

# A gap analysis of work-related road safety in the UK: Working towards a national standard

S Helman, S Buttress and R Hutchins



## **PUBLISHED PROJECT REPORT PPR626**

### **A gap analysis of work-related road safety in the UK: Working towards a national standard**

**S Helman, S Buttress and R Hutchins**

---

**Prepared for:** Metropolitan Police Service, Traffic OCU (SC015)

**Quality approved:**

Jenny Stannard  
(Project Manager)



Graham Grayson  
(Technical Referee)



## Disclaimer

This report has been produced by the Transport Research Laboratory under a contract with Metropolitan Police Service. Any views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of Metropolitan Police Service.

The information contained herein is the property of TRL Limited and does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the customer for whom this report was prepared. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure that the matter presented in this report is relevant, accurate and up-to-date, TRL Limited cannot accept any liability for any error or omission, or reliance on part or all of the content in another context.

When purchased in hard copy, this publication is printed on paper that is FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) and TCF (Totally Chlorine Free) registered.

## Contents amendment record

This report has been amended and issued as follows:

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Editor</b>	<b>Technical Referee</b>
1.0	21/08/12	First draft for customer comment	SH	GG
1.1	04/10/12	Reissue after customer acceptance	SH	GG

## Contents

Executive summary	3
Abstract	6
1 Introduction	7
1.1 Work-related driving – scope of the problem	7
1.2 The role of the Metropolitan Police Service and this project	7
1.3 Background	8
1.3.1 Work-related driving – risk factors	8
1.3.2 Managing work-related road risk – legal responsibilities and good practice	8
1.4 Scope of this project	9
2 Method	10
2.1 General approach	10
2.2 Participant recruitment procedure	10
2.3 Organisation types	10
2.4 Interview topic guide	11
2.5 Procedure	11
2.6 Method of analysis	11
3 Results	12
3.1 Background	12
3.2 General findings	12
3.2.1 Key motivators for management of WRRS	12
3.2.2 The perceived importance of work-related road safety	13
3.2.3 General features of a national standard	13
3.2.4 Key components	15
3.2.5 Consequences of non-compliance	20
3.2.6 How a national standard should be disseminated	21
3.3 Role of the police	21
3.3.1 High profile and respect	21
3.3.2 Dissemination	21
3.3.3 Enforcement	22
3.3.4 Concerns over resourcing	23
3.4 Current templates for the management of work-related road risk	23
4 Discussion, conclusions and recommendations	27
4.1 The perceived importance of work-related road safety	27

4.2	A simple, evidence-based national standard	28
4.3	The role or roles of the Police	29
	Acknowledgements	31
	References	32

## Executive summary

### Background

Work-related road safety continues to present a serious public health problem, with many hundreds of fatalities and many thousands of serious injuries each year in Great Britain resulting from road collisions in which someone is driving for work at the time.

The approach taken to tackling the work-related road safety problem in Great Britain has been to raise awareness with employers of their obligations under health and safety law, which states that driving for work is covered under general health and safety legislation. Outreach programmes such as Driving for Better Business, and guidance from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) have played a part in this. Progress has certainly been made in raising awareness of the importance of managing work-related road risk, although accident statistics suggest that much remains to be done in reducing injuries.

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has a direct role to play in work-related road safety, and it has a memorandum of understanding with the HSE (HSE, 2010) outlining duties it can carry out relating to the enforcement of health and safety law.

Against this context, the MPS commissioned this project to address two questions. First, with a wide range of guidance documentation available to employers but no national standard, what should a national standard look like? Second, what role or roles should the Police play in the future in work-related road safety?

### Method

Structured telephone interviews were used to gather data from stakeholders regarding their perceptions of good practice in work-related road safety, their thoughts on a national standard, and their opinions on the role or roles that the Police might play in this area. A qualitative analysis technique (Thematic Content Analysis) was used to interpret the data and condense it into key themes relevant to the central research questions. Thirty stakeholders were interviewed, yielding over 1700 individual quotes that formed the basis of the analysis. Twenty of the stakeholders were termed 'Strategic' in that they represented organisations taking an overview or advisory role in the work-related road safety field. The remaining 10 stakeholders (termed 'Fleet' stakeholders) were fleet managers at companies drawn largely from the list of Driving for Better Business champions. This was done deliberately so that the opinions gathered from businesses represented good practice. Three academics working in the field made contributions as the analysis progressed. Finally, existing templates for the management of work-related road risk were reviewed to establish their suitability to form the basis of a national standard.

### Findings and recommendations

1. An important general finding of the current research is that the management of work-related road risk is widely perceived to be lagging behind the management of general health and safety risk in the workplace, even among stakeholders who represent good practice.
2. There is an appetite among stakeholders in this study for the consistency of approach that a national standard could bring.

3. Based on feedback from stakeholders in the current study, a national standard should:
  - Be simple to apply and not require great administrative effort
  - Be mandatory if possible
  - (In its dissemination) address the business case for management of work-related road risk, as well as its safety benefits
  - Contain guidance on the management processes to be put in place to identify risks (modelled on general health and safety risk management process of 'plan-do-check-act')
  - Contain guidance on the importance of gaining senior management buy-in to managing work-related road risk
  - Require licence checks for drivers
  - Require vehicle maintenance and procurement
  - Require journey planning
  - Require the collection of data to monitor performance, including the investigation of incidents
4. The components identified by stakeholders in this study for inclusion in a national standard can be considered as a sensible baseline from which to begin. However stakeholders (in particular Fleet stakeholders) were clear that a standard should also contain guidance on practical interventions to reduce the risks identified. Our judgement is that the standard should have guidance only on those practical measures that have a basis in good quality evidence to support them, or an *a priori* case for their effectiveness. Our suggested list then is:
  - Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving *per se*
  - Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving during the highest risk periods related to sleepiness (broadly, 2-6am, and 2-4pm)
  - Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving while using in-car devices that are distracting (e.g. mobile phones)
  - Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving while under time pressure (and thus may lead to increased speed)
  - Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving in specific, identified risky situations in particular sectors (for example planning journeys to avoid interactions between large goods/construction vehicles and cyclists at junctions)

Beyond the well-understood mechanism of reducing exposure to the activity of driving itself, or to well-understood risk factors, we see little value in having guidance on other defined practical measures unless they have been properly evaluated.
5. There are two likely mechanisms by which a standard might be developed. First, a standalone national standard could be created along the lines of what is described above. If this path is chosen, we recommend that the TfL Fleet



Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) standard is used as an initial template, since in our judgement it is most suitable for this purpose.

A second alternative is that ISO 39001 (to be published later in 2012) might be relied upon to provide guidance on process, while a separate document (possibly an Approved Code of Practice published by the Health and Safety Executive) could provide guidance on practical interventions.

6. Whichever mechanism is chosen as the next step, there will need to be work to develop content for the standard. The Police are perceived as being one of the key stakeholders who would have input into this, given their expertise in the area (specifically relating to enforcement). Given their previous experience in outreach activities of this type, those running the Driving for Better Business programme would appear to be in an ideal position to galvanise action to move a standard forward, if its resources and funding status permit.
7. Our key recommendation for the role of the Police in the future of work-related road safety is that they explore ways to ensure that information regarding traffic offences reaches businesses (when the offences have been committed while driving for work). This would permit information on traffic offences to serve as an important input and output metric in businesses' risk management systems.
8. The Police are perceived as having the respect and credibility to help with the dissemination of consistent messages regarding both the standard the importance of work-related road safety. The Police will need to prioritise their activities in this area based on their resources; our recommendation is that the Police focus on wider general dissemination activities such as conferences and trade shows, as this would most effectively draw on the respect and expertise they are seen as having in this field.

