

Session 3: Transport Users

Panel 1

Witnesses: Neil Grieg, Director of Policy and Research, IAM
Kevin Golding-Williams, Public Affairs and Policy Manager, Living Streets
Roger Geffen, Campaigns and Policy Director, CTC
Craig Carey-Clinch, Public Affairs officer, Motor Cycle Industry Organisation

Panel 1: Starts

Stephen Glaister: Good. Are we set? Thank you, everybody, thank you so much for coming. Thank you for your evidence, very helpful, we've read it. You should know that we're recording this and we will be producing a transcript for publication. So before we start the discussion would you like to make a short opening statement, any of you? Roger? Mr Geffen?

Roger Geffen: Okay. Roger Geffen, Campaigns Policy Director, CTC. Really I suppose our key points are the need to tackle both actual and perceived deterrents to cycle use in order to maximise its health, environmental, economic and other benefits. At the moment Britain is a poor-performing country in terms of cycle safety compared with many of our continental neighbours and that is largely because the risks in Britain are actually higher but they're also perceived to be higher and it's important to tackle both. The other thing to say about this is that the health benefits of cycling far outweigh the risks involved and that is not widely known. In other words, cycling, despite the risks, significantly increases your life expectancy. The health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks by various estimates but the government accepts one of around 20 to 1 and there's a European-wide figure of about 24 to 1, so we're pretty sure that that's the right kind of ballpark. And therefore we should not be deterred from encouraging more people to cycle on the basis that it's perceived to be dangerous, we need to tackle that perception because in countries like The Netherlands it's not, it's... And even in Britain the risks of cycling are... you're less likely to be killed in a mile of cycling than a mile of walking so we should be encouraging it, not be deterred from encouraging it by the fear, but we need to tackle the fears. Those fears come primarily from high traffic volumes and speeds, that is one thing to tackle, particularly through things like 20 mph speed limits, we need to tackle road user behaviour, promote driver awareness of what is responsible cycling, how to tackle bad driving. The law needs to come down more heavily on bad driving through better policing and more appropriate sentencing. We need to tackle the particular threat from lorries. Lorries do not have a high rate of involvement in injuring cyclists but they have a very high rate involvement in killing them and that of course, in addition to the obvious grief and trauma; that generates headlines that deter people from cycling as well. So those are the sorts of issues. In terms of joining up, we need to make sure that the legal system is joined up, we need joined-up action, particularly around lorries, and there's one other issue I flagged up in this evidence which is specifically around the issue of tramlines and rail crossings, which is particularly timely given the Edinburgh tram scheme has just opened. A law firm who we've been in touch with has rounded up over 100 cases of cyclists who've already had falls on those tramlines before the trams even started opening and there are huge issues about who is responsible for that, and similar issues arise at level crossings which is an issue that the Transport Select Committee has recently looked at. So I hope that gives an overview of some of the issues.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you very much. You appreciate that our terms of references are broadly about the general principles involved in safety so it's not particularly about the interests of any one group but I'm sure that will emerge in the discussion. Thank you. Mr Golding-Williams.

Kevin Golding-Williams: Hello. Yeah, I'm Kevin Golding-Williams, I'm the Public Affairs and Policy Manager at Living Streets. In terms of a quick summary, really what we're interested in and our angle

on this around transport safety is actually making walking safer and easier and considering some of the mechanisms and how we can get there. I would echo some of Roger's comments around perceptions and actual risks regarding safety, they both need to be considered equally if we're going to get more people walking. In our response we consider legislative approaches around some of those comments that have already been made around the 20 mile an hour limits but also issues around funding as well and in particular the cross-departmental links across Whitehall and the areas that safety and transport safety starts moving into other departments. In particular in relation to walking we're talking here about the Department for Health, the Department for Education and the Department for Communities and Local government, and that is quite a key requirement, I think, for this whole issue. Broadly, there's a decrease in walking numbers, in particular with the numbers that are walking to school, and fears around perceived safety risks are quite key around that and our recent report, Pupil Priority, highlights that particular issue. But also when you look at the KSI statistics you do see a transition issue in terms of ages from the ages 8 to 9 up to around 12 to 13 and there is a very clear cliff edge area there and that really needs to be focused upon. I think that's my comment at the moment.

[00:09:29]

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Mr Carey-Clinch?

Craig Carey-Clinch: Thank you, Chairman. Actually I would like to say I'm grateful for your comment about the debate today being on broad principles of road safety because I think in terms of motorcycle safety the broad principles of transport safety policy are something which do need addressing if we're to realise the opportunities that exist to properly tackle motorcycle safety and also to look at how this particular mode of transport can benefit society as a whole. Roger's opening remarks regarding the economic and social benefits of cycling are well made and to a great extent also apply to motorcycling in terms of CO₂ and congestion reduction, easing journey times, improving quality of journeys for people and also helping to look at economic growth areas. Motorcycling has been proved to be a social benefit; we run a scheme called Wheels to Work which helps to give work transport to young people in particular. But if you look at the safety situation we have a falling casualty situation at the moment, 40% down on fatalities over the 2005 – 2009 average, since 1993 the low points in the market and the high points in casualties in recent times a 23% decrease in total casualties, but we do have a problem with proportionality, in other words being 1% of road traffic and around 18.7% of all road deaths – that's not something that can be ignored. The motorcycle industry I'm here to represent today takes a very strong view that if we're to do more, if we're to turn modest casualty falls into a real reduction and at the same time to realise the opportunity for society and for citizens that can come from increased motorcycle use, then a much more holistic view needs to be taken of how motorcycle safety is integrated within wider road safety policy. At the moment the issue for motorcycling that most people seem to put across a view on is, "We have a motorcycle safety problem, what do we do about that problem?" It's a fair point but the reaction to a problem is usually, "Get rid of that problem," and policies to reduce the amount of motorcycling in fact do nothing to improve safety for those who continue to ride, who are riding. Instead, what we would encourage in transport policy as a whole is motorcycling, like cycling, as a two-wheeled mode of transport offers society huge opportunities, "How do we address the real issues of safety that come from motorcycling in order to realise that opportunity for society as a whole?" Thank you.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Grieg.

Neil Grieg: Yes, sir, a short few words from us echo some of the things that have been said already, particularly links across government, long-term funding commitments are obviously key for us when we look at things like road maintenance, and perhaps the recent shift towards localism has perhaps reduced the priority for road safety. I think our key sort of view is that the priority for road safety in particular, (inaudible 00:12:20) looking at safety in general but road safety, it doesn't seem to be there as it was a few years ago. Also, as being a training organisation, as you can imagine, the role of driver error, rider error,

human error, training and coaching I think is often underestimated. We've seen major advances in road and car design. Car design (inaudible 00:12:39) moving ahead a pace, road design has still got a long way to catch up and that's where the funding issues come in. We still haven't taken on board really this idea of it's got to be lifelong learning, actually getting people to improve their riding and driving over the course of their driving career, and of course that then focuses in on the early start, younger drivers, the first six months, that kind of thing, the fact that we leave young drivers to learn by their mistakes, and also of course an older population, ageing population driving as well, what do we do about that. But the key for us is more priority for road safety, better links between departments across government, again, particularly NHS was mentioned, and also more long-term funding. We've started to see that in areas like road maintenance but particularly at a local level it is still very much short-term funding issues. Thank you.

[00:13:24]

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. So in various ways I think each of you has made an appeal for some kind of consistency across the piste of the respective modes. Mr Grieg, you were talking about local authority versus national government, you've talked about motorcycling versus other modes, cycling versus other modes, walking versus the other modes. What's your view about...I mean, we're as an institutional structure here and the legislative framework, how can we get better read-across, consistency between all the different interests in this game?

Roger Geffen: (Inaudible 00:14:05). I mean, I think that the key issue here is leadership. That is clearly a role for government here. The government needs to set the tone that other organisations then follow, that's what governments are there for, to set the priority of road safety within road policing, for instance. At the moment one of the things we've seen is that over a decade we've seen overall police numbers rise and then fall again to roughly the same level as they were a decade previously but road policing has suffered a 29% cut, in other words it's suffered a relative loss of priority compared with policing overall. And I think Neil Grieg is touching on the fact that, similarly, the lack of national targets for around road safety has led to a loss of priority for road safety within local authorities. Now, I do have to put a caveat around targets because I think it's important to set the right kind of targets. For the sorts of reasons that have been touched on for motorcycling, if you aim simply to reduce cyclist casualties or cycle fatal and serious injuries then there is the temptation on road safety officers to reduce cycle use, which is counterproductive to public health for all the reasons I touched on about the health benefits far outweighing the risks. So you have to set the right kind of targets, rate based targets, that measure the risk of cycling per unit of cycle use in some way, but the targets do need to be there. They are an important driver of joined-up action from police forces, from local authorities and particularly, I would say, to get joined-up action from the freight sector. There are operators in the freight sector who want to do the right thing but they're being undercut by, if you like, the 'cowboys' who are able to get away with it because it is not a priority to tackle lorry safety for government. The Transport for London has been doing stuff, some of the industries have been doing stuff, the government has been ignoring the lorry safety issue, this is a key area where leadership is needed.

Stephen Glaister: Right. Any others on this?

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yeah.

Stephen Glaister: Carey-Clinch.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yes, thank you. Leadership is key, I completely agree with the points made on that, but looking to the Department for Transport to try and offer that leadership I think has been proven not necessarily to be the perfect way to go forward. We have seen a lot of cuts in this particular government, I think I've heard it said in many places that "We ain't seen nothing yet" in terms of what will carry on from here, for various reasons. Highly political area, I know, but what that does suggest to me is that in terms of road safety leadership

then government should be persuaded to put the trust in those professionals who exist in bodies such as PACTS and others to encourage bringing those bodies together and providing that very leadership. So to a great extent what is happening today is part of that whole leadership thing but it's getting government to recognise that and to buy into it rather than just putting it at sort of arm's length and saying, "Well we agree with some bits and agree with another". So it's about building confidence within government, it's about bringing together various organisations and institutions to look at safety problems and difficulties. In terms of motorcycle safety leadership, we have started that process through holding a conference on the issue at DFT last November, we've come together with ACPO to look at motorcycle safety and policy, discussing those matters with the DFT with the aim of seeking their support for our leadership in these areas and at the same time looking towards organisations like PACTS and others to join us in this challenge to look at the whole road safety and transport policy dynamic when it comes to safety. Additionally, forging new alliances with cycle groups, looking at the issue of electric bikes, transport and safety and looking across other areas of motorcycling and its interface with other modes of transport is also important. So 'leadership' is the word but I don't necessarily think we should constantly look to government for that, this is an area perhaps we need to provide for ourselves.

