

MEETING REPORT

Workshop in preparation of the interim evaluation of the Policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020

Brussels, 17 November 2014

1. Introduction

This stakeholder workshop was organised in preparation of the interim evaluation of the *Policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020*. The aim was to gather inputs and to get stakeholder opinions on a few questions linked to the evaluation.

Szabolcs Schmidt, Head of Unit, DG MOVE Road Safety Unit, introduced the topic and presented the planned process of an interim evaluation. A technical support study will be done by external road safety expert Ms Jeanne Breen. This study and the outcomes of the stakeholder workshop will inform the Commission interim evaluation which is expected to be ready by second quarter of 2015. The final report will be published on the Commission website for transparency.

2. First discussion: looking back

The first part of the workshop discussed the opinions and views of stakeholders on the road safety impact of the Commission in the first part of the strategy period: Did they consider the concept helpful to bring the EU as a whole forward and were the tools appropriate and the decisions made on the right level to be most efficient?

Participants were overall very positive and the consensus among those who took the floor was that the Commission had indeed been successful and added value; the same results would not have been achieved with only national level initiatives. It was stressed that the EU target had been important in encouraging and boosting national initiatives.

Best-practice sharing and creating platforms for experts; product safety directives and type approval; technical harmonisation and standards and the cross-border enforcement directive were mentioned as strong points, helping Member States, citizens and companies. The importance of EU boosting national efforts or international platforms was noted.

Looking back, some participants would have preferred a fully-fledged action plan instead of the strategic policy framework provided in the *Policy orientations*.

The road safety improvement since 2011 was described as stronger for car drivers and passengers whereas several participants noted that the performance for vulnerable road users including motorcycle riders was more disappointing. Increases in cycling in some Member States had also presented safety challenges.

A key factor noted for road traffic crashes was road user behaviour: especially the responsibility of drivers of motorised vehicles.

Several participants stressed the shared responsibility between different DGs and the difficulties for them to lobby both on MOVE and ENTR for vehicle safety issues, for example. It was suggested that the Commission has not yet explored the full potential of horizontal synergies and links between different policy areas.

3. Second discussion: looking forwards

The second part of the workshop was future-oriented, asking for inputs on whether the Commission might need to adjust its priorities, targets or set of measures to improve the chances of reaching the 2020 target.

The focus of participants was on the one hand on the road user perspective: asking for strengthened focus on life-long education and training, including possibly first-aid training, plus enforcement of rules; on the other hand on technical developments such as infrastructure improvement, ITS, active safety, distraction issues, emergency care issues etc.

Speed was proposed as a priority issue to be dealt with, as was drink-driving, drug-driving, seat belt use and driver telephone use. Speed was especially discussed with regard to urban areas and low-speed zones where meeting participants suggested that more enforcement was needed to improve respect of speed limits; Intelligent Speed Adaptation systems could also be of help in those areas.

For technical issues, both setting of standards and raising standards was requested. Some organisations preferred that Member States incentivise the introduction of vehicle safety technologies in a non-binding way. Design of trucks (both passive and active) was discussed as an area with further potential, complementing the work on active safety technologies and road user behaviours. Extending safety rules to the back seat – e.g. seat belt reminders – was another proposal. Fast-tracking the introduction of new safety technologies through procurement was mentioned.

It was noted that several EU measures introduced in the previous decade would have an impact on 2010-2020 outcomes, whereas measures introduced since 2011 might take a while to reveal their impact.

A framework taking into account the ageing society, urbanisation, the need for green modal shift including specific actions for safer cycling, and the roll-out of new technology for safety was requested.

The large potential to integrate road safety into urban mobility plans was highlighted. Scoreboarding and monitoring of results, not least in connection with urban mobility and sustainable urban mobility plans, was encouraged.

As a working method, the evidence-based approach was called for and more analysis of factors contributing to road crashes and their outcomes. Future demographics also posed new challenges.

An additional target on serious injuries was strongly supported and encouraged by many stakeholders. Some participants proposed a target level of 35% from now to 2020 which they believed to be challenging and achievable. The setting of a serious injury target was called "an important milestone for the years to come". Other participants stressed the additional need for

Careful research and analysis in order to empirically identify truly effective countermeasures. It was discussed whether an empirically derived target (as opposed to a strategic target) was at all possible at the moment.

