Implementing the Recommendations of The World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention

Tony Bliss

The World Health Organisation and the World Bank—jointly issued on World Health Day 2004 by the World Health Organisation and the World Bank—highlights the growing public health burden of road deaths and injuries in low and middle-income countries. It also makes a powerful case for concerted and urgent action to address the problem, as a global development priority. This Note summarizes the findings of the ‘World Report’ and provides guidelines to assist with the implementation of its recommendations. These will require both countries and donor agencies to substantially scale-up and refocus their activities, with a strong emphasis on managing for results.

A country capacity review is a mandatory first step to build a multisectoral framework for dialogue between counterparts in different ministries, between Bank staff working in different sectors, and between Bank staff and their client agencies. The findings of the review should be used to prepare an investment strategy for short, medium and long-term actions required to build a sustainable safety management capacity. It should include interventions to urgently target high-risk roads and achieve rapid reductions in deaths and injuries. The absence of reliable death and injury data must and need not impede immediate action, but the building of countrywide data systems should be included as part of the strategy.

Dialogue must also be initiated with all international stakeholders to foster a global partnership that can assist and accelerate the process of low and middle-income countries building their scientific, technological and managerial capacities to prepare and implement innovative and cost-effective road safety programs.

FINDINGS OF THE WORLD REPORT ON ROAD TRAFFIC INJURY PREVENTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank jointly issued The World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention1 on World Health Day 2004, which was dedicated by the WHO to the improvement of global road safety.

The World Report sets out the most complete global data available on deaths and injuries from road crashes. It also presents projected future outcomes worldwide, if measures are not urgently taken to prevent them. These deaths and injuries already create unacceptable global public health, social and economic development losses. Every year an estimated 1.2 million people are killed and up to 50 million more people are injured or disabled on the world’s roads.

World Bank projections indicate that global road fatalities will increase by more than 65 percent between the years 2000 and 2020, unless intensified safety interventions are implemented, with this trend varying across regions of the world. Fatalities are predicted to increase by more than 80 percent in low and middle-income countries, but decrease by nearly 30 percent in high-income countries (Table 1)2.

By 2020, road deaths and injuries are predicted to be the third leading contributor to the global burden of disease and injury.3 Low and middle-income countries already bear about 90 percent of the current burden of road deaths and injuries and they will experience the greatest growth in casualty rates over this period. A large proportion of crash victims in these countries will continue to be their more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Bank Region</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income countries</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The **World Report** highlights road safety as a social equity issue. Road crashes have a disproportionate impact on the poor who experience limited access to post-crash emergency care and face costs and loss of income that can push families into poverty. Crude estimates of the economic costs of road deaths and injuries put them at an average of 1 percent of GNP for low-income countries, compared with 1.5 percent for middle-income countries and 2 percent for high-income countries. These costs could be far higher in low income countries, especially if the social costs of pain and suffering were fully accounted for.

A key message of the **World Report** is that the costs of road crashes can be substantially avoided, because successful programs in high-income countries over the last thirty years have demonstrated that road deaths and injuries are predictable and can be prevented. However, investment in the prevention of road crashes and injuries is currently not commensurate with its growing public health priority in low and middle-income countries. Research and development programs are inadequate and the implementation of cost-effective safety measures is not widespread.

The **World Report** emphasizes that road safety is a responsibility shared by government, industry, nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, with participation by people from many disciplines and the wider community.

It also emphasizes the complexity and hazardous nature of the road transport system, which must be understood as a whole and designed and operated to compensate for human vulnerability and fallibility. In this regard, **Vision Zero** in Sweden and **Sustainable Safety** in the Netherlands are promoted by the **World Report** as leading examples of good practice.

The importance of establishing reliable data systems for road safety planning and decision-making is stressed, but their poor quality in low and middle-income countries is not seen as impeding immediate action, because much can be achieved by simply adapting and applying proven safety practices.

The **World Report** invites governments to assess the current status of road safety in their respective countries and makes a set of recommendations to be used as flexible guidelines to assist this process. Low and middle-income countries lacking sufficient resources to fully apply these recommendations are encouraged to seek partnerships with international organizations and other entities to assist their implementation.