[00:18:06]

Stephen Glaister: Yeah, Neil Grieg.

Neil Grieg: Yeah, I think the leadership issue for us, and I talked about the NHS a lot and I think we do see them coming out and joining in. You know, if you look at safety camera partnerships, if you look at safety committees around England and around Scotland the NHS are represented but often at a very junior level and I've yet to see... I'll give an example. In Scotland, for example, where the road safety policy is led by a junior minister and therefore anybody who comes along from Health is below him so you never see a Health Minister involved. It's the same down here in England as well, you don't get that higher level commitment to public policy that's there. So there may be a road safety policy there, there may be road safety objectives and targets, whatever you like to call them just now, but they don't seem to get the buy-in at a senior level in other departments apart from the Department of Transport. And that is a problem that I've seen repeated all over the country in terms of you do get them on board, they either don't come to meetings or they come at a junior level and very little interaction takes place. So you need that leadership at a higher level to make sure that the NHS does get involved, it does send the right people and does show commitment to your own policy for road safety.

Stephen Glaister: It strikes me that there's a problem in what you've been saying. Nothing wrong with what you've been saying but it creates a logical problem. Leadership, yes, seems to involve setting targets partly and adequate resourcing partly, and you've put it on the shoulders of government to do. In practice that must mean Secretary of State for Transport, I guess, but if it's the Secretary of State for Transport or a junior transport minister how does Health get onto the agenda? So how are we going to achieve this sort of single-minded leadership within government when there are so many different interests?

Kevin Golding-Williams If I may suggest that actually a model that we could be looking at here is similar to that that's been adopted in terms of Olympic and Paralympic legacy with the Moving More Living More which is actually based in the Cabinet Office and is bringing together DFT, DH and also DFE around what can these different institutions bring to the party in terms of trying to increase physical activity, and, arguably, around this particular issue of transport safety this would seem to lend itself to that central coordination. Quite simply, what's happening at the moment is that it's sitting in a DFT silo and it's not reaching out to other departments. The Department of Health clearly have an interest in increasing levels of physical activity. Only recently the Department for Education has just ended a consultation with regards to school transport and this is critical for millions of children travelling to school every day, and some of the comments and references that were made in the consultation document about road safety were essentially suggesting that actually

there are certain areas where children just shouldn't simply walk, therefore by adopting that approach you'll make it safe; where actually all you're doing is suppressing demand, actually you should be bringing it up to standard. Now, with a joined-up approach there would be conversations and bilaterals and trilaterals taking place. At the moment and within the current framework I'm not entirely sure that's taking place, the implication being when you adopt a localist framework what you're actually seeing are local authorities actually reducing the number of road safety officers because of the lack of this joined-up approach within Whitehall.

Roger Geffen:

I would relate this to the issue of capital and revenue and the corresponding issue of to what extent are we aiming for more and safer cycling? Now, CTC ran a campaign five years ago called Safety in Numbers based on this evidence that cycling gets... There is an association between higher levels of cycle uses associated with better cycle safety. The causal relationship, the causal mechanisms are not known and not provable but it appears that it's likely to work two ways, that it's partly going to be because the more cyclists there are, the greater driver awareness of cyclists, it's partly because the more cyclists there are, the greater political will to invest in cycling, but they can and should go hand in hand, that is the key point. How do you get them to go hand in hand? Partly by tackling those fears that I talked about, and that is where awareness campaigns come in and that requires revenue funding which is where the Department of Health potentially has a very useful role to play in providing the revenue funding that enables us to promote walking as well as cycling through the Health sector for different populations; for young people, for older people, in schools, in work places, for Health patients, for people with disabilities, you name it. But if we want to tackle the physical infrastructure that deters people from cycling that's capital funding and that surely needs to come primarily from the Department of Transport. And then there is this other... There's a regulatory element which also needs to come primarily from the Department of Transport but also from Europe around lorry safety. And then finally there is the crossover into the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice around the adequate resourcing of the police and justice system and getting the sentencing framework right. So it's not just about the Department of Transport, I would absolutely agree with that, but there is an important role for cross-departmental collaboration within government and also at the local level.

[00:23:29]

Stephen Glaister:

Jason Torrance.

Jason Torrance:

Can I just bring your points together, which I think largely are well made. Who should make the final decision if various government departments are collaborating, as of course they should do? Who makes the decision, who has the authority and in fact what binds them together? The example, Kevin, that you raised of the Moving More Living More document, very good but it just has ideas for action in it, so are you proposing a cross-departmental strategy or that the Prime Minister or someone should have the final say? What's the actual practical mechanism that binds this collaboration together?

Neil Grieg:

I think in my experience it has to be a government strategy document. The Scottish government have a Road Safety Strategy document which covers everything but in reality it doesn't bring out, as I say, the real players to actually make it work, so it does fall onto Transport but it does include police, it does include courts, it does include NHS and all the others. So I would say that you do need some kind of overall government policy which is cross-departmental and everyone should be heeding to and everyone should be involved in putting it together as well. But how you then get people to buy into that afterwards is quite difficult without some sort of senior level leadership. I mean, some of the examples we've quoted in our response, you know, France and things like that, you're talking about countries with really bad road safety. You know, the French were killing so many people, they had no penalty points system, they had no drink/driving enforcement, they really were... they had to do something so it had to be at presidential level. And then as things have improved you can see what happens when you have too much power because the last President was bringing in fairly severe legislation such as everyone must carry a self-

test kit no matter what and now we've got a new President who says you can carry it but if you don't carry it you've committed an offence but you won't get a fine, and it gets a big complicated. So that's top level getting involved in detail too much but it was a push from the highest level to really say, "This is a huge issue, we must do something about it" that got them going down that path in the first place.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Grieg, in the Scottish system what is it that allows you and everybody else to describe it as a '*government* safety document' as distinct from a Department of Transport safety document? Is there any... I thought (overspeaking) –

Neil Grieg: It is billed as the 'Scottish Government's Road Safety Strategy', as far as (overspeaking).

Stephen Glaister: But how did it get... I mean, is it endorsed somehow by the whole Scottish government?

[00:26:24]

Neil Grieg: It is, yes, it is endorsed.

Stephen Glaister: Is there some process by which it's formally endorsed?

Neil Grieg: Well it was endorsed, lodged and then passed back to Transport is what happened but...

Stephen Glaister: But it is real -

Neil Grieg: It is real, yes.

Stephen Glaister: - I mean, it isn't just a Transport document?

Neil Grieg: Yes, and it does contain targets and it does contain long-term, short-term, immediate-term and it is broken down. But again you could argue it's over-complicated because it has over 96 different things in it which are tasks for different people and people lose track of where that's going.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Carey-Clinch.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yeah, I've been sitting here thinking about this issue because the experience we have of government strategies across departments, etc., have not necessarily always been great ones and I was thinking really about a number of things; you had the government Safety Strategy in the last administration, 1998/99, that was supposed to bring several departments together, at the lower level you had the government Motorcycle Strategy of 2005 which was meant to bring several departments together. All these things are launched with a great amount of good feeling and sentiment and sign-up but the reality is departments rarely talk to each other, departments' officials tend to change with alarming rapidity at times, for instance it looks like we're about to see another set of road safety officials at DFT, some areas of divisions disappear entirely within departments, so you lose those original aims of joined-up thinking. That's part of the reason why I think that steering my comment that getting proper sign-up from ministers, Secretary of State level for structures which are supported by government, not necessarily managed by government, may be a way to go, although in itself that allows government the opportunity to divorce itself from what those bodies say. So really this is a question without an easy answer.

Stephen Glaister: Yeah, sure. Anybody want to pick that one up? Jason, you wanted to talk about –

Jason Torrance: (Inaudible 00:28:15), no.

Stephen Glaister: Oh sorry. Ben, you wanted to talk about –

Ben Johnson: So, I mean, in this kind of... I'm interested in this line you've put forward, Roger, on risk and, you know, targets and how targets have to be measuring the right thing and this perception there is that the tension existing between growing and making safer and when you have inconsistent targets – I suppose that's a kind of reasonable observation to make – I'm suppose I'm just wondering how you reconcile those two objectives that you're suggesting might be in tension and, you know, if one were to be growing cycling or indeed, you know, walking or motorcycling faster than you were improving the risk of those modes that would result in more people being killed or seriously injured or slightly injured, more collisions happening on the roads, and whether you think that would be success.

Roger Geffen: Well I would say that both historic evidence over time in this country, in The Netherlands and comparisons between places within Britain and between countries all shows that there is this very consistent relationship that as cycle use increases, and indeed pedestrian activity increases, you can expect pedestrian and cycle safety to improve with increasing numbers. Now, that's not something that one should take for granted because, as I say, because there is this probably a two-way causal relationships you have to work at both sides of the causal relationship. You need to create the conditions where more people will be happy to cycle and more parents will be confident to allow their children to cycle by creating the conditions where it looks safe, feels safe, but at the same time you shouldn't be deterred from encouraging cycle use because by... Those fears shouldn't deter you from encouraging cycle use. They can and should go hand in hand, all the evidence suggests they can and should, so we've got to have a strategy that aims for both and we ought to have the confidence that all the evidence says that they can and should go hand in hand, let's aim for them both and make sure that the targets encourage us to do both and not to trade them off against one another, which is what road safety officials have historically tended to do. Anyone who was growing up in the '60s and '70s, they experienced all those road safety awareness campaigns which were all about telling children that roads are terribly, terribly dangerous, you should keep away from them, and that has been very damaging to our culture. The Dutch and the Danes, they just don't have that sense that, you know, the roads are dangerous places, keep the children away, they've designed their streets so that they feel like places where you would expect children to be playing, and children do play in the streets in a way that we've forgotten in this country, that's partly about the design and it's partly about culture.

