

ROAD SAFETY FRAMEWORK STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Wednesday 28 September 2016, 10:00-13:00
Conference Room 1, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh

Minute of meeting

Members in attendance

Donald Carmichael (Chair)	Transport Scotland
Jeanne Breen OBE	Independent
Derek Crichton	SOLACE Scotland
Dr Graham Foster	NHS Scotland
Hugh Gillies	Transport Scotland
ACC Bernard Higgins	Police Scotland
Robert Nicol	COSLA

Other attendees

ACO David McGown	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
Richard Morrison	Transport Scotland Analytical Services Division
Supt Fraser Candlish	Police Scotland
Luke Macauley	Transport Scotland
Michael McDonnell	Transport Scotland and Operational Partnership Group Chair

Secretariat

Stuart Baxter	Transport Scotland
Dario Dalla Costa	Transport Scotland

1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 The Chair welcomed new Members Jeanne Breen, Independent, Derek Crichton, SOLACE Scotland, and Robert Nicol, COSLA. Apologies had been received from Roy Brannen, Transport Scotland, and ACO Robert Scott, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service who was represented by ACO David McGown.

2. Minute of previous meeting

2.1 The draft minute of the March 2016 meeting was agreed as an accurate record of the meeting with the insertion of one word required under item 5.3: "...increased levels of traffic, with no **fatal** accidents anywhere on the route..." Members noted that all resulting actions had been completed. The minute would be amended accordingly and published on the Transport Scotland Road Safety web pages. **Action: Secretariat**

2.2. ACC Bernard Higgins provided an update on the progress made on introducing Speed awareness Courses (SAC) in Scotland. Police Scotland has conducted initial scoping and is keen to introduce the scheme across Scotland which would be delivered by a contracted company and managed through the National Drivers Offender Retraining Scheme. On 23 August 2016, the Speed Awareness Steering Group agreed that the introduction of Speed Awareness Courses in Scotland would be worthy of trial, as the concept has won favour in England and Wales as a means of delivering on road safety outcomes without initial recourse to

the criminal process. Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS) Policy Unit are currently considering a proposal that Police Scotland be afforded the right to refer drivers for SAC when their speed is over the limit and deemed to be at an appropriate threshold for that intervention. Drivers exceeding that threshold or those who have previously attended a SAC within a pre-determined period would be dealt with according to current procedures.

2.3 Members noted that there was not as yet a robust evidence base on the effectiveness of such educational interventions in reducing speeding offences or recidivism, and that the Scottish pilot should be supported by an ongoing evaluation and assessment of the evidence baseline as data became available. The SPB acknowledged that a cross-partnership Short Life Working Group had been convened to explore possible options for the pilot and that an options appraisal paper from the Group would come forward for discussion at the next meeting of the SPB.

Action: Police Scotland

3. Membership, Remit and Terms of Reference (ToR) – Discussion Paper 1

3.1 In ratifying the revised Membership, Remit and ToR of the SPB, Members requested minor drafting changes of the ToR to better reflect the positive partnership approach that had been re-emphasised as a result of the mid-term review, to note the role of other non-Members attending SPB meetings and to take account of minor changes suggested by the Operational Partnership Group (OPG). Revised ToR will be circulated to Members for information. **Action: Secretariat**

4. Framework 2015 Milestone reduction targets – Information Paper

4.1 Richard Morrison provided a summary of the statistics contained in the Key Reported Road Casualties Scotland 2015; highlighting the following:

- Due to the relatively low number of casualties, small changes can appear dramatic when discussed in percentage terms.
- The overall long-term trend is a picture of dramatic decrease in incidents, and this necessarily entails that diminished returns will be realised for our efforts.
- It is important to ensure that the general trend is on track, rather than examining the results year-on-year in order to take a sufficiently nuanced approach; for example, to avoid undue focus on outliers.

4.2 The Board discussed the importance of remaining vigilant to external factors, including possible economic factors, which may affect the long-term downward trend in casualty numbers as we approach the 2020 targets. Members acknowledged the importance of the revised Governance role to monitor such external factors and identify areas where new activity or re-focussing of current activity on priority focus areas may be required to support the continued downward trend. In so doing Members noted the recent publication of an OECD report on causal links to road casualties and acknowledged the importance to keep the evidence on causal links under close review and to also take into account where the bulk of the casualties are occurring for example on the Trunk Road Network. Hugh Gillies acknowledged that such analysis could be performed.