**WORLD REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **Identify a lead agency in government to guide the national road safety effort.** This recommendation stresses the importance of institutional leadership which derives from a designated legal authority to make decisions, control resources and coordinate the efforts of all participating sectors of government. Lead agencies can take different institutional forms, but they must be adequately funded and publicly accountable for their performance. They must also actively engage and collaborate with all groups in society that can contribute to improved safety outcomes. Their effectiveness is considerably enhanced by strong and sustained political support for the initiatives they promote.

2. **Assess the problem, policies and institutional settings relating to road traffic injury and the capacity for road traffic injury prevention in each country.** This recommendation underscores the complexity of managing for safety across the road transport network and the vital role played by reliable data and effective institutional structures in sustaining safety improvements. Simple, cost-effective data systems that are consistent with international standards for recording and classifying road deaths and injuries should be established. Institutional capacity to implement effective injury prevention measures at a country level must also be appraised.

3. **Prepare a national road safety strategy and plan of action.** This recommendation emphasizes the multisectoral and multidisciplinary dimensions of a national road safety strategy. It must address the safety of all road users and engage all stakeholders across government, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, the media and the general public. A national road safety strategy should also be linked to strategies in other sectors and set ambitious but realistic safety targets, complemented by a national action plan setting out specific interventions to achieve them.

4. **Allocate financial and human resources to address the problem.** This recommendation highlights the importance of cost-benefit analysis in setting expenditure priorities for road traffic injury prevention, drawing on the evaluation of interventions by countries worldwide. To achieve safety targets, new funding sources may have to be found for the required level of investments. Priority will also have to be given to training programs across a range of disciplines, to build the skills required to develop and implement national road safety strategies. Participation in global and regional training networks and international conferences can contribute to this process and further strengthen country capacity.

5. **Implement specific actions to prevent road traffic crashes, minimize injuries and their consequences and evaluate the impact of these actions.** This recommendation summarizes the range of ‘good practice’ interventions that could be considered by all countries. Specific country-based actions should be based on sound evidence, be culturally appropriate, form part of a national road safety strategy and be evaluated for their effectiveness.

6. **Support the development of national capacity and international cooperation.** This recommendation calls for a substantial scaling up of international efforts to build a partnership focused on strengthening capacity at the country level to deal with the growing road safety crisis. United Nations agencies, nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, philanthropic foundations and donor countries and agencies all have an important role to play in increasing support for global road safety to levels provided for other health problems of comparable magnitude. Leadership, coordination and an ongoing process engaging relevant government ministers will be required to develop and endorse a global plan of action that is consistent with other global initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals.
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

Managing For Results

The recommendations of the World Report focus on safety management issues at the country level, emphasizing agency accountability for results, multisectoral collaboration, capacity building and the creation of a supporting global partnership.

This focus is well aligned with the World Bank’s results management agenda which seeks sustained improvements in country development outcomes through stronger partnerships and systematic management attention to results at all stages of the development cycle: planning, implementation and completion.

Managing for road safety results requires action to be taken at three levels: in countries, where the results are to be achieved; within the Bank, to be a more effective agency; and across development agencies, for greater impact through collective action.

At the country level the focus must be on supporting clients to better specify desired road safety outcomes in national strategies, set realistic goals and develop more effective monitoring and evaluation systems.

Within the Bank the road safety results focus must be strengthened in Country Assistance Strategies. Sector strategies – particularly Transport and Health – must be better aligned to contribute to country results and individual road safety operations must be given a stronger results focus.

Across development agencies the emphasis must be on fostering a well-focused partnership for the management of road safety results, including harmonization of country-level reporting and performance evaluation.

Capacity building provides the foundation that underpins these three areas of work. Success will be determined by the effectiveness of measures taken to:

- build the capacity of countries to design and implement road safety strategies and measure their results;
- build the capacity across the Bank to align and coordinate sector strategies and operations with desired country results; and
- build the capacity of the Bank and other development agencies to collaborate more effectively and harmonize for greater results.

These priorities are addressed in the following guidelines prepared to give operational guidance to Bank staff in their consideration and implementation of the World Report recommendations.