[00:31:10]

Stephen Glaister: Richard Allsop and then Jeanne Breen.

Richard Allsop: I could go a little further in that direction. I mean, I'm I think in some ways in a minority in the road safety community, I mean, my personal strapline, which goes beyond road safety, is 'safety is for living, living is more than just keeping safe', and therefore we should all recognise that in society people will not always make the lowest risk choices, the other advantages may be sufficient for them personally to compensate for risk. But nevertheless, I wonder what you think of the general principle in relation to choice that society should be seeking to inform all of us who are faced with so many choices but especially in areas where there are differentials in risk that we should be aware, along with the other advantages and disadvantages of choice concerned, of the actual risks, sources or risks, reasons why our perceptions might be different from that, and in particular also be informed of everything that we might consider doing as a free choice but might consider doing to reduce the risk to ourselves and not necessarily a free choice where it comes to reducing risk that we impose on other people – there is a difference. I don't know how that strikes - I think it affects at least three of you - in terms of our broad approach in society to this issue of choice and risk.

Roger Geffen: Well I'll pick up particularly that last point because I think where you were saying that it unites three of us as representatives of three vulnerable road user groups, certainly pedestrians and cyclists impose far less risk on other road users than other road users impose on pedestrians and cyclists – that is very clear. And therefore in terms of

awareness campaigns it is important to not do what Craig was alluding to, to view walking and cycling, pedestrians and cyclists as the problem, but to promote a culture of responsibility about how we all use the roads, and I know we've got to acknowledge that not all cyclists use the roads responsibly, that is an area where good cycling has a role to play, but the type of road users that impose the greatest burden of danger need to have the greatest responsibility and that goes right through to lorry drivers obviously at the extreme end. Now, I should have said not just lorry drivers but the whole freight sector because it's not just about the drivers, it's about the way the lorries are designed, it's about the way the fleets are managed and the way that companies impose just on time delivery on lorry drivers. So it's about a whole culture of how we manage that imbalance of risk across different organisations. But the other side to this is, in seeking to raise awareness among cyclists, particularly child cyclists, you know, parents passing on road safety education to children, we need to not overstate the risks of cycling. Because of that point that I raised earlier that the health benefits are far greater than the risks we've got to be encouraging it as a safe and normal activity whilst at the same time working really hard to create the physical conditions and the regulatory conditions where that is increasingly true over time.

[00:35:09]

Richard Allsop: And developing the responsibility of the cyclists and their parents where they're young to be –

Roger Geffen: Absolutely, that's where road safety –

Richard Allsop: - protecting not only others but also to be protecting themselves where it's open to them to do so. (Overspeaking) –

Roger Geffen: Yes, that's... I would agree but it's also really important that they are aware of their responsibility to pedestrians in particular and to the most vulnerable pedestrians in particular.

(Overspeaking.)

Kevin Golding-Williams Yeah, I think it's quite an interesting point because not everyone is a pedestrian, not everyone's a cyclist, in fact cyclists are drivers and drivers are pedestrians and, strangely enough, we all probably do one of those at some point in the day, perhaps we do all of them at some point in the day. Actually just taking it down to a very simple practical level the journey to school is quite a nice example of this. We did some polling, we released a report a few weeks ago aimed at the Prime Minister to get a grip of the various departments that I've already alluded to, and one of the things that we got back were that 34% of parents of kids at primary school felt that the area around the school was fairly or very unsafe, and it was a perception. Now, when we start to break this down as to why this is the case you start looking at issues such as pavement parking, parking on zigzag lines (inaudible 00:36:23), so how do we then move forward, how do we improve it, and we are all these different people. So parents who are drivers were commenting that it's awful that other parents are driving their children to school and chucking them out of the door literally as they get to the school gate; without any sense of irony that in fact they were doing it themselves. Now, one of the things that we've been doing through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund is running a Walk to School programme for the last two years and that's increased the number of walking journeys by about 26%. It's also brought in capital investment match funded by local authorities to bring in things such as crossings and using things such as school route audits for parents, children and teachers to identify how they can make the journey to school safer, and of course they're wearing multiple hats, they're wearing those hats as pedestrians, as cyclists and also as motorists to what will make that journey to school easier in terms of walking, and I suppose it links finally back to Jason's point around sort of central government and the whole issue of funding. The Local Sustainable Transport Fund has been integral for the whole area of active travel over the last two or three years, moving forwards that fund will end in the next

couple of years and I think we need to be looking at some new fund around an active travel fund mechanism but looking at where other potential pots of funding exist, and I think one of those areas is a single growth fund and looking at local economic partnerships. What we know from our research last year and the Pedestrian Pound good quality public realm can increase footfall by 40%. There's a very clear economic case here for investment in good quality public realm; by improving the public realm we can increase the walking and cycling rates but we can also address those perceived and actual risks such as crossings, bringing in 20 mile an hour limits and also improving street design, which not only improve safety but also improve economic activity as well for the high street. So it is very much interlinked.

Stephen Glaister: Breen.

Jeanne Breen: Well I've got two questions picking up on what has just been said, and following on firstly from Richard's question, a question for all the transport users organisations, to understand what steps you take within your own organisation to increase awareness about the risks as well as the benefits of your particular mode of road travel. So that's the first question, and what you're actually doing and whether or not you're doing both things. And then, secondly, on a slightly different point but related to what you were just saying, Roger, do you think that other countries - and there's the talk of The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and certain other Nordic countries come into this - but do you think that other countries are more proactive in their network safety management and road safety engineering than we have been say over the last ten years, and do you think a safe system approach would help to give that approach a real shove?

[00:39:55]

Roger Geffen: Shall I kick off? Well on the first question CTC played a key role in effectively reinventing cycle training about 12 or 14 years ago. The previous Cycle Proficiency Scheme had pretty much fallen apart and was very much... you know, in so far as it was staggering on it was very much in the spirit of telling the children to be very, very afraid of the roads, you know, "We'll teach you to wobble round bollards in a playground but don't think of going near the roads," it was really very counterproductive to actually promoting more as well as safer cycling. So we kind of got a grip on that and persuaded the government and Cycling England to recast the Cycle Training Agenda so it's now called Bikeability. It has three levels to it where sort of learning to not fall off is Level 1 and basic control skills are Level 1, handling sort of minor roads, the sort of things that you'll do through into your early teens is Level 2, and then the confidence to handle the major junctions is Level 3. And it's there for adults wishing to rediscover cycling as well as for younger children so it's really important that we make that Level 2 training available to make sure that... and Level 3 training in secondary schools to give people that confidence. And the point there is that it's actually... if young people are viewing this whole process of cycle training as a rite of passage and therefore cycle trainers are somebody they look up to because by doing your Bikeability cycle training you're going to get greater freedom in your life. So if a cycle trainer says to you, "Do think about your responsibility to older pedestrians," you're much more likely to listen to that cycle trainer than, you know, some lecturing advertising campaign from government, to be honest; they are very good messengers for this sort of thing. And, you know, we've done a lot of work to kind of promote that side of things through the Cycle Training Agenda but on the other side of things we are very keen to see this joining-up in terms of driver understanding of what does it take to do cycle safety. A lot of work with the AA, conversations with the IM, with the RAC. Particularly the AA have been really good at saying that we've got to break down this idea that there are two drivers(?). As Kevin said, most cyclists also drive, quite a lot of drivers also cycle - and the more the better for improving the safety in numbers effect - and therefore the thing we need to be doing is promote driver awareness of what it is good driver behaviour. Likewise, we're not lecturing drivers about how to not be dreadful, we need to promote good positive messages to all road users groups about what it is to be a responsible road user, whatever kind of road user you are, but that does need to then be backed up by the legal system coming down like tonne of bricks on those who don't adhere to those

messages. And in terms of organisational joining-up, the more we've got road safety officials in local authorities promoting those awareness campaigns at the same time as the police are doing corresponding enforcement action around the negative that you're trying to prevent, those... You know, that's how drink/driving was tackled, by good awareness campaigns, legitimising enforcement activity, the enforcement activity strengthening the message to those who wouldn't otherwise heed it; joining those two things up by getting road safety awareness and enforcement joined up.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Any of the others want to comment on the first question which is what you do? Yes, Mr Carey-Clinch.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yeah, the approach we've taken has been several-fold, firstly to educate riders themselves, to talk to manufactures about the way in which they promote the product, and thirdly to look at how riders are trained and educated and then how government looks at things. The MCI now is coordinating much of what goes on with the police-led Bike Safe initiative, runs a call centre for that has a very close liaison with ACPO on those particular issues. We work quite closely with the DFT on the formulation of motorcycle aspects of the Think campaign which is aimed at various road users but there is a specific motorcycle aimed end of that. Enforcement, picking up on Roger's point really about the need to actually accept that there are some of your users, you're never going to get to them with traditional road safety messaging, you've just to go out and get them off the streets; there is a role definitely for enforcement in that. And then also looking at things like improving the level of training, getting trainer accreditation for motorcycle trainers into place, working with DVSA on that, and finally looking at what government is doing in terms of policy to encourage safer motorcycling and to raise awareness amongst other road users of the vulnerabilities of motorcycle users and (overspeaking) other two users as well, so...

[00:44:45]

Stephen Glaister: Mr Grieg.