## Abstract

According to official road safety statistics, many hundreds of fatalities and many thousands of serious injuries result each year in Great Britain from road collisions in which someone is driving for work. In the absence of a national standard for the management of work-related road risk, this project addresses two questions. First, what should a standard look like? Second, what role should the Police play in its development and use? Interviews were held with 30 stakeholders (including 10 fleet managers) to explore these questions. Existing templates for the management of work-related road risk were also reviewed. Findings showed that work-related road safety is perceived as in need of improvement. There is appetite for the consistency that a national standard could bring. Key components for the standard are suggested, including the importance of having guidance on practical measures to reduce risks, as well as guidance on risk management processes modelled on the health and safety approach. Two possible mechanisms by which a national standard might be developed are suggested; either a standalone standard should be developed, or a practical guidance document (possibly an Approved Code of Practice published by the HSE) should be developed to support the forthcoming ISO 39001. A key role for the Police in supporting work-related road safety in the future will be in enabling information about driving offences committed while driving for work being made available to employers. In addition, the Police have the credibility and respect to engage in wide dissemination relating to the standard, and to work-related road safety in general.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Work-related driving – scope of the problem

Work-related driving continues to represent a serious public health problem. Grayson and Helman (2011) cited road collision statistics from the Department for Transport showing that in Great Britain in 2009, 18 per cent of all drivers and riders aged 16 or over who were involved in a collision in which someone was injured were recorded as having a journey purpose of 'driving for work'<sup>1</sup> at the time of the collision. Analysis of the most recent data available (2010) shows the same figure.

This is likely to be an underestimate because journey purpose is not always known<sup>2</sup>. However even if we assume that the true percentage is no higher than 18 per cent, using current road casualty figures as a guide we can be reasonably certain that annually in Great Britain, there are hundreds of fatalities and thousands of serious injuries in collisions involving someone driving for work at the time.

## 1.2 The role of the Metropolitan Police Service and this project

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is directly involved in work-related road safety, with Transport for London recently funding six Police Constables in the Commercial Vehicle Unit, and two Detective Constables in the Traffic Intelligence Unit.

There is a memorandum of understanding between the MPS and The Health and Safety Executive (HSE, 2010) which sets out ways in which trained MPS officers can "...intervene, enforce and prosecute in the Occupational Road Risk and Work Related Road Safety arena under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974" (HSE, 2010, paragraph 1.2). Specific duties for appropriately trained Police officers are described in the memorandum; they include follow-up visits to companies after serious collisions and on-road offences, appropriate enforcement action regarding driver behaviour and the condition of vehicles, and awareness-raising and dissemination activities either during company visits or at seminars, workshops and freight forums.

The MPS has identified that there is no national standard for managing work-related road risk. It is possible that this is one potential reason why the message that vehicles used for work driving are part of the workplace as far as health and safety law is concerned does not appear to have reached all employers.

In order to address this potential gap, the MPS has commissioned this research project to try to establish how best to develop a national standard. The project also seeks to identify the role or roles the Police might best play to improve work-related road safety.

---

<sup>1</sup> If the journey purpose 'commuting to/from work' is included, the figure rises to 28%.

<sup>2</sup> This is because in collision data in the UK the most commonly-recorded journey purpose category (69% of collisions) is 'other/unknown', and it is likely that some of the 'unknowns' are in fact 'driving for work'. Unfortunately it is not clear what proportion of the 'other/unknown' category is 'unknown', and thus the upper bound on the extent to which the 'driving for work' percentage is an underestimate remains undefined. Over the next three years, the 'other/unknown' category is being split in reporting, so in future years it should be possible to have a firmer estimate from actual collision data.

## 1.3 Background

To set the context for the project it is instructive to consider two key aspects of what is known about work-related road safety. These are the risk factors for work-related driving, and the broad approach that has been taken to managing work-related road risk over the last decade.

### 1.3.1 *Work-related driving – risk factors*

Research has consistently demonstrated that the issue of work-related road risk is not solely due to the high mileages that work-related driving typically entails. Instead there is a 'fleet driver effect' contributing to road collision involvement above and beyond exposure (see Grayson & Helman, 2011, for a recent review and discussion).

The broad risk factors that contribute to this effect by increasing collision risk have been shown to be fatigue, time-pressure, and distraction, all of which can occur in work-related driving.

In addition to these broad risk factors there are specific risks associated with some types of work-related driving. One example that has been prominent in GB for some time is the risk posed by large goods vehicles to cyclists and other vulnerable road users, especially when turning left at junctions (for example due to drivers being unaware of the presence of cyclists to the left or in front of their vehicles, often in blind-spots, when executing a turn).

The important thing to note for our purpose here is that **at least some of the activities and behaviours that increase the risk of a collision occurring in work-related driving are known, and therefore can be managed.**

### 1.3.2 *Managing work-related road risk – legal responsibilities and good practice*

The approach taken to improving work-related road safety in GB has health and safety law as its foundation. Under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 employers are required to ensure (as far as is reasonably practicable) the health and safety of their employees while at work. They are also required to ensure the health and safety of other individuals affected by their undertakings. The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 require that employers manage their health and safety effectively, including carrying out risk assessments and periodically reviewing these to ensure that they remain appropriate.

Driving for work is included in health and safety law and is thus covered by the Act and Regulations described above. The approach taken over the last decade in GB to try and improve work-related road safety has been largely based on raising awareness of this with employers, and also on building a compelling business case for reducing work-related collisions. For example, the Health and Safety Executive has increased its guidance and assistance, and the outreach programme 'Driving for Better Business' has played a prominent part in drawing attention to work-related driving through the recruitment of 'business champions', many of whom have reported reductions in collisions, and associated monetary savings. The Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007, under which a company or organisation can be found guilty of corporate manslaughter has also played a part in encouraging organisations to manage their work-related driving risk.

The combined effect of such activity has certainly been positive in that it has made more employers aware of the importance of managing their road risk. In practice, however, many Health and Safety Practitioners have suggested that the management of work-related road risk lags some way behind the management of workplace health and safety in terms of how widespread it is, and how effectively it is implemented.

Although some companies have shown that it is possible to reduce their work-related road risk through comprehensive management programmes and packages of interventions, Grayson and Helman (2011) note that the evidence base is not sufficiently well developed to permit an appraisal of which components of these programmes are actually responsible for improvements in safety. This is particularly unfortunate for the large number of small to medium sized businesses that collectively are believed to represent the majority of the risk; such employers are currently perceived as being those who are least likely to engage with the management of work-related road risk, and it might be argued that the lack of off-the-shelf solutions that are known to work is contributing to this.

The important thing to note for our purpose here is that **despite the legal framework being in place, and considerable efforts being made in recent years to raise the profile of work-related road safety with employers, there would still appear to be room for improvement.**

#### 1.4 Scope of this project

Within the context described above, this project has been commissioned by the MPS to examine how best to develop a national standard on the management of work-related road risk, what such a standard might look like, and what role the police might play in this and the future of work-related road safety.

The rationale for the project is that a national standard would assist the MPS in undertaking the activities defined in their memorandum of understanding with the HSE; with a single national standard, employers would know what they were expected to do to manage their work-related road risk, and the Police would have a clear point of reference in order to facilitate their enforcement, education and dissemination activities.

This report describes the research project which employs interviews with stakeholders, and analysis of existing approaches and templates for managing work-related road risk (including a draft ISO standard). The project builds on previous TRL work for the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (Grayson & Helman, 2011) to address two main research questions:

1. What should a national standard for the management of work-related road risk look like? (This includes an appraisal of existing templates that might be used as the basis for a standard.)
2. What role or roles might the police play in developing and/or supporting a standard, and in contributing to improvements in work-related road safety?

In addition to these central questions, consideration is given to several other issues, including how traffic offences might be used by employers and the police as a proxy measure for the management of work-related road risk, what existing good practice in managing work-related road risk looks like, and what role might be played by outreach programmes such as Driving for Better Business in the future.

## 2 Method

### 2.1 General approach

Structured telephone interviews were used to gather data from key stakeholders on a number of topics related to the questions of interest.

In particular, stakeholders were asked to comment on:

- What is held to be 'good practice' in the management of work-related road risk
- What should be the key components of a national standard on managing work-related road risk
- The extent to which stakeholders perceive that 'good practice' in work-related road safety currently includes consideration of driving offences
- The potential role(s) of the police in delivering and supporting a national standard for work-related road safety

The interview data were analysed using qualitative techniques designed to extract central themes and messages, so that conclusions could be drawn.

### 2.2 Participant recruitment procedure

Potential participants were selected from TRL's contacts, from a directory of organisations that had taken part in the Driving for Better Business initiative, and from contacts provided by the MPS. Organisations were contacted initially by email, with follow-up phone calls where needed.

