Cour des comptes

INTOSAI WGEPPP
EVALUATION OF PUBLIC ROAD SAFETY POLICY

Gilles Andréani, President of chamber

July 7-8, 2021

PLAN OF THE PRESENTATION

1. The issue
2. Evaluation questions
3. Calendar
4. Quantitative studies
5. Qualitative studies
6. Stakeholder engagement
7. Results
8. Recommendations

1. THE ISSUE

- **Public road safety policy designed and implemented by the State** and local authorities in metropolitan France : *departments*, municipalities, inter-municipalities

- **A large number of stakeholders:** road users, infrastructure managers, car manufacturers, health care actors, insurers, research organizations

- **Spectacular results over a very long period:** 18,000 killed in 1972, less than 3,500 in 2018 and 2019

- **A statistical « plateau » from 2013,** in France as in other European countries. Period taken into account: 2008 to 2019.

- **Fall in France's relative position within the EU:** 7th out of 28 in 2008, 14th in 2019

- **Unfavorable trend in the number of injuries and in certain categories of users:** cyclists, pedestrians, seniors

2. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

➢ **How effective : Do the results of the road safety policy (RSP) tie in with the expected improvements?**
- Do the results of the road safety policy and their evolution over the 2008-2018 period reach the defined targets?
- Do the defined targets provide a global measure of the effectiveness of RSP?

➢ **What relevance : Have the priorities and the levers of action at work since 2008 been sufficiently adapted to the goals pursued?**
- Are all the factors responsible for fatal or serious accidents correctly identified and prioritized?
- Do the choice of actions and the priority given to them take into account all accident factors in a balanced way as well as their respective impacts?
- Are the methods of control and sanction of the traffic laws violations adapted ?

➢ **What coherence : To what extent is road safety policy supported by other public policies (including mobility / health) at national or local level?**
- Is the coherence between RSP and mobility policy organised at national and local level?
- How far should RSP be adapted to the specific situation of each type of territory (urban, peri-urban, rural, mountains)?
- Is the policy implemented supported by the stakeholders? How is their participation sought?

3. CALENDAR

- ➢ **Preparation: December 2018 to July 2019**
    - • Feasibility Note
    - • Evaluation Plan
    - • Selection of samples from foreign countries and French *départements* (local authorities)

- ➢ **Shared Diagnosis: Sept 2019 to March 2020**
    - • Investigations in the territories
    - • Conduct of studies
    - • Benchmarking

- ➢ **Break (Covid 19): April to August 2020**

- ➢ **Synthesis and recommendations : September to March 2021**

- ➢ **Finalization: March to June 2021**
    - • Last contradiction
    - • Formal validation
    - • Editorial adjustments

4. QUANTITATIVE STUDIES

➢ **Analysis of the causes of fatal accidents in France**
  - Data mining of a comprehensive database of fatal crashes for the year 2015.
  - Partnership with a public research and study organization (CEREMA)
  - Econometric study on the correlations between accident factors and mortality

➢ **Measuring the integration of speed limits into driver's behaviour**
  - Use of data collected by the agency responsible for automated speed enforcement (ANTAI)
  - Study of the variation in speeds recorded when speed cameras are downgraded and can no longer issue a warning

➢ **Study of the action plans of public authorities**
  - Census, classification, measurement of the implementation and effects of the 300 measures taken by the Governments during the period
  - Exhaustive analysis of the 3 five-year plans of each of the 100 French *départments*

5. QUALITATIVE STUDIES

➢ **Interdepartmental comparisons :**
- Selection of 6 dé*partments* out of 100
- Selection of 3 pairs of *départements* that are comparable in terms of geographical and socio-demographic data, but with contrasting results in terms of road accidents
- Search for key success factors by studying the local conditions for implementing the policy
- Focus groups organized by a polling company (IFOP) to measure the acceptability of the policy by citizens and their degree of support

➢ **International comparisons :**
- Collection of data and studies from the OECD, the EU and various public and private international organizations
- Case studies: Sweden, Netherlands, UK, Germany, Spain

6. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

➢ **A <u>support committee</u>**
  - Composed of academia experts and administrative officials implementing the policy in the territories
  - 3 meetings, at every major stage of the investigation
  - Confidential consultation on the Court's work

➢ **A <u>users' committee</u>**
  - Composed of 19 representatives of associations working in the field of road safety
  - 3 meetings at every major stage of the investigation
  - Confidential consultation on the Court's work

➢ **An <u>extended committee of stakeholders</u>**
  - Composition identical to that of an existing advisory body, the National Road Safety Committee (CNSR)
  - 70 members representing all policy stakeholders
  - Consultation on the progress report, during a study day, with contributions from experts and discussions

7. RESULTS

➢ **A synthesis report**
- 150 pages of text
- 110 pages of annexes, presenting the details of the studies
- Communication of the report to stakeholders and to the press on July 1, 2021

➢ **Three main conclusions**
- Road safety policy was defined in the 2000s and is legitimately focused on user behaviour. Infrastructure and vehicle condition factors are less important.
- The model of this policy must evolve: road safety policy must become more readable and more fully integrate mobility and ecological transition policies.
- A conceptual and practical renewal is needed, with greater involvement of stakeholders, seeking the support of citizens and drawing on good practices observed abroad and in the regions.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

17 recommendations addressed to State administrations.

Grouped under five headings:

➢ **Adopt strategic planning**

➢ **Seek greater support**

➢ **Optimize behavioral control**

➢ **Improve steering instruments**

➢ **Improving the administrative organization**