of potential categories, and one infringement can be assigned several traffic penalty fees.
- Option 3 (enforcement level): Information on red light cameras is available only through **cities** and **municipalities**.
- Option 4 (speeding): cameras geographically distributed, but **not possible** to determine the number per **urban/rural** areas based on police records so to not reveal the exact locations of speed enforcement cameras.

Lessons learned - Poland

- Option 1 (effort):
 - number of controls available only for **drink-driving**. Still, no distinction per vehicle type is available.
 - data on number of controls are available, however **without distinction** per **infringement**, instead per vehicle type.
- Options 3, 4 (enforcement level, speeding):
 - the number of red light cameras, fixed speed cameras and section control stretches are **available centrally** (Centre for Automatic Enforcement of Road Traffic within the General Inspectorate for Road Transport)

Lessons learned - Portugal

- Option 1-3 (effort, effectiveness, enforcement level): Not available data or not preferred KPIs
- Option 4 (speeding):
 - Data before and after radars' activation reveal **36%** reduction in **accidents** involving injuries, **74%** decrease in **fatalities**, **44%** reduction in **serious injuries**, and **36%** decrease in **slight injuries**.
 - All speed control locations are **clearly indicated** on roads through traffic **signs**, listed on a **website** and integrated in an **app**.

Key choices for the future methodology

- Close cooperation with the Traffic Police and other Authorities is needed to obtain data on enforcement procedures and results that are not freely available.
- Specific traffic infringements seem of more interest i.e. speeding and drink-driving. Still other infringements should not be overlooked when enforcement methods and results are explored.

Current status of the Methodological Guidelines

- KPI Enforcement may concern any **step** of the **penal procedure** comprising enforcement of traffic regulations.
 - **Methods and procedures** for the enforcement of traffic regulations and **available data** on procedures and results are substantially **different** among countries.
 - Key road safety **problems** in each country and **associated** road safety **offences**, road **user** groups, or **roads** types must be considered for the selection of useful KPIs.
 - Each Member State should choose the most appropriate and useful KPI Enforcement based on **applicability** and **availability** of data as well as on the particular **needs** in the respective country.
- **No single definition** for the KPI enforcement of traffic regulations is provided.
- **Minimum methodological requirements** for alternative KPI Enforcement options that relate to different aspects of enforcement are provided.

Discussion / Questions

- Is it possible to improve data availability on enforcement effort and effectiveness?
i.e. support Traffic Police improve recording of conducted checks and their results?
- Should drivers be (fully) aware of enforcement systems (e.g. location of speed cameras) or not?
- Need for a centralised system including all information on enforcement of traffic regulations procedures, equipment, activities and results from all responsible stakeholders (e.g. Traffic Police, local and regional authorities, road operators)