

Evaluation of the Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership Final Report

Henning Lauridsen and Torkel Bjørnskau

The Institute of Transport Economics (TOI) holds the exclusive rights to the use of the entire report and its individual sections. Contents of the report may be used for referencing or as a source of information. Quotations or references must be attributed to TOI as the source with specific mention made to the author and report number. Contents must not be altered. For other use, advance permission must be provided by TOI. The report is covered by the terms and conditions specified by the Norwegian Copyright Act.

Title: Evaluation of the Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership - Final Report

Author(s): Henning Lauridsen; Torkel Bjørnskau

TØI report 724/2004
Oslo, 2004-11
70 pages
ISBN 82-480-0433-3
ISSN 0802-0175

Financed by:

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Project: 3018 Evaluation of the Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership

Project manager: Henning Lauridsen

Quality manager: Tor Lerstang

Key words:

Evaluation, road safety, development assistance, partnership

Summary:

The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) is a global partnership of business, civil society and government working for sustained reduction of road accidents in developing and transition countries. GRSP, which started operations in 1999, has a global secretariat and national committees overseeing activities in ten focus countries in Africa, Asia, Central Europe and Latin America. The review of performance reveals that GRSP activities are relevant and address global and country level road safety in a meaningful way. Generally, GRSP activities appear effective, although some deficiencies were identified. The evaluation concludes that GRSP has developed successfully. With continued support and adjustments to its mode of operation, it has the potential to develop further and address the challenges of the global road safety crisis.

Tittel: Evaluering av Sida-støtten til Global Road Safety Partnership - Sluttrapport

Forfatter(e) Henning Lauridsen; Torkel Bjørnskau

TØI rapport 724/2004
Oslo: 2004-11
70 sider
ISBN 82-480-0433-3
ISSN 0802-0175

Finansieringskilde:

Styrelsen for Internasjonellt Utvecklingsamarbete (Sida)

Prosjekt: 3018 Evaluering av Sida-støtten til Global Road Safety Partnership

Prosjektleder: Henning Lauridsen

Kvalitetsansvarlig: Tor Lerstang

Emneord:

Evaluering, trafikksikkerhet, utviklingshjelp, partnerskap

Sammendrag:

Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) er et globalt partnerskap av privat sektor, NGO og myndigheter som arbeider for bærekraftig reduksjon av antallet veitrafikkulykker i utviklingsland. Organisasjonen, som ble startet i 1989, har et globalt sekretariat og nasjonale komiteer i foreløpig 10 land i Afrika, Asia, Latin-Amerika og Øst-Europa. Gjennomgangen av GRSPs aktiviteter viste at disse er relevante og retter seg mot global og nasjonal trafikksikkerhet på en meningsfull måte. Generelt fremtrer GRSP som en effektiv organisasjon, selv om enkelte svakheter finnes. Evalueringen konkluderer at GRSP har utviklet seg positivt. Med forststøtte fra partnerne og tilpasninger i arbeidsmåten, har organisasjonen et godt potensial til å utvikle seg videre og ta opp de utfordringer som må takles for å kunne løse den globale trafikksikkerhetskrisen.

Language of report: English

The report can be ordered from:
Institute of Transport Economics, the library
P O Box 6110 Etterstad N-0602 Oslo, Norway
Telephone +47 22 57 38 00 Telefax +47 22 57 02 90
Price NOK 200

Rapporten kan bestilles fra:
Transportøkonomisk institutt, biblioteket
Postboks 6110 Etterstad, 0602 Oslo
Telefon 22 57 38 00 - Telefaks 22 57 02 90
Pris 200

Preface

This Final Report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership. The evaluation has been carried out for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) by the Institute of Transport Economics (TOI).

Road safety is an issue of immense human proportions. Worldwide, more than one million people are killed in road accidents each year and as many as 50 million are injured according to the World report on road traffic injury prevention, which was launched by the World Health Organization and the World Bank in April 2004. Without appropriate action, road traffic injuries are predicted to be the third leading cause of disability and injury in 2020. The economic cost of road accidents varies from one to two per cent of gross national product and the global cost is estimated at US\$ 518 billion per year. The share of low-income and middle-income countries is estimated at US\$ 65 billion or more than they receive in development assistance

The evaluation has been carried out by an evaluation team comprising Mr. Henning Lauridsen (Team Leader) and Dr. Torkel Bjørnskau. The analyses, conclusions and recommendations of the report are those of the evaluation team and should not be attributed to Sida or any of the many stakeholders that have contributed to the evaluation.

We would like to express our appreciation and thanks for the co-operation of the Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) Secretariat, the GRSP stakeholders in the ten focus countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America, as well as the staff of Sida, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the World Health Organization, The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the Department for International Development, UK and other GRSP stakeholders contacted during the evaluation.

Oslo, November 2004
Institute of Transport Economics

Sønneve Ølnes
Acting Managing Director

Jan Vidar Haukeland
Head of Department

Table of Contents

Summary	
Abbreviations and Acronyms	
1 Introduction	1
Background and Scope of Evaluation	1
The Road Safety Problem	2
Report Contents	2
2 The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP)	3
2.1 Objectives and Strategy	3
2.2 Mode of Operation - The GRSP Approach	5
2.3 Programme Output	7
2.4 Focus Countries	8
2.5 Sida Input to GRSP	9
3 Programme Performance	10
3.1 Relevance	11
3.2 Effectiveness	11
3.3 Efficiency	11
3.4 Impact	12
3.5 Sustainability	13
4 Lessons Learned	13
5 Demand for Policy Advice and Programme Assistance	14
5.1 Experience with Road Safety Assistance	15
5.2 The World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention	16
5.3 Overall Demand for Road Safety Assistance	18
6 Mobilisation of Requisite Input	19
6.1 The Country Level	19
6.2 The Regional Level	19
6.3 The Global Level	20
7 Comparative Assessment of the GRSP Concept	20
8 Conclusions and Recommendations	22
8.1 Conclusions	22
8.2 Recommendations	24
References	25
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	28
Annex 2: List of Persons met and interviewed	32
Annex 3: Focus Country Briefs	34

Summary:

Evaluation of the Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership

This Final Report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP). GRSP is a global partnership of business, civil society and government working for sustained reduction of road accidents and aimed at improving road safety conditions in developing and transition countries.

