

Distr.: General
13 March 2016

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety

Seventy-fourth session
Geneva, 21-24 March 2017

Analysis of WHO discussion paper “Developing voluntary global performance targets for road safety risk factors and service delivery mechanisms”

Submitted by WP.1 Chair and WP.1 Secretariat

1. To facilitate discussion at its seventy-fourth session, the WP.1 Chair and secretariat has prepared this document which contains an analysis of the WHO Discussion Paper on developing voluntary global performance targets for road safety risk factors and service delivery mechanisms (Informal document No.5).
2. The WP.1 Chair and secretariat believes that there may be a discrepancy between the mandate referred to in the WHO Discussion Paper and the “approach” proposed. As is explained in this document, the “approach” seems to be a mix of two approaches.
3. The WP.1 Chair, with the support of the WP.1 secretariat, is ready to help WHO in the process of elaborating sensible voluntary global performance targets as per the appropriate selected approach. With this in mind, this paper contains alternative suggestions for developing voluntary global performance targets for each of the two approaches.

I. General Comments

4. We understand from the mandate cited in paragraph 5 of the WHO Discussion Paper that: “WHO, in collaboration with other United Nations agencies and the United Nations regional commissions, is to continue facilitating a transparent, sustainable and participatory process with all stakeholders to assist interested countries to develop voluntary global performance targets on key risk factors and service delivery mechanisms to reduce road traffic fatalities and injuries.”

5. The WHO Discussion Paper (of 14 February 2017) does not elaborate on the key risk factors that were used as the basis for the development of the voluntary global performance targets. The WHO Discussion Paper also does not elaborate on the service delivery mechanisms.

6. Therefore, it is not clear whether WHO’s proposed voluntary global targets are to be associated with the key risk factors mentioned in General Assembly Resolution A/RES/70/260 (paragraph 5: non-use of seat belts, child restraints and helmets, drinking alcohol and driving) or the five pillars found in the Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety 2011-2020 (road safety management, safer roads and mobility, safer vehicles, safer road users and post-crash response).

7. The latter appears to be the starting point in the WHO Discussion Paper table for the global targets. Thereafter, WHO’s proposed voluntary global targets appear to be a random mixture of targets and indicators related to a number of activities listed in the Global Plan’s five pillars. The majority of activities listed in the five pillars have not been included. The selection criteria for inclusion or exclusion is not clear.

8. We note WHO’s earlier and continuing mandate to collect data on the key risk factors which are published as part of WHO’s bi-annual Global status reports.

9. We also note that the Global Plan has a comprehensive and detailed list of objectives, actions and corresponding indicators. WHO has also collected the data in this area on the basis of which WHO is expected to produce a final assessment by the end of the Decade ie. by 2020 in which quantitative evaluation of progress made should be presented.

10. Generally speaking, targets and indicators related to the key risk factors should be specific, measurable and achievable. Their effectiveness in improving a policy issue (in this case, road safety and preventing fatalities and injuries) should also be evidence-based/proven. For example, there are qualitative indicators proposed (such as existence of multisectoral national road safety action plan, existence of lead agency, national legislation meets best practice) which will be hard to prove have a direct impact on improving road safety or reducing the number of road fatalities/injuries, though anecdotally we know they usually have a positive impact.

11. At its seventy-ninth session, the Inland Transport Committee (ITC) “took note of the presentations on road safety global targets (under different agenda items) that will be monitored at a global level by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, and which focus on the Sustainable Development Goals, and also in the global tracking framework under development by the transport community led by the World Bank, as well as by WHO the meticulous collection of data for the series of the Global Status reports”. ITC also requested “the secretariat and the relevant Working Parties, especially WP.6, WP.1 and WP.29 to provide substantive comments and continue contributing to all three initiatives, and in particular, to emphasize the importance of including targets related to the accession and effective implementation of United Nations road safety legal instruments administered by the Committee” (paragraph 31 of Informal document ITC (2017) No.11).

12. Accordingly, a reference should be made to UN specific regulations and agreements’ provisions (e.g. related to motorcycle helmets, seat-belts and child restraints) rather than to refer to legislation meeting “best practice”. The inclusion of an additional indicator/s and target/s related to the accession and implementation of United Nations road safety legal instruments is also believed to be required.

13. Paragraph 18 refers to 2030 as the timeframe for the achievement of the voluntary targets. At the same time, both the SDG specific road safety target 3.6 and the Decade of Action for Road Safety are to expire by 2020. Hence, the timeframes are not in sync with SDG target and the Decade of Action. An explanation behind this would be helpful especially since it has to be clear how the voluntary targets are to help in achieving the SDG target.

