Version 13 October 2014

Road safety planning

Good practice examples from national road safety strategies in the EU

Non-paper as food for thought and discussions

This non-paper is a living document which will be regularly updated with the inputs and best practice examples provided by Member States.

Contents

Scope of the initiative: caveats and limitations 2

National road safety strategies, national action plans and national enforcement plans 3

Analysis part 1: Planning aspects and strategy format 3

Good planning practices from Member States' national strategies 4

Analysis part 2: Action plan contents 7

Education and training of road users 7
Enforcement of road traffic rules 8
Safe infrastructure 8
Safe vehicles 9
Use of modern technology 9
Emergency and post-injury services 10
Vulnerable road users 11

Annex 1: List of examples 13

Annex 2: List of references 14

Introduction

The European Commission initiated an analysis of national road safety strategies in the EU, in follow-up to the *Policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020.* Plenty of good planning practices and interesting road safety actions have been found that might be worth-while to share between Member States. This paper lists some of the good practice examples that might serve as food for thought for further discussion.

The paper has two parts: the *planning* practices and the *content* of the action plans.

The good *planning* practices discussed here are not new but well-known and internationally recommended aspects of road safety planning. Yet, to raise the issues to discussion might inspire wider application of these practices throughout the Member States.

The good *action* examples listed give a few highlights out of the plethora of road safety measures included in the available national road safety action plans. The list is not exhaustive nor to be seen as a prescribed checklist. It should be considered an illustration of the wide selection of actions used by Member States today.

"Recommendation 3: Prepare a national road safety strategy and plan of action."
World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, 2009[1]

The existence of a high-quality national road safety strategy can be seen as an indicator that road safety is an issue on the political agenda. A well-crafted plan can be a tool for responsible authorities to identify the most relevant road safety actions, to focus their work efficiently and to assign the necessary resources. The road safety plan can also be a tool for accountability and transparency, communicating road safety priorities to the citizens.

The road safety strategy might be of less importance to Member States that already have an established road safety culture, whereas it might play a bigger role as supporting tool for those who started working more recently on these issues.

Most of the EU Member States have already adopted national road safety strategies or are in the process of preparing one.

Scope of the initiative: caveats and limitations

The objective of the initiative is to illustrate the rich diversity of good practice examples that may be found in the existing road safety plans. The analysis has been done on the basis of national road safety strategies and action plans provided by Member States. All Member States are not quoted in this discussion paper. This does not mean that Member States not mentioned have no good practices: only that the Commission has not yet received inputs from them or that their national road safety plan is still in the pipeline of being finalised.

The impact of the national best practise examples has not been assessed when establishing this discussion paper. The good practice examples are taken directly from Member States national road safety plans and are therefore actions that Member States have already found useful to prioritise. Before these good practice examples are picked up by another Member

[1] Tony Bliss and Jeanne Breen, The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, *Country Guidelines for the Conduct of Road Safety Management Capacity Reviews and the Specification of Lead Agency Reforms, Investment Strategies and Safe System Projects*, 2009

State, a national assessment should be made to establish the actual usefulness of the actions in the specific Member State and at the specific time.

The good practice examples considered in this list have been selected to show a broad mix of actions related to different action areas: enforcement, education, infrastructure, vehicles etc. Action examples showing a trend in several Member States are also highlighted. Finally, it must be emphasised that the road safety planning is only a tool and the key to road safety is still the effective implementation of planned actions.

National road safety strategies, national action plans and national enforcement plans

Some Member States have several road safety planning documents, as stand-alones or linked together. There might be a separate *road safety strategy* outlining the vision and strategic targets together with an elaborate problem analysis. There might be a *road safety action plan* listing the concrete actions to be carried out, forming a sort of work programme. There might also be a separate national *enforcement plan* for road safety. Some Member States have one or several complementary plans for addressing the safety of certain road user groups, road types or road safety problems, for example a separate motorcycle safety plan. Some Member States have opted not to have a traditional road safety plan at all, managing instead by objectives and performance indicators.

If several documents are used, preparing them in a co-ordinated way helps to avoid duplications and to ensure that actors work towards the same main objectives. Preparing the road safety plans in a joint effort should also ensure effective use of often scarce resources.