Sida, which has supported GRSP since 2000, has commissioned the Institute of Transport Economics (TOI) to undertake the evaluation. The objectives are to (i) Review the main outputs and activities since July 2000 in the light of the Programme's objectives emphasising the current phase that started in July 2002, (ii) Review the pro and cons of the GRSP concept and the modalities of action and (iii) Review the existing demand relating both to policy advice and programme assistance. The evaluation is based on information collected in the period June – September 2004.

The Road Safety Problem

The World report on road traffic injury prevention - prepared jointly by the World Health Organization and World Bank in 2004 - indicates that the number killed in road accidents worldwide amounts to more than one million each year and as many as 50 million are injured. Projections indicate that these figures will increase by about 65 per cent over the next 20 years unless there is new commitment to prevention of road accidents. Low-income and middle-income countries account for about 85 per cent of road traffic deaths. It is anticipated that road traffic deaths will increase substantially in low-income and middle-income countries. Without appropriate action, road traffic injuries are predicted to be the third leading cause of disability and injury in 2020. The economic cost of road accidents varies from 1 – 2 per cent of gross national product. The cost in low-income and middle-income countries is estimated at US\$ 65 billion or more than they receive in development assistance.

Review of Main Output and Performance of GRSP

At the global level, the GRSP secretariat in Geneva is active in several fields in addition to its secretariat function for the governing committees and support to focus countries. The most important fields are promotion of road safety and the partnership approach as well as knowledge sharing through a well functioning website, a knowledge base, focus notes, research reports/information notes and other publications.

The GRSP output relates strongly to the results of activities in the ten focus countries in Africa, Asia, Central Europe and Latin America. GRSP has generated

a large amount of road safety activities and projects in these countries, varying from a few in some countries to more than twenty in others. Most activities in focus countries fall under information, education and training. Focus country activities in 2004 amount to approximately US\$ 4 million in total or three times the current budget of the GRSP secretariat in Geneva.

The review of performance reveals that GRSP activities are relevant and address global and country level road safety policies in a meaningful way. Generally, GRSP activities appear effective as they address the objectives defined. It should be noted, however, that objectives are formulated in quite general terms. Two weaknesses have been identified. One concerns the difficulties in generating road safety activities in some focus countries, e.g. in South Africa where the current activity level is low. The other concerns upgrading of the ability to demonstrate good practice in focus countries as very few proper evaluations of projects are undertaken today.

It is difficult to assess the efficiency of GRSP operations, as the evaluation framework has not allowed in depth investigation in this regard. The information gathered, however, indicates that efficiency is fairly good at the secretariat level and possibly also at the country level. Furthermore, it appears that the GRSP secretariat has developed into a professionally strong entity.

Also impacts have been difficult to assess, mainly because comprehensive evaluations of GRSP projects are missing. Only one project has been formally evaluated. There are, however, indications of positive effect in some focus countries, notably Hungary (one evaluation carried out), Brazil, India, Poland and Thailand.

The GRSP has a well functioning secretariat and what seems to be a sound financial basis. It appears that the organisation is moving rapidly towards organisational and financial sustainability. Sustainability at the country level is, however, not assured yet. Two countries, India and Thailand, appear to have achieved sustainability. Another two countries, Brazil and Poland may be close to reaching sustainability and focus at this stage on how to take the final step in this direction. For four countries, Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary and Romania sustainability has not yet been secured. The same applies to South Africa where sustainability may be at risk. Finally, in Vietnam, operations are only starting up now.

A number of lessons have been learned during the evaluation team's reviewing of experience, among them: The World Bank and other international development agencies are indispensable road safety partners. National branches of international corporate partners appear to be vital catalysts for building focus country networks and transferring knowledge. When introduced at the national level, it is of vital importance that GRSP fits into the present pattern of road safety organisations. GRSP operations may be easier to develop if there already is a well functioning National Road Safety Committee with extensive activities and government support. Impacts of focus country activities cannot be properly documented unless comprehensive evaluations become a standard component of such activities. This, however, will require clear guidance and possibly additional support and financing from the GRSP secretariat.

Review of Demand for Road Safety Policy Advice and Programme Assistance

The assessment of the overall demand for road safety assistance is based on experience from previous road safety work in low-income and middle-income countries and the new understanding brought forward by the World report on road traffic injury prevention (The World Report). Experience with traditional and usually minor "first generation" road safety projects has been less positive than expected. The World report projects a dramatic increase in road deaths and injuries towards 2020. The United Nations (UN) General Assembly debate on the global road safety crisis and the World report in April 2004 revealed a huge demand for intensified safety interventions in low- and middle-income countries. Against this background it appears that a new kind of major stand-alone "second generation" multi-sector road safety projects are required in such countries.

Most of the road safety interventions needed are not simple ones. They require multi-sector co-operation at the government level of the transport, health, police and education sectors. In addition, input from civil society and the private sector will be required. Resource mobilisation is clearly needed if low- and middle-income countries that face the biggest challenges are going to make substantial progress. In addition to road safety investments, capacity building at government level is urgently required in such countries to enable governments to address efficiently the interventions needed. Such capacity building is required prior to that a country can start implementing major new road safety projects.

Few low- and middle-income countries have so far introduced road safety measures that have led to significant reduction of road deaths and injuries. Awareness raising, capacity building and in very many cases international assistance to major new second generation road safety projects are, therefore, required. If the new US\$ 25 million road safety project, now being negotiated between Vietnam and the World Bank, should form the model for new road safety projects, the total costs for addressing the global road safety crises will be high and much higher than what is being spent today. Addressing the crises will, in respect of official international development resources, require a substantial increase in the allocations to road safety for multilateral and bilateral development organisations. In addition comes support from civil society and the private sector.

Against the above background it appears that the overall demand for international road safety assistance will increase substantially over the next few years. This will be the case for road safety financing as well as for technical assistance and it seems likely that the demand for GRSP services will increase similarly.