4. Conclusions and final words

The Commission thanked all participants and noted the broad support and scope for EU-wide inputs and the continuing need to provide added value over and above what could be achieved by Member States. The Commission noted that there had been useful discussion of EU targets, the need to improve vulnerable road user safety, the scope for product safety standards and legislative activity, education and enforcement initiatives and knowledge transfer on best practice.

Participants were invited to submit fact-reports, data and additional analysis they have and they were given the opportunity to submit written contributions with more detailed answers to the questions in the discussion paper before the deadline of 28 November 2014.

Annex 1: Written contributions to the stakeholder consultations - summary of inputs

15 stakeholders submitted written contributions in connection to the workshop held on 17 November 2014. Of these, five came from Member States and ten came from organisations, industry and road user groups with an interest in road safety.

The respondents replied to eight specific questions.

1. Do you believe that EU level initiatives have contributed to the decreased number of road fatalities during the last couple of years? In what areas do you consider EU actions for road safety to have been most efficient and successful?

The answers received were all positive, with the one exception of the Federation of European Motorcyclist Associations (FEMA) who replied that for motorcyclists, EU initiatives have not contributed to a notable decrease. All other stakeholders confirmed their belief that EU initiatives have contributed to road safety improvements

It was noted that the EU road safety initiatives were of course not the only explanatory factor to the reduced number of road deaths.

"It is clear that EU initiatives have positively contributed to the decreased number of road fatalities during the last couple of years."

ASECAP

2. Do you see any unintended positive or negative effects produced by Commission road safety initiatives – if so, what?

Most respondents did not identify any unintended effects.

Some positive side-effects mentioned were: synergies and added value thanks to the interaction between Member States; a more uniform approach to road safety matters and increased interest in road safety discussions among national stakeholders.

Some negative side-effects mentioned were: the "legislation fatigue" among Member States and a negative effect on road safety for motorcyclists caused by the third driving licence directive shifting focus from training to testing of motorcycle riders.

"Too much legislation creates resistance in the participating countries."

ECTRI

3. Do you believe the same results could have been achieved easier or at a lower cost in other ways (e.g. by soft measures instead of legislation or vice-versa)?

Those who replied to this question all agreed that the same results could not have been achieved with only soft measures instead of legislation; with the exception of Austria who stressed that it is difficult to be certain of the effects of any single initiative and therefore impossible to estimate the cost-benefit ratio of soft measures compared to legislative measures.

4. Do you believe the same results could have been achieved by Member States at national and/or regional level without the EU interventions?

Finland and Germany assumed the same results could perhaps have been achieved also by national level initiatives. The European Conference of Transport Research Institutes (ECTRI) makes the distinction between the best road safety performers, achieving their results before EU legislation, and Member States with poor road safety performance where EU initiatives made a great impact.

"The EC has credibility and authority that supports the implementation of initiatives at national level."

Road Safety Authority,
Ireland

Other respondents did not believe that the overall results would have been achieved with work only on the national level.

5. Do you believe the same or better results could have been achieved by an alternative organisational set-up at EU level (e.g. a separate road safety agency)?

The majority of respondents did not believe another set-up could have produced better results. Some stakeholders emphasised that the influence of an agency would not be as big as that of the Commission. Other stakeholders instead said a separate road agency might be a good idea for knowledge transfers, bringing stakeholders together and improved harmonisation of standards.

Stakeholders also proposed that better results could be achieved with better cooperation and closer collaboration among Commission units and Directorate-Generals.

6. Do you consider the strategic target on 50% reduction of road deaths to still be relevant and realistic with regard to the size and characteristics of road safety problems in the EU today?

All stakeholders stressed that the strategic target was relevant and important. Some had doubts that it was realistic, especially with regard to motorcyclists.

"The EU target remains crucial, as is action to achieve it."

ETSC

Several of the respondents also mentioned the need for an additional target on seriously injured.

7. Do you consider the seven strategic objectives of the Policy orientations on road safety still relevant in relation to the current main road safety problems and challenges – should anything be deleted or added to this list?

All respondents considered the seven objectives of the Policy orientations to be still relevant, with a reservation by FEMA regarding the details of some of the existing objectives.

Stakeholders proposed that additions could be made to the policy framework to include objectives linked to: the ageing society, new vehicle types such as e-bikes; work-related road safety; safety equipment and traffic safety management systems. Several stakeholders mentioned the need to put more emphasis on the safety of vulnerable road users and on training, education and enforcement to better address road user behaviours.