### 2.3 Organisation types

The initial list drawn up for approach contained 41 contacts in a variety of organisation types including:

- Road safety organisations including charities
- Police who have active roles in work-related road safety
- Trade organisations
- Organisations with a variety of fleet sizes
- Insurance providers
- Providers of fleet-management or technology services and other consultants

For convenience and ease of reporting, the stakeholders have been described throughout the report either as 'Strategic' or 'Fleet' stakeholders, where the following definitions are used:

- 'Strategic' stakeholders include consultants, trade associations, road safety organisations and charities, providers of fleet management services or technology, and insurers. Although heterogeneous, the central feature of this group is that they take an overview or advisory position regarding work-related road safety.

- 'Fleet' stakeholders were managers of fleets within organisations. Again the group is heterogeneous (especially with respect to fleet size – running from tens to thousands of vehicles) but the central feature is that they represent people who are directly responsible for managing work-related road risk. It is also worth noting that because this group was drawn almost entirely from Driving for Better Business champions, it represents organisations who are already highly engaged with the issue of managing work-related road risk. This was a deliberate decision, given that the objective of the project was to gather detailed knowledge on good practice in order to address the research questions.

From the 41 stakeholders approached, 30 agreed to take part and were interviewed. In addition to these, five academics working within work-related road safety were approached for their opinions as the main analysis progressed, and three replied (one from outside Great Britain). Their feedback was taken into account in finalising the findings and formulating recommendations.

## **2.4 Interview topic guide**

Prior to each interview, participants were sent an information email inviting them to take part. A follow-up email was sent to those who indicated they would be willing to participate, which contained the key topics that would be discussed in the interview. This gave participants information to allow them to prepare for the interview if they wished. These emails can be seen in Appendix A.

All interviews followed an interview guide which can be seen in Appendix B. This standardised approach ensured consistency irrespective of which TRL researcher conducted the interview.

## **2.5 Procedure**

The 30 telephone interviews with strategic and fleet stakeholders were conducted by four TRL researchers. The interviews were recorded using Digital Voice Recorders and were transcribed by an external transcription company before content analysis was conducted by TRL researchers.

Academics were contacted informally through email.

## **2.6 Method of analysis**

The transcripts were analysed using Thematic Content Analysis (e.g. Neuendorf, 2002). This involves condensing raw data into categories and themes based on inference and interpretation. To ensure that the qualitative data were explored exhaustively, two researchers coded the data, comparing themes and sub-themes on a regular basis to ensure that any new themes emerging from the data were captured.

The analysis was facilitated using XSight computer software. The software assisted the researchers in compiling and comparing the interview data, and exploring the relationships between the themes emerging from the analysis.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Background

Thirty interviews were conducted, with the stakeholder types broken down as follows:

Stakeholder type	Number of interviews
Insurance providers	3
Road safety organisations	5
Trade organisations	2
Businesses or other organisations with a range of fleets sizes	10
County Council	1
Providers of fleet services	2
Consultants	2
Charities	3
Government Department	1
Police	1

As described in Section 2.3, the businesses (large and small fleets) are described as 'Fleet' stakeholders, while all other stakeholders are described as 'Strategic'.

The 30 interviews gave rise to over 1700 individual quotes that formed the basis of the qualitative analysis. The sections below describe the key findings that emerged from this analysis. First we describe general findings, and then findings associated with the two key research questions – what a national standard might look like, and what role or roles the Police might play in the future of work-related road safety. Any key differences between the perceptions of Strategic and Fleet stakeholders are discussed when relevant.

Throughout the results section, direct quotes that illustrate the themes being discussed are given, along with an indication of whether the quote was offered by a Fleet or a Strategic stakeholder, or from one of the academics.

### 3.2 General findings

#### 3.2.1 Key motivators for management of WRRS

For Fleet stakeholders, the dominant motivation for managing their work-related road risk was financial. The starting point for some businesses was to reduce the increasing costs of insurance, along with a desire to reduce the costs of maintaining and repairing vehicles. Reference was also frequently made to managing the risk associated with accidents, including the potential damage to brand image. Additional benefits were noted, including advantage in the business marketplace:

*'And the other benefits are obviously that the amount we've reduced accidents, and incidents, our vehicles that now stay on the road, so there is a customer benefit as well, and our labour turnover has gone down.'* - Fleet stakeholder



Academics also noted this issue in their responses, pointing out that often in-vehicle technologies and other initiatives (such as speed management) gain traction in fleets because of their potential to save money, rather than their safety impacts.

Although there is broad understanding in the WRRS field that companies are often motivated by monetary savings, it is interesting to note that the Strategic stakeholders most often mentioned the reduction of accidents as their main motivation for management of work-related road risk, as well as a desire to share good practice with other organisations.

*'The key motivator is to improve the involvement of the corporate sector in delivering enhanced safety on the roads' – Strategic stakeholder*

### **3.2.2 The perceived importance of work-related road safety**

The other major general theme that emerged from talking to almost all stakeholders is that there is widespread concern that many businesses do not consider implementing policies for managing road risk to be a high priority, and that the management of work-related road risk needs to 'catch up' with more general health and safety risk management. A wide range of quotes from Strategic stakeholders illustrate this:

*'There's institutionalised blindness to the risks of work-related road safety.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'I'm sure if you went along to a lot of companies and said what are you doing about work-related road safety they wouldn't have a clue what you're talking about, especially the smaller companies.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'So I think the real core issue is just actually persuading more people to take it more seriously.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'The end game is move to a position where risk on the road is treated equally with other risks.'* – Strategic stakeholder

Fleet stakeholders were also clear that things needed to improve:

*'...we are trying to sort of increase the profile of...[work-related road safety]...if you like, and to sort of change people's opinions of it'* – Fleet stakeholder

*'...the obvious thing is making people aware of it; organisations, not just people, organisations. You know, I know...[big national companies using]...hire cars left right and centre, and yet haven't got anything in place to show the drivers are compliant.'* – Fleet stakeholder

One academic suggested that one reason why road risk is seen as less important than general health and safety in the workplace is that the HSE is perceived as being capable of enforcing health and safety law, but that it:

*'...has been clear about...(its)...inability to deal with issues relating to road risk.'* – Academic

There is considerable room for improvement in the management of work-related road risk, if the stakeholder responses in this project are anything go by.

### **3.2.3 General features of a national standard**

There was general support for the consistent approach that a standard could bring. Several opinions were expressed on how this might be achieved. Some stakeholders

questioned whether a national standard itself was required, as a variety of guidance documents from a range of organisations already exist. Others wondered whether an accepted code of practice would be a more beneficial addition to the field.

*'I don't know whether you can have a national standard. Well, you can provide best practice...and not necessarily standards, but best practice and best advice for people, which is probably more the answer at the end of the day.'* – Fleet stakeholder

Strategic stakeholders tended to state that compliance with a standard should be voluntary. Contrasting with this, Fleet stakeholders tended to suggest that compliance with a standard should be mandatory, with fines or other legal consequences for non-compliance. There was a feeling from Fleet stakeholders that many businesses will not voluntarily adopt a standard unless there is legal enforcement or a very strong business case to do so. It was suggested that larger businesses are more likely to have the resources to comply, but smaller businesses will consider it a cost and those complying will potentially be at a commercial disadvantage to those ignoring the standard. It was further suggested by some strategic stakeholders that one method of obtaining compliance with a standard would be for larger business to require their subcontractors to demonstrate good practice management of work-related road safety.

*'... for instance, if I am a local authority and I'm putting out a tender for people, I may put that in, that I want you to demonstrate to me that you are at a gold-standard level in the area of managing work-related road safety.'* – Strategic stakeholder

A dominant theme throughout the interviews was that the size and type of businesses need to be considered by any standard. Strategic stakeholders in particular stated that a standard would need to be scalable, and easily tailored to individual businesses. although some fleet stakeholders expressed similar concerns:

*'I think it's quite a challenge to set a national standard; it would have to be tailored for different types of businesses. You know a white-van fleet, a drop and collect type delivery fleet is very different to our fleet which is a company car specific only and perk-related. So I think it would have to be... it would have to be tailored to the business.'* – Fleet stakeholder

However concern was raised that if the standard was too generic it would be difficult to apply, and that simplicity would be the key.

*'...our smallest fleet is one vehicle, our biggest fleet is multi thousands. So to try and have something that's applicable to that wide variety of end customers or end businesses is going to be tremendously difficult. So to have anything it would have to be very, very simple...'* – Strategic stakeholder

In addition it was suggested that compliance with a national standard should be audited to permit businesses to advertise their compliance.