Action: TRBO

4.3 Members noted that there was a necessary role for the OPG to monitor the evidence base and identify where the SPB may require to focus its consideration of progress towards 2020 targets and in identifying options for Ministers on the Framework and casualty reduction targets beyond 2020. The Framework milestone reduction targets would be a standing item on the SPB agenda to facilitate such discussion.

Action: OPG & Secretariat

5. OPG Report – Discussion Paper 2

5.1 Michael McDonnell, in his capacity as the OPG Chair, provided a verbal report on the main outputs of the OPG meeting held on 28 July 2016. The Group ratified its ToR, remit and membership, whilst acknowledging that a motorcyclist representative should be identified and invited to sit on the Group. The Group had approved the format of the Indicator Toolkit, for tracking progress on overarching outcomes, and the operational risk register. The dynamic of the revised OPG Membership had been positive and the group acknowledged its clear responsibility to support the SPB on monitoring and managing progress towards the Strategic Delivery Plan (SDP). Consideration was also given to the Key Reported Road Casualties Scotland 2015 statistics, and five funding proposals for project activity supporting the Framework (see item 8 Framework funding).

5.2 Members acknowledged the participatory approach that had been taken with the mid-term review and that this had re-invigorated the partnership approach to delivery of the Framework. Key individuals had been identified to sit on the OPG as a consequence to further foster this approach. The Board recommended that the OPG should keep under review its membership and frequency of meeting should this become necessary to revise. The Board agreed that the OPG with SPB could share, as appropriate, meeting papers and draft minutes of respective meetings to support a clear line of communication for the revised Framework Governance model.

Action: SPB and OPG Secretariat

6. Framework Outcomes – Discussion Paper 3

6.1 Members were broadly content with the presentation of Framework outcomes and acknowledged the use of the Framework outcomes toolkit to drive discussion. It was stressed that the information presented must remain fully up-to-date, be interpreted accurately with supportive narrative and fine-tuned as necessary for consistency.

6.2 There was discussion about the most productive way in which the SPB could strategically engage with the Framework outcome indicators and the way in which the presentation of data almost inevitably influence the direction of any discussion and engagement. Members noted that the OPG has a key role to play in the finer detailed analyses of information and evidence to inform the Board where it should take the strategic view on specific outcomes in this respect. The SPB agreed the toolkit in principle but requested that further consideration be given to identifying clear functionality guidance to help support Members in using the Toolkit, particularly on assessing the RAG status of individual outcomes, before the next meeting of the SPB.

Action: SPB & OPG Secretariat

6.3 In noting that the OPG had agreed the toolkit reflected the 2016 baseline position for the overarching outcomes and indicators, the SPB agreed that it would be important to monitor other possible outcomes and indicators if the evidence-base supported their use as a means of tracking progress to 2020 targets and in developing options for the Framework beyond 2020. It was noted that although the indicators are driven by the Framework, it would be important to also focus on the causal link between Framework indicators and the aim of reducing and ultimately preventing death and serious injury in road accidents. Members noted the established link between mean speed and serious and fatal accident injury outcomes and it was agreed to investigate the availability and presentation on this data. Further discussion acknowledged that it was not too early to start considering future refreshes of indicator selection beyond the 2020 horizon. In the first instance this could usefully include investigation of possible indicators based on mean speed using data from the speed camera partnership and speed

counters on the trunk road network; this could enable proxy measurement of the overarching speed outcome. **Action: TS Analytical Services Division**

7. Framework Risk Register – Discussion Paper 4

7.1 Members noted the strategic risks set out and the PESTELLO approach to be appropriate. It was recommended that some fine tuning of the drafting on the identified economic and operational risks was required to clarify better the distinction between them, and that additional risks around the economic cycle and what possible threats there may be to Framework delivery as a consequence of the BREXIT referendum result.

7.2 It was agreed that the Risk Register would require ongoing in-depth consideration, and that this should be done taking into account the operation risk register to facilitate consideration of the need to escalate or de-escalate respective risks. In the first instance, both the SPB and the OPG risk registers would be circulated to members to assist any further comments or suggestions on the risk register before the next meeting of the SPB.

