

Operational Partnership Group

28 July 2016, 10:00 hours

Scottish Government, Conference Room 3, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ

Note of Meeting

Attendees

Michael McDonnell (Chair)	Road Safety Scotland
Andy Edmonston	Police Scotland
Martin Millar	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
Keith Irving	Cycling Scotland
Stuart Hay	Living Streets Scotland
Karen McDonnell	RoSPA Scotland
John Alexander	Scottish Ambulance Service
Neil Chisholm	SCOTS
Stewart Leggett	Transport Scotland
Graham Thomson	Transport Scotland
Luke Macauley	Transport Scotland
Richard Morrison	Transport Scotland Analytical Services
Andrew Price	Scottish Community Safety Network
Marie-Claire Chaffey	Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service
Gwen Hamilton	Scottish Government Marketing and Corporate Communications

Secretariat

Sarah Guy	Transport Scotland
Dario Dalla Costa	Transport Scotland

Apologies

Neil Greig	Institute of Advanced Motorists
------------	---------------------------------

Welcome and Introductions

1. The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the Operational Partnership Group (OPG) since the conclusion of the Framework Review. He noted that while the OPG had existed before, it had not met on a regular basis with most business conducted virtually. The revised governance structure meant an enhanced role for the OPG which would see it meet on a bi-annual basis.
2. The Chair formally welcomed new representatives John Alexander (Scottish Ambulance Service) and Stewart Leggett (Transport Scotland) and noted apologies from Neil Greg, and his proposed replacement, Gill MacGregor (IAM RoadSmart).

Remit and Terms of Reference

3. The Chair invited members to comment on and agree the contents of Discussion Paper 1.
4. It was discussed and agreed that the Safety Camera Programme would continue to be governed by the Strategic Partnership Board (SPB) rather than the OPG.

5. When discussing the SPB remit (Annex A) it was suggested that the following changes be highlighted to the SPB for consideration:

- Bullet point 1 read as “Using its ~~influence~~**relationship** with Ministers and senior partner organisations...”
- Bullet point 7 read as “Hold ~~Scottish Government~~ **road safety** delivery partners to account and...”

6. The Group also discussed the OPG Membership (Annex B) and it was noted that there are direct representatives of two modes on the OPG (Living Streets for pedestrians and Cycling Scotland for cyclists) but no equivalent for motorcyclists. This led to a discussion around whether direct representatives were required for the speed and age outcomes. The Chair pointed out that the OPG seemed to be about the right size at the moment and additional members may make the group large and unwieldy. It was agreed that membership of the Group was about right but, if members thought there was a specific need, groups representing older and younger drivers or other specialist areas would be invited to attend meetings as required. However, it was agreed that the Secretariat would pursue a Motorcyclist representative as a permanent member on the Group.

7. When discussing the OPG remit (Annex C) it was recommended that:

- Bullet point 1 now read as “Review, analyse, distil information **and evidence** which...”
- Bullet point 3 now read as “Align respective organisational **core** activity in accordance with direction provided by the SDP and the SPB” - to also reflect the need for individual organisations to be able to listen and react to their own stakeholders.

8. Questions were also raised as to whether the SPB would delegate some powers, in relation to funding, for example, to the OPG to allow the latter to make meaningful decisions. Although the Secretariat reminded members of their strengthened role in analysing and making recommendations in relation to partner activity, it was agreed that the matter of funding approval and clearance would be raised through the Secretariat for the next SPB meeting.

Agreement points:

- Suggest changes to the SPB remit for the SPB to consider. **Action: Secretariat**
- Seek a motorcycle representative to add to the OPG. **Action: Secretariat**
- Propose and seek OPG and SPB approval of amended wording to OPG remit bullet point 3. **Action: Secretariat**

Key Reported Road Casualties Scotland 2015

9. RM 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.

10. The Framework is clear that the focus should remain on long term trends, not year-on-year information.

11. It was felt that info-graphics are generally welcome and function well to present information. However, the selection of what to present can be somewhat arbitrary, which is why conversations with stakeholders are important, to ensure the most pertinent information is chosen. Employing upper confidence and lower confidence levels were discussed and, while it was recognised they can be useful when dealing with short-term variations, a purely mathematical approach needs to be informed by appropriate contextual understanding from practitioners.

12. The OPG felt that the some further contextualisation may be useful; for example:

- Exploring how the increase in cycling and Light Goods Vehicle use have impacted on the results.
- Comparing these results with what is occurring in other countries, specifically KSI numbers levelling out.
- How low incidence / high impact events compare with high incidence events in their effects on headline figures.

Indicator Reporting Toolkit

13. The group agreed that the toolkit needed to be a living document, owned by the Group, and adapted and amended as necessary. There was support for the layout, structure and content of the document, and an acknowledgement by all members that the toolkit centres around the identified Outcomes, Indicators and Commitments agreed through the mid-term review. There was some discussion on potential changes to priority ranking levels; for example, looking specifically at RSF commitment 21 on the Safety Camera Partnership. It was agreed that any adjustments would be made in agreement with the SPB.