Comparative Review of the GRSP Concept

Two new global initiatives are now being planned, the World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund and the private sector Global Road Safety Initiative (GRSI) of the Sustainable Mobility Project of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development. Both may be seen as competitors to GRSP.

It appears that the proposed World Bank trust fund is aimed at governments in low- and middle-income countries. Its main role will be capacity building in the public domain. It is still at an early stage of development but could when launched provide an effective preparatory facility for multi-sector second generation road

safety projects. The GRSI private sector initiative will focus on areas where the private sector could play a role. It will need a secretariat but it may want to collaborate with the GRSP secretariat and thus avoid the establishing of a complete new entity for this purpose.

GRSP is the only existing body and it has been operating successfully for five years. It has performed well and it has a potential for adopting its operation to meet the new challenges. The two new initiatives will aim at different targets. GRSP and the two new initiatives appear to have highly different aims and the modes of operation will be different. They could rather be seen as complementary organisations than competing bodies. On the other hand, GRSP and the new initiatives may to some extent be seen as competitors in respect of financial resources.

Introduction of the two new global initiatives appears as a challenge to GRSP. It seems, however, likely that GRSP based on its current performance and professional strength and with continued support and adjustments to its mode of operation could adapt well to the new global road safety challenges.

The possible adjustments to the GRSP mode of operation could be based on a systematic assessment of the emerging challenges, in particular the changes in demand for policy advice and programme assistance and the two planned new global initiatives. Such assessment would also provide a more solid framework for an in depth review of the weaknesses identified by this evaluation, notably the need for better structured and more operational objectives and a more systematic approach to evaluation of GRSP activities. Such review could lead to a discussion of possible adjustments to the basic GRSP tri-sector approach in the light of the emerging challenges.

Recommendations

The conclusions of the evaluation show that GRSP has developed successfully. With continued support and adjustments to its mode of operation, it could easily develop further to address the new global road safety challenges as well as playing a useful role at the regional and country level.

The GRSP organisation will have an important role to play in the light of the new understanding of the global road safety crises. The new GRSI private sector initiative may choose to use GRSP for some secretariat functions as a means to supporting country activities. The partnership approach is useful and a continued balance between government, private sector and civil society partners is considered important. Further support from international development agencies is therefore needed. The output and possible future impact of GRSP appear to justify financial support from all the various groups of partners.

Against the above background, it is recommended that Sida continue supporting GRSP for a new period of three to five years. Two adjustments to the mode of operation are, however, recommended to rectify weaknesses identified during the evaluation. One concerns the definition of objectives. A clarification and clearer structuring of objectives, including measurable operational targets, would enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of GRSP. The other adjustment concerns improving the ability to demonstrate good practice in focus countries, which

today is weakly developed. Much more emphasis should be given to evaluating and analysing the effects of road safety interventions in focus countries.

In addition, it is suggested that GRSP more comprehensively review its mode of operation. This should be based on a systematic assessment of the emerging challenges, among which the changes in demand for road safety policy advice and programme assistance and the planned new global initiatives. Such assessment would provide a useful framework for the in depth review of objectives and operational targets as well as relevant input to the development of a systematic approach to the evaluation of GRSP's own activities.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CHF	Swiss Franc (SFr)
DFID	Department for International Development, UK
EA	Executing Agency
EU	European Union
€/EUR	Euro
Ft	Hungarian Forint (HUF)
GRSP	Global Road Safety Partnership
HUF	Hungarian Forint (Ft)
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDA	International Development Association (World Bank Group)
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organisation
LA	Lead Agency
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LDC	Least Developed Countries
NDF	Nordic Development Fund
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NRSC	National Road Safety Council
PLN	Polish Zloty (Zl)
PPP	Public/Private Partnership
SADC	Southern Africa Developing Community
SATCC	Southern African Transport and Communications Commission
SEK	Swedish kronor
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SSATP	Sub-Saharan African Transport Policy Programme
SFr	Swiss Franc (CHF)
TA	Technical Assistance
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
US\$/USD	United States Dollar
Zl	Polish Zloty (PLN)

Exchange Rates (Bank of Norway, 10 September 2004)

CHF 1 =	USD 0.7934
EUR 1 =	USD 1.2219
HUF 100 =	USD 0.4870
PLN 1 =	USD 0.2776
SEK 1 =	USD 0.1343
USD 1 =	EUR 0.8184

1 Introduction

This Final Report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership. It is based on information collected in the period June – September 2004 and subsequent factual comments on the Draft Report. The report has been prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference (see Annex 1).

Background and Scope of Evaluation

The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) was initiated by the World Bank in 1999 under the umbrella of the bank's Business Partners for Development (BPD) programme. GRSP is a global partnership of business, civil society and government working for sustained reduction of road accidents and aimed at improving road safety conditions in developing and transition countries where the toll of road deaths and injuries is disproportionately high.

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) has supported GRSP since 2000. The initial agreement, signed by the two parties 8 May 2000, provided for financial support to GRSP covering e.g. funding of a GRSP adviser, executive road safety training and inputs into knowledge sharing activities. The total support from Sida to GRSP has amounted to approximately SEK 10.5 million for the period July 2000 - end 2004.

Against this background, Sida has commissioned the Institute of Transport Economics (TOI) of Oslo to undertake an evaluation of the Sida support to the Global Road Safety Partnership. The objectives of the evaluation are to (i) Review the main outputs and activities since July 2000 in the light of the Programme's objectives emphasising the current phase that started in July 2002, (ii) Review the pro and cons of the GRSP concept and the modalities of action and (iii) Review the existing demand relating both to policy advice and programme assistance.

The scope of the evaluation as described in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1) includes a number of detailed tasks. The tasks can be structured in review of documentation plus the following five key tasks that reflect the above objectives:

- (i) Review the main output and performance along the five core criteria normally used for evaluation, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency (including operational aspects), impact, and sustainability;
- (ii) Review the lessons learned, among which barriers for achievement of objectives and realism of objectives;
- (iii) Review the demand for policy advice and programme assistance and the situation for mobilising requisite input;
- (iv) Assessment of the comparative advantage of the GRSP concept; and
- (v) Recommendations on feasibility of a new 3-5 years phase.