Neil Grieg: Yeah, a couple of things. We've always kind of assumed that what we do is a good thing and, you know, the IM's been around for over 50 years and it was based on police principles and so on, but what we're actually doing now is we're actually putting that into quality standards so the Driving Examiner is now called the Director of Quality Standards, and we are trying to ensure that the IM training that we deliver in Land's End is the same as the IM training you'll get in John O'Groats because in the past it was down to individuals in the way it was done. So there's a big push within ourselves to improve the quality of what we do, track it. We have a relationship with the Institute of Motor Industry, IMI, you can get a qualification now in being an advanced driver trainer. The other thing I wanted to highlight we're doing is that on our commercial side we are implementing ourselves in-house ISO 39001 which is the Road Safety Management standard for the world, and I think there's a big opportunity here because we now have an off-the-shelf product which we can give to government departments, big companies, and say, "Look, if you want to have a good road safety policy for your drivers, both company car drivers and private individuals driving for business..." which is, as we know, a third of all deaths is a figure that gets bandied about, "... ISO 39001, having an occupational road risk policy is a simple thing". And we think that should be linked with things like public procurement, you know, the government should not be giving huge contracts to people who don't even check the driving licence of the people who are going to be implementing those contracts. So we do think that - these things exist now, ISO 39001 - it needs a big push. The big push before in commercial training was corporate manslaughter, that hasn't really happened, we haven't really had any cases of corporate manslaughter brought to the courts, it was always a fear thing; you went to fleets and said, "Train your drivers or one day they'll kill someone and the directors will be up for corporate manslaughter". It's never happened and it hasn't really pushed people to get the training done. So there may be some issues around the law we could talk about there but certainly in terms of new

things ISO 39001 is something we'd like to see pushed by government as well as organisations such as ourselves.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Golding-Williams, did you want to comment on this issue?

Kevin Golding-Williams: Yeah, it's just a sort of suggestion really sort of around sort of the other countries aspect. Obviously there are many of the usual suspects, the Dutch and the Danish and the like, but actually I think there are some lessons to be learned just over the border with our friends in Wales and the work that they've been doing through the Active Travel Act. It's still early days, I've been very involved in the development and in particular for pushing that they include reference in the legislation to promote Active Travel, which wasn't included in the first drafts of the Bill, but actually requiring that any new infrastructure does consider walking and cycling but also that there is a requirement to promote that as well by local authorities. And within that what you're starting to see now, both in terms of the recent Public Health white paper in Wales and also the emerging(?) road safety work, is that there is an increased consideration of actually how you can bring in road safety aspirations whilst improving the infrastructure of the network in Wales for all road users, both motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, and also how you can get increased levels walking and cycling in order to free the roadways up as well.

[00:48:07]

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Mr Kelly, you wanted to (inaudible 00:48:09).

Roger Geffen: Sorry, can I just come in on just one extra point following on from the Wales (overspeaking)?

Stephen Glaister: Very briefly, please, because we are (overspeaking) time.

Roger Geffen: I'm watching the time. I absolutely agree with Kevin about the role of the Active Travel Wales Act. The thing that's missing here in terms of leadership is consistent design standards. We've now got several organisations, Transport for London, the Welsh Assembly, Transport for Greater Manchester, the Highways Agency, are all producing different design standards for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, and a number of local authorities will doubtless start doing this for lack of clear standards from national government. This is one area where localism has not benefit whatsoever, it is not in anybody's interests or in the interests of drivers or of cyclists for cycle design to be done differently in one borough from the adjoining borough. The Dutch have very (overspeaking) –

Stephen Glaister: Before you go on, you're taking us away from where we were.

Roger Geffen: I thought it was -

Stephen Glaister: Mr Kelly, did you want to –

Roger Geffen: I thought it was related to Jeanne's question. Sorry, (overspeaking) –

Stephen Glaister: Let's come back to that, I do want to come back to this (inaudible 00:49:09) because it's an issue but, Mr Kelly, you had a question.

Professor Mike Kelly: Yeah. So far I haven't heard any evidence presented from any of you about behaviour change, yet almost everything you've talked about has been about behaviour change, whether it's a politician's, whether it's an organisation's, whether it's an institution's, and if I were going to be critical of what I've heard I would say this, that the notion that we can bring about change using the familiar techniques of promoting messages, education, information and all that kind of thing I would have to say to you that's a thoroughly discredited position in terms of the psychology of behaviour change. There are much broader issues at stake which are reviewed by NICE, for example, which inform some of

the things that the Welsh have taken onboard in the way that they've used NICE guidance hitherto. So I wonder if you could just explain to us what you see as the relationship between things like...you've mentioned standards, we've heard about infrastructure and design, how you see those things impacting on behaviour and behaviour change, rather than this rather 1950s version of how you bring about behaviour change which is by telling people information and then processing that information and doing the right thing. You produce about 1% of behaviour change doing that kind of thing.

Roger Geffen:

It depends what behaviour change you're seeking. I think that there is some evidence that... I mean, Neil may disagree with what I'm about to say here, that in terms of driver awareness and training the one thing that does work is hazard perception. Skills control is not known to relate to improved driver safety but hazard perception is, as I understand the evidence base on this. We're still very early days in understanding the safety impact of cycle training. I've been badgering the Department of Transport to gather the research on this because there are plenty of databases of people who received cycle training eight, ten years ago, cycle training organisations have those databases, it would now be possible to find out whether people who've done cycle training are safer cyclists but also potentially whether they then become safer drivers, whether what they learn through cycle training means they're better able to learn to drive and they have safer attitudes because of their experience from being, as it were, on the other side of the windscreen. That needs researching. But I do absolutely agree that we shouldn't be pinning everything on education, even with my point about backing up awareness with enforcement, I think that is an important point that the two can synergise, but they do also have to go hand in hand with the built-in environment. If the regulatory environment tells you to do one thing and the road is just designed... just doesn't fit; you know, if the signs say 20 mph but the road environment doesn't look like a 20 mph speed limit people aren't going to stick to 20 mph. If you design it so that it feels like the sort of space where children are going to be playing drivers will understand why those rules are there.

[00:52:17]

Stephen Glaister:

Any others on Mr Kelly's point? Yes, Mr Carey-Clinch.

Craig Carey-Clinch:

Yeah, again, as Roger said, I think it depends on what you mean by 'behaviour change'. There are a couple of ways of looking at it; you can either lead by example, in other words see lots of people die and think, "I don't want to," educate them or ban things, and, to be honest, I don't really want to live in a world where lots of things are banned. However, a lot of things can happen in terms of circumstance and education and example which do tend to lead towards behaviour change, and I would cite evidence in that as to the shape of the motorcycle market and its changes since the year 2000 to what it is now. Back in the year 2000 nearly 48% of the market was super sports bikes and, as we know, there was an awful lot of coverage and publicity of the born again biker problems and the number of people who were getting killed or seriously injured on motorcycle. Now super sport bikes are around 15% of the market and there's a lot more work being done amongst those riders to improve their skills through track day events, road training and safety education, but things that sat outside of that were the economic situation and the change in the image of what is cool in biking should be with the advent of the whole round the world motorcycle paradigm, the crash leading to a lot more commuter motorcycling, the economic crash, that is. It changed the whole shape of the market and that in itself has actually had an impact in a positive way on risk and safety. So it is possibly to generate a behaviour change through changes of imagery through subtle and soft approaches rather than just providing prescriptive ways to try and force that change.

Stephen Glaister:

Mr Grieg.

Neil Grieg:

The problem we have is there's no incentive to improve your driving; once you've passed your test there's no real financial incentive. The only financial incentive out there seems to be insurance premiums and that doesn't really work because we've got a very competitive insurance market in the UK and people can usually better a premium

anywhere by shopping around, the way they discount the first year to attract people in. So I don't, unfortunately, have a magic answer but we do feel that incentives do work. If you look back over various things that have happened in transport, things like (inaudible 00:54:19) petrol, even the growth of UNCAP(Euro NCAP?) safety car meetings, that kind of thing, incentives have been there, people have gone out and chosen things that they've got cheaper. Unless you have some incentives to improve your driving, to take it more seriously, I don't think you're ever going to change people's behaviour, the vast majority will continue to think they're fantastic drivers.

Stephen Glaister: Yeah. Mr Grieg, we heard from Roger Geffen just now about the importance of design and I know you've got some background in this and it strikes me, from what I know of the Road Safety Foundation's work and others, that there's... What you've been saying is fine but there's a whole other subject which is designing the roadside network better to be forgiving when people do make mistakes. Is that not the case?

Neil Grieg: I think you have to, unfortunately, be kind of data led here and the data says that drivers are not very good. (Laughs) They do go into corners too fast, it varies with age and so on, and –

[00:55:21]

Stephen Glaister: Airline pilots make mistakes too.

Neil Grieg: They will have crashes, they will have crashes, and if they're going to have crashes and you know how to mitigate those crashes...and then that's where we buy into the safe system completely, that you should do that. And I think we thought we felt we'd got that message over a few years ago but I think with the spending cuts and so on it's kind of taken a bit of a backseat. I know the Highways Agency are doing a lot of work on roadside protection and that kind of thing but it doesn't seem to get the publicity it probably merits because it's working away in the background there. And what seems to be get publicity all the time is the car, the car technology, and now we've got autonomous emergency braking being touted as the next big thing and that... We'll go back to the responsibility thing, drivers think they're making a safe responsible choice based on the car, they don't think of what's happening to the people around them, because of those choices, because all they hear is 'safety, safety, safety' about the technology.

Stephen Glaister: You know, as I drive around I see situations, just in terms of trees or telegraph poles, but I think if I were a factory inspector under the Factories Act I'd stop the road and we just would not be allowed. But we don't do that on roads and I...Am I wrong about that?

Neil Grieg: I think it would be very difficult to protect every single tree (laughs) -

Stephen Glaister: No, I understand that.

Neil Grieg: -but I think you can do a lot more, particularly on... Well, the problem is we have so few crashes now that we don't have black spots like we used to have, we have spread along long distances, long roads, it's quite difficult to predict where these things can happen, but certainly I think...and we always felt when I used to work for the AA and work for EuroRAP that if you could link in safety performance star rating into funding you might actually get some real progress there.

Stephen Glaister: I agree with you. Who should be responsible for doing that and making sure that happens? At the moment it's being done by charities basically, isn't it?