Analysis part 1: Planning aspects and strategy format

This preliminary analysis has its point of departure in the results-based management principles, recommended for example in the recent ISO standard on road safety management systems[2], the DaCoTA project final reports[3], the 2006 and 2012 ETSC reports on road safety management[4], the Bliss and Breen report for The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility in 2009[5] and by the WHO[6].

Most Member States already to some degree use the results-based management approach. This planning method seems to have several benefits for clarity, transparency and accountability.

> "…in every country many elements of good road safety policy are in place, but there is still scope for greatly improved procedures in many of them."
> *European Transport Safety Council, 2012*[7]

[2] International Standardisation Organisation, *Road traffic safety (RTS) management systems — Requirements with guidance for use*, 2012, Ref no: ISO 39001:2012(E)
[3] Papadimitoiu E, Yannis G, Muhlrad N, Gitelman V, Butler I, Dupont E (eds) *Analysis of road safety management in the Eyrioeab ciytriues, Deliverable 1.5 Vol II of the EC FP7 project DaCoTA*, 2012 and Muhlrad, N. *Final report of WP1 – Road Safety Policy, Deliverable 1.6 of the DaCoTA project*, 2012, http://www.dacota-project.eu/Deliverables/DaCoTA_D1.6_FinalReport2.pdf
[4] European Transport Safety Council, *A methodological approach to national road safety policies*, 2006 and European Transport Safety Council, *6th PIN report*, 2012
[5] Bliss and Breen, The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, 2009
[6] WHO, *Global Status Report on Road Safety: Europe*, 2013
[7] European Transport Safety Council, 2012

Good planning practices from Member States' national strategies

1. *Strategy period: long-term planning provides the basis for long-term efforts*

Many Member States adopt strategies for a period of ten years, as does the European Commission. The rationale is that, as road safety is by nature a long-term effort, a strategy for the objectives and main activity areas over a longer time span would be more effective than only short-term planning.

2. *Applying the Safe System approach*

Many Member States apply a road safety philosophy such as the Safe System approach (also: *Sustainable Safety* in the Netherlands or *Vision Zero* in Sweden). The approach has been identified as a "best practice" by the EU-funded SUPREME project.

> "A *Sustainable Safe* road system aims to prevent crashes and if they still occur, to minimise their consequences. It is based on the idea that people make mistakes and are physically vulnerable."
> *SUPREME project, 2007*[8]

3. *Using lessons learned to sharpen the action plan from one strategy period to the next*

Countries such as the UK[9] show a good example of lessons learned – making explicit use of assessments of past performance to prioritise the actions that have shown to be most effective.

4. *The link between problem analysis and action priorities to do the right things*

Several Member States, for example Finland[10], link directly the analysis of main current problem areas to the choice of priority areas. Analysis of the main problem areas aims to support the choice of political priorities. Clearly presenting the link between problem analysis and action priorities also increases credibility and legitimacy of these priorities.

> "Recommendation 2: Assess the problem, policies and institutional settings relating to road traffic injury and the capacity for road traffic injury prevention in each country."
> *The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, 2009*[11]

5. *Scientific choice of measures gives legitimacy*

Following the political decision on priority areas, the selection of concrete measures is often, but not always, clearly based on scientific studies and cost effectiveness considerations. If the set of actions chosen is perceived as evidence-based, citizens and politicians are more likely to perceive them as legitimate and relevant. One example of fact-based analysis is the Swedish *Management by Objectives* which quantifies the life-saving potential of actions to be taken in the next decade, analysing their possible contribution to the national target.[12] The availability of data is a precondition for carrying out a comprehensive analysis.

> "Even in some countries where policies are highly knowledge-based, it does not seem that full advantage is taken of the scientific evidence that is available internationally or nationally for policy formulation."