The evaluation started with participation in the annual meeting of GRSP in June 2004. The assignment, which is mainly based on literature review, has also included visits to Sida, to the GRSP secretariat and brief missions to two of the GRSP focus countries, Hungary and Poland. Information concerning the other eight focus countries has been collected by review of documentation made

available by the GRSP secretariat and a limited number of telephone interviews with GRSP members in the various countries. Subsequently, country briefs have been prepared for all the ten focus countries based on a standard format to facilitate comparison and analysis. Factual comments on all draft country briefs have been provided by GRSP. This approach has not allowed in depth analysis of the road safety situation and GRSP output and performance in the focus countries but has given a general overview that has been used as basis for our generalised comparison and review. The country briefs are attached as Annex 3.

The Road Safety Problem

Road traffic accidents have for several decades been considered a serious problem of concern particularly for the transport sector. The World report on road traffic injury prevention (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004) indicates that the number killed in road accidents worldwide amounts to more than one million each year and as many as 50 million are injured. Projections indicate that these figures will increase by about 65 per cent over the next 20 years unless there is new commitment to prevention of road accidents. Unsafe road traffic systems are, therefore, not only a transport sector problem but also seriously harming global public health and development.

Low-income and middle-income countries account for about 85 per cent of road traffic deaths and for 90 per cent of the annual disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost because of road traffic injury (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004). It is anticipated that road traffic deaths will decline by 30 per cent in high-income countries between 2000 and 2020 but increase substantially in low-income and middle-income countries. According to the same source, road traffic injuries were ranked as number nine among the leading causes of the global burden of disability in 1990 measured in DALYs. Without appropriate action, road traffic injuries are predicted to be the third leading cause of disability and injury in 2020.

The economic cost of road accidents varies from 1 per cent of gross national product in low-income countries to 1.5 per cent in middle-income countries and to 2 per cent in high-income countries. The global cost is estimated at US\$ 518 billion per year. The share of low-income and middle-income countries is estimated at US\$ 65 billion or more than they receive in development assistance (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004).

A more detailed description of the World report on road traffic injury prevention appears in Section 5.2.

Report Contents

The Final Report has been structured in accordance with the principles outlined in the Inception Report. Subsequent to this introduction follows a description of the Global Road Safety Partnership in Chapter 2. The main outcome and performance of the programme are presented in Chapter 3, whereas lessons learned appear in Chapter 4. The demand for road safety policy advice and programme assistance is discussed in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 looks into the mobilisation of requisite input for road safety advice and assistance and presents the various other sources and

approaches available, while Chapter 7 comprises an assessment of the GRSP concept in comparison with other approaches. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter 8.

References are listed subsequent to the main text body. Annex 1 comprises the Terms of Reference. A list of persons met and/or interviewed appears as Annex 2. Finally, GRSP focus country activities and performance are summarised in standardised country briefs in Annex 3.

2 The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP)

2.1 Objectives and Strategy

The overall objectives of GRSP are defined as follows in the Terms of Reference (see Annex 1):

- (i) Awareness raising of traffic safety gains among key decision makers aiming at creating partnerships between governments, regional organisations and the private sector;
- (ii) Strengthening of the capacity of partners through training in international best practices;
- (iii) Co-ordination and involvement amongst all agencies to make best use of their partnerships and strengths;
- (iv) Systematic analysis of data emphasising that road safety programmes to be based on cost-effectiveness and scientific methods; and
- (v) Strategic research for filling the gaps in existing databases and co-ordinating research activities as much as possible in order to share relevant results and avoid duplication.

It appears that the above definition derives from a preparatory or earlier stage of GRSP and it is not fully consistent with the current formulations. As this evaluation covers the period 2000 – 2004 but with an emphasis on the current phase, which started in July 2002, we consider it more relevant to look for more current objectives to provide the framework for the review of the main output and performance of GRSP. Identification of objectives is, however, somewhat complex as GRSP has defined objectives in various contexts, among them the strategy, the mission statement, the Constitution and the business plan. The latter two have recently been adopted by the Steering Committee.

The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) strategy embodies the following key elements (Global Road Safety Partnership 2004 g):

- Forging a partnership between all the key groups in society with a strong vested interest in improving road safety - the business community, civil society, government and donor agencies. This coalition becomes the focal point for interest in road safety interventions. Partners collaborate on road safety projects and press government to deliver on those interventions which

only government mandate and accomplish (e.g. research, major infrastructure improvements, road safety database analysis, etc.).

- Undertaking, with finance provided by the business members of the coalition, small-scale interventions and demonstration projects, which show that road safety can be improved in achievable and cost-effective ways.
- In a typical donor intervention, the concerned government agency tends to focus unduly on only minor infrastructure improvements (e.g., black spot improvements and road safety audits). The local GRSP partners emphasise a collaborative and holistic approach to road safety with all stakeholders contributing resources by actually financing and implementing the required interventions.
- Sharing lessons learned from ongoing projects already being implemented or involving the business sector and demonstrating that partnerships can increase development impact.

The GRSP mission statement, as it appears on the standard GRSP leaflet, is as follows: "A global partnership between business, civil society and government dedicated to the sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads in developing and transition countries."

The Constitution (GRSP 2004 b) defines the objectives of the GRSP programme in the following way: "GRSP's principal objective is to facilitate the sustainable reduction of road traffic casualties in developing and transition countries through partnerships between business, civil society and governments. The Partnership's main activities are to identify and promote relevant good practice and, in selected developing and transition countries (the focus countries), to support projects involving collaboration between two or more partners which are designed to test and demonstrate good practice in reducing the number of road casualties. GRSP is not a funding agency and does not finance road safety interventions normally financed by governments".