Neil Grieg: It is and it should be part of the mainstream assessment of roads, you know, by the Department of Transport. The Highways Agency do do it but they don't seem to build it in, it never gets a really top priority within how they allocate their funding, because funding is allocated for economic reasons and other reasons as well.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Carey-Clinch, I'm sorry, you wanted to come in.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Not too much to add really, and on the safety system approach I think we'd certainly sign up to that. The important thing about safe systems approaches is they need to be recognisant of all different vehicle types and I've seen several different schemes in countries around Europe, particularly in the Nordic countries actually, where Vision Zero is very much a priority, but when you see wire rope safety barriers down the middle of single carriageway roads they're absolutely lethal when it comes to single track vehicles. But, conversely, under the same thinking you're seeing some good work done on crash barrier designs with regards to mitigating motorcycle injuries. So, you know, looking around Europe it's a case of looking at best practices, making sure that they apply across different vehicle types and incorporating those. The EuroRAP programme, as you mentioned, I think, is extremely important in terms of making us aware as in industry where we need to target our efforts on sort of hot spots for motorcycle crashes but also helps to highlight where road needs improving.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Now, I'll bring in Jason Torrance in a second but we're coming close to our end of time and there are two issues I do want to make sure get covered. One is, Nicola, the issue about burden of proof which appears in your evidence. Not now, not now, in a moment. And the other is the issue about learning from instance that's mentioned in I think CTC evidence about coroners' reports and learning more from what happens. But first of all Jason.

[00:58:56]

Jason Torrance: I just wanted to tie the two elements of the discussion that we've been having over the last 15, 20 minutes or so together, around infrastructure and around behaviour change, and ask you what opportunities do you think there are in the current Infrastructure Bill and the investment in new infrastructure and what threats, conversely, you think there is in the reduction and in some cases absence of revenue funding for behaviour change programmes and information (inaudible 00:59:39).

Roger Geffen: Okay, I will be brief because I'm conscious of time. We, CTC, as (Inaudible 00:59:49) and other cycling organisations, have got wholly behind the Get Britain Cycling report with its parliamentary inquiry from the All Parties Parliamentary Cycling Group with its recommendation for funding for cycling of at least £10 per head rising to £20 over time, even that would still take us short of Dutch levels of cycle spend. That is basically reallocation of transport funding in order to maximise the value of a transport mode that has huge benefits, as I touched on at the start. Now, some of that can be the sort of thing the Highways Agency is already doing. The Highways Agency is already starting to do this, to allocate some of its funding towards what is known as 'cycle-proofing' all its new work. The government is encouraging local authorities to do likewise. That is all very useful and Kevin has touched on the value of the local growth fund, you know, allocating some of that for these transport modes that have these huge economic, health and other benefits. What we then need to do to, to come to your point about revenue and capital and how the link, is particularly to target behaviour change programmes at areas where new or improved cycle provision has gone in. This is a lesson from Transport for London; the Cycle Superhighways, I think much of infrastructure – not all of it – much of it is not terribly super but actually those programmes have worked because they've been linked to awareness campaigns to promote cycling. So that's where I think the linkage needs to come in. And if I may make one last point, which is we really need some of the infrastructure spending to be targeted at junctions and at crossings of the major roads, those are the major deterrents to cycle use, they may not be the accident black spots because people tend to avoid them, so if we really want to get people cycling target the major roads and crossings.

Stephen Glaister: Any others?

Kevin Golding-Williams: Yes. So, I've already made the points around the single growth fund, I don't think there's any harm in looking at framework legislation, an active Travel Bill for England, looking at what's happened in Wales. Could contain provisions around 20 miles an hour, tackling the chaos around Traffic Regulation Orders regarding pavement parking and a whole host of other issues that are being picked up here. I think that framework Bill could be quite an interesting approach for that. In terms of the revenue funding, the LSTF has already been mentioned, that we we think there is an argument around some form of active travel fund looking towards the next parliament, and really the real reason for that is the hyper(?) local context which is engaging communities, and it's picking up Mike's comment earlier around behaviour change. In the initial stages during the debates in the Senedd in Wales people were seriously proposing that you were going to get behaviour change by giving out maps at railway stations – put in a new path, put in a new cycleway, give it up now, people walk. Crazy, absolutely crazy. It's only actually by providing that revenue funding for things like Bikeability, for things such as Walk to School, where you actually get people going in, you know, running assemblies - teachers don't have the time to run assemblies – actually going out on school route audits around the area, taking the governors, the children, the teachers, and it's really contingent on the revenue funding that those sorts of programmes continue.

[01:03:10]

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Any others who want to comment or shall we (overspeaking)?

Neil Grieg: Any investment in new roads brings with it the new designs that we've talked about and the new standards so it has to be welcomed and –

Stephen Glaister: Resurfacing also, some of that kind of maintenance work.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yeah, and I think for motorcycling which receives almost no investment outside of a bit from LSTF into Wheels to Work and some on the road safety and Think campaign, I mean, it's a case of infrastructure design, as I mentioned before, should be consistent across different modes, and a lot of what works for cycling also works for motorcycling but, conversely, when you're looking at visibility at junctions in particular we could do with something there. But more than anything else any bills that come through mustn't just talk about two or three different modes as a supported mode, transport should be looked at in a management based way, so in other words all modes have a legitimate place within the system and therefore should be catered for within particular bills or initiatives or funding.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Dr Christie.

Nicola Christie: In The Netherlands they have the law of proportionate liability so there is big vehicles crashing into vulnerable road users are assumed to be responsible in terms of civic reparations. Do you feel that's something that we should embrace and if so, do you think there would be a cultural change in terms of how motorists view vulnerable road users like cyclists and pedestrians?

Craig Carey-Clinch: In short, no. Bad road users are bad road users, be they vulnerable or otherwise, people should take responsibility for how they use the roads, end of story.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Carey-Clinch, that's clear(?).

Roger Geffen: If I may (inaudible 01:04:42).

Stephen Glaister: Quickly. Briefly, please.

Roger Geffen: Yeah, very quickly. I think it would create a change but it's very difficult to prove it because most of the countries... I mean, those rules aren't just in Holland, in fact it's pretty much every continental European country apart from Great Britain, Ireland, Cyprus

and Malta who have those rules and most of them introduced them in the '20s and '30s and therefore the data isn't there to do the kind of comparing before and after that would settle this question one way or another, therefore we are working on hunches. The one thing that it would do, which would make a huge difference, would be when pedestrians and cyclists are very seriously injured or bereaved at least the whole kind of victim blaming that goes on in the courts and then having to fight to defend yourself against an insurance company that's trying to pin the blame on you or the loved one who you've lost... the angst and the cost of doing the civil law in the way we do it is horrendous and we really do need to change it for those reasons if not for...even if...regardless of whether or not it produces behaviour change.

Stephen Glaister: (Overspeaking) –

Neil Grieg: (Overspeaking) see it as a bit of a diversion at the moment when we should really be concentrating on the infrastructure. I think we've no problem, if you go to Holland it's so clear and a bit that's been several people, if the infrastructure says 'Pedestrians and cyclists have priority here' then we have no problem with changing the law. At the moment it doesn't.

[01:06:07]

Stephen Glaister: Mr Allsop, I think you wanted a supplementary on that.

Richard Allsop: A somewhat related point, if I may, and this is an opportunity for a very quick answer, but new rates(?)... the interesting...very briefly, little use has been made of the corporate manslaughter in this connection and I think that connects with some concerns that the CTC has about sentencing and particularly the use of the careless and dangerous offences. Very quickly, I mean, we've been grappling with careless reckless and dangerous since just after the Second World War and in particular I gave three years of a lot of work to it with Peter North in the 1980s. Many of our recommendations were very effective but our recommendations on careless and dangerous and zilch effect, the courts have continued to behave, and prosecutors, just as before, and have you, briefly, a new angle that we could recommend people to follow on this which is different from anything that's been thought of in the 60 years since the Second World War?

Neil Grieg: We do feel that the range of offences available now are probably pretty much there, there's an offence for everything. I think there's a big push for stronger and stronger sentencing without any real proof that that works but I think there is definitely, there's a dichotomy between the perception of justice being seen to be done and what the courts actually hand down, and even I am amazed sometimes by the light sentences given to people who've been doing 149 miles an hour or whatever. And there is a review coming but I think for us the range of offences are there, it just seems that when they get to court they're not actually being used consistently.

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yes, I'd agree. Consistency is the key aspect.

Stephen Glaister: Agreement from Mr Carey-Clinch. Any others?

Roger Geffen: Can I?

Stephen Glaister: Very quickly.

Roger Geffen: It's one of those things that's very difficult to do a brief answer. I will let my evidence stand –

Stephen Glaister: Just before you go on, if you want to elaborate, write to us, send us a note about this and it would be very, very helpful if you could, because I notice –

Roger Geffen: Yes, I'm conscious that the government has recently announced a whole review of both the offences and sentencing which we weren't anticipating at the time when we produced these booklets. These are proposals for reform within the current statutory framework but if you actually think about a different statutory framework then I'll need to send three other options which I think would be worth considering and I will send those in writing.

Stephen Glaister: That would be very helpful.

Male Speaker: Please do.

Roger Geffen: Yes. Thank you.

Stephen Glaister: Look, we are out of time and we must move on to the next witnesses so I just wanted to log – not for comment now – but my personal interest and maybe my colleagues' in the proposition – I think it was in the CTC evidence – that we're not learning as much as we should from the processes like the coroners' courts and police investigations in situations where the police make a judgement that the victim has actually killed him or herself and so there isn't much to investigate. The whole area of how we are much more systematic about learning what we should about what actually happened, where there may or may not have been a criminal act, I think that's something that if you have views about that that you wanted to send in and you haven't already done, it would very interesting to hear about that.

[01:09:32]

Craig Carey-Clinch: A whole wealth of data which we're simply not looking at in all that at the moment, sir, I strongly agree with the point.

Stephen Glaister: Data we haven't been looking at?

Craig Carey-Clinch: There's a whole wealth of data within that area we're simply not considering at the moment, so I strongly support the point.

Stephen Glaister: Where does that sit?

Craig Carey-Clinch: Well currently with the policy.

Stephen Glaister: That's nineteen

Craig Carey-Clinch: Yeah, that's nineteen (overspeaking).

Neil Grieg: But also with the NHS.

Craig Carey-Clinch: (Overspeaking) NHS as well.