*'I believe it is important for organisations to have some form of visible certification that they are operating good practice in work-related road safety.'* – Strategic stakeholder

Fleet stakeholders in general stated that they wanted the standard to provide clarity on those measures against which their compliance to the standard would be graded. In

addition, Fleet stakeholders were quite clear that the effort required to fully comply with a standard should not be too onerous.

*'A small fleet should potentially not have to do the same as a large fleet; but, you know, it shouldn't be made too difficult. That has always been the biggest hurdle. If it's perceived as a huge amount of work for an organisation that isn't even doing anything anyway.'* – Fleet stakeholder

A final general theme regarding the standard was that one organisation should be responsible for it, although multiple organisations should support it with consistent messages.

### **3.2.4 Key components**

The key components that stakeholders perceived as important for inclusion in a standard were buy-in from senior management, a management process modelled on health and safety management, good communication, policies assessing and controlling risk for drivers (including licence checks) and vehicles, vehicle maintenance plans, appropriate driver training, collection of data to monitor systems, incident investigation and analysis, and journey planning. These are explored in further detail in the sections below.

When discussing the key components for a national standard, Strategic and Fleet stakeholders often made reference to existing schemes and guidance for managing work-related road safety as exemplars of the kinds of procedures that should be adopted. Thus it should be borne in mind that stakeholder responses to the questions asked will have been partly flavoured by their experience of current guidance.

#### **3.2.4.1 Buy-in from senior management**

There was broad agreement among Strategic stakeholders that the most important requirement for managing road risk is senior management commitment which feeds in to a company culture in which consistent messages reinforce any policies in place.

*'...making sure that it's either the CEO or someone within the board, that someone at senior level takes not just an interest, but also responsibility for managing work-related road risk.'* – Strategic stakeholder

Surprisingly, Fleet stakeholders did not tend to raise this issue unprompted. However feedback from one of the academics who works extensively with businesses on this issue, and the experience of the authors, shows that often those middle managers who are managing work-related road risk struggle to gain compliance from drivers if the senior managers in their organisation undermine the policy by not showing commitment.

#### **3.2.4.2 Management processes**

Strategic stakeholders expressed the opinion more frequently than Fleet stakeholders that any standard should take a process-based approach following the management model of 'plan-do-check-act' (in many ways aligned with the health and safety management approach).

Within such a system, it was suggested that performance would be measured against defined criteria, outcomes reviewed and targets set for continual improvement.

*'There should be a management system and it should have a clear allocation of roles and responsibilities. For example, it should set out what legislation is being*

*followed, it should set out how you review, how you audit, how you implement things, and then it should also set out operational controls and tackle every subject that is related to work-related road risk individually, ranging from potentially small subjects like you should wear a seatbelt and you shall not speed, to bigger subjects such as a driver wellness policy that looks at stress and fatigue and drugs and alcohol.’ – Fleet stakeholder*

Feedback from one academic echoed the importance of outcome goals within such a system:

*‘(Nationally)...we have defined goals for a number of indicators such as speed compliance and helmet use. A number of activities are carried out to engage stakeholders, organisations and companies on all levels to engage and take part of the work to fulfil these goals. This means that transport companies take part through defining goals for themselves and develop measures that they can carry out in their organisation.’ – International academic*

It was felt by many stakeholders of both types that the standard should contain clear guidelines exemplifying policies, and also interventions. This was seen as particularly important for smaller businesses that may not have the time or resources to create their own policies.

Communication of the policy to staff was also seen as key by all stakeholders, and was backed up by feedback from academics. Without staff engagement it is perceived that there will be a gap between the behavioural ‘attitude’ of the company and that of individual drivers.

*‘They knew the policy on mobile phones but they saw the senior executives...ignore it so they felt it was therefore something that didn’t apply to them.’ – Strategic stakeholder (discussing a case-study)<sup>3</sup>*

The issue of communication was also raised by two academics as being crucial to the successful introduction of in-vehicle technologies (see Section 3.2.4.9), particularly in relation to privacy.

*‘It may be contentious because employees are not happy with the ‘spy in the cab’ and evidence suggests that drivers fail to check web-based feedback after a while. There may also be some behavioural adaptation issues that are as yet, not well understood.’ – Academic*

*‘Privacy laws are the single biggest issues facing organisations trying to manage fleet safety – engaging employees to allow data about them to be used for risk management is a key issue that organisations need to manage.’ – Academic*

### 3.2.4.3 Assessment of driver risk

Several of the fleet stakeholders reported using online risk assessments, on-road assessments or driver profiling tools to identify the potentially higher risk drivers. These may be administered on new recruits, or before the employment decision is made.

---

<sup>3</sup> This quote is also clearly related to the issue of senior management buy-in, and ‘leading by example’.

One of the Fleet stakeholders described the use of pre-employment assessments of driver competence where employees drive as part of the business, or where there is a need to drive a particular type of vehicle.

*'We started the pre-employment assessments, that made a difference, because everyone we employed was capable, therefore the labour turnover decreased, because people weren't going out and if you take on a job that you can't confidently do, you just get stressed out and leave anyway, either after a series of accidents or incidents, or just the general stress of driving something that you're not capable of doing.'* – Fleet stakeholder

Strategic stakeholders also suggested that the assessment of risk for drivers is vital. This is not surprising given that a 'plan-do-check-act' approach is favoured; risk assessment needs to address all risks.

*'So I think there should be something in that standard that says, okay, you might not have had a crash in the last three years so I've put you in the lowest category, for instance. But your next one might be your last one and without some kind of proactive look at your driving, it'd be very difficult to determine that currently.'* – Strategic stakeholder

Some Fleet stakeholders use management companies to monitor incidents and penalty points obtained by drivers, although a number of the Fleet stakeholders suggested that driving offences should be seen as the responsibility of drivers. This is unfortunate, as clearly driving offences can act as a proxy for risk; offences such as speeding have been shown to be linked to collision risk in road safety research, and working practices (in the case of speed, tight delivery schedules) are believed to encourage such offences. The academics questioned backed up the importance of this issue, with the following quote suggesting an innovative way to encourage shared ownership of the risk.

*'As long as the driver gets a ticket, there is something wrong with the strategies and implementation, which should motivate the management to cooperate even more with the drivers. An obvious way to deal with offences is to share the penalty between the driver and the company if possible.'* – International academic.

In summary, assessment of driver risk needs to be part of a national standard, and offences provide one measure of risk. We return to discussion of this when we turn our attention to the role of the Police.

#### 3.2.4.4 Licence checks

An omnipresent theme among Fleet stakeholders was that licence checks should be included in a national standard. Such checks are perceived as a simple way to determine not only a driver's legal status but also their offence history, with number of points and type of offences seen as a proxy indicator of the driver's likelihood of involvement in further incidents.

There was recognition that for smaller companies, visual checks of paper licences may be the preferred method, as there are costs attached to checking the licence with the Driver Vehicle and Licensing Agency. However, there was also recognition that information gained in this way may be out of date or incorrect.

*'A paper licence at the moment is not very reliable. We know that there are lots of duplicates out there, and so you need to have access to a reliable data source'*  
– Strategic stakeholder

#### 3.2.4.5 Driver training

Another component mentioned by almost all Fleet stakeholders and by some Strategic ones was driver training, either generally or as a control measure for perceived higher risk drivers, with such individuals being targeted to receive additional training. Some of the Fleet stakeholders also described how driver training might also be offered as a remedial measure to drivers post-incident. It is not surprising that driver training is mentioned as often as it is, as there has been a tendency in work-related road safety (and in road safety more generally) to default to driver training as the preferred intervention when trying to manage risky drivers.

Previous research has been quite clear on this issue, however: driver training is, as yet, largely unproven as a safety intervention. One academic alluded to this in their comments, as did a Fleet stakeholder:

*'Driver managers often have little understanding about what they can do to mitigate risk and tend to employ driving instructors to deliver in-car training. As you know – there is little evidence that this is effective.'* – Academic

*'...a lot of the time people throw driver training at things, like, as you've had a few accidents we'll put you on a driver training course and that'll fix that. I don't necessarily think that driver training really works.'* – Fleet stakeholder

#### 3.2.4.6 Vehicle procurement

For company owned vehicles, some fleet stakeholders reported that they have stringent procurement policies that require the vehicle to have specific safety features such as ABS or ESC (electronic stability control), and that consideration of this would be desirable in a standard. Parking sensors were also mentioned as a safety feature for avoiding collision risk for cheaper (but more numerous) bumps and scrapes.