The GRSP business plan has defined the following goals for 2010 when GRSP aspires to be:

- A leading global organisation for road safety – bringing together needs and resources. The principal place where government talks to business and NGOs about road safety;
- The principal point of contact to bring together partners in order to deliver feasible and effective road safety projects;
- An outstanding knowledge source;
- Neutral, respected, trusted and viable.

The business plan also includes a specific objective for 2004, namely to raise GRSP's profile on the world stage, and a number of specific targets for the year.

Considering the above definitions of objectives and strategy elements, we consider the following two objectives, which both derive from the Constitution, as core objectives. They provide the main framework for the review of output and performance of GRSP:

- (i) Facilitate the sustainable reduction of road traffic casualties in developing and transition countries

- (ii) Work through partnerships between business, civil society and governments

In addition to the core objectives, the following two objectives, which in the Constitution are designated as main activities, are considered as being of particular importance for the review of performance:

- (iii) Identify and promote relevant good practice
- (iv) In selected developing and transition countries (the focus countries), to support projects involving collaboration between two or more partners which are designed to test and demonstrate good practice in reducing the number of road casualties

The latter objectives both relate to good practice. Identifying good practice, supporting projects in focus countries designed to test and demonstrate good practice and promoting good practice are important issues in this context.

The above review shows weaknesses in respect of GRSP's definition of objectives. They are quite general in nature and appear to change over time. In principle a good management system should be based on goals or overall objectives that are operationalised into more specific objectives or indicators that allow precise ex post assessment of the organisation's achievements. General objectives are also a complicating factor in respect of evaluations.

2.2 Mode of Operation - The GRSP Approach

The GRSP Constitution (GRSP 2004 b) was adopted by the Steering Committee 18 June 2004. It states: "GRSP is a voluntary association between business, civil society and governmental bodies who collaborate in an effort to reduce road casualties in developing and transition countries. The members of the association are called 'partners' and they may belong to the programme at the global and/or national level. There are two categories of partners: 'global partners', who guide the policies and direction of the overall GRSP programme; and 'local partners' who work together to develop and support programmes of specific projects in selected 'focus' countries. ... Activities in the selected focus countries are supported and energised by GRSP 'Advisors'."

The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) aims at finding more effective and innovative ways of dealing with road safety in developing and transition countries. Through a special approach to road safety, GRSP partners collaborate and co-ordinate road safety activities. This approach aims at capacity building of local institutions and by enhancing the ability of professionals and communities to pro-actively tackle safety problems (Global Road Safety Partnership 2004 g).

This concept underlies the Global Road Safety Partnership, seen by the organisation as a new paradigm for dealing with road safety in the target countries. The partnership is an informal network of businesses, civil society organisations and relevant government departments working together to realise common goals. The expectation is that partnerships between these three sectors will result in more effective and sustainable development activities than if any of these partners acted on their own. So far GRSP is involved in initiatives in ten focus countries (see Section 2.4 below).

GRSP has a Steering Committee (SC) comprising representatives of the various groups of partners and an Executive Committee (EC). GRSP works through the secretariat in Geneva and through local committees in the focus countries. The GRSP Geneva budget (expenditure) 2004 amounts to SFr 1,645,046 (US\$ 1,305,179). Some 22 per cent of the budget is allocated to part-time advisers that work directly with the focus countries and a further 23 per cent relates to country work by full time secretariat staff and financial support to country secretariats.

According to the GRSP Constitution, focus countries are chosen from those where road safety is recognised as a problem and where governments are willing to tackle the problem. It is a precondition that the country has an agreed framework, usually a National Road Safety Action Plan within which GRSP can operate and that GRSP global partners have the capability and commitment to develop and support local partnership projects. A formal selection procedure, which was developed by an internal GRSP working group on focus country selection in 2003, is based on a set of criteria and associated indicators, which could be used to track progress of a country.

In the selected focus countries, GRSP principally:

- (i) Works with local partners drawn from business, government and civil society to help build a strong coalition committed to improving road safety;
- (ii) Energises and encourages the local partners to identify and work together to develop and implement projects designed to improve road safety and mitigate the consequences of road casualties;
- (iii) Works with multilateral and bilateral development agencies to help improve the effectiveness of their road safety programmes;
- (iv) Promotes demonstration projects (focus projects) to illustrate the effectiveness of alternative road safety interventions and helps to broker access to development agency funds to mainstream those interventions which have been shown to be effective;
- (v) Monitors lessons learned and makes them available to others; and
- (vi) Offers advice on emerging good practice and encourages others to share their knowledge with the wider road safety community.”

GRSP is currently active in ten countries (see Section 2.4 below). It is monitoring developments in other countries and proposes to adopt additional focus countries as and when resources are available. Before a country can be adopted as a focus country, it must satisfy the criteria described above.

Once selected, the country is assigned a GRSP Advisor who is responsible for developing and animating a local partnership organisation to identify specific partnership projects designed to address problems of road safety. The country-level partnership is usually made up of local business interests (normally including some of the global GRSP partners), civil society organisations and government agencies. Formally, the local GRSP committee is the owner of the focus country projects and activities. There are, however, cases when an individual partner in a focus country does not allow other GRSP partners to get involved in a project. In some cases, GRSP seems to claim ownership of projects that appear to be generated by others.

Progress in each focus country is reviewed on a regular basis and reports are presented to the Executive Committee (EC) and the Steering Committee (SC). The EC makes recommendations to the SC about achievements of a focus country programme in relation to its objectives and whether any non-performing focus countries should be dropped from the programme or whether any new focus country should be added to the portfolio.

2.3 Programme Output

At the global level, the GRSP secretariat in Geneva is active in several fields in addition to its secretariat function for the governing committees and support to focus countries. The most important fields are on the one hand promotion of road safety and the partnership approach and on the other hand knowledge sharing.

Road Safety Promotion

The GRSP secretariat has contributed to various road safety conferences and seminars. In addition, the secretariat has contributed to the WHO and World Bank World report on road traffic injury prevention launched on World Health Day 7 April 2004 and debated in the UN General Assembly 14 April. GRSP participated in the stakeholder forum held at the UN 15 April together with other members of the global road safety committee.

The GRSP secretariat has also contributed to the outlining of the proposed new World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund (see Chapter 6).

