NEEDS FOR EVIDENCE-BASED ROAD SAFETY DECISION MAKING IN EUROPE

Emmanuelle Dupont, Heike Martensen, IBSR/BIVV; Nicole Muhlrad, Heikki Jähi, French, IFSTTAR; Eleonora Papadimitriou, George Yannis, NTUA; Gabriele Giustiniani, CTL; Wim Wijnen, SWOV; Klaus Machata, KfV; Ilona Buttler, ITS; Rachel Talbot, TSRC; Victoria Gitelman, Technion.







The DaCoTA project aims at anchoring the development of the European Road Safety Observatory (ERSO) into policy-making by feeding information on the needs for data, knowledge and methodologies obtained from decisionmakers and stakeholders in European countries.

Consultation of needs - Basic tenets:

- Scientific support is necessary to road safety management.
- Road safety management is a complex process involving numerous steps, some of which may not be obvious to the scientific community.
- A comprehensive description of this process is necessary to investigate the needs for scientific input felt at the various steps, by those working at the road safety research - management interface.



SELECTION OF THE EXPERTS PANEL

STEP 1 : EC NATIONAL EXPERTS GROUP:

- Meets regularly to advise on RS statistics and performance indicators
- Includes representatives from all EU member states and from non-EU Schengen countries (Norway, Switzerland, Iceland).

STEP 2 : ENLARGEMENT OF THE PANEL:

• National experts and DaCoTA partners indicate one-two national(s) qualified for the consultation



STEP 3 : OFFICIAL REQUEST FOR CONTRIBUTION SENT BY EC TO EXPERTS INCLUDED IN THE PANEL



| General | Project co-financed by |
|---------|------------------------|
| obility | Directorate-General ar |
| nsport | Transport |

CONSULTATION

▶ TOOL: THE R.S. MANAGEMENT MATRIX - DECOMPOSES RS MANAGEMENT ALONG 2 DIMENSIONS:

1 The key tasks for policy making and RS management:



Fact finding:

diagnosis of the road safety situation in the country



Contraction of the second seco

- Programme development:
- setting up targets
- selecting appropriate measures to reach them



Preparing implementation:

- identification of implementation requirements in all relevant sectors (infrastructure, vehicles, behaviour, health...)
- costing the overall programme
- assessment of funding mechanisms
- ...

Monitoring and evaluation:

- following up accident and injury trends
- forecasting future trends
- assessment of the effect of policies and measures in the short and long term
- ...

2 The type of information necessary

Data: basic data, more complex indicators...

Technical tools for data treatment: analysis and modeling techniques Other decision-support tools: methodological guidelines, syntheses, etc. Training tools: training programmes and other training systems (simulation, games, etc.)

▶ TWO CONSULTATION METHODS...

Semi-directive interviews:

- in-depth
- in the interviewee's mother tongue

Written contributions:

• free use of the RS management matrix to provide contribution













3 RESULTS

EXPERTS PARTICIPATION

79 experts contacted, 38 contributions returned (20 were interviews and 18 written contributions).

SYNTHESIS OF RESULTS

Fact-Finding:

- Improvement of data already available and of their exploitation: • address underreporting,
 - develop a common reportable definition of serious injuries and crashes,
 - further link accident data with other types of data (vehicle registration, licenses, crash location, work-related accidents register...).

Programme development:

- Matter of concern: in practice, discontinuity between programme development and other RS management activities (fact finding or monitoring and evaluation).
- Setting up targets:
- Methodological guidelines to select targets (realistic yet ambitious).
- Need to work with intermediate and specific targets (e.g., to priority areas or groups).
- Taking account of the fact that the desirable improvement in RS may depend on the current performance level of each region or country (e.g. the lower the road safety performance of a region or country, the higher the potential for road safety improvement).
- Selecting measures:
 - Data and technical guidelines for assessing the expected of measures (more sophisticated approach to cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses, methods to assess the *combined* effect of measures).
 - Cumulative knowledge on *observed effects* (international databases, meta-analyses...).





The full results report is available at: www.dacota-project.eu/deliverables.html

| Table: number of written contributions and interviews depending of the respondent's function. | |
|---|--|
| Number of contributions | |
| | |

| RS decision maker | 4 |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Head of RS research group | 10 |
| Advisor on RS programs | 8 |
| In-house expert/statistician | 7 |
| RS Researcher | 5 |
| Unknown | 1 |
| Total | 35* |
| | |

interview and a written contributions, these are counted only once in the total reported here

Preparing implementation

• Information specifically relevant to the *implementation* of measures seems to be totally absent from the current process:

- conditions for implementation,
- costing methods for implementation at its various steps,
- data/information on funding possibilities

Monitoring and evaluation

• While being the last step of evidence-based road safety policy making, monitoring and evaluation should also serve as the point of re-initiating the whole process of assessing the situation, selecting new measures, etc.

• Particular emphasis is given on the development of tools enabling the identification of reasons and mechanisms that may lead to more or less favourable outcome.

!Key question affecting the transferability of experience between countries!

4 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

• Road safety is a science, and only to the extent that this scientific basis is treated seriously can reliable support to decision makers be provided.

• The current insufficient consideration of the knowledge, data and tools already available to road safety management is due to a lack of awareness of the added value of evidence-based decision making.

• Efficient evidence-based policy making would ideally require:

• Institutional arrangements allowing the *centralisation of road safety* management (at national level) in a single dedicated organization, while establishing the necessary links and interactive procedures for addressing local road safety management needs and processes.

• Compulsory consideration of scientific evidence for each road safety decision, by means of appropriate procedures exploiting standardized methodologies, knowledge and data for carrying out the necessary analyses.

• The integration of road safety with other policies (mobility, health, or environmental sectors) would be an important next step for maximizing the benefits of evidence-based policy-making.