14. Finally, as the mandate refers to “WHO, in collaboration with other United Nations agencies and the United Nations regional commissions” facilitating the process related to the development and implementation of the voluntary global performance targets, it is unclear why non-UN actors ie. non-State actors are made responsible for data collection with regard to some indicators.

II. One approach: the key risk factors approach

15. In the table, suggested targets and indicators related to the key risk factors identified in A/RES/70/260 are found under the “Safer road users” core area. If the correct approach is to use these key risk factors, then these should be standalone and comprehensive. That is, with the exception of these, all of the other Global Plan pillars and activities should be removed from the table.

16. If this approach is to be used, it seems sensible to construct the target/indicator table in the following way:

<i>Key risk factor</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>2030 Target</i>	<i>Recommended policy action for achieving the target</i>
Speeding	1. Annual number of road deaths due to speeding	1. Decrease the number of deaths due to speeding by xx %
	2. Annual number of road injuries due to speeding	2. Decrease the number of injuries due to speeding by xy %	
Drink driving	1. Annual number of road deaths due to drink driving	1. Decrease the number of deaths due to drink driving by yy %	
	2. Annual number of road injuries due to drink driving	2. Decrease the number of injuries due to drink driving by yz %	
Etc.			
Totals	1. Annual number of road death	1. Decrease the number of death by 50%	n.a.
	2. Annual number of road injuries	2. Decrease the number of injuries by 50%	

17. In our view, the proposed indicators (as you see them above) should be sub-indicators of the general indicator on road deaths and road injuries both produced in accordance with commonly agreed international definitions to be provided in the paper. This is very important as any work on road safety crucially relies on all countries following the same definition of “road fatality” and “road injury”. They are also a useful indicator of good governance. To collect fatality data the right definition has to be used and its collection involves close cooperation of the police and health sectors.

(a) The target values linked to the risk factors should add up to a total decrease of 50% for both deaths and injuries to match the SDG target 3.6. Their specific weights however might be left for fixing by countries themselves.

(b) The policies column might be a very helpful column to be included, as it would show countries the directions to follow in order to achieve the specific targets. We suggest that policy actions are grouped as follows: legislative action, enforcement action, education action.

(c) WP.1 Bureau with the support of the WP.1 secretariat will be pleased to assist WHO in elaborating the policy actions as per its areas of expertise.

III. Alternative approach: Global Plan pillars

18. If the correct approach is to use the Global Plan pillars, it should be clarified which are the key risk factors under each pillar as per the mandate for this exercise.

19. In this case, it seems sensible to us to formulate the following key risk factors and construct the target/indicator table as indicated below:

<i>Risk factors</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Reference material</i>
Ineffective road safety management	Increase the effectiveness of road safety management	1.Establish road safety data system 2.Adhere to UN legal instruments 3....(other targets/actions) from the Global Plan for the Decade of Action)	1.% of road safety indicators collected and published 2.% of UN legal instruments acceded to	1. These are the road safety indicators in this document (X number). 2. The number of UN legal instruments relevant to road safety are X.
Unsafe roads	Increase safety of roads	1. Establish black spot elimination programme.	1.Number of black spots rectified ...	
Unsafe vehicle	Increase passive safety of motor vehicles	1.Establish vehicle standards in accordance with UN 1958 agreement on ... 2.Enforce these standards... 3.Establish periodic technical inspection	1.% of UN standards introduced into national legislation 2.Number of standard infringement 3.Number of periodica technical inspections	

<i>Risk factors</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Reference material</i>
Unsafe road user	Increase safety of road user	scheme... 1.Establish rules of the road 2.Enforce rules of the road 3Educate on rules of the road	carried out... 1.% of rules of the road stipulated in UN road safety agreements in national legislation 2.Number of traffic infringements issued to road users for not complying with road rules 3.Number of education activities and training on rules of the road...	1. Relevant road rules to be listed here (with a total X number).
Ineffective post-crash response	Increase effectiveness of post-crash response

(a) The above formulations are initial suggestions which would need to be further elaborated on.

(b) Should WHO choose this second approach, WP.1 Bureau with the support of the WP.1 secretariat will be pleased to assist WHO in elaborating sensible policy targets and indicators as well as the necessary reference material in the areas of their expertise, ie. WP.1 with regard to risk factors related to safety management, roads and road users.

20. WP.1 Bureau is looking forward to receiving clarification from WHO on which is the approach to be followed in developing the voluntary global performance targets and to be invited to elaborating the necessary details as per the choice made.