14. There was discussion about the front sheet of the Outcomes and the agreed Indicators being pivotal in monitoring and measuring progress. The Group discussed how to get the balance right between the high-level data needed and the context provided by the supporting text to the graphs. In general, and including the additional detail charted for the Cyclists and Pedestrians Outcomes regarding those seriously injured and killed, members felt that this had been achieved in the toolkit.

15. There was general discussion around the wealth of additional information that could be available for consideration in relation to the commitments. However, there was a consensus that additional data should only be provided to support the toolkit where it is high-level and directly aligned to the Indicators. For example, this was discussed in relation to the uptake and effect of commitment RSF74 on 20 mph zones and limits. The Group agreed that additional evidence and data, including Road Information Tracking Study (RITS) data, could be provided for review at the next meeting. Members were advised that the RITS questionnaire had recently been reviewed, and a copy of the revised questions would be supplied to members.

16. It was noted that, while it was important for the purpose of baselining, there was a high level of detail on the individual commitments. It was recommended that in future, the amount of historical information could be reduced, making the document more succinct.

17. The Group agreed that evidence and data set out in the toolkit would be used as a baseline for each indicator for 2016.

Speed

18. Discussion took place about commitment RSF74 on 20mph limits and the desire for better quality data on 20mph. It was acknowledged that benchmarking would be awkward because of different adoptions of 20mph speed limits throughout the country, and the quality of the data available through STATS19.

17-25 year old drivers

19. NC highlighted there was anecdotal evidence that suggests the rush to drive at 17 had reduced, which some may interpret as being linked to a fall in the number of young drivers on the road network. The Group agreed that it would be useful to gather evidence on this topic for discussion at a future meeting.

Agreement points:

- Members were largely content with the structure and layout of the toolkit, finding it to be a workable document.
- Members agreed content as a baseline for 2016.
- Members agreed that any changes to the priority rating levels would be made in agreement with the SPB.
- Produce a paper for discussion at the next OPG meeting highlighting available data on 20mph limits (including the limitations of that data). **Action: Secretariat**
- Members agreed to gather further information on licensing rates for the 17-25 age group and consider it at the next meeting. **Action: Secretariat**
- TS Analytical Services to provide details of RITS revision. **Action: RM**

Operational Risk Register

20. Members were advised that the Risk Register had been developed by the Road Safety Policy team as a companion document to the Toolkit. The Group agreed the structure and format of the document and considered the individual risks and scoring. The Members agreed its primary function should be to address and treat future risks, and it was agreed that the Register should be owned by the OPG and be a living document which should not become static.

21. The Group considered and agreed that the Risk Register should be maintained at a high level, and contain risks relating to the priority areas and commitments as well as any overarching risks.

22. It was acknowledged that a lack of resources and funding are the main issues affecting delivery of actions, and that a commitment to the delivery of road safety initiatives was needed at a local level. The loss of road safety officers was identified as a barrier to delivery in certain parts of the country. It was highlighted that this was already identified as an issue on the SPB Risk Register, which contains overarching risks related to the Framework and the SDP more broadly. The Group agreed that any overarching risks identified should be flagged up to the SPB, along with any operational risks the OPG considers significant enough to highlight to the SPB.

23. The Group requested time to further consider the detail surrounding each risk identified and the scoring allocated. It was agreed final comments should be submitted by the end of August and subsequently reflected in the document before it is baselined.

24. The Group discussed risk ownership as recorded on the register, and agreed that individual members should be allocated to each specific risk. The Group also felt outlined

timescales would be helpful in monitoring risks and ensuring any mitigating action can be conducted, thus enabling members to report effectively on progress to the Group.

Agreement points:

- The OPG was broadly content with the Risk Register format.
- Consider and agree risk ownership and timescales with members for next meeting. **Action: Secretariat**
- Members to submit further comments on the Risk Register via email by the end of August (to include any amendment to the scoring system). **Action: All**
- Reflect any amendments and agree content as baseline for 2016. **Action: Secretariat**

Framework Funding

25. The Group welcomed the 5 concept bids received in response to the call for larger-scale projects and pieces of work, and discussed the funding parameters set. It was recognised that whilst only simple concepts and project outlines were requested for this 2016/17 funding, in future there would be benefit in providing partners with a proposal template.

26. GT highlighted that budgets for 2017/18 would be determined through the Spending Review, the content of which will be determined in the coming months and published towards the end of 2016.

27. The Group was advised that, if a recommendation was not approved or could not start until the next financial year, there is no guarantee that funding would be available. The Group recognised that this was the first time that funding concepts had been requested in this way and, therefore, if value was noted in a proposal, the OPG and the secretariat should provide support to those making the applications to help them meet the funding criteria. Nevertheless, members were advised that, in spite of budgeting questions, the Group should not simply dismiss multi-year projects as that runs the risk of excluding necessary/useful projects.