[8] SUPREME Project, 2007
[9] *Strategic framework for road safety 2008-2020*
[10] *From Objectives to Outcomes, Road Safety Plan until 2014*
[11] Bliss and Breen, The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility 2009
[12] Swedish Transport Administration, *Analysis of Road Safety Trends 2011: Management by Objectives for Road Safety Work, Towards the 2020 Interim targets,* http://publikationswebbutik.vv.se/upload/6797/2012_150_Analysis_of_road_safety_trends_2011.pdf

DaCoTA, report 1.5, 2012[13]

6. *Using prognoses and risk assessments to prepare for "worst case scenarios"*

While analysis of present problems and past performance is generally of very high quality in the road safety strategies, a few Member States have also gone further, providing a *prognosis* on the development of key road safety aspects in the future. Others have also included a specific *risk assessment*, discussing potential factors that might negatively affect implementation of the plan, in order to be able to avoid them or mitigate their consequences.

7. *Strategic objectives motivate stakeholders*

Strategic targets can help to strengthen motivation of stakeholders to act for road safety. Targets also facilitate accountability and follow-up on achieved results. Most of the Member States with an adopted national road safety strategy have also adopted a strategic target, often linked to the European target of halving the number of road deaths between 2010 and 2020.

"Targets should be based on forecasts of exposure, levels of risk, and the acceptability and effectiveness of policies and measures or risk reduction."
ETSC, 2006[14]

8. *Operational objectives help to focus the work*

Some Member States, e.g. Latvia[15] and Spain[16] have in addition adopted quantitative operational objectives. It could be for example an objective on the outcome for a specific target group such as "25% less drivers between the ages of 18 and 24 killed or seriously injured at the weekend" or a target for increased average seat belt use. Targets should be "specific and measurable wherever practicable"[17]. Operational objectives can also be used as performance indicators in view of up-coming monitoring and evaluation.

9. *Output targets add transparency*

Lithuania[18] is one of the countries that have also adopted concrete output targets as a tool to facilitate evaluation and follow-up. These output targets enable citizens and stakeholders to follow the progress and know what to expect from the road safety work. An output target is formulated as a quantified direct output expected from an action, for example the number of officers who should go through a specific training programme.

Strategic target	Example: "50% fewer fatalities by 2020" (EU target)
Operational (outcome) target	Example: "25% less drivers between the ages of 18 and 24 killed or seriously injured at the weekend" (Spain)
Output target	Example: "Number of police officers trained to recognise drivers affected by narcotic or other psychotropic substances: 250 by 2014; 1000 by 2017" (Lithuania)

10. *Responsibility assignments and clear deadlines facilitate implementation*

Some Member States, for example Ireland[19], have specified the deadlines for the actions proposed in the action plans. Hungary[20] and Croatia[21] are among the Member States that have

[13] Papadimitoiu E, et al, DaCoTA project, 2012
[14] European Transport Safety Council, 2006
[15] *Road Traffic Safety Programme for 2007–2013*
[16] *Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020*
[17] International Standardisation Organisation, ISO 39001:2012(E)
[18] *National road safety development programme for 2011-2017*
[19] *Road safety strategy 2013-2020*

clearly assigned responsibility for implementing each action to a specific entity at local, regional or national level. Such division of labour can be expected to facilitate follow-up and accountability.

11. *Assessment of costs and defined sources of funding make actions realistic*

Some Member States have not only considered what needs to be done but also what budget is needed and available for each action proposed. This increases transparency and chances of successful implementation; the budget committed is also a proof of the political will to take road safety seriously.

The DaCoTA project[22] found a common discrepancy in road safety management: that funding is normally annual although the programmes are multi-annual. Such financial insecurity for the long-term creates risks for the implementation of programmes. Considering long-term funding options can be a way to address such risks.

"Recommendation 4: Allocate financial and human resources to address the problem."
The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, 2009[23]

12. *Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are tools for accountability*

The DaCoTA project found that "only in a few countries, evaluation of safety measures is part of the culture and a routine within the road safety programme, with a dedicated budget."[24] However, many of the EU national road safety strategies today do include a discussion on specific evaluation and monitoring mechanisms. For example, Slovakia[25] and the UK have each set up *reporting structures* to make sure that the authority with main national road safety responsibility in their respective countries can follow-up the implementation of delegated tasks and actions.

Furthermore, monitoring and evaluation are sometimes aided by clearly defined *performance indicators*, often logically linked to the targets that are set. For example Poland has put together a detailed list of 35 specific performance indicators such as share of drivers exceeding the speed limits on different road types, number of victims in different types of accidents or average arrival time of rescue services to an accident spot[26]. Defining performance indicators adds to clarity, making the aim and desired results clearer for both citizens and the implementing authorities. They can also help ensuring that key road safety issues are prioritised, e.g. by adopting performance indicators specifically for safety of certain road user groups or certain road types. Performance indicators may be qualitative or quantitative in their nature.

Regular analysis of performance indicators can facilitate a pro-active approach to accident prevention: for example, if a road is found not to fulfil the set safety criteria it can be prioritised for actions even before the road fatality rates on that road have reached a critical high. Mid-term evaluations can provide useful information to improve a programme already during the strategy period.

[20] *Road safety action programme 2011–2013*
[21] *National Road Safety Programme Of The Republic Of Croatia 2011-2020*
[22] Papadimitoiu E, et al, DaCoTA project, 2012
[23] Bliss and Breen, The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility 2009
[24] Muhlrad, N., DaCoTA project, 2012
[25] *Road safety enhancement strategy in the Slovak Republic in the years 2011 to 2020*
[26] *National road safety programme 2013-2020*

13. *Inclusive approach to mobilise stakeholders*

Some European countries opt to prepare their national road safety strategies in an inclusive approach, bringing together the commitments and planning of all relevant agencies, authorities, all levels of administration and even NGOs and the commercial road transport actors. For example Norway includes in their national strategy the commitments of a wide range of actors, ensuring that road safety is planned as a horizontal aspect and that all relevant actors work together in a coordinated and efficient way.

14. *Transparency for accountability and citizen participation*

The UK Department for Transport publishes provisional quarterly road safety statistics which enable people to hold the Government to account and enable emerging trends to be monitored between the publications of annual figures. This stimulates the debate on road safety and ensures that the key stakeholders and members of the public are aware of the road safety picture.

Analysis part 2: Action plan contents

Member States must choose and prioritise the road safety actions that best respond to the main problems on their own roads. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to road safety planning and the needs of each Member State will also change over time.

The list presented here is therefore in no way a prescribed checklist to simply adopt without context-specific analysis. The list is simply highlighting some key action areas and concrete measures that might be of interest for a Member State seeking inspiration and lessons learned.

Education and training of road users

1. *Alternative channels to reach broader target groups: E-learning, website handbooks and social media campaigns.*

For example Estonia[27] commit in their action plan to develop e-learning tools to enhance road safety education for children and youth, in order to make road safety information accessible to young people via the tools they like to use. Other Member States have for example published on-line guidelines with safety advice for drivers or developed social media strategies to better reach out with road safety messages via non-traditional communication channels.

2. *"Safety halls" for driver training*

Some Member States, for example Sweden, have built "Safety halls" – centres for experience-based driver education and risk awareness trainings. Courses at such safety halls can be part of the driver training. Also other Member States have access to similar training facilities, such as the road safety referral centres called "NESTS" (Networks and Education for Safety in Traffic) set up via the EU co-funded AVENUE project[28].

3. *Regular campaigns for awareness raising*

A good example of a successful information campaign is the Belgian "BOB campaign"[29] against drink-driving. The campaign was described as a "best practice" by SUPREME because it was regular, monitored and evaluated, and supported by complementary enforcement measures.

[27] *Estonian National Road Safety Programme 2003–2015*
[28] AVENUE project, http://www.avenuefortrafficsafety.eu/national-fixed-nests.html
[29] http://www.bob.be

4. *Stakeholder mobilisation for road safety education partnerships*

For example the Irish road safety action plan includes commitments to work together with the industry and with other authorities for specific road user education campaigns.

> "Action 49: Work with Iarnród Éireann and the Railway Safety Commission to educate road users on the correct use of railway level crossings by conducting awareness campaigns on an annual basis".
> Ireland, *Road safety action programme 2013-2020*

5. *Focus on distracted driving and distracted road users*

There is an increasing focus among several Member States on the risks of road traffic distractions – not least looking at the increased use of new technologies including smart phones. Several Member States run specific information campaigns in order to persuade road users to remain attentive in road traffic. Fact-based risk analysis of new technical devices and their effects on road user behaviours as the basis for developed legislation and enforcement work have also been highlighted as a good practice during the meetings of the High Level Group on Road Safety.