#### 3.2.4.7 Vehicles and maintenance

There was agreement from both types of stakeholder that processes for managing vehicle maintenance should feature within a national standard, but some strategic stakeholders expressed concern about whether current procedures are implemented adequately, in particular whether check sheets were completed without follow-up.

*'It's one thing having a check sheet but how well is it policed and how thorough is it? Senior management definitely have a part to play checking up on the condition of the vehicle.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'So there is an element of encouragement and management, internal discipline within companies to make sure that vehicles are effectively maintained.'* – Strategic stakeholder

#### 3.2.4.8 Use of data to monitor performance

Reference was made, mainly by strategic stakeholders, to the need to collect data to provide a measure of organisational safety performance, and to aid continual improvement. Part of the management process should be to create key performance indicators that provide a baseline against which to measure improvement. This might include fuels costs, number of crashes, reported near-misses, and, if telemetry information is available, number of extreme driving events such as speeding and harsh braking.

*'But [data collection] in terms of actually measuring the effectiveness of those [interventions]...[checking] is what we're doing the right thing, then clearly that's a critical area because without [data] you're going in the dark.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'How do you know whether what you've got is adequate if you're not actually sort of reviewing it and having a look at it and making changes accordingly?'* – Strategic stakeholder

#### 3.2.4.9 Data collection – telematics

There was an acknowledgement among fleet stakeholders that most of the larger companies are investing in telematics, such as “black boxes” which are fitted to the vehicle to collect various data such as harsh acceleration, braking and fuel consumption.

Strategic stakeholders generally felt that the introduction of telematics provided companies with an important source of data regarding driver behaviour, but that there was a need to understand what to do with these data.

*'There's a lot of telematics data that's going in and showing that there's habitual speeding and the company's doing nothing about it. So it's not just the data, it's what you do with it I think will be the critical thing.'* - Strategic stakeholder

*'Probably the most important single element is telematic intervention to determine the risk level that drivers are taking. So monitoring the actual performance of a driver when he's driving,'* – Strategic stakeholder

It was recognised that this is not the answer for every company, and depends on fleet type and size. Collection of these data was seen to be important for a van delivery service, but not essential for a “perk” fleet (one where little or no business mileage is made).

*'I don't believe that telematics is the answer for every... for all company car fleets either. I think there are ways of achieving good savings and having a good campaign, a good approach to road safety without installing all types of technology.'* – Fleet stakeholder

#### 3.2.4.10 Incident investigation and analysis

There was broad agreement from strategic stakeholders that the standard should require data collection from incidents, which would form part of the management process for review and improvement.

It was further commented that among smaller businesses this information was not always analysed and used to inform strategies for reduction.

*'My experience from being at quite a few fleets, small fleets that is predominantly but not exclusively, is that they don't get any organisational learning from collisions. ...Some of them have to be taken by the hand and guided through the process and they are quite happy to rely on the insurance process to record and adjudicate on what's happened and they don't understand.'* – Strategic stakeholder

#### **3.2.4.11 Journey planning and consideration of alternative modes of travel**

There was broad agreement from both types of stakeholder that consideration should be given to journey planning within the national standard. Management processes should support this by ensuring that business demands do not require unfeasible journey times between meetings or excessive journey miles, for example.

Some strategic stakeholders suggested that a national standard should include consideration of whether a journey was necessary, or whether alternative methods of achieving the business aim could be employed. It was recognised that one way of reducing road risk was to minimise or reduce exposure. There was acceptance that this would not be appropriate for all businesses, and would be dependent on the business type. However, it was suggested that there may be many routine journeys that could be replaced with public transport or teleconferencing. A few Fleet stakeholders also recognised the value in this:

*'I mean the companies have got to realise that essentially why do our people drive so much? Why can't we do other things? Why can't we use public transport and work on the transport?'* – Fleet stakeholder

#### **3.2.5 Consequences of non-compliance**

On the whole, Strategic stakeholders suggested that companies should be incentivised to comply with the standard rather than be penalised. The general view was that compliance with such a standard would be voluntary.

*'...most standards within the British Standard ISO system are not mandatory... on the whole they're not, they're there to be used by industry if they want to use them.'* – Strategic stakeholder

In contrast, Fleet stakeholders were more likely to recommend some form of punitive measure. However, some also suggested that it would be beneficial to provide improvement notices and support to aid the business to comply with the standard.

*'Depending on the seriousness of it, then we're giving you so long to improve that situation and come back with evidence to us. And in my mind if that person does that, then whether you still give them a little fine or not I don't know. But if that company does that and responds and does something positive, then you've taken them forward. But for people who out and out blatantly breaking rules, and never on this planet are going to do it, then they should be fined severely I think.'* – Fleet stakeholder

One method mentioned by both Strategic and Fleet stakeholders was for compliance to be a requirement for tendering for work, which could help provide the basis for a business case for adopting the standard.



### **3.2.6 How a national standard should be disseminated**

No clear message emerged as to how the standard should be disseminated. Indeed the main finding was that none of the stakeholders had a strong opinion on the matter (although see Section 3.3.2).

A few routes to dissemination of a national standard were suggested, including the use of Management Institutions, Trade Associations, Road Safety Partnerships, conferences and other events. It was also suggested that larger companies or service providers should require compliance with a standard for their subcontractors.

One key point was made by a number of stakeholders was that in order for the standard to have credibility one organisation needs to be spearheading it. It would then be important for a consistent message to be delivered by all relevant stakeholders who were playing a supporting role.

## **3.3 Role of the police**

Stakeholders were asked to consider the role that police might play in supporting and disseminating a national standard. There were four main themes that emerged. The first was a general theme related to the respect (in general) that the Police enjoy among stakeholders. In terms of actual roles for the Police, dissemination and enforcement were mentioned. Finally, some stakeholders raised the issue of perceived resource limitations.

### **3.3.1 High profile and respect**

A recurrent theme from both types of stakeholders was that the Police are well-respected and are known to have a high level of expertise and experience regarding road safety. It was felt that they would have a big impact if they spoke to companies within their communities. In particular, as one Fleet stakeholder described, a direct approach from police would have more credibility to raise the profile of work-related road safety than other external consultants with services to sell.

*'... if there are businesses that don't immediately engage, I think having a police officer, or the police involved in effectively the recruitment process for the businesses to make sure that they are engaging would be sensible, because of their position of authority.'* – Strategic stakeholder

However, a few Fleet stakeholders expressed the opinion that that some companies may feel distrust about the purpose for the police visiting the companies:

*'Because I think it would get peoples' backs up immediately, and it's... it's the old syndrome of ... well, I don't know, authoritarian.'* - Fleet stakeholder

### **3.3.2 Dissemination**

In terms of dissemination the Police already work in partnerships, and attend road shows and seminars, but stakeholders suggested that the police could take a more proactive, preventive role by visiting companies within their communities to offer guidance and support for complying with a standard.

*'I think this is an opportunity for the police to be seen as the preventer rather than the punisher.'* – Strategic stakeholder

*'I think that would be quite a powerful tool if they could go into companies and issue this sort of standard, ... tell them why it's been introduced, rather than it just coming through on an email or something like that. I think actually physically going into companies and delivering these messages and the reasons why. So trying to sell the message rather than tell it to them.'* – Fleet stakeholder

Using their expertise and experience, the police are ideally placed because of their local knowledge to disseminate information to companies. They are likely to be aware of the smaller businesses that may not find out about a national standard in other ways.

*'I certainly think that they're really in a position to help support it [a national standard] and particularly communicate to those people who everybody struggles to communicate with, which is the people who are getting it wrong in terms of their enforcement role, they will be picking up on those people who are getting it wrong and also then able to help to encourage those people get the help that they need.'* – Strategic stakeholder

There were a few respondents that questioned whether the police should be involved in disseminating a national standard. The feeling was that the standard should be an industry-based process and should be disseminated by industry organisations.