A country capacity checklist is provided to assist operational staff and their counterparts make a quick but comprehensive assessment of national preparedness to successfully manage road safety results.

Guidelines are then provided to assist the preparation of a Bank/donor supported investment strategy. This should aim to address the long-term process of overcoming country capacity weaknesses, while seeking to identify specific operations which could rapidly improve road safety results.

Finally, priority areas for building a supportive global partnership are sketched out. It is intended that these will help shape the agenda for more in-depth dialogue with international stakeholders, by highlighting the areas of support that require scaling up and harmonization.

Country Capacity Checklist

Before preparing country road safety investment strategies and operations it is important to conduct a quick and systematic review of national safety management capacity.

Such a review may also be required at a regional, provincial or city level, depending on country arrangements and the nature of Bank operations under consideration.

A country capacity review is a mandatory first step in setting out an integrated multisectoral framework for dialogue between Bank staff and their country counterparts on potential road safety investments.

Capacity review findings should be reflected in Country Assistance Strategies and related sector strategies and projects aligned to contribute to desired country results.

Safety management systems are undeniably complex, but their capacity can be readily reviewed across three best practice dimensions: their focus on results, their safety interventions and their implementation arrangements.

The following sections provide quick and simple checklists to guide such a review.

Results focus

Key questions include:

- What data are readily available to identify road deaths and injuries?
- Which road users face the biggest risk of being killed and injured in the road transport system?
- What is officially considered to be an acceptable and achievable level of safety for all road users?
- Have national and provincial targets been set for improved safety performance?
- Which agencies are responsible for achieving this level of safety and how are they held to account for the performance achieved?

It is important to probe the risks faced by different road user groups (drivers, passengers, pedestrians, cyclists etc.), assisted by available data from highway agencies, police, hospitals and other sources.

It is also important to locate and rank where possible those sections of the road network with the highest concentrations of deaths and injuries, across the hierarchy of urban roads (for example, residential, distributor and freeway) and the hierarchy of inter-urban roads (for example, national and provincial).
Examine available statistics for similar types of roads may highlight regional or other discrepancies between the number of crashes and the percentage of those that result in injury or death. Depending on injury reporting rates, higher death ratios may indicate weaknesses in road design and construction, or in emergency responses, including police, fire/rescue and emergency medical services (EMS). Examining the location of crash deaths—at the scene or in hospital—may also point to weaknesses in EMS or fire/rescue services.

Where data is deficient or simply unavailable, extensive agency, industry and community consultations may need to be conducted to identify user groups most at risk and locate hazardous sections of the network.

The best starting point for these discussions is within the health sector, particularly with the medical staff of hospitals that attend to crash victims.

The issue of acceptable and achievable levels of safety and related responsibilities and accountabilities must be addressed at the highest agency and ministerial levels, especially across the Transport and Health sectors.

In this dialogue it is important to identify the scale of the national health loss incurred by road crashes, compared to other causes of death and injury in the country concerned.

Targets for improved safety performance can take various forms as described in Table 2.

### Table 2: Safety Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Outcomes</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final outcomes consist of social costs, fatalities and serious injuries. They are what the country seeks to avoid. Targets can be expressed in absolute terms and also in terms of rates per capita, vehicle and volume of travel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes are not desired for themselves but for what they entail—better final outcomes. They include average traffic speeds, the proportion of drunk drivers in fatal and serious injury crashes, seatbelt-wearing rates, helmet-wearing rates, the physical condition of the road network and the standard of the vehicle fleet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outputs represent physical deliverables, for instance the number of police patrols, or alternatively they can correspond to milestones showing a specific task has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If reliable fatality and injury data and information on the likely effectiveness of specific safety interventions is available, national and provincial targets for managing results can be calculated and set at all of these levels.

However, where such data and information is deficient, output targets reflecting the degree of road safety effort may have to suffice, ideally supplemented by systematic surveys of intermediate outcomes.

### Interventions

Key questions include:

- Have comprehensive safety standards and rules been set for roads, vehicles and road users?
- Are compliance regimes in place to ensure adherence to identified safety standards and rules?
- Do the identified standards and rules and related compliance regimes clearly address the safety priorities of high-risk road user groups?
- How favorably do identified standards and rules and related compliance regimes compare with international best practice?

