Road Safety Management Profile

Italy

Overview

Figure 1 summarises "good practice" elements, lack of such elements and peculiarities concerning structures, processes, policy-making tasks and outputs. These are based upon the investigation model developed within the DaCoTA research project, and the related questionnaire responses of at least one governmental representative and one independent expert in each country.









Structures, processes and outputs

In Figure 2, road safety management structures, work processes and outputs in Italy are described according to the policy-making cycle (agenda setting, policy formulation, adoption, implementation and evaluation). Focus is on the national organization and the relations between national and regional/local structures.











Good practice "diagnosis"

The existing RS management structures and processes in Italy were set against the "most complete RS management system" which would be obtained for a country fulfilling all the "good practice" criteria [1] (see Appendix).

Diagnosis: Italy	
"Good practice" elements	 Parliament plays an important part in deciding and adopting policy orientations.
	 The ministry of Transport has been designated as Lead Agency, responsible for designing the road safety programme and corresponding interventions. At the medium-level decision-making level, an inter-sectoral coordination
	body had been created by law.
	✓ At the planning and implementation levels, in the absence of real coordination, the ministry of Transport acts at the inter-sectoral level on the basis of cooperation.
	 A national structure has been created for stakeholder consultation (including the private sector).
	✓ Use of benchmarking at the planning level.
	✓ A medium-to-long term multi-sectoral targeted road safety programme.
	 Regional road safety programmes are coordinated with the National Road Safety Plan and partly funded by the Lead Agency.
	✓ Global monitoring of the effects of the road safety programme.
	 A "vertical" monitoring procedure (from regional to national government) is being formally set up.
	✓ Some university-based multi-disciplinary research teams (CTL).
	 Beginning of a good cooperation between managers and researchers (technical assistance for programme design), knowledge-based policy- making is developing.
Elements needing improvement	✓ The inter-sectoral coordination structure created by law for planning and implementation has not been set up.
	✓ The national to regional level relationships are entirely "top-down".
	✓ No long term "vision".
	✓ The multi-annual programme did not include any busget estimate.
	 No identifyable road safety budget, no sustainable funding mechanisms for road safety.
	 Cooperation between managers and researchers has not been good in the past years.
	✓ The current (now ending) road safety programme has not been based on knowledge.
	 There is no current training plan for road safety actors at the national or regional level.





Appendix

The most complete RS management system which would be obtained for a country fulfilling all the "good practice" criteria identified, were used as a reference (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Reference country profile (Sources: [1].[2])

Legend

Structures vernment o continuitors Elected body **1**171 involvement Proces Kne producti Treining Knos Funding Outputs **Characteristics** Rusta (good) (relative) hby





References

- [1] Muhlrad, N, Gitelman V, Buttler I. (Eds) et al. (2011) Road safety management investigation model and questionnaire, Deliverable 1.2 of the EC FP7 project DaCoTA.
- [2] Papadimitriou, E, Yannis G., Dupont E., Muhlrad N., Gitelman V., Butler I. et al. (2012) Analysis of road safety management in the European countries, Deliverable 1.5 Vol.II of the EC FP7 project DaCoTA.

Disclaimer

- This profile concerns a 'snapshot' of the road safety management system. As some countries are already undergoing an evolution process, the current situation may already be different for an observer from what was described by the experts interviewed in the first quarter of 2010.
- The results are based on both the coded answers to the questionnaire and the comments from the experts interviewed. A thorough cross-analysing of the comments from both the governmental and the independent experts proved to clarify the final picture of a country's situation.
- As English had to be used as the common language for the analyses, the comments and observations provided by the persons interviewed had to be translated from their home language; particular care was taken so that the names or titles of the national structures described are entirely accurate