Knowledge sharing

The GRSP has established a well functioning website. The site includes a Knowledge Base that gradually is being developed. GRSP regularly publishes a newsletter, GRSP News, with so far 12 issues. The annual reports 2003 and 2004 are more informative than previous reports and are aimed at external readers.

GRSP publications are crucial elements in knowledge sharing. So far seven focus notes (usually around 7 pages, size A 5) and four research reports/information notes (4 pages or more, size A 4) have been issued:

Focus Notes (usually 7 pages, A 5 format)

- Road safety education in schools (undated)
- Road safety publicity campaigns (2002)
- Estimating crash costs
- Motor vehicle insurers and road safety (2003)
- Community participation in traffic law enforcement (2004)
- Road safety education in schools (undated)
- First Aid: It saves lives on the road (with IFRC) (undated)

Research Reports/Information Notes

- Impaired driving in developing countries (2004)
- Impact of road crashes on the poor (2004)
- Road safety management (4 notes) (undated)
- Estimating global road safety fatalities (undated)

Focus notes and other elements of the knowledge base are subject to external review before publication.

In addition GRSP has published a report called *Moving ahead – Emerging lessons in 2001* and various brochures.

The reports/notes listed above are in most cases based on available international experience. So far, specific GRSP experience from focus countries projects has not been used or only to a very limited extent been documented and used as background documentation for reports aimed at knowledge sharing.

Focus country Activities

The GRSP programme output relates very much to the results of the activities in the ten focus countries. The GRSP secretariat provides advisory services to all these countries. Activities and output in the countries are summarised in Section 2.4 below.

2.4 Focus Countries

GRSP is currently involved in the following ten focus countries:

Africa:	Ghana, South Africa
Asia:	India (Bangalore City), Thailand, Vietnam
Central/Eastern Europe:	Hungary, Poland, Romania
Latin America:	Brazil (4 cities), Costa Rica

Extension of activities to new focus countries is being considered, among them China and Russia. Extension of activities to the regional level through the establishing of regional nodes is also being considered.

Table 2.1 below presents an overview of the ten focus countries. Most focus country operations started in 2000. Only Vietnam is a latecomer and operation in that country is still at an initial stage. In eight countries GRSP addresses road safety at the national level. In two countries, however, the focus is local. In Brazil GRSP works in four medium-sized urban municipalities and in India in one major city, Bangalore.

GRSP has generated large numbers of road safety activities and projects in the focus countries, varying from a few in some countries to more than twenty in others. Most activities in focus countries fall under information, education and training. There are, however, examples on other kinds of activities, among them statistics and information systems, road safety planning and road improvement schemes. In some cases, activities are described as GRSP activities even when they may be financed by other sources.

An attempt has been made to estimate the 2004 budget. Experience from the two countries visited shows that this is somewhat difficult. In most cases, budgets are linked to projects and not to the overall activity of the GRSP country organisation. There are also cases when information concerning project budgets may not be

Table 2.1 Focus Country Overview

Country	Established year	Coverage	2004 Budget US\$ 1,000	Status
Brazil	2000	4 cities	1,000	Very active
Costa Rica	2000	National	517	Active
Ghana	2000	National	87	Active
Hungary	2000	National	257	Active
India	2001	1 large city	935	Very active
Poland	2000	National	153	Very active
Romania	2000	National	191	Active
South Africa	2000	National	40	Low key operation
Thailand	2000	National	820	Very active
Vietnam	2004	National	n.a.	Initial stage of operation
Average			444	
Total			4,000	

Source: Annex 3

disclosed by the financier. Further, in-house work carried out by partners may not be included in the project budget. We have, nevertheless, made an attempt to indicate the 2004 budget for the various countries in Table 2.1. The total, which relates to nine focus countries and not includes Vietnam, is approximately US\$ 4 million for 2004. The total budget of the GRSP focus country organisations is, therefore, three times the budget of the GRSP secretariat in Geneva that amounts to approximately US\$ 1.3 million (see Section 2.2 above).

Table 2.1 also indicates the status of operation in each of the focus countries. It is an assessment based on the information collected and reviewed during the evaluation. Four countries are characterised as very active, Brazil, India, Poland and Thailand. They have a number of ongoing projects and have been active for several years. Four countries are characterised as active, namely Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary and Romania. One country has a lower profile at this stage, namely South Africa, although the activity level may now be on the increase. Finally, Vietnam is at an initial stage of operation.

The focus country activities are described in more detail in Annex 3. For each country a standard format has been used, comprising an overview table, a description of background and objectives of the GRSP activities, an outline of the activities, evaluation by core criteria and lessons learnt. The annex also for each country lists the persons interviewed/met and documents reviewed during the evaluation.

2.5 Sida Input to GRSP

Swedish support to GRSP commenced in 2000. The initial budget for the two-year period up to June 2002 was SEK 1,575,000. This, however, was later increased to SEK 2,535,000 (then the equivalent of US\$ 257,374). The Sida support comprised initially a part time adviser for Asia (focusing on Thailand and Vietnam) and a regional road safety course. After the increase more time was

allocated to the adviser and support was also given to a GRSP seminar aimed at the ASEAN countries.

The second phase of the Sida support commenced in July 2002. The total budget for the period 2002 – 2004 was SEK 8 million of which SEK 6 million was an en bloc grant, “core funding”, to the GRSP secretariat. The remaining SEK 2 million was allocated as “directed funding” and aimed at specific activities to be agreed separately. This funding has been used for a variety of minor activities, among which a research project on the involvement and impact of road crashes on the poor, road safety appraisal missions to Laos and Sri Lanka and support to the GRSP knowledge base. Generally, it appears that the direct funding activities may incur considerable administrative efforts on both sides. It is, however, not a specific issue of this evaluation.

Considering both periods together, it appears that the dominant component of the Sida support has been core funding, although that term was not used in the first phase. The review of performance will, therefore, be aimed at GRSP in general.