Interventions should be reviewed within a framework that acknowledges their systematic nature, as set out in Table 3. Interventions address the safe design and operation of the road network, or the conditions under which vehicles and road users can safely use it; and they set specific standards and rules for this safety and aim to secure compliance with them.

Close attention should be paid to the safety standards that are set for road network design and the extent to which they are clearly defined within a hierarchy of roads and respond to identified road user risks.

It is also important to review if safety audits are conducted to ensure compliance with these standards and if network surveys are regularly carried out for safety maintenance and hazard identification purposes.

Likewise, safety standards and related compliance regimes for vehicles and road users should be thoroughly appraised.

Vehicle safety standards are important for vehicle users and vulnerable road users. Procedures for ensuring compliance with them, as a prerequisite for entry to the vehicle fleet, should be reviewed. These standards can relate to active safety features (e.g. lighting and conspicuity) and passive safety features (e.g. side and frontal impact protection, pedestrian and cyclist protection, and safety belts).

Standards promulgated by the world’s leading vehicle safety jurisdictions—USA, Japan and Europe—provide a useful benchmark for assessing country policies.

The extent to which driver licensing standards take account of the higher crash risks of novice drivers and older drivers should also be reviewed.

Police enforcement of safety standards and rules must be carefully examined. Particular attention should be paid to police operational practices targeting unsafe behaviors like speeding, drink-driving and non-wearing of safety belts and helmets.

Likewise, police enforcement of the safety of commercial transport operations—both freight and passenger—must be reviewed.

It is most important to assess if the overall scale of police enforcement initiatives are sufficient to ensure effective compliance. Experience in best practice jurisdictions indicates that about 20 percent of total police budgets are dedicated to road policing activities.
The extent to which road user education and awareness campaigns are designed to support police enforcement initiatives should also be appraised.

### Table 3: Classification of Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Rules</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and operation of the road network.</td>
<td>Compliance interventions aim to make road builders and operators, the vehicle and transport industry and road users adhere to safety standards and rules, using a combination of education, enforcement and incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of entry and exit to the road network for vehicles and road users.</td>
<td>Standards and rules cover road design, construction and maintenance and related activities such as roadside emergency medical services. They also govern how the road network is to be used by setting speed limits, vehicle standards and vehicle and road user licensing requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation arrangements

Key questions include:

- Are funding mechanisms established, sufficient and sustainable?
- Are legislative instruments well matched to the road safety task?
- Are interventions being coordinated to maximize efficiency and effectiveness?
- Are interventions monitored, evaluated and adjusted accordingly?
- Are the government, business and community responsibilities to ensure a safe road system being actively promoted?

Identifying and quantifying total funding allocated to agencies for road safety can be difficult, particularly when it is embedded in broader sector budgets. However, it is important to seek high-level confirmation of budget sources, processes and levels.

Specialist skills will most likely be required to review road safety legislation. This will depend on the complexities of the legal codes and the extent to which they have been structured or restructured to consolidate previous legislation. Road safety legislation typically addresses road, vehicle and user safety standards and rules—and related compliance—but it has often evolved over time, without adequate cross-referencing.

National coordinating bodies may exist, but unless their membership includes agencies fully accountable and funded for road safety results, experience suggests they will be ineffective. In best practice countries these bodies are usually the extension of accountable agencies that ‘own’ and use them as platforms for mobilizing resources and coordinating multisectoral partnerships, in pursuit of agreed results.

Implementation arrangements must be scrutinized and related to agency and stakeholder responsibilities and accountabilities for managing road safety results. In particular, monitoring and evaluation systems and safety promotion initiatives must be reviewed in this context.

### Preparing Safety Investment Strategies and Related Operations

The findings of safety management capacity reviews—expressed in terms of results focus, interventions and implementation arrangements—will provide a platform to prepare safety investment strategies and related operations.

Although different low and middle-income countries will have relative strengths and weaknesses, it is likely that their safety management capacity will be found to be deficient, as reflected by the findings and recommendations of the World Report and World Bank experience over the last two decades.