8. Would you propose any additional, realistic measures at EU level (respecting the subsidiarity and proportionality principles and within EU competence) that could address the current/future problems and challenges of road safety in order to contribute to the 2020 strategic target?

For improved road user safety, many stakeholders stressed the need for better road user training – high quality and cost effective training. This was proposed to be combined with stepped-up efforts on enforcement. Several stakeholders mentioned the specific challenge of distracted road users.

For infrastructure safety, FEMA voiced disappointment with the lack of progress on safer guardrails for motorcycles. Harmonised speed limits on motorways and in urban areas were also proposed.

"The huge amount of unsafe guardrails still in place throughout the EU makes clear the case for EU-wide legislation."

FEMA

For safer vehicles, the Verband der TÜV shared a number of proposals for strengthened roadworthiness testing in the EU. Extending legislation for mandatory seat belt reminders was mentioned.

The ITS area was emphasised by several stakeholders. Requests included: funding for road safety technology research; legislative measures to ensure market penetration of technologies with proven road safety effect (i.e. Automatic Emergency Braking); extended focus to ITS also for motorcycles; and making cooperative technologies an EU priority.

Several stakeholders stressed the need to move forwards on the serious injury initiative. Austria also proposed looking into best practices for traffic rules in the event of an emergency or a car breakdown on motorways.

In addition, some general remarks were received. The evidence-based approach with cost-benefit analyses was supported. One stakeholder remarked that EU legislative processes are today too slow and the impact of legislation comes too late. Another stakeholder requested the Commission to prepare common calculation principles for cost of traffic deaths and serious injuries.

Annex 2: List of participants in the stakeholder workshop, 17 November 2014

NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANISATION
Schmidt	Szabolcs	European Commission
Sanz Villegas	Mayté	European Commission
Schäfer	Annette	European Commission
Lindahl	Susanne	European Commission
Amrhar	Tarik	European Commission
Aarse	Rob	Transport en Logistiek Nederland
Adminaite	Dovile	ETSC
Avenoso	Antonio	ETSC
Basset	Ludovic	ACEM
Bramans	Girts	Permanent representation of Latvia
Breen	Jeanne	Jeanne Breen Consulting
Burns	Velma	Irish Road Safety Authority
Cobbaut	Johan	CITA
Cré	Ivo	POLIS
Delhaye	Aline	Federation of European Motorcyclists Associations
Diez	José	European Union Road Federation
Ellul	Glen	Malta Transport Centre
Fernández	Eduard	CITA
Goebelt	Richard	TÜV
Ishikiriya	Yusuke	CLEPA
Iwatani	Satoru	CLEPA
Jost	Graziella	ETSC
Kato	Masaya	Toyota Boshoku Europe N.V.
Kennedy	Alan	Nissan Technical Centre Europe
Kuester	Fabian	European Cyclists' Federation
Lacroix	Jacqueline	Deutscher Verkehrssicherheitsrat (DVR)
Lenz	Olivier	Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile
López Leza	Luisa	MOVING
Maître	Isabelle	Fédération Nationale des Transports Routiers
Markmanrud	Martin	Nordic Logistics Association
Martinez Sans	Fuensanta	ACEA
Mersch	Jeannot	Federation of European Road Victims
Mousel	Thierry Henri	CLEPA
Peeters	Roger	Laser Europe
Pető	Gábor	Permanent Representation of Hungary to the EU
Purdie	Ruth	TISPOL
Radetzky	Robert	Austrian Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology
Regenberg	Lynn	Bosch
Rewell	Simon	Insure The Box Limited
Rubika	Iveta	Permanent representation of Latvia

Saile	Dirk	Bundesverband Güterkraftverkehr Logistik und Entsorgung
Schulze	Horst	FERSI
Shovelton	Elizabeth	Department for Transport, UK
Sica	Augusta	International Commission for Driver Testing (CIECA)
Soenen	Jan	Transport en Logistiek Vlaanderen
Stacey	Stephen	EuroRAP
Thiant	Alois	Insurance Europe
Todts	William	Transport & Environment
Townsend	Ellen	ETSC
Trottein	Robert	Laser Europe
Van Mele	Julie	IRU
Vansnick	Mark	Belgian Ministry of Transport and Mobility
Willigers	Dolf	FEMA
Zakrzewska	Aleksandra	Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur