Road Safety Management Profile

Isreal

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 Israel 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 Israel 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: Israel	
"Good practice" elements	 Growing political will, road safety is a major social issue. Parliament has adopted the national road safety programme. The National Road Safety Agency (NRSA) has been created as Lead Agency (under the Ministry of Transport). NRSA works at the inter-sectoral level on the basis of cooperation (rather than coordination). NRSA also coordinates and offers technical support for road safety work performed by local authorities. The national structure for stakeholder consultation has recently been reactivated and opened to NGOs.
	 A national Road safety Observatory. A national medium-term targeted and inter-sectoral road safety programme (including institutional building and task allocation). An estimate of the budget needed for programme implementation has been made. Global evaluation of the road safety programme. Some research sponsored by some of the road safety partners.
Elements needing improvement	 NRSA as Lead Agency does not have decision-making power (at medium level, decisions are taken by the Minister of Transport). Inter-sectoral coordination at the implementation level cannot be effective for structural reasons (NRSA is under the ministry of Transport, not at the highest level). The role of the stakeholder consultation structure in relation to NRSA is undefined. Failed attempt at securing a legal road safety funding procedure. The process for presenting and adopting the next national road safety programme.is unclear, which questions the sustainability of the current road safety management organization. No separate road safety budget, insufficient funding in some sectors, insufficient manpower in all sectors. No formal monitoring of implementation. No systematic evaluation of road safety measures (although some evaluations have been performed in the Infrastructure and Enforcement sectors). No steady research budget. Existing university-based research teams depend too much upon European and other external funding. No training plan for road safety actors (only some punctual training sessions).





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])







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