Neil Grieg: I mean, road safety stats last year estimated £15 billion cost of accidents but in reality it's £34 billion because we're under-reporting. So, again, back to NHS. (Laughs)

Stephen Glaister: I suggest some independent body should be trying –

Craig Carey-Clinch: 'Authoritative' I think is the word you're looking for.

Stephen Glaister: Alright, 'a body' (laughs) with scientific authority.

Roger Geffen: It would be very useful to know how many local authorities, how much effort actually goes into fulfilling their duties under Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act to investigate and learn lessons from road traffic injuries. As far as we can tell from little evidence, they're doing very little on this.

- Stephen Glaister: A last comment from Dr Christie.
- Nicola Christie: No, just on that point, it's very interesting that Wales under the Public Health actually did a thematic review of fatal collisions as part of...you know, under the safeguarding (inaudible 01:10:43) car occupants aged 14 to 17, but that was done under the safeguarding. So extending that kind of thematic review of this very in-depth information about fatal cases I think would be useful.
- Stephen Glaister: Gentlemen, thank you very much, we must move on to our next witnesses. Thank you.

Panel 2

Witnesses: Jack Semple, Director of Policy, The Road Haulage Association
James Hookham, Managing Director- Research and Policy, Freight Transport Association

Panel 2: Starts

- Stephen Glaister: Good afternoon, thank you for coming. Would you like to make an introductory statement? I don't think we have written evidence from either of you.
- James Hookham: You certainly don't from the FTA, Chair, for which apologies but I'm happy to supply that. Yes, I'll kick off, if you like, Jack. And had we made a written submission, I think we would have... certainly based on the discussion you've had so far, be wanting to particularly talk about transport safety in the road mode. Clearly, the other systems, the other modes, have their own issues. I think that the particularly timely approach of this inquiry is to be looking at road safety in particular and I'm going to confine my comments to that even though the FTA represents users of all the modes. Our written evidence would undoubtedly have brought to your attention, as if it was needed, that most of the freight is moved in vehicles above a three and a half tonne weight threshold and therefore requires an operator's licence to be used on the roads. That comes with it, a commitment by the operator of that vehicle, a range of quite onerous undertakings which are enforced through executive agencies of the Department of Transport, particularly now the DVSA and more ominously through the Traffic Commissioners who have the powers to issue the licences in the first place and indeed the powers to take them away if those undertakings are not reached. I want to make a few comments, if I may, at some point about behaviour change, I was very interested in the questions you were asking and the comments you were making there, and in that context the fact that truck drivers are also similarly licensed, they are vocationally licensed, that's an entitlement to drive these vehicles which first has to be earned through a practical driving test and then from September this year through the possession of effectively a theory test, the Driver CPC as it's known, and indeed that can be removed as well by the Traffic Commissioners for infringements and poor driving behaviour. So the drivers and operators of commercial vehicles above this particular threshold are very heavily regulated and there are certainly well established, long-established institutional arrangements for monitoring and indeed challenging safety behaviour for commercial vehicle truck drivers and operators.

[01:14:47]

There's certainly been a huge change in the technical quality of the vehicles over the years, safety has been paramount in that; the improvement in the braking capability of heavy vehicles, the steering, the information available to the driver has moved on enormously, largely driven by technical legislation largely emanating from the European institutions and that was effectively brought to a close... the ultimate manifestation of that with the introduction of what is known as 'type approval' legislation whereby these various safety features of vehicles are incorporated into a formal European specification which all manufacturers and equippers of vehicles have to meet, and that's in the process of being cascaded down the weight ranges of vehicles during this year and into next year.

Behaviour change I believe lies at the root of some of the issues that we've been talking about. I suspect we are approaching the law of diminishing returns and what more can be done on technical improvements, and certainly building on some of the lessons I think are evident in the way that vocational drivers are managed and regulated might bear possibly lessons there to read across to the wider road user community.

The other area I would've liked to have highlighted – again, it's come up in your previous discussion – is the interface between road traffic legislation, which is long established in the Road Traffic Acts and associated legislation, and the scope of the Health and Safety at Work Act. And this is normally talked about in the context of driving at work which, by definition, all of my members, drivers and indeed Jack's are regulated in that way, so they are driving in the course of their work therefore they come under the scope of employer legislation and responsibilities, and indeed we might talk a little bit about perhaps why there hasn't been a successful prosecution yet under corporate manslaughter because I think that, again, featured in your earlier discussion.

On leadership, I think that there is an important role played by the Traffic Commissioners setting the standard and setting a tone, not altogether perhaps in the most effective and efficient way but nevertheless they certainly play a figurehead role in setting safety standards, and I've rarely met an operator or indeed a driver that welcomes a visit to a public inquiry to be held account to them so there's some lessons there. And I think your inquiry is particularly timely as as of yesterday the government is now embarking on its process of transitioning the Highways Agency into a government owned company. Its intent to give the regulation of the new company to the Office of Rail Regulation and there is certainly a big unanswered question and indeed an opportunity to address road safety targeting in an entirely new context. And, again, there will be some important read-across from the way in which Network Rail as owner of the rail infrastructure has been challenged and targeted in improvement and safety traditions and it will be interesting to see the way that that reads across into the new arrangements for what the future of the Highways Agency might look like.

[01:18:22]

I'm going to end on a positive note, and that is the last time I checked the statistics said that actually the UK had the best road safety record in Europe. That may have changed but I think by one or two measures that is still the case, so we can't be doing everything wrong. One of the things we should start with perhaps is working out what we are doing right and making sure we're building and maximising on that. And it does seem to me that very often in the discussions about road safety, and I don't mean this at all to be flippant, but we do sometimes struggle to define what exactly is the problem we are trying to solve, and if it is an absolute reduction in the number of killed and seriously injured, which is an entirely laudable goal, then we need to move on to actually identify what is the root causes of some of those, identifying what are the issues and acting on them. Part of the problem is that very often particular causes or issues arise from the result of a very, very small number of accidents and collisions and it's quite difficult often to distinguish the signal from the noise here, and certainly in trying to ask questions of ourselves as an industry – and this is an issue that the DFT's Road Safety Compliance Forum is addressing – just trying to sort out where are the most incidences of non-compliance, for example, so that government and industry collectively apply its efforts to raising awareness, education or indeed higher enforcement. It's actually proving quite difficult. So maybe one of the tasks the Transport Safety Commission might like to address itself is to actually identify what is it we do next, what is the next big issue that we need to solve, or is it we've got to the point where there are so many relatively small different issues that it's not immediately obvious where the next big safety gain is coming from?

So I hope that helps to substitute for the absence of written evidence, Chair, and I look forward to your questions.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. And I should've said before you started we are recording this and there will be a transcript.

James Hookham: Of course yes.

Stephen Glaister: That'll go onto the record. Mr Semple then.

Jack Semple: Yes, thank you, and, similarly, if you'd like written evidence we can provide that. I'm not sure there is anything I'd disagree with in what James has said so I'll not seek to repeat it, only to add that I think there are aspects of road safety where I think the politics gets in the way of the evidence base or there is plenty of politics but not much evidence. So I think we've concerns about the extent to which 20 mile an hour speed limits, for example, might come onto roads for which 30 miles an hour is perfectly safe and reasonable, and we're seeing an awful lot of heat in London with some really difficult problems. I think the key point really is, to pick up on what James has said and what I gather others have said, I think there's a lot more that could be done to identify the specific problems. We had this debate when there was a debate last year or the year before about should there be targets, "Let's identify much more closely what the problems are and then we can work out solutions". And specifically the roads authorities have huge amounts of information at the moment which they don't mine to learn lessons, the police also. The police are responsible for extensive closure of our roads and we never hear anything about what they learn from that. We have in London, specifically in terms of lorries, the HGV industrial taskforce which has taken a whole lot of lorries off the road, we're not being told why those lorries get off the road. There's far more information that we could get. We've been suggesting to the Highways Agency for some years now that they could, for example, for a period of three months look at the top six incidents each week on the network involving an HGV – shouldn't be too difficult – "Let's see if there are some lessons that we can learn. Where are the problems? What's causing the accidents? Are there lessons we can learn, and if we can learn lessons can we then structure some sort of solution?" And I think the same, obviously of particular concern in terms of HGVs, but I think the same is true of everything else to do with what happens on our roads.

[01:23:00]

Stephen Glaister: Just for clarity, you said authorities were holding lots of data, you mean the highway authorities?

Jack Semple: The roads authorities. If I say the Highways Agency people instantly say, quite rightly, "What about Transport Scotland, what about the local authorities?" The roads authorities and also I think – and the point has already been made this afternoon – the police have a role to play here because (inaudible 01:23:27) but there doesn't seem to be... Maybe this is a specific point I should make. There doesn't seem to be any funding for this, we're talking about in the greater scheme of things very small sums of money. So to take an example which is very close to our hearts at the moment which is the HGV Industrial Taskforce, they have DVSA enforcement officers and Met police officers out on the road every single day and yet they don't have any budget for analysing the results of what they do. Surely we're not talking about a huge sum of money? But I think that's a very specific small example but I think that can be extrapolated right across the network; trunk roads, local authority roads, we're not actually learning anything very much and developing specific policy points to address the issues that we identify.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Dr Christie and then Ben Johnson.

Nicola Christie: Yes, defining the problem... What role do businesses have in providing data in defining the problem and what leverage should HSE have in terms of leadership in that?

Stephen Glaister: Mr Semple?

Jack Semple: I think the largest business operating trucks in this country has about 2,000 heavy vehicles and there are something like 350,000 or 400,000 heavy vehicles on the road. The roads authorities and the police have the ability to look at the big picture in a way that no operator in the country has or ever will have. That said, I think it's incumbent, and I think to a degree there's a legal obligation, it's incumbent on individual companies to ensure that they are doing what they can do to have as few accidents as possible, and we are seeing - and we have evidence of this in terms of our Road Haulage Association members - that there is a continuing active drive to build on what is already a very strong safety culture, and I would emphasise the last point. But what I would say, approaches to road safety have to be holistic so, for example, for a haulage company the roads are their place of work, you know, retailers have shops, manufactures have factories, and so forth; for a haulage company basically the road is his place of work. But he doesn't have control over what's happening there, there are other road users over which he has no control. He doesn't control the infrastructure, he doesn't control the weather; he does what he can. So the road authority can sit above that and take the big picture view with the police.