Various alternative methods of dissemination were discussed, including the use of social media to create newsgroups that companies register with. It was suggested that police might share data and information as a benefit with those companies complying with the standard. In addition the use of community partnerships and business networks was suggested.

*'I think that it needs to be the right people within the police, who can go in and actually have a conversation with the businesses to explain some of the benefits of addressing their work-related road safety if they're not doing so already.'* – Strategic stakeholder

### **3.3.3 Enforcement**

There was broad agreement from both types of stakeholders that it was important for the Police to be seen to be prosecuting those who commit offences while driving for work, for example with speeding or using mobile phones. Also the police are seen to be well-placed for providing information on work-related road safety to drivers they stop:

*'I think the police are well placed in a practical way, at the side of the road, to say, here you are, have a think about this before you do that again. So I think, yes, that's a useful area.'* – Strategic stakeholder

Several stakeholders mentioned that there was a need for the police to investigate incidents further to discover whether there is a driving for work element.

*'There needs to be systems which will pick up on those things as well and even if the behaviour is not serious enough to warrant a criminal prosecution, there's still lots of things that you, the firm could be expected to do in terms of monitoring and technology and stuff.'* – Strategic stakeholder

In addition, if several drivers committing similar offences were found to come from the same company, it was suggested that using that intelligence to follow up with the company would be a route to provide support and information about the standard.

### **3.3.4 Concerns over resourcing**

Both types of stakeholder voiced broadly similar concerns over a lack of police resources. It was acknowledged that there are many demands on police time, and providing a dissemination role would stretch these further.

*'I think the police have got enough on their hands, and I don't think they want to be involved in that. They may want to, but I wouldn't have thought so, I would have thought they'd pass it over to someone else like they do with the HSE.'* – Fleet stakeholder

Some stakeholders felt that there was currently a disinclination by officers to investigate whether there are underlying work-related causes in incidents, but that this may be due, in part, to resourcing issues.

Several stakeholders expressed concern that resourcing issues may also currently prevent the Police from following up on so-called 'minor offences' such as mobile phone use or speeding at the company level, leading to a belief that there is less chance of being prosecuted.

*'I would imagine there would be some sort of case for the company there by [the Police] taking a more robust attitude to enforcing the so called minor offences would... you know, would be in a position to drive people to be more active in road risk.'* – Strategic stakeholder

## **3.4 Current templates for the management of work-related road risk**

One possible way to create a national standard would be to base it on an existing template. With this in mind, several existing templates that are offered (either commercially or freely) to businesses to help them manage their work-related road risk were reviewed<sup>4</sup> to assess their suitability as the basis for a standard. The feedback gathered from stakeholders (in terms of their expected or desired features of a standard) was taken into account while reviewing these templates.

Not surprisingly, given the range of organisations from which they originate, the templates varied somewhat in their focus and style. In short, no single template was found that was suitable as the sole basis for the national standard that the authors feel is required to address the needs identified in the study. The draft international standard (ISO39001) also has shortcomings in its current form, and as such should not be viewed as the whole solution even if widely adopted.

Table 1 presents summary notes on all the templates reviewed. Most are not suitable as a standalone national standard, based on the feedback we received from stakeholders. The one that is most suitable in the authors' opinions is the TfL Fleet Operator

---

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that any conclusions drawn on the basis of the review of these templates do not reflect the authors' opinions of the templates *per se*. Rather, they reflect the authors' opinions as to the suitability of the templates as the basis of a national standard on managing work-related road risk, in light of the feedback received from stakeholders in this project and on the basis of our judgement.

Recognition Scheme (FORS). This is because it is written in an accessible style, and is structured explicitly as a standard. In addition as well as being clear on the processes that are to be taken in managing risk (for example risk assessments, documentation procedures) it is clear on some of the interventions that can be used to help address specific risk factors (e.g. close proximity safety equipment for large vehicles).

Despite the promise of the FORS template, if a national standard were to be based on it further content would be needed in terms of specific advice regarding interventions. In the authors' opinions the content in the HSE 'Driving at Work' advice document would serve as the best starting point for this, again largely due to its accessible style and focus on practical advice that has an *a priori* link to risk; an example of this kind of content is the hierarchical advice relating to eliminating hazards entirely, and then if this is not possible, finding ways to reduce exposure to risk,. Finally it stays focused on known risk factors with coverage of reducing drivers' temptations or pressures to speed, or to drive while tired.

The draft international standard (ISO39001) also has shortcomings, mainly in the sense that it again fails to provide any detailed guidance on specific interventions, and also that it is not written in an accessible style.

**Table 1: Summary descriptions of existing templates and assessment of their suitability as the basis of a national standard**

Template	Description	Suitability as basis for national standard/justification
<b>ISO39001 Draft International Standard</b>	Draft of ISO39001 international standard on road traffic safety management systems.	<p><b>Not suitable as a replacement for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>Main reason for this is that it is not written in an accessible style, and also that it lacks practical advice on how to put measures into place to change the relevant performance and risk factors.</p> <p>One positive of the document is that it identifies performance factors based on evidence, and focuses on exposure and the final safety outcome factor of deaths and serious injuries (although note that minor injuries and damage-only accidents are not mentioned as intermediate safety outcomes, which they should be).</p>
<b>Driving at work: Managing work-related road safety (Health and Safety Executive)</b>	Guidance document for employers, covering a wide range of areas.	<p><b>Partly suitable as the basis for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>Introduction, legal responsibilities and benefits sections are written clearly, as is the section on carrying out and reviewing risk assessments.</p> <p>Focus is on elimination of hazards, and if this is not possible, taking steps to minimise their impact. This is desirable given the <i>a priori</i> case for the effectiveness of such an approach (i.e. reducing exposure to risk). Later sections focus on the driver, the vehicle, and the journey as areas in which risks need to be assessed, and most content is based on evidence (i.e. key risk factors being fatigue, time pressure, distraction, importance of seat belts). No mention of specific risk factors for some vehicle and journey types (for example cyclists and lorries turning left).</p>
<b>Fleet Health Check (IAM Drive and Survive)</b>	Document positioned as the first step in the IAM Drive and Survive Consultancy offering for driver risk	<p><b>Not suitable as the basis for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>Main reason for this is the style in which it is</p>

Template	Description	Suitability as basis for national standard/justification
	<p>management. Checklist of questions for employers to answer.</p>	<p>written being designed to elicit information from an employer, rather than to provide guidance on how to manage risk. No mention of specific risk factors for some vehicle and journey types (for example cyclists and lorries turning left).</p>
<p><b>Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) (Transport for London)</b></p>	<p>Requirements document for use by fleet operators who wish to gain recognition under the FORS scheme.</p>	<p><b>Possibly suitable as the basis for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>Written clearly, and presented explicitly as a standard. Each requirement is written clearly, a purpose is given for each, and examples of how each requirement can be demonstrated are also given along with suggestions for further guidance. Requirements in areas of management, vehicles, drivers, and operations. Slightly freight-centric, although this means that key risk factors such as cyclist vulnerability are covered.</p>
<p><b>Management of Occupational Road Risk (MORR) (Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents)</b></p>	<p>A comprehensive set of guidelines covering a range of areas such as mobile phones, journey planning, driver assessment and training, etc. Most offer a sample company policy on the areas they cover.</p>	<p><b>Partly suitable as the basis for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>The guidance notes are well-written, and provide good background information on the problem areas and what research there is on them. There is a strong emphasis on process, but practical recommendations are too few and probably aim too high to act as a national standard. Similarly, the sample company policies could be seen as too demanding by some smaller operators.</p>
<p><b>PRAISE (Preventing Road Accidents and Injuries for the Safety of Employees) documentation</b></p>	<p>Thematic report No. 9 (Work-related road safety management programmes) and other specific thematic reports produced as part of European project.</p>	<p><b>Not suitable as the basis for a national standard based on feedback from stakeholders in this project.</b></p> <p>Although the PRAISE outputs contain a wealth of information, and can be seen as excellent reference sources for those seeking a broad range of information about work-related road safety, they are not written in a clear and accessible style (being more academic in approach).</p>

## 4 Discussion, conclusions and recommendations

The current project set out with the aim of addressing two key questions.

1. What should a national standard for the management of work-related road risk look like?
2. What role or roles might the Police play in developing and/or supporting a standard, and in contributing to improvements in work-related road safety?