Enforcement of road traffic rules

6. *Cross-border enforcement and education of drivers going abroad*

The application of the cross-border enforcement directive is mentioned by several of the Member States concerned as an important step towards improved enforcement of road traffic rules. The new enforcement possibilities should also be accompanied by information campaigns to make drivers aware of the need to continue to drive by the rules also when going abroad.

7. *Section control for efficient speed enforcement*

Italy[30] counts its section control system as among its most successful actions: the section control action contributed during one year to decreased average speeds of about 15%.[31]

8. *Immediate feed-back to offenders*

While automatic detection of offenders can be a cost-efficient way to expand the share of the road network being controlled, there are pedagogic benefits from road-side checks that can give immediate feedback to the offending driver. An enforcement officer who stops the road user on the spot can explain directly the potential road safety effects of the driver's behaviour, with better odds of effecting a change of that behaviour; and minimising the time-span from the offense to the offender facing the complaint has been found to be a useful measure.

9. *Mapping of speeding "black spots"*

The Czech Republic[32] proposes to make a specific "black spot" mapping of the road sections where speed limits are most often dangerously exceeded. Such analysis is made in order to make enforcement efforts more effective for road safety purposes.

Safe infrastructure

10. *Infrastructure safety management on national roads*

Several Member States commit in their road safety strategies to extending road infrastructure

[30] *National Road Safety Plan Horizon 2020* (version not yet formally adopted, November 2013)
[31] Autostrade per l'Italia
[32] *National road safety strategy 2011-2020* and *National plan for the implementation of regulations*

safety management principles – e.g. black spot mapping and road audits – also to the national roads and even municipal roads and city streets. The EU Infrastructure Safety Management Directive[33] only covers TEN-T motorways, but the safety benefits of the directive principles are of course also valid for the entire road network.

"3.15.1: Road safety audits (safety assessments in planning phases) for all relevant construction or reconstruction projects, including those outside the major road network. Regular road safety inspections, including roads outside the major road network."
Austria, *Austrian Road Safety Programme 2011 – 2020*

11. *Junctions turned into roundabouts*

Some Member States commit to turn more existing junctions into roundabouts. Sweden and Netherlands are examples of countries that already went far in completing such transition from junctions to roundabouts, with more than 2000 roundabouts respectively. The objective is to reduce the number of conflict points and the vehicle crossing speeds. The roundabouts are also found to be a "best practice" by the SUPREME project[34].

12. *Motorway crash-barriers that protect motorcyclists*

Germany[35] proposes actions to improve the coverage of under-run protection systems on motorways, for preventing motorcycle riders from sliding dangerously under the crash barriers in the case of a fall. Safe road barrier systems in high-risk areas were also promoted as a "good practice" by the EU-funded ROSA project.

"Good Practice 1.2.3.1.1.B.3: Governments should promote the use of motorcycle-friendly infrastructure guidelines when they exist, and develop such literature where it is missing."
ROSA Project, 2011[36]

Safe vehicles

13. *Promotion of safe vehicles by public procurement*

Some Member States propose in their action plans to start promoting vehicle safety standards (e.g. Euro NCAP ratings) as criteria for public procurement of vehicles. Other Member States have already developed similar public procurement criteria.

14. *Roadworthiness tests of mopeds*

Portugal[37] commits in its action plan to modify the relevant laws to introduce periodic vehicle inspections for mopeds and other powered two-wheelers. The European Commission has earlier found the technical inspections of mopeds a cost-beneficial action for road safety and included it in the 2012 proposal for a revised Directive on periodic roadworthiness testing[38].

Use of modern technology

15. *ITS for speed management*

The further deployment and use of ITS tools such as Intelligent Speed Adaptation is mentioned by several Member States, not least by committing to look into Intelligent Speed

[33] *Directive 2008/96/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on road infrastructure safety management*, OJ L 319, 29.11.2008, p. 59–67, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0096:EN:NOT
[34] SUPREME Project, 2007
[35] *Road Safety Programme 2011*
[36] ROSA Project, *European Handbook on Good Practices in Safety for Motorcyclists*, 2011, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/projects/rosa_handbook_infra_en.pdf
[37] *National road safety strategy 2008-2015*
[38] http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-555_en.htm

Adaptation as a tool against notorious speeders. The SUPREME project found Intelligent Speed Adaptation to be a "promising practice"[39]. Dynamic digital speed maps, proposed for example in the Danish road safety strategy[40], can be of help in introducing intelligent speed adjustment systems.