Action: All Members and Secretariat

8. Framework Funding – Discussion Paper 5

8.1 Discussion paper 5 set out three blocks of funding proposals that had been developed, following the March meeting of the SPB, in support of framework Priority Focus Areas and other existing Framework areas. In considering the request of Members to consider and ratify the OPG recommendations on the funding streams, it was acknowledged that any strategic discussion on funding must match value-for-money with the ability to fully utilise the road safety budget to support Priority Focus Areas and overarching outcomes. This would involve balancing priority area funding with providing grants for non-priority areas which are still worth pursuing in supporting other existing Framework areas.

8.2 The Board noted the historical difficulties encountered when attempting to spend the Road Safety budget; highlighted once again by the relatively few bids received. It was felt that better strategic fund management techniques could be employed, such as publicising the fund more effectively and utilising a less compressed bidding timetable. It would also be vital for the Board to consider how future bids satisfy the Safe System approach and meet international best practice benchmarking. Noting a Framework budget surplus, even in the face of the existing proposed project activity, the value of performing a Road Safety Management Capacity Review recommended by the OECD and World Bank was raised for further consideration.

Action: Secretariat

8.3 The SPB noted the work that had been done by the OPG in developing the proposals to a point where they were recommending funding of all 5 project streams. However, the view was expressed that the compressed timeframe left available in the current financial year and the high-level nature of the information provided to members in the discussion paper, were both limiting factors in facilitating a comprehensive assessment of the proposals by the SPB. Consequently, and conditional on the OPG recommendation and the application of outcome based evaluations, the SPB agreed to full funding of the proposals made by Cycling Scotland, Scottish Borders Council and Living Streets. Project proposers would be contacted to follow-up any further residual project refinements, including the requirement for independent outcomes based evaluation of the project activity. The gap in the provision of a project proposal to support motorcyclist outcomes was noted and the SPB directed the OPG to revisit options for developing and funding such a project this financial year. **Action: OPG Secretariat**

8.4 The SPB noted the funding of the TRL research on pre-driver interventions and approved in principle to funding managing occupational road risk via the RoSPA Scotland grant proposal. However, it was noted that the scope of the activity may be somewhat limited and that consideration should be given to how this may be widened out to encompass other key areas of work-related road safety, such as corporate procurement of safer vehicles.

9. Safety Camera Programme Report – Discussion Paper 6

9.1 Luke Macauley, in his capacity as head of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme (SSCP), provided a summary of the Programme's first Annual Report and updated the SPB on the SSCP's next steps. As a transitional year in implementing outcomes from the Safety Camera Programme Review, the 2015/16 Annual Report centres on progress made to date. Reporting of the formal Key Performance Indicators, applicable from April 2016, will be reflected in future performance reports submitted to the SPB.

9.2 Members welcomed the Report, both in terms of content and format and noted the encouraging progress made through 2015/16 in delivering the Review's recommendations for more efficient and effective outcomes, and maximising the Programme's casualty and collision reduction potential. Areas for further progress and improvement were noted, including: staffing, deployments, maintenance, local engagement and communications. Opportunities also exist in 2016/17 for the three Units to work more collaboratively, establishing and improving upon new practices and working methods. In addition, a number of work streams will be of increasing importance in 2016/17, most notably: the implementation of outcomes from the site selection exercise; the introduction of the Forth Replacement Crossing ITS (Intelligent Transport System); and considerations on Speed Awareness Courses.

9.3 It was noted that the Programme's focus is on smarter activity, ensuring that appropriate sites are being enforced with appropriate technology, with enforcement to reflect collision and speeding profiles. KPIs were also discussed in this regard, and ensuring that available budget is maximised. The Board asked how the SCP fits into the bigger picture – for example, when considering such aspects as the economy or emission reduction – and LM stated that the SCP team is already exploring these areas.

9.4 The SPB was informed of a report on "*The Effectiveness of Average Speed Cameras in Great Britain*" that was due to be published soon and this will be circulated to Members for their information once it had been published.

Action: SSCP Programme Office

10. AOB & Date of next meeting

10.1 No items of AOB had been received and none was raised. The next meeting of the SPB will be held on or around 30 March 2017 in Glasgow. The Secretariat will trawl for Members availability

Action: Secretariat