In low and middle-income countries a road safety results focus is usually absent. Targets are rarely set and little is known about the effectiveness of interventions, given the absence of reliable performance data. Agencies are rarely held to account for safety results that fail within their sphere of responsibility and influence.

Deficiencies are also evident in safety interventions. Standards and rules governing the safety of roads, vehicles and road users are often fragmented and not based on best practice. Likewise compliance regimes are often ineffective and unduly reliant on education alone to ensure that standards are met and rules abided by. Enforcement lacks purposeful direction and incentives to comply are weak. Poor road user, agency and industry safety performance can be readily observed in the road environment, as can the deaths and injuries that result.

Institutional implementation arrangements remain the biggest impediment to progress. Funding and legislation are usually poorly matched to the task of improving road safety nationwide. Coordination arrangements are often ineffective and hampered by limited agency accountability for achieving safety results. Monitoring and evaluation of safety performance is at best superficial. Safety promotion and programs are often confined to special days of the year and are usually focused on road user responsibilities alone.

This brief overview illustrates the likely situation in many low and middle-income countries. However, it does not substitute for a comprehensive country review, which should be undertaken using the capacity checklist provided in the previous sections.

An important function of such a review is to officially reach a consensus on country capacity weaknesses and how to best overcome them.

It should be recognized that many identified deficiencies cannot be corrected quickly, especially the building of effective implementation arrangements, which in best practice countries have evolved over a long period of motorization and successive governance reforms.
Capacity review findings should be used to prepare a safety investment strategy to guide multi-sectoral road safety operations. The safety investment strategy should be flexible and address identified capacity weaknesses. It should set out the short, medium and long-term actions required at a country level to build a sustainable safety management capacity.

It should also identify immediate and urgent road safety interventions for more detailed preparation, targeting high-risk roads to achieve rapid reductions in deaths and injuries.

An absence of reliable safety data must and need not impede immediate action. However, the building of countrywide data systems should be one of the medium-term investment priorities.

The following sections provide brief guidelines to assist the preparation of Bank road safety operations.

**Sectors**

All relevant sectors must be engaged in the preparation and implementation of road safety operations: especially the Transport, Health, Education and Justice sectors.

Given the strong emphasis on institutional capacity building and results management, alignment with public sector reform objectives may also require consideration and be beneficial in specific operations.

**Scale**

Ideally, operations should be of sufficient scale and intensity to contribute positively to the long-term process of country capacity building for sustainable safety, while achieving measurable road safety results in the short-term. This latter objective can be achieved by targeting high-risk situations and deploying sufficient resources to make an impact.

As country circumstances may not always permit investment in large-scale programs or projects, more modest operations may have to be considered. However, building capacity and achieving results must remain the operational focus.

**Sequencing**

Country circumstances will also determine how the implementation of the long-term investment strategy can best be launched and sequenced.

In countries where the results focus and implementation arrangements are stronger, large-scale demonstration projects may be appropriate to launch the investment strategy and rapidly generate the success needed to engender greater momentum for the longer-term.

In countries where the results focus and implementation arrangements are weaker, smaller projects may be appropriate to first build the management tools required to overcome these weaknesses.

**Road types**

Different operational responses will be required for different types of roads, reflecting their different institutional settings and traffic and land use functions.

City and neighborhood-wide operations may be considered as a comprehensive response to improving safety in urban areas where people live, work and shop. Inter-city and urban corridor operations may be considered, where excessive speeding contributes to greater fatality rates.

Urban areas can be administratively more homogenous than inter-city corridors and may be suited to area-wide safety operations that can also contribute to the achievement of urban development strategies seeking better integration of traffic and land use functions, to improve overall urban amenity.

In high-speed environments priority must be given to the creation of a sustainable police enforcement capacity, by developing specialized highway patrols.

**Instruments**

A range of Bank instruments (e.g., policy dialogue, technical assistance, and investment and program loans) are available to assist the development, preparation and implementation of country road safety strategies and related operations.

The current approach of treating road safety operations as a minor sub-component of considerably larger road infrastructure projects must be reconsidered and opportunities for stand-alone road safety operations actively explored with country counterparts.