Intelligent traffic management systems that can read the road situation and adapt speed limits via variable speed signs can also be a useful tool in this regard. The Danish road safety strategy is one of the national plans proposing to work with variable speed signs adapting to local conditions.

16. *Automatised data gathering and processing*

Member States work increasingly on efficient models for automatised data gathering and processing, in support of road safety enforcement efforts. Automatic detection of speed offenders in France is highlighted as a best practice by the SUPREME project[41]. France has also prioritised more efficient and intelligent speed control tools, e.g. radars that can measure a vehicle's speed at some distance, thereby detecting speed offenders even if they slow down just before the camera, and discriminating or selective cameras able to distinguish a lorry from a car and able to identify a speeding car among several vehicles driven on parallel lanes on a motorway. Another modern enforcement tool identified as efficient by Member States is an automatic speed camera which is placed in an un-marked police vehicle and which can identify the speed of passing or over-taking vehicles.

17. *The use of alcohol ignition interlocks*

Using to a wider extent the alcohol interlocks, for example for repeat offenders, is proposed by some Member States, in line with the finding of the SUPREME project that this is a "best practice": it was estimated by this project that alcohol interlocks contributed to a reduction by 40-95% of the number of convicted drink-drivers committing new drink-driving offences.[42] Alcohol ignition interlocks are also sometimes used in specific actions targeted at professional drivers.

18. *Application of further in-vehicle safety systems*

Denmark proposes in its national road safety action plan the increased use of a number of in-vehicle safety systems. For example, intelligent tools such as lane departure warning, drowsiness detection systems and emergency braking systems are mentioned in this regard. These safety systems can help counteract errors made by an inattentive driver.

Emergency and post-injury services

19. *Targets for reduction of the number of serious injuries*

Almost all Member States have adopted a strategic target on fatality reductions. Some Member States, e.g. the Netherlands[43], have gone further and also adopted a strategic objective for reducing the number of serious injuries. The adoption of strategic targets on seriously injuries is put forward as a general recommendation by the European Transport Safety Council[44] and mentioned in the Commission staff working document on serious road

[39] SUPREME Project, 2007
[40] *Every accident is one too many – a shared responsibility. Danish Road Safety Commission National Action Plan 2013-2020.*
[41] SUPREME Project, 2007
[42] SUPREME Project, 2007
[43] *Road Safety Strategic Plan 2008-2020*
[44] European Transport Safety Council, 2012

traffic injuries[45]. The common EU definition of serious road traffic injuries is since 2013 based on the medically defined Maximum Abbreviated Injury System, MAIS, with a score of MAIS 3 or above defined as a serious injury.

"In 2020, traffic accidents should cause no more than 500 fatalities and 12,250 injuries." Netherlands, *Road Safety Strategic Plan 2008-2020*

20. *Linking hospital and police data*

Connected to the serious injuries target, Austria[46] commits in its action plan to integrate hospital and police data, in order to improve data collection on serious road traffic injuries. Such linkage of databases was found as an effective option for collecting more useful data in the Commission staff working document on serious road traffic injuries. It is also a recommended practice by the European Transport Safety Council[47] and an action receiving high priority ranking in a survey among road safety stakeholders by the DaCoTA project[48].

Vulnerable road users

21. *30-zones in residential and sensitive built-up areas*

Several Member States focus on speed management, i.e. by setting out to establish zones with a 30 km speed limit in built-up areas and areas with high vulnerable road user presence. Cyprus[49] and Bulgaria[50] are two of the Member States presenting such actions. Low speed zones in residential areas were also found to be a "best practice" by the SUPREME project[51].