The total Sida contribution for the four-year period 2002 – 2004 has been SEK 10,535,000 or US\$ 1,414,851. The Sida contribution in the GRSP 2004 budget amounts to SFr 336,000 out of a total estimated income of SFr 1,709,250, i.e. 20 per cent. Other bilateral donors and the World Bank contribute with SFr 423,000 in 2004 or 25 per cent of the total, which means that the Swedish share amount to 44 per cent of the donor contribution this year. Subscriptions from private sector partners and civil society partners amount to SFr 866,250 or 51 percent of the budget. The remainder, SFr 84,000, is due to other contributions.

3 Programme Performance

The review of performance of the GRSP is based on the five core criteria normally used for evaluation of development projects, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. For each criterion, the review is done in respect of both the GRSP secretariat and the GRSP focus countries. Reference is made to Annex 3, which in more detail reviews performance for each of the ten focus countries.

As described in Chapter 1, the evaluation is mainly based on literature review and information gathered through visits to Sida, to the GRSP secretariat and brief missions to two GRSP focus countries, Hungary and Poland. Information concerning the other eight focus countries has been collected by review of documentation made available by the GRSP secretariat. This has been supplemented with a limited number of telephone interviews with GRSP members in the focus countries, advisers and other experts.

GRSP was evaluated two years ago (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2002) together with the three other Business Partners for Development organisations. The evaluation focused on the tri-sector partnership approach rather than on performance in respect of road safety. One of the findings of the evaluation concerns the focus of GRSP. The evaluation report concludes that GRSP was first intended to be an initiative that studied partnership in the road safety context but developed into an initiative that studied and promoted road safety, and the partnership was essentially considered to be of secondary importance. At the end

of 2001, however, the focus on tri-sector partnership was once again re-emphasised. The 2002 evaluation's limited focus on performance in respect of road safety is very general and hardly interesting at this stage.

3.1 Relevance

GRSP Secretariat

The relevance of the GRSP activities at the global secretariat level seems obvious. Activities are directed towards reduction of road traffic casualties in developing and transition countries and promotion of the partnership approach for the same purpose.

Focus Countries

Also at the country level GRSP activities are clearly relevant and in line with national policies on road safety (see Annex 3).

3.2 Effectiveness

GRSP Secretariat

It appears that the main activities of the GRSP secretariat are aimed at achieving the objectives identified in Section 2.1 above. The promotion of road safety work at the focus country level contributes to the reduction of road traffic casualties in developing and transition countries and the work is based on partnerships between business, civil society and governments. Other GRSP activities identifying good practise, supporting projects in focus countries designed to test and demonstrate good practise and promoting good practice are important issues in this context. It should be noted, however, that GRSP's objectives are formulated in quite general and vague terms. This makes a more precise assessment of performance in respect of effectiveness and other core criteria of the evaluation more difficult.

There are two weaknesses at this stage. One concerns the difficulties in generating road safety activities in some focus countries, e.g. in South Africa where the current activity level is low. The other weakness relates to the ability to demonstrate good practice in focus countries when few proper evaluations of projects are undertaken.

Focus Countries

Generally, effectiveness seems to be good in the focus countries. Most focus countries have defined two main objectives, which are the same as the general GRSP objectives, namely (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads. Country level activities seem generally to be designed to develop partnerships and to contribute to achieving sustainable reduction of road death and injury. Also in the focus countries, it appears that objectives are formulated in quite general terms.

3.3 Efficiency

Performance related to the efficiency criterion has been much more difficult to assess. This is partly due to that the evaluation framework did not allow in depth investigations in this respect but also that some data required for this purpose are not available.

GRSP Secretariat

The GRSP secretariat has through the focus country operations contributed to generating a wide range of road safety activities, which appear relevant and effective in the light of the objectives defined. The total budget for activities in focus countries are estimated at approximately US\$ 4 million in 2004 or three times the budget of the GRSP secretariat (see Section 2.4).

The secretariat, which is hosted by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and follows the lean operational guidelines of that organisation, appears today as an efficient organisation. Furthermore, it seems that efficiency has improved during the last couple of years.

In addition, it should be mentioned that the secretariat has developed into a professionally strong entity. There are several in-house experts and the secretariat has good access to additional expertise when required.

Focus Countries

Efficiency is difficult to assess at the country level, as hardly any data in this respect are available. For the two countries visited, Hungary and Poland, our, rather subjective assessment, is that efficiency is fairly good and that the GRSP secretariats appear to be quite efficient, although they are only staffed on a part time basis.

3.4 Impact

Generally impacts have been difficult to assess. The main reason is that comprehensive evaluations of GRSP projects largely are missing, thereby also making it very difficult to identify possible good practice in respect of GRSP's own projects. This is considered a serious organisational weakness, as one of the objectives of GRSP is to identify and promote relevant good practice.

GRSP Secretariat

The main impact of the secretariat is linked to generation of the road safety activities in focus countries as described below. It appears that the secretariat currently is active in generating new focus countries and possible regional nodes. The results of this will, however, only materialise in the years to come.

Focus Countries

In one case, Hungary, an evaluation study was carried out for a black spot improvements project comprising three locations. Impacts include speed reduction and possibly also reduction in accident numbers. The latter, however, can only be verified after more time has elapsed.

In Brazil, no evaluations have been made and relevant statistics give a somewhat mixed picture for the different municipalities. There is, however, reason to believe that the GRSP activities have a favourable impact on road safety, given the measures adopted. The best development in road safety seems to have been achieved in Juiz de Fora with substantial reductions in fatalities and serious injuries in parallel to an increase in the number of vehicles in the period 2001-2004.

In India, there is reason to believe that the safety measures introduced in the City of Bangalore may affect road safety positively. Campaigns are, however, seldom very effective, and in order to ensure impact, a helmet wearing law, enforced by

the police would be preferable to just a helmet wearing campaign. Given the fact that police enforcement is part of the effort to reduce the drink driving problem, there is reason to believe that this effort may prove effective.

In Poland, the effects of the various projects have not been documented but may to some extent have contributed to the reduction of road deaths in Poland the last few years.