Consideration should be given to the potential application of Sector Wide Approaches as an effective means to support country-led programs and special lending instruments such as Adaptable Program Loans and Learning and Innovation Loans.

Whatever the funding arrangements, road safety operations must be founded on an agreed investment strategy that aims to build a sustainable safety management capacity and have a strong results focus. If these conditions are not met, road safety projects or components embedded in larger infrastructure projects are unlikely to achieve sustainable success.

**Interventions**

Planning for road safety operations can draw on successful measures taken in best practice countries and adapt them to country circumstances. Table 4 provides some examples of proven cost-effective interventions that have been well canvassed in the *World Report*.

**Performance measures**

The results achieved by road safety operations must be measured by a combination of final outcomes, intermediate outcomes and outputs, or in some instances just by outputs alone, where no measurable linkage with outcomes can be made (Table 2).
Table 4: Examples of Cost-Effective Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Theme</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Environment</td>
<td>Safe design of new infrastructure, to meet the safety requirements of all its potential road users. Retro-fitting of low cost safety design features to reduce injury severity (e.g. median dividers on rural roads; separation and calming for motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians; traffic roundabouts at risky junctions). Systematic safety audits of road designs to ensure compliance with safety standards and regulations. Systematic reviews to identify road hazards and remedial treatments. Systematic maintenance of all safety features of the road environment, especially signs, markings and pavement surface quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Management</td>
<td>General deterrence-based police enforcement and education to ensure compliance with speed limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Belts And Helmets</td>
<td>General deterrence-based police enforcement and education to ensure compliance with front/back/child restraints and cycle/motorcycle helmet standards and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Driving</td>
<td>General deterrence-based police enforcement and education to ensure compliance with legal alcohol limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice Drivers</td>
<td>Graduated driver licensing system to control and reduce the exposure of young drivers to risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Safety</td>
<td>Harmonization with international best practice and systematic inspection and certification to ensure industry compliance with standards and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicles</td>
<td>General deterrence-based police enforcement and education to ensure compliance with safe loads, driving hours and vehicle standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Safety</td>
<td>Traffic safety education in the core school curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>Pre-hospital care and victim recovery targeted to high-risk corridors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fostering a global partnership

Successful implementation of the World Report’s recommendations will require capacity building in the countries concerned and across Bank units to ensure alignment of sector strategies and operations with desired road safety results.

The success of this venture will also require capacity building across the Bank and its development partners, to achieve more effective collaboration and greater harmonization of future road safety initiatives.

Dialogue must be initiated with all international stakeholders to foster and focus a global partnership that can assist and accelerate the process of low and middle-income countries building their scientific, technological and managerial capacities to prepare and implement cost-effective road safety programs.

The priority areas to be addressed in more depth by this dialogue include the global scaling up and harmonizing of related technical assistance, funding, education and training, knowledge transfer and research and development.

NEXT STEPS

The recommendations of the World Report will take time and substantial resources to be successfully implemented. The guidelines provided in this Note are designed to assist Bank staff in the Transport, Health, Education and Justice sectors and country counterparts with their contributions to this process.

Further information and tools will be disseminated, as they become available.

Planned products include:

- More detailed checklists and operational guidelines, based on further regional and country experiences and analyses.
- A resource guide to international road safety partners and stakeholders and an appraisal of their current and planned services including technical assistance, funding, education and training, knowledge transfer and research.
- Specific guidelines setting out clear strategic and operational responsibilities across Bank sectors and related coordination arrangements.
- A comprehensive assessment of Bank instruments and their applicability to country-based road safety investment strategies and operations.

TO LEARN MORE AND PROVIDE INPUT

To learn more about planned developments of further information and tools and to provide related input on country issues contact:

Tony Bliss
Senior Road Safety Specialist
Transport and Urban Development Department
The World Bank, 1818 H Street NW
Washington DC 20433, USA

Email: abliss@worldbank.org

Transport Notes are available on-line at: http://www.worldbank.org/transport/publicat/tr-notes.htm

Urban Notes are available on-line at: http://www.worldbank.org/urban/upgrading/urban-notes.htm
ANNEX 1

Vietnam Case Study

The Vietnam Road Safety Project, currently being prepared by the Government of Vietnam for World Bank funding, provides a useful case study to illustrate the application of the implementation guidelines provided in this Note.