"Action 6.1.3. Stimulating and supporting local and municipal authorities to increase the number and range of lower speed limits in areas with greater pedestrian and cycle traffic." Bulgaria, *National strategy for improving road safety in Bulgaria for the period 2011–2020*

22. *"Code de la rue" – a focus on the vulnerable road users*

A focus on vulnerable road users appears in most national road safety action plans. In e.g. France there is since 2008 a proposed change in the system of traffic rules to increase awareness of and respect for the safety of the most vulnerable road users. This is called the "code de la rue" approach. Among the concrete measure linked to this approach are low-speed zones with pedestrian right of priority. The Greek national road safety strategy report[52] also proposed adaption of traffic light intervals to take into account the slower walking pace of elderly or people with disabilities. Protection of the vulnerable road users can be complemented with specific enforcement actions to ensure that also pedestrians and cyclists follow the traffic rules.

23. *High risk site analysis: the Child accident atlas*

Germany has developed a measure called "the Child Accident Atlas", identifying the most accident-prone places especially for children. The approach could also be applied on other road user groups, e.g. cyclists, motorcyclists or elderly.

[45] European Commission, *Staff working document: On the implementation of objective 6 of the European Commission's policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020 – First milestone towards an injury strategy*, SWD(2013)94 final, http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/03/doc/swd(2013)94.pdf

[46] *Austrian Road Safety Programme 2011-2020*

[47] European Transport Safety Council, 2012

[48] Muhlrad, N., DaCoTA project, 2012

[49] *2012-2020 Strategic Road Safety Plan for Cyprus – Final Report*

[50] *National strategy for improving road safety in Bulgaria for the period 2011–2020*

[51] SUPREME Project, 2007

[52] *Strategic Plan for the improvement of road safety in Greece, 2011-2020*

24. *Urban road safety plans*

For example Spain has looked separately at the challenges in urban areas, proposing specifically designed actions to address the road safety risks in towns and cities. Making road safety a mandatory or recommended element of sustainable urban mobility plans can be a way to enhance urban road safety actions. Projects such as the EU co-financed regional road safety programme "Save Our Lives" in Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia also support urban road safety planning; the "Save Our Lives" project has provided both urban road safety strategies and action plans in its pilot areas.

"Action 7.1.5: Incorporate road safety into sustainable urban mobility plans."
Spain, *Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020*, Appendix I

25. *Campaigns for increased use of reflective devices*

Promotion of reflective devices used by pedestrians and cyclists has been a success story especially in the northern countries with long and dark winters but could be a cheap action for increasing safety of for example children also in other parts of the EU.

Annex 1: List of examples

Good *planning* practices from Member States' national strategies

1. *Strategy period: long-term planning provides the basis for long-term efforts*
2. *Applying the Safe System approach*
3. *Using lessons learned to sharpen the action plan from one strategy period to the next*
4. *The link between problem analysis and action priorities to do the right things*
5. *Scientific choice of measures gives legitimacy*
6. *Using prognoses and risk assessments to prepare for "worst case scenarios"*
7. *Strategic objectives motivate stakeholders*
8. *Operational objectives help to focus the work*
9. *Output targets add transparency*
10. *Responsibility assignments and clear deadlines facilitate implementation*
11. *Assessment of costs and defined sources of funding make actions realistic*
12. *Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are tools for accountability*
13. *Inclusive approach to mobilise stakeholders*
14. *Transparency for accountability and citizen participation*

Good *action* examples from Member States' national strategies

1. *Alternative channels to reach broader target groups: E-learning, website handbooks and social media campaigns.*
2. *"Safety halls" for driver training*
3. *Regular campaigns for awareness raising*
4. *Stakeholder mobilisation for road safety education partnerships*
5. *Focus on distracted driving and distracted road users*
6. *Cross-border enforcement and education of drivers going abroad*
7. *Section control for efficient speed enforcement*
8. *Immediate feed-back to offenders*
9. *Mapping of speeding "black spots"*
10. *Infrastructure safety management on national roads*
11. *Junctions turned into roundabouts*
12. *Motorway crash-barriers that protect motorcyclists*
13. *Promotion of safe vehicles by public procurement*
14. *Roadworthiness tests of mopeds*
15. *ITS for speed management*
16. *Automatised data gathering and processing*
17. *The use of alcohol ignition interlocks*
18. *Application of further in-vehicle safety systems*
19. *Targets for reduction of the number of serious injuries*
20. *Linking hospital and police data*
21. *30-zones in residential and sensitive built-up areas*
22. *"Code de la rue" – a focus on the vulnerable road users*
23. *High risk site analysis: the Child accident atlas*
24. *Urban road safety plans*
25. *Campaigns for increased use of reflective devices*