The project mainly employed interviews with stakeholders in an attempt to answer these questions. Those stakeholders who are responsible for managing work-related road risk directly (i.e. in fleets), and those stakeholders who have a more strategic and advisory role in the field were spoken to, so that their perceptions on the key topics could be established. The stakeholder interviews were supplemented with input from academics working in the field, and an appraisal of some existing templates for the management of work-related road risk.

In this section we consider the maturity of work-related road safety when compared with wider workplace health and safety. Then on the basis of the findings of the current study, and our understanding of the wider field of work-related road safety, we recommend the next steps that ought to be taken to work towards a national standard. Finally, the roles that the Police might best serve in this process and in the future are discussed.

### 4.1 The perceived importance of work-related road safety

**An important finding, that sets the scene for the the conclusions of the current research is that the management of work-related road risk is widely perceived to be lagging behind the management of health and safety risk in the workplace.** This will not come as a surprise to those working within the field, but it is nonetheless important to have it documented as a key finding that has emerged from discussion with a wide range of stakeholders, including businesses that represent good practice ('Driving for Better Business' champions).

There are issues in the wider literature that are also relevant here. For example, numerous commentators have pointed out that the fact that work-related road injuries are not reportable in the RIDDOR database adds to the perception that that work-related road safety is somehow separate from workplace safety, even though in legislation it is not. Additionally, in the recent independent review of health and safety legislation, Löfstedt (2011) is forced to conclude that:

*'...my terms of reference did not extend to the introduction of new regulation, I did not explore suggestions from stakeholders for duties that should be added to the regulations, such as the introduction of an explicit duty on company directors or a requirement to report work-related road traffic accidents'* (Löfstedt, 2011, p25).

Keeping any review within scope is important, but it is instructive for our cause here that this author was forced to defend specifically the absence of the very area that our stakeholders have identified as a key gap in the field.

One of Löfstedt's wider recommendations is that the HSE reviews its Approved Codes of Practice (ACoPs). The HSE is currently consulting on this issue, and although new ACoPs

have been deemed out of scope in the consultation, the consultation itself may present an opportunity to explore the extent to which ACoPs may represent one mechanism by which a national standard might be created.

**There is an appetite among stakeholders in this study for the consistency of approach that a national standard could bring.** We now turn our attention to what such a national standard should contain.

## 4.2 A simple, evidence-based national standard

Grayson and Helman (2011) concluded that although there is undoubtedly some good being done in the field of work-related road safety, the evidence base is not sufficiently developed to permit an understanding of which components of interventions (which are often multi-faceted) are most effective in bringing about safety improvements. One argument that is sometimes forwarded in response to this is that as long as some good is being done, it doesn't matter how this is being achieved. In a world of unlimited resource (or in the case of large businesses, 'slack' in the system to permit investment in wide-ranging and multi-faceted work-related road safety programmes), this argument holds. However Fleet stakeholders have been clear that what they require from a standard is a business case, and guidance not only on the processes they need to put in place, but also simple guidance on those practical steps they need to take to be meeting good practice in terms of effecting risk reduction. Löfstedt (2011), when discussing wider health and safety in relation to the ACoPs produced by the HSE, notes that this is particularly true of small and medium size enterprises, who often require guidance on how to meet particular health and safety regulations.

The question remains however; what should go in to a standard? On the one hand the answer to this is contained in this document; a simple-to-follow risk management system modelled on the health and safety 'plan-do-check-act' model, plus the components mentioned by stakeholders. Some of these components should be seen not as good practice but simply as a starting position for any business that is looking to manage its activities on a sensible basis. These include the importance of senior management buy-in (which should always be seen as necessary but not sufficient), licence checks (a first pass at checking risk, as well as ruling out drivers who do not have legal permission to drive), vehicle maintenance (to rule out the small number of accidents that will occur due to mechanical failure, but also to promote a professional image of the company) and the collection of data to monitor performance. Fleet stakeholders were also clear that some way of ensuring compliance with the standard should be included.

The draft of ISO 39001 was reviewed as part of the current study, but it was not found to meet all of the needs identified by stakeholders. This was mainly because it focuses exclusively on the management processes required for the identification and management of work-related road risk, and does not contain any practical guidance on those measures to be put into place to actually address the risks identified. However, it seems likely that when it is published later in 2012, ISO 39001 will attract wide attention, and may establish itself quickly in the market. If this is the case, and if this makes the publication of a separate standalone national standard redundant, then another mechanism will need to be found to ensure that there is also a 'standard equivalent' set of practical guidance to sit alongside ISO 39001. One way in which this might be achieved is through a new ACoP, published by the HSE.



Regardless of whether a national standard stands alone, or whether a combination of ISO 39001 and a new ACoP is used, there is the question of what guidance should be contained in the standard regarding which practical interventions employers should use once the risk assessment approach outlined above has been used to identify the key risks. Our position on this issue is informed partly by our previous work in work-related road safety, although it is worth noting that the findings from this study concur (especially the request from Fleet stakeholders that they do indeed require guidance on practical measures).

**In our opinion a national standard, in addition to guidance on the proper management processes that need to be in place, and the baseline components mentioned above, should have guidance only on those practical measures that have a basis in good quality evidence to support them, or an *a priori* case for their effectiveness.** Our suggested list then is:

- Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving *per se*.
- Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving during the highest risk periods related to sleepiness (broadly, 2-6am, and 2-4pm)
- Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving while using in-car devices that are distracting (e.g. mobile phones)
- Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving while under time pressure (and thus may lead to increased speed)
- Measures that seek to reduce exposure to driving in specific, identified risky situations in particular sectors (for example planning journeys to avoid interactions between large goods/construction vehicles interacting with cyclists at junctions)

**Beyond the well-understood mechanism of reducing exposure to the activity of driving itself, or to the well-understood risk factors, we see little value in having guidance on other specific practical measures unless they have been properly evaluated.** Grayson and Helman (2011) list some measures that have been evaluated to some degree (including the use of vehicle telematics, although what is done with these is rarely defined) although none in a GB context. If good quality evidence builds in favour of particular interventions then clearly these should be addressed in the standard as and when it is updated. The focus should be on simple solutions that require little outside help to administer to small and medium size enterprises.

In terms of creating the standard along the blueprint outlined above, some guidance and input will be needed from several organisations, including the Police, the HSE, and some of the expert stakeholders interviewed in this study. One key role required will be in marshalling input from these experts. **Given their previous experience in outreach activities of this type, those running the Driving for Better Business programme would appear to be in an ideal position to galvanise action to move a standard forward, if its resources and funding status permit.**

### 4.3 The role or roles of the Police

The final consideration is what role or roles the Police might play in work-related road safety. **As mentioned above, the Police would clearly have a role to play in creating the content and style of a national standard.** In addition, the MPS already

have a clear set of roles to play as outlined in their memorandum of understanding with the HSE.

Stakeholders in this study were united in saying that the Police have the reputation and the respect to deliver various roles within work-related road safety. They have an obvious role to play in enforcement of road traffic law, and one way in which they can have a large impact on drawing attention to the importance of work-related road safety is to follow up driving offences committed when driving for work, with those businesses responsible for the drivers who commit the offences. It is obvious that driving offences, while not perfect, are a good early indicator for risk, and can be used as an input into a company's work-related road risk management system.

**Therefore our key recommendation for the role of the Police is that they explore ways to ensure that information regarding traffic offences reaches businesses (when the offences have been committed while driving for work).**

There will of course be technical and data issues to overcome. For example the detection of traffic offences through means such as fixed and average speed cameras is not always managed directly by the Police. In addition, it will be necessary to utilise vehicle registration information to identify those offences that are committed while driving in work-related vehicles. Nonetheless the Police are in an ideal position to engage with the relevant partners involved.

Finally, the Police will also have a role to play in disseminating the message regarding the importance of work-related road safety. There are clearly a number of ways in which this can be achieved. First, the Police may wish to disseminate the consistent message supporting the national standard approach through wider outreach activities (for example at conferences and trade meetings). Second, they may wish to engage directly with businesses in a preventative or educational role. Both of these were suggested by Fleet stakeholders in this study as being valuable. We recognise however (as do several stakeholders in this study) that the Police do not have unlimited resources, and that therefore a level of prioritisation will be required. **Our recommendation is that the Police focus on wider dissemination activities, as this would most effectively draw on the respect and expertise they are seen as having in this field.**

## **Acknowledgements**

The work described in this report was carried out in the Safety Division of the Transport Research Laboratory, and was jointly funded by the Metropolitan Police Service, and the Association of Chief Police Officers. The authors are grateful to Graham Grayson who carried out the technical review and auditing of this report. In addition, we would like to thank those organisations and individuals who contributed to the study by taking part in interviews.