Argyll and Bute Council

28. Although this failed to meet many funding parameters, the OPG felt that Argyll and Bute Council should be given the opportunity to reapply with a more detailed plan. Motorcyclists are perceived as a difficult target audience to reach and this project has good potential as an education campaign. Bikers also have a strong online presence and a non-Government website would be welcome. The project might not be innovative and it may prove difficult to gauge its effect on the target audience, but the nationwide approach, the potential to lead to innovation in reaching bikers and its broad focus all added to its value.

Cycling Scotland

29. To avoid conflict of Interest, Keith Irving left the room while the Cycling Scotland bid was discussed. The OPG agreed that this idea had merit but lacked detail. It required further information – particularly in explaining how the project would be delivered – in order to become a full proposal. The idea is sound, and can be linked to other vulnerable road users, but more work must be carried out on both the timeframe and funding.

RoPSA grant proposal

30. RoSPA's proposal was originally part of a larger bid. The OPG recognised that there was merit in this project but questioned whether, as a single, smaller proposal, it fell within the funding parameters.

31. Members acknowledged that there may be a lack of available evidence, and it was asked if any statistics were available to support the proposed work. It was agreed that this proposal had merit for relatively little investment, and the possibility of funding outwith the Framework should be considered.

Scottish Borders Council

32. This was seen as a comprehensive bid and consideration was given to the potential for it to be rolled out across Scotland. It was recognised it could be difficult to evaluate as it might take a number of years, and it was agreed that any evaluation should be carried out via an independent process. The proposal covered a whole priority area and, in particular, the older driver element was very positive, but more detail would be required.

Living Streets

33. To avoid conflict of Interest, Stuart Hay left the room while the Living Streets bid was discussed. This was seen as a very positive proposal and the OPG was interested in the potential benefits of this work being conducted by a third sector organisation. Members agreed the section that set out best practice and stakeholder sharing was particularly positive. The proposal covered many of the funding parameters; however, particularly in light of the budgeting restraints outlined above in paragraph 27, difficulties could arise by it spanning a two-year period. The Group questioned whether the project could be carried out in one year as there were concerns as to what would happen if the funding were to cease at the end of the first year. Other issues considered, and agreed, as requiring additional information included the cost of managing expectations and there being no mention of match funding.

Transport Research Laboratory

34. Members welcomed the TRL proposal. The Group commented on the project initiation being imminent and highlighted this would need to be managed carefully to ensure the research maintains the highest quality and is on track for delivery by February 2017. It was agreed that this should be recommended to the SPB for approval, but that approval should be given to TRL in principle to enable work to begin in tandem with SPB consideration and subject to its approval.

RoSPA funding for continuation of core activities

35. The OPG was informed that ROSPA Scotland have applied for grant funding of £179,342 for a 20 month period from 1 August 2016 to 31 March 2018. This funding is being sought to enable ROSPA to continue to deliver the SQA Road Safety Qualification and promote the management of occupational road risk (MORR) through the Scottish Occupational Road Safety Alliance (SCORSA).

36. The Group was advised that, historically, the road safety policy budget has provided funding for ROSPA over many years; however, this is the first time the OPG has been asked to consider the RoSPA funding request. Whilst this proposal covers a different period of activity to previous years, the same two main pieces of work were covered as in 2016/17 for roughly the same overall budget. Members were asked to note that SQA activity and funding has been reduced and a full evaluation will be conducted, whereas SCORSA activity and funding has substantially increased. Extra activity proposed includes increased regional workshops/webinars which focus on 17-25 and older drivers.

37. The OPG acknowledged the work carried out by RoSPA in promoting the framework's goals and recommended it subject to some amendment.

Agreement points:

- Merit was seen in the proposals from Argyll and Bute Council, Cycling Scotland, Scottish Borders Council and Living Streets –correspondence will be sent to the respective organisations requesting them to provide more detail on their proposals, and offering support, in order that they may meet the funding parameters. Updated proposals would be shared and OPG approval sought electronically. **Action: Secretariat**
- In future, more guidance would be provided to both those submitting submissions and OPG members. **Action: Secretariat**
- If necessary, in future, organisations will be requested to re-submit applications after the initial sift, before being presented to the OPG. **Action: Secretariat**
- RoSPA's proposal (paragraphs 30-31 above) would not be submitted to the Board; however, a different way of providing the funds would be explored. **Action: Secretariat**
- TRL proposal to be recommended to SPB for approval. Phase 1 will begin in tandem with, and subject to, approval by the SPB.
- OPG will recommend to the SPB that RoSPA core activity funding continue.

AOCB

38. No other business had been tabled, and none was raised.

Next Meeting

39. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 26 January 2017: Victoria Quay, Edinburgh.

CLOSE