Stephen Glaister: (Overspeaking).

James Hookham: One particular innovation just recently, the past few years, that has really addressed that has been the development of a risk scoring system by VOSA, now the DVSA, and this was a system based on the number of infringements, performance annual test for each vehicle, and indeed to compliance with drivers' hours legislation by each driver, and this is aggregated up, held centrally and reported to the Traffic Commissioners and is available to the operator. It's a numeric score normally reported as either being good, indifferent or bad - red, yellow or green. One of the challenges DVSA have had is that that score is often sought by customers of road hauliers as part of the bidding process, so actually using it as a proxy for "How safe are you? How good is your compliance?" So there's been a little bit of controversy because it's not quite what it was intended for and it doesn't always give the answers to that question in quite the way that it's intended, but nevertheless it's driving the right behaviour. So almost using a government led indicator to then try and start a discussion between the customer and the buyer is perhaps an example of the way in which this kind of behaviour is changing within businesses.

[01:27:38]

Stephen Glaister: Mr Semple coming back?

Jack Semple: Without disagreeing with James, VOSA or DVSA had to have a mechanism for trying to target its efforts and with strictly limited resources. That again is input-based. What the roads authorities and the police have the ability to do is look at the road safety outcomes and what's missing, for example, in terms of VOSA's useful system, is any correlation between the two, and what we're lacking at the moment is a sufficient analysis, I would suggest, on the road safety outcomes; what actually is causing what happens on the network?

Stephen Glaister: Mr Johnson.

Ben Johnson: I have some sympathy with that view across the whole collision problem but I think it's fair to say that within a heavy good vehicle cycle fatality space, which is obviously one that's very heavily publicised and London is very much aware of and it's right up there in people's minds as an issue, I think it's fair to say that for that particular category there is an over-representation of fatalities for that manoeuvre (inaudible 01:28:59) vehicles involved. And there's really quite a good understanding about what's causing those collisions and what the challenges to having a safe transport interaction between those two road users is, and there are a number of issues involved, not least cab design, not least driver training, not least cyclist behaviour, not least infrastructure, but we do understand I think quite well what those challenges are and it is the one area where there is a lot that we know and a lot we can do, and for I guess a lot of your membership is the

one area that they'd be looking to address. So I think across the piste of the challenge that we can't really drill down from the Stats19 data alone into what the problems are but I think with respect to your sectors would you not say that, in London at least, that we do understand what these challenges are in quite a lot of detail and have quite a lot of solutions to them?

Jack Semple: Do you want to take that?

Stephen Glaister: Mr Hookham, yeah?

James Hookham: No, I'd agree with you, that's a London issue specifically because of the high population of cyclists and the density of that traffic. I think you probably have a potential solution with sensors and the fitting of under-run(?) based on the evidence that you've gathered, I accept that, but the debate that the Mayor and Transport for London have entered into into the redesign of cabs is now starting to generate the kind of trade-offs now because cabs were designed the way they are for a reason, partly to give good visibility of the road, to helping manoeuvring and to give better sight of other road users that are on there. Now, admittedly, that comes with blindspots so it's important that in solving one problem we don't then go and create another one in other contexts, maybe on motorways or faster roads rather than in city streets. I mean, it seems to me that that was a particularly useful example of I think what Jack is saying, that the evidence available, albeit a relatively small number, was examined and a trend or a common cause was identified. I'd like to hear a little bit more about what the other 50% or 60% of causes were because lorry collisions are certainly not accounting for all of the fatalities, but I think that certainly a lot of effort's being made by a lot of companies that use London roads frequently to address that through the fitting of this kind of equipment. If I might just move onto say, though, I'm not entirely certain that that's actually going to solve the problem, I think the really big tough nut to crack is the behaviour and road user attitude I think we're in danger of believing there is an engineering solution to all of this when in fact the more challenging issue is, as has been discussed before, getting people to understand that it is dangerous out there, it is risky, it does need a very different approach and mindset towards taking driving a lot more responsibly and be much more aware of the potential consequences and therefore getting that recognised. That's certainly what's instilled in professional drivers through their vocational test and through their driver CPC, it comes across very much in larger companies, particularly responsibilities in managing their health and safety record, because they have that to manage as well, and a lot of that work is directed at getting the driver to understand the responsibilities that they take on in discharging that job.

[01:32:43]

Stephen Glaister: Mr Semple.

Jack Semple: I think we have had, what, the last two years nine fatalities in London in each year involving HGVs. It's not clear yet the extent to which litigation actions involving HGVs will solve that problem. Some of the very recent incidents have involved very quality conscious and visibly quality conscious large operators. I think we're talking about nationally just under 20% of incidents involving HGVs, not just in the two week period where there were six fatalities last November, three were with HGVs and three were with passengers vehicles, which have all the low heights and... There some interesting research published by a member of the London Assembly in April this year that in 2012 an accelerating trend up to that latest figure that buses were three times more likely to be involved in killed or in serious injury incidents in London than HGVs. So, yes, there's an issue with the HGVs' design, unquestionably, and both our organisations I'm sure we can say, and our members, have been working in the great majority of cases to optimise the safety and the driving culture of their vehicles but we have to take a holistic view of this, there has to be a holistic approach. The latest fatality this week was on a bit of infrastructure that had already been effectively, if can use this term, 'condemned' and was going to be upgraded and... But I think the broader point I was making, if I could, is that

we don't yet have the answers to that issue but if we put a fraction of the effort and resource into looking at the, what is it, 2,000 death on our roads a year that we have into seeing if we can reduce that nine figure. And, to pick up James's point, our members have said very specifically, "It doesn't matter what we do with our drivers or our vehicles, if there is not an improvement in the behaviour of cyclists we will not see the road safety outcomes that we're all looking for". And we have a member who was involved in the last of the three Bow Roundabout fatalities where everything was working, he had all the whatevers, and, as the coroner said, the cyclist went through a red... It's awful, it is absolutely awful, the cyclist went through a red light and basically (inaudible 01:35:50) on doing that sort of thing. I've been asked by the Board to look at the counselling of lorry drivers involved in these incidents because it's very clear that the consequence for the driver is very severe, and lorry drivers I believe generally, but specifically in London, particularly in London, are very well aware of that and nobody gets into a lorry, in London particularly, who is not mindful of the danger to cyclists and mindful throughout his driving day.

Stephen Glaister: Right. (Inaudible 01:35:36) -

James Hookham: Sorry, just because this is being recorded, can I put on record, though, that this is not us being defensive; this is certainly not us being indifferent to this. It's often interpreted that we are but I think it's really (overspeaking) we're having a constructive debate here about improving road safety, that we do identify the best use of the effort and the money available.

Jack Semple: Well said.

[01:36:57]

Stephen Glaister: Briefly, Mr Johnson, then we'll move on.

Ben Johnson: Yeah, and I think, speaking for TFL, we entirely recognise that enthusiasm to engage and desire to be part of the solution here, but also, just on that point about the fatality at Bow. I was at that coroner's hearing and one of the things that was brought up in that was the transgression of drivers' hours on a number of occasions prior to the incident happening which wasn't taken forward as a contributory factor to that collision. So I think there's a kind of wider question of compliance here which, you know, with the HGV taskforce, for example, the work that DVSA and the police are doing there, we've had of 2,000 stops 600 FPNs issued, and it may well be the case that digging down into what those are for so that we can really understand what solutions to pursue is something that more effort needs to be thrown at. But that doesn't...you know, one third-ish doesn't feel like a good level of compliance to me.

Jack Semple: Let's...If I could make one point...

Stephen Glaister: Quickly.

Jack Semple: The compliance - a point that has been made frequently by the Met police - was highly targeted and if TFL would like to put a little bit of budget into analysing the results that would be very, very welcome and could I make that request now of TFL to fund analysis of the results that you've found on that and let's have a discussion on that.

Ben Johnson: Let us pick that up, yeah.

Jack Semple: Thank you.

Stephen Glaister: Jason Torrance.

Jason Torrance: We've spent a fair bit of time talking about London and I just wanted to bridge to the rest of the country and just ask you what learnings do you think we have from London, how is

the rest of the country different, what's replicable, and I'm particularly looking at things like FORS and various taskforces, etc. But I just wanted to broaden out from particularly looking at London and particularly looking at cycle casualties to a broader canvas really, so...

Jack Semple:

I think the point I would make is that we don't have enough information on accidents. I mean, in terms of London a lot of our members operating in London would say it's a different world, it's a different world in terms of operating environment from the rest of the country, but I think the key point is we can learn lessons in terms of encounters not only with cyclists but with other vehicles. And in terms of safety generally, I think that's a lesson that applies to all road users, ours obviously as well. And the behaviour – and this is more a point elsewhere in the country than in London where congestion is so severe – but the behaviour of other road users influences lorry drivers. For example, a lorry driver is trained and asked and encouraged by his employer to drive defensively, to coast up to traffic lights and so on and so forth, if he's constantly cut up by other vehicles that's going to be an increasingly dangerous thing to do, apart from anything else, but he's going to be increasingly disinclined. So I think the driving culture as a whole influences the way people drive to a significant extent.

Stephen Glaister:

Mr Hookham?

James Hookham:

I think it's very good point, Jason, I think London for a number of years now has led and others have followed. I think that the most important development in this area has been the report to the Roads Taskforce that TFL published last year and I think that that (inaudible 01:41:06) over a longer term a trend that will eventually see a different breed of commercial vehicle in urban areas compared to ones that are used for general distribution. I think FORS is possibly the starts of a trend where the specifications and the fitting of vehicles starts to depart and you need at this point to bring into consideration, given you're only talking about the same vehicle, not just the safety aspects, the single biggest driver of change at the moment in this respect in London is air quality, and certainly that's been the biggest technical driver on the design of goods vehicles over the past 20 years. So not only have you got the safety factors, you've got the air quality factors. You clearly do not want to simply develop a policy which creates only necessarily smaller vehicles because you're just going to multiply the population of vehicles to deliver what it needs to deliver to the population of London. London will be 10 million people by 2030, The Evening Standard told me last week, I think it was, so this is only going to be a trend that grows, so I expect in trying to optimise and compromise on all of those issues - assuming that the population of London continues to want to be fed and watered and serviced – it's going to be a real challenge and probably best addressed separate to the other but equally pressing issues, for example, of carbon reduction and safety issues for longer distance journeys on the strategic road network and so on. And I think London in that respect sets a trend where the Roads Taskforce report was indicating a rebalancing of priorities between motorised and non-motorised traffic, and I think that came through very clear, and with that comes I think a quite important issue about then specifying the kinds of vehicles that then occupy that road space.