Country capacity checklist

A quick and systematic review of national safety management capacity was conducted in Vietnam to appraise its safety results focus, interventions and implementation arrangements—and strengths and weaknesses were identified. Road safety was clearly a high government priority in Vietnam, as reflected in their National Policy on Accident and Injury Prevention 2002 – 2010 and their National Program for Traffic Safety 2001 – 2005, which was prepared by the National Traffic Safety Committee. Modest performance targets had been set, but the basis of their derivation and means of achievability were unclear. The questions of what was an acceptable level of safety and which agencies were accountable for its achievement had barely been addressed. Systematic data on road deaths and injuries were not readily available. Interventions were fragmented and not strongly targeting the safety priorities of high-risk road user groups. Standards and rules set for the road environment, vehicles and road users were low and compliance with them poor. Implementation arrangements were weak: sustainable sources of funding, well grounded legal instruments, effective coordination, robust performance monitoring and evaluation and active promotion of shared safety responsibilities were all lacking. The review findings pointed to a growing road safety crisis, unless strong measures were urgently taken.

Preparing a safety investment strategy and related operations

Based on the review findings, an investment strategy was prepared to guide Bank road safety operations, with the vision that over the coming 15 years Vietnam will build a safety management system that produces best practice safety outcomes on a controllable and sustainable basis. In pursuit of this vision, the focus is on building institutional capacity across the Transport, Health, Education and Justice sectors, and creating supporting partnerships with communities, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. Short-term priorities are to take control of safety in high risk highway corridors and to prepare a national strategy for further action. Medium-term priorities are to introduce targeted results measurement and to implement safety programs systematically across the country. Long-term priorities are to establish an independent safety agency and to consolidate program delivery arrangements.

In line with the Country Assistance Strategy for Vietnam, the strategy addresses the health shocks that push people into poverty or make escape from poverty more difficult, by targeting reductions in the health losses and economic inefficiencies resulting from road deaths and injuries. It aims to more sharply focus government safety initiatives and support Bank and donor operations, within an comprehensive results management framework. Integral to the strategy’s design is a ‘break-through’ process in its first phase, which will address the urgency of the safety situation in Vietnam and mobilize all partners and stakeholders whose participation is critical to the achievement of the strategy’s vision. This aims to generate the knowledge, experience, momentum and success required in the face of an escalating road toll to overcome institutional inertia and the seeming indifference of road users to the risks they face on Vietnam’s roads.

Phase 1 of the Vietnam Road Safety Project is currently under preparation. Initially the project was being considered as a small sub-component of a large road network improvement project, but following the country capacity review its scale was substantially increased and the government then decided to prepare it as stand-alone operation. The project is multisectoral in scope and in parallel with building longer-term capacity it aims to achieve measurable road safety results in the short term. A prime focus will be the creation of “Safe Highway” demonstration corridors (located on national highways) which will pilot an integrated suite of best practice safety measures, including low cost engineering improvements, targeted police enforcement of unsafe behaviors supported by education and awareness campaigns, school based education programs, enhanced emergency medical services and related vehicle and driver licensing initiatives. The project will also support the development of a national crash reporting and analysis system.

Safety results in the demonstration corridors (and control corridors) will be comprehensively monitored before, during and after the project interventions. Results monitored will include final and intermediate safety outcomes and related community attitudes. The effectiveness of interventions will be fully evaluated to create benchmarks for their future roll-out to remaining high-risk sections of the network, as envisaged for the second and third phases of the project.

Fostering a global partnership

International agencies are already supporting the project. The New Zealand Agency for International Development and the UK Department for International Development are funding project preparation activities and professional support to Vietnam traffic police is being provided by the New Zealand Police, as part of a prospective twinning arrangement currently under consideration by the jurisdictions concerned. The Asian Development Bank is reviewing ways to align its future activities with the Bank investment strategy and operations, as part of developing its road safety strategy for ASEAN countries. The Vietnam Red Cross, the Asia Injury Prevention Foundation and the Global Road Safety Partnership are also actively considering ways to contribute to the project.