Annex 2: List of references

National road safety planning documents

- Austria, *Austrian Road Safety Programme 2011-2020*
- Bulgaria, *National strategy for improving road safety in Bulgaria for the period 2011–2020*
- Croatia, *National Road Safety Programme Of The Republic Of Croatia 2011-2020*
- Cyprus, *2012-2020 Strategic Road Safety Plan for Cyprus – Final Report*
- Czech Republic, *National road safety strategy 2011-2020* and *National plan for the implementation of regulations*
- Denmark, *Every accident is one too many – a shared responsibility. Danish Road Safety Commission National Action Plan 2013-2020.*
- Estonia, *Estonian National Road Safety Programme 2003–2015*
- Finland, *From Objectives to Outcomes, Road Safety Plan until 2014*
- Germany, *Road Safety Programme 2011*
- Greece, *Strategic Plan for the improvement of road safety in Greece, 2011-2020*
- Hungary, *Road safety action programme 2011–2013*
- Ireland, *Road safety strategy 2013-2020*
- Italy, *National Road Safety Plan Horizon 2020* (version not yet formally adopted, November 2013)
- Latvia, *Road Traffic Safety Programme for 2007–2013*
- Lithuania, *National road safety development programme for 2011-2017*
- Netherlands, *Road Safety Strategic Plan 2008-2020*
- Poland, *National road safety programme 2013-2020*
- Portugal, *National road safety strategy 2008-2015*
- Slovakia, *Road safety enhancement strategy in the Slovak Republic in the years 2011 to 2020*
- Spain, *Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020*
- Sweden, *Analysis of Road Safety Trends 2011: Management by Objectives for Road Safety Work, Towards the 2020 Interim targets,* *http://publikationswebbutik.vv.se/upload/6797/2012_150_Analysis_of_road_safety_trends_2011.pdf*
- UK, *Strategic framework for road safety 2008-2020*

Other references

- AVENUE project, http://www.avenuefortrafficsafety.eu/national-fixed-nests.html
- Tony Bliss and Jeanne Breen, The World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, *Country Guidelines for the Conduct of Road Safety Management Capacity Reviews and the Specification of Lead Agency Reforms, Investment Strategies and Safe System Projects*, 2009
- *Directive 2008/96/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on road infrastructure safety management*, OJ L 319, 29.11.2008, p. 59–67, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0096:EN:NOT
- European Commission, *Staff working document: On the implementation of objective 6 of the European Commission's policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020 – First milestone towards an injury strategy*, SWD(2013)94 final,

http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/03/doc/swd(2013)94.pdf

- European Transport Safety Council, *A methodological approach to national road safety policies*, 2006
- European Transport Safety Council, *6th PIN report*, 2012
- International Standardisation Organisation, *Road traffic safety (RTS) management systems — Requirements with guidance for use*, 2012, Ref no: ISO 39001:2012(E)
- Muhlrad, N. *Final report of WP1 – Road Safety Policy, Deliverable 1.6 of the DaCoTA project*, 2012, http://www.dacota-project.eu/Deliverables/DaCoTA_D1.6_FinalReport2.pdf
- Papadimitoiu E, Yannis G, Muhlrad N, Gitelman V, Butler I, Dupont E (eds) *Analysis of road safety management in the Eyrioeab ciytriues, Deliverable 1.5 Vol II of the EC FP7 project DaCoTA*, 2012
- ROSA Project, *European Handbook on Good Practices in Safety for Motorcyclists*, 2011, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/projects/rosa_handbook_infra_en.pdf
- SUPREME Project, (Summary and publication of best Practices in Road Safety in the EU Member States), 2007, http://ec.europa.eu/transport/roadsafety_library/publications/supreme_c_handbook_for_measures_at_the_country_level.pdf
- WHO, *Global Status Report on Road Safety: Europe*, 2013