## References

- Grayson, G. B. & Helman, S. (2011). Work-related road safety: a systematic review of the literature on the effectiveness of interventions. Research report 11.3. Institute of Occupational Safety and Health.
- HSE (2010). Memorandum of understanding between the HSE and the MPS. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/howwework/framework/mou/met-mou-jan.pdf> - retrieved 13/08/2012.
- Löfstedt, R. (2011). Reclaiming health and safety for all: an independent review of health and safety legislation. London: The Stationary Office
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

## Appendix A Approach and information emails

### A.1.1 Approach email

Dear xxxxxx

TRL is carrying out research for the Metropolitan Police Service which we hope will help to identify what a national standard for the management of work-related road risk would look like, and what role the police might play in developing and supporting such a standard.

The project involves us interviewing stakeholders from across the work-related road safety sphere (business champions, suppliers, policy makers and so-on) and we have identified you as someone with whom we would really like to speak.

The interview would be carried out over the telephone, and is likely to take around 45 minutes. The focus of the interview would be on updating our awareness of what is known about approaches to managing work-related road risk, and people's opinions of the role that the police may play in this important safety activity.

If you are willing and able to take part, I would really appreciate you indicating this by return email. I, or one of my team, will then contact you with some further details and to arrange a convenient time for us to speak with you.

Best regards

xxxxxx

### A.1.2 Information email

Dear xxxxxx

Thank you for your reply.

*<Text tailored for recipient – asking for suggested time slots and telephone number>*

The interview is likely to last around 45 minutes. The broad questions we will ask you are as follows:

1. What in your opinion currently represents 'good practice' in the management of work-related road risk?
2. What do you think the key components of a national standard on managing work-related road risk should be?
3. Focussing specifically on WRRS and driving offences, to what extent do you perceive that 'good practice' in WRRS currently includes consideration of driving offences?
4. What, in your opinion, would be the best role for the police in delivering and supporting such a national standard for WRRS?

You are welcome to consider these questions in advance of your interview, but don't feel that you need to do any preparation. When we conduct the interview, there will be plenty of opportunity for you to answer the questions and explore them in more depth with the interviewer.

Thank you again for agreeing to take part in this research.

Kind regards

xxxxxx

## Appendix B Interview topic guide

### Interview guide: Work-related road safety review

We are carrying out research for the Metropolitan Police Service which we hope will lead to a national standard for work-related road safety.

This interview forms part of a consultation with a range of expert stakeholders in the field. The focus of this interview will be on updating our awareness of what is known about approaches to managing work-related road risk from key stakeholders. Part of the focus of the research is also to try and understand what role the police can play in this.

We have developed an interview guide that I would like to work through. The questions I will ask you are the same ones we are using for all stakeholders – this helps us to gain an understanding of any differences between stakeholders' viewpoints. There are **no right or wrong answers** so please be as honest as you can. It is ok if you feel you can't or don't want to answer some of the questions.

Because we want to find out your thoughts and views, I will be saying as little as possible during the interview and will listen to you.

I would like to **record the interview** with your permission. This will avoid me having to scribble everything down as you speak. We will only use the recording to help with writing the report. Once we have transcribed the audio recording, the audio files will be destroyed. All information reported will remain anonymous at all times, and nothing you say will be linked with you personally. You will not be personally identifiable in any reports that come out of this work. Are you ok with all of this?

If Participant agrees: I have now turned on the voice recorder.

I expect this interview to **last between 30 minutes and one hour**. Is this ok?

### Background

How would you describe the nature of your organisation's business?

What is the key motivator for management of work-related road risk in your own organisation?

Do you see your organisation as having a role to play in the wider field of WRRS?

*Possible prompts – supplier of services, setting an example*

### WRRS

**What in your opinion currently represents 'good practice' in the management of work-related road risk?**

*By good practice we mean the measures that most or all of the professionals working within WRRS would agree should be included in the standard approach to managing work-related road risk.*

What sort of measures do you feel hold the most promise for improving WRRS? Can you provide any examples?

What improvements/changes would you like to see happening in the future, e.g. in the next 5 years?

What do you think the gaps in knowledge about WRRS currently are?

How can examples of good practice be best disseminated?

**What do you think the key components of a national standard on managing work-related road risk should be?**

*For example, specific interventions, data collection, performance management, basic pre-checks on drivers, remedial action against drivers, training, disciplinary action, monitoring.*

For each component, can you say why you think it needs to be included? What evidence is there that it should be included? Is it self-evident?

If such a national standard were to exist, what do you think the consequences should be for organisations that do not meet it?

How should such a national standard be disseminated and driven forward? Which organisations might take a lead in this?

**What we'd like to do now is focus specifically on discussing WRRS and driving offences. To what extent do you perceive that 'good practice' in WRRS currently includes consideration of driving offences?**

*For example speeding, driving without due care and attention, illegal vehicle condition (e.g. tyres), seat belts, careless and reckless driving.*

Why do you think this is?

Can you give any examples, including any from your own company?

How useful/ important is it to have a focus on offending? Why/why not?

**What, in your opinion, would be the best role for the police in delivering and supporting such a national standard for WRRS?**

Prosecutions for non-compliance?

Dissemination of information?

Publicity?

Policy/standard development?

Data collection and provision?

Remedial action on offending?

Promoting monitoring of offending at the company level?

**Are there any other points you would like to discuss relating to WRRS?**







According to official road safety statistics, many hundreds of fatalities and many thousands of serious injuries result each year in Great Britain from road collisions in which someone is driving for work. In the absence of a national standard for the management of work-related road risk, this project addresses two questions. First, what should a standard look like? Second, what role should the Police play in its development and use? Interviews were held with 30 stakeholders (including 10 fleet managers) to explore these questions. Existing templates for the management of work-related road risk were also reviewed. Findings showed that work-related road safety is perceived as in need of improvement. There is appetite for the consistency that a national standard could bring. Key components for the standard are suggested, including the importance of having guidance on practical measures to reduce risks, as well as guidance on risk management processes modelled on the health and safety approach. Two possible mechanisms by which a national standard might be developed are suggested; either a standalone standard should be developed, or a practical guidance document (possibly an Approved Code of Practice published by the HSE) should be developed to support the forthcoming ISO 39001. A key role for the Police in supporting work-related road safety in the future will be in enabling information about driving offences committed while driving for work being made available to employers. In addition, the Police have the credibility and respect to engage in wide dissemination relating to the standard, and to work-related road safety in general.

Other titles from this subject area

- PPR418**      **Mobile phone and seat belt usage rates in London 2009.** S Narine, L K Walter and S C Charman. 2010
- PPR414**      **The effect of traffic signal strategies on the safety of pedestrians.** J Kennedy, M Crabtree, J Castle, J Martin and M Elliott. 2009
- PPR413**      **The relationship between driver fatigue and rules limiting hours of driving and work.** A M Parkes, W Gillan and S Cynk. 2009
- PPR248**      **Review of international road safety good practice.** J A Castle and G E Kamyia-Lukoda. 2007
- PPR247**      **Review of road safety good practice in English local authorities.** J A Castle and G E Kamyia-Lukoda. 2007
- PPR223**      **New and improved accident reconstruction techniques for modern vehicles equipped with ESC systems.** R F Lambourn, P W Jennings, I Knight and T Brightman. 2007

Price code: 2X

ISSN 0968-4093

**TRL**

Crowthorne House, Nine Mile Ride  
Wokingham, Berkshire RG40 3GA  
United Kingdom

T: +44 (0) 1344 773131  
F: +44 (0) 1344 770356  
E: enquiries@trl.co.uk  
W: www.trl.co.uk

Published by



**IHS**

Willoughby Road, Bracknell  
Berkshire RG12 8FB  
United Kingdom

T: +44 (0) 1344 328038  
F: +44 (0) 1344 328005  
E: trl@ihs.com  
W: http://emeastore.ihs.com

ISBN 978-1-908855-20-6



**PPR626**