[01:42:58]

Male Speaker:

So is a regulator approach such as FORS, is that replicable in other cities, or in other parts of the country (overspeaking) desirable?

James Hookham:

Well it might be, provided it's the same standard. Because what you don't want to end up with is a specification for not just a goods vehicle, any vehicle in London, different from the one that's in Manchester or Oxford or anywhere because all of a sudden you completely reduce the productivity of the vehicle if it can only be used for one location, the cost of distribution with obviously escalate, you've got gross inefficiency, more pollution, more vehicles on the road. So it's not an easy solution.

Jack Semple: I wonder if I could pick up just the comment you're saying about FORS being regulatory. My understanding is FORS isn't regulatory and that's quite an important point. And FORS is not, in all but one or two details in the higher levels, is not concerned with the vehicle, it's concerned with the operator's processes of how he manages the business. The regulatory requirement there is the O licensing system and there is an interesting... a degree of overlap, if you like, between FORS and O licensing system; where FORS is going to be felt is in the... It's now been picked up particularly by the construction industry by customers of people who operate trucks, that's where it's being felt. So it's not a regulatory burden, it's a contractual burden, and we're going to see quite an interesting evolution now in that the taxpayer has been entirely or almost entirely funding the FORS process up until now and that may change. It may change even in London but certainly externally. So FORS is moving into the commercial uptake system. The Road Haulage Association has got a lot of experience in terms of auditing the compliance systems and procedures of companies, that's a very important part of what the RHA does, and increasingly so I have to say we do it to a greater depth than my understanding of FORS, and we also have (inaudible 01:45:39) businesses, as others do, to develop. But I think the interesting correlation is between FORS as a contractual requirement in terms of how the businesses run and the O licensing systems, and you see that with the way the RHA systems and procedures audit the space. So half of the audits we do, very roughly, are for companies that are just wanting a belt and braces check that they couldn't be doing things better and half of them are done on companies that have got into a spot of bother with the Traffic Commissioner, with the regulator, and the Traffic Commissioner has requested an audit of the company's systems and procedures. And so I think it's very important that FORS is not a regulatory measure.

Stephen Glaister: Thank you. We must move on. Jeanne Breen and then Nicola Christie.

[01:46:33]

Jeanne Breen: In some countries the freight transport and road haulage sectors have been very actively supporting and adopting the ISO 39001 standard, new road traffic safety management systems standard, directed at organisations of all shapes and sizes and noted to be of particular use for those organisations that generate a lot of transport, and I'm interested to know to what extent you're promoting ISO 39001 in the UK and what the take-up of it has been so far in your sector as it's generally thought to be a very useful ISO standard by road safety experts globally. I'm just interested to know what your take is on it and how far we've got in the UK in thinking about it.

Jack Semple: If I could come back to you with a specific view on ISO 39001. The RHA actively promotes the Health and Safety Executive's Guide to the Management of Work Related Road Safety which is a well-established document in the UK. In terms of that area, we are very active in related training issues and in advice and which is something we are continuing to develop. We highlight the necessity and the importance of work related road safety and it's my belief that certainly in the professional haulage sector that is a very prominent issue on companies' agendas. We have that in survey evidence from our members. To give an example, a recent survey we carried out on –

Jeanne Breen: Can I just say it's a very specific question; could you address my specific question, please? We haven't got a lot of time, I don't think.

Jack Semple: At the moment I would say our focus is on promoting the Health and Safety's equivalent and in our own promotion of the ideas behind work related road safety.

Stephen Glaister: Mr Hookham, did you want to comment on that question?

James Hookham: Only that I think we're focused on the promotion of the requirements of O licensing and indeed the work related road risk, we don't promote specifically the ISO standard as such, but it's available for a means of measuring performance in the way that you described.

- Stephen Glaister: We must move on. We've got ten minutes left and I've got a couple of questions from Dr Christie and Mr Kelly. So just very, very briefly.
- Jack Semple: If I could say we are doing work at the moment to identify areas where that sort of thing could be improved and, again, we're very keen to look at outcomes as well as processes.
- Stephen Glaister: Thank you. Dr Christie.
- Nicola Christie: You've talked a lot about the quality of vehicles and how they may change with technology, what about the quality of the drivers in terms of occupational driving? We know that the rail industry now has quite rigorous psychometric testing of their drivers, and I say this in relation to a case that hit the papers this week in which an HGV driver was surfing on the web and he crashed into a broken-down vehicle and killed a 20-year-old and injured her fiancé, and there have been a number of cases like that. So in what way is the industry looking to improve the quality of your drivers?
- Jack Semple: First of all the example you're quoting, I don't think there's an employer in the industry who would other than condemn that sort of behaviour. It happens; I'm told that it happens, some foreign drivers visiting here. That's an enforcement issue. That's a really important enforcement issue and I don't think employers would be happy to see that because the consequences for employers of an accident are very severe.
- Stephen Glaister: (Inaudible 01:51:01) what's the answer to the question, what's the industry doing to improve the standards?
- Jack Semple: I'll drop you a note on that because it's quite (overspeaking) –
- Stephen Glaister: That would be very helpful.
- [01:51:11]
- Jack Semple: Because it would be quite a lengthy list of issues that we're addressing but on that particular point there are some companies that are fitting cameras in their cabs, inward-facing cameras, but I don't think that is something that we've yet seen a need for. And I would come back to what we haven't got sufficiently and what neither the police nor the Highways Authorities or anybody else has done adequately, is identified specific problems for us to address, but I do believe that companies are addressing problems themselves.
- Stephen Glaister: Mr Hookham, anything to say?
- James Hookham: I can say that there's a huge focus on drivers at the moment, partly because of the imminence of the driver CPC deadline for this theory qualification that I mentioned earlier. As the country comes out of recession a lot of our members are reporting that there is a shortage of drivers, not many people want to go back to driving now that there's a greater number of jobs, so a lot of time and effort is being put into making driving more attractive than it was and ensuring that drivers that are selected and recruited do achieve not just the statutory standards but the 'cultural' standards, if you like, within the particular company, and inevitably it's individual businesses that are doing this. But driver improvement programmes and understanding better the kind of person that makes a good lorry driver is certainly an active programme within some companies.
- Stephen Glaister: We'll finish with Mr Kelly but just before we come to that... I'm sure the vast majority of lorry drivers are professionals are thoroughly responsible people who want to improve the way the industry works. In aviation, as I understand it, pilots, who have the same attitude, are encouraged all the time to feedback information about near misses, what went wrong, on a no blame culture, I guess you don't have that system in road haulage.
- James Hookham: Some companies do, yes, (overspeaking).

- Stephen Glaister: Is there a system that allows that kind of feedback?
- James Hookham: Absolutely, yeah. And it's probably part of the answer about ISO 39001, a lot of the features of what makes a good safety system are either embedded already or required, so certainly those businesses that adopt the sort of pyramid approach to management of health and safety, that for every fatality there's always a magnitude, or serious injuries, slight and near miss reporting. Businesses are challenged to make sure that the right proportion of near misses are being reported because statistics show that for every one serious incident there'll be be that proportion of high ones. And, again, it's nothing that the industry does, because there's no statutory requirement for that, but the responsible health and safety minded businesses are certainly doing that, and indeed not just doing it for the transport aspects of their businesses, they're doing it for all the aspects of their businesses.
- Jack Semple: Chairman, I do welcome your context of the great majority of drivers and the way they perform the task and it is important because I think that's a message that doesn't come across often enough. I think in terms of the lessons that can be learnt, this was really the point that I started with, drivers do come back and feed back to their employers, their employers feedback to people like James and myself and we come to the Department for Transport and we say, for example, "Can we do more to educate other road users about aspects of lorry behaviour through the Highway Code because our drivers tell us that that's needed". So there is this process and I think the idea that in the aviation sector there's not always quite so much goes on and there's a lot that is controlled and you can put in systems, a lorry is out on the road and is seeing interactions on an altogether different scale with other road users.
- James Hookham: Just one very important point –
- [01:55:30]
- Stephen Glaister: Thank you. I'm sorry but we must just let Mr Kelly have the last question in the last five minutes.
- Professor Mike Kelly: And it's directed to you, Mr Hookham, and it relates to something you said at the beginning which was this, that you drew some comparative data between the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe, I think, and also comparative over time and said, "The rates of fatalities have been falling and are comparatively better, we must be doing something right," you said. Now, I think that's an important approach and certainly in my field in Health that's something we've done for many years, we try to work out what produces health rather than what causes illness. Now, can you point us towards sources of evidence and data or researchers or colleagues or professional bodies who are doing that where we're learning from what's gone well rather than always focusing on what I might refer to as the 'pathogenic' approach which is trying to work out all the things that might go wrong? And it's really for information, I think, because it will be important for us to get some sense of that line of evidence as well as the evidence on the pathology.
- James Hookham: I'd be delighted to and if I can take notice of that question, Chair, I'd be delighted to feed back (overspeaking) on that.
- Stephen Glaister: Please do.
- James Hookham: Thank you.
- Jack Semple: Sir, could I mention just in a sentence, I think the insurance industry probably has a fair bit to contribute on this as well. To give one example, something that's come to my notice fairly recently is that there seems to be an uptake in incidents when drivers return from holiday and some employers manage that process specifically. The insurance industry

may have something to help us with... So where there are these lessons that can be learnt I think we could do more.

Stephen Glaister:

Well perhaps that's a good place to stop just a few minutes ahead of time. Thank you very much. And I do encourage you to send those written materials. Thank you.

[End of transcript]