In Thailand, no effects have been documented. On the other hand, general international experience clearly shows that the measures chosen in Thailand, especially police controls and helmet wearing have safety effects. It is, therefore, likely that the GRSP activities may have had an accident-reducing effect.

3.5 Sustainability

GRSP Secretariat

At the global level, GRSP has a well functioning and professional secretariat and what appears to be a sound financial basis. New international road safety initiatives as described in Chapter 6 below may widen the financial basis of GRSP. This may allow an extension of country level activities and strengthening of country level support. In this perspective, it appears that GRSP is now moving rapidly towards organisational and financial sustainability.

Focus Countries

Sustainability at the country level is not clearly defined by GRSP. Organisational sustainability, however, does not appear to be assured in general. Two countries, India and Thailand, appear to have achieved sustainability. Both have a solid organisational footing, good linkages with government and a high activity level. Another two countries, Brazil and Poland may be close to reaching sustainability and focus at this stage on how to take the final step in this direction. For four countries, Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary and Romania sustainability has not yet been secured. The same applies to South Africa where sustainability may even be at risk due to a poor relationship with the national government (see Annex 3). Finally, in Vietnam, operations are only starting up now.

4 Lessons Learned

This chapter presents lessons learned during the evaluation. They are the results of analyses made by the evaluation team. GRSP did after less than three years of operation summarise emerging lessons (GRSP 2001). Some of these lessons correspond with the following lessons learned identified during this evaluation:

- (i) National branches of international corporate partners appear to be vital catalysts for building focus country networks and transferring knowledge
- (ii) The World Bank and other international development agencies are indispensable road safety partners. Effort needs to be devoted to improving co-operation with such organisations
- (iii) The partnership approach may prove difficult to establish and it may be difficult to gain mutual trust. Co-operation at the project level is, however, instrumental in this respect

There are several lessons learned in individual focus countries (see Annex 3) during the evaluation that seem to be of general significance:

- (iv) When introduced at the national level, it is of vital importance that the GRSP organisation is institutionalised to some degree and fits into the present pattern of road safety organisations. If not GRSP may be seen as a competitor to established organisations like the road safety organisation OBB vested in police in Hungary
- (v) If government authorities already have adopted a Public Private Partnership (PPP) approach, it is important that road safety/GRSP is introduced within the present organisation, like in Bangalore, and not as what may be seen as a competing organisation, like in South Africa
- (vi) GRSP operations may be easier to develop if there already is a well functioning National Road Safety Committee with extensive activities and government support like in Poland. If this is not the case, like in Hungary, private sector may be less interested in becoming partners
- (vii) To some extent strong support from international donors may facilitate GRSP operations like in Poland. In some cases, however, GRSP may be viewed as less relevant, given the fact that the organisation itself brings little money into road safety activities. The attitude of the government to road safety and private sector participation as well as the national road safety activity level may at least partly explain this difference
- (viii) Ceremonies and awards to persons or organisations promoting road safety, which is used in Brazil and Costa Rica, seem to be a useful measure that could be adopted also in other countries
- (ix) Impacts of focus country activities cannot be properly documented unless comprehensive evaluations become a standard component of such activities. This, however, will require clear guidance and possibly additional support and funding from the GRSP secretariat
- (x) One of the great advantages of GRSP is the global co-operation with large companies such as Shell and 3M. If GRSP manages to mobilise such companies to participate in local road safety projects, their contribution is quite unique. Furthermore, some of these companies have a safety standard in their transport operations, which may function as best practice examples, for instance Shell's Health, Safety and Environment (HSE) management system. The HSE management includes state-of-the-art quality systems for driver management and driver training, i.a. defensive driving training, which would be useful for the road haulage industry.

5 Demand for Policy Advice and Programme Assistance

This chapter outlines the general experience with road safety assistance to developing and transition countries and briefly describe the recommendations of the World report on road traffic injury prevention. Finally the overall demand for road safety assistance is discussed.

5.1 Experience with Road Safety Assistance

Road safety has been on the agenda for official development assistance the last two decades, starting with minor bilateral projects in the 1980s, among which Kenya, supported by Finnida, and Botswana, supported by Sida, (Lauridsen 1984). Gradually, road safety project became integrated components of large World Bank and regional development bank highway sector projects, e.g. in Sri Lanka, Malawi and Benin. Often bilateral donors or regional organisations like the Nordic Development Fund (NDF) rather than the lead agencies (usually the development banks) have funded such road safety components. Compared to these very large highway sector projects, the road safety components have usually been small and in some cases quite marginal. Traditionally road authorities or Transport Ministries have managed such components. In many cases co-operation with other government bodies of concern to road safety work (Ministry of the Interior/Police, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health) has been difficult or even non-existent. The impacts of such "traditional" road safety projects on road deaths and injuries have usually been highly limited and very seldom sustainability has been achieved. In some cases the road safety activity has dwindled away over time and a new donor have come into the country after a period of time and supported a new road safety project.

In many respects, experience with the above traditional road safety projects, which we could call "First generation" road safety projects, has been less positive than expected and in some cases rather frustrating for the recipient government and for the donor. In addition, the activity level achieved through traditional road safety projects has been much too low to effectively address the current road safety crises worldwide. The World report on road traffic injury prevention as described in Section 5.2 below can be seen as a new approach to and a new model for road safety work in developing and transition countries.

Poland, one of the focus countries visited during the evaluation, has prioritised road safety work much higher than the above traditional road safety projects. Poland has experienced a decrease in the number of fatalities from 7,333 in 1990, to 6,294 in 2000 and to 5,640 in 2003. Parallel to this, the number of vehicles has increased with more than 80 per cent from 9.0 million in 1990 to 16.3 million in 2003. The road safety efforts in Poland are partly under the Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport and partly under the Ministry of Health. A World Bank supported road sector project has in its current phase allocated €10 million to the road safety component and will in the next phase allocate €5.7 million, altogether €15.7 million (US\$ 19.2 million) to road safety. The biggest sub-component is improvement of hazardous road stretches. In addition, the EU will finance construction of 50 roundabouts. The Ministry of Health is implementing a major programme that also contributes to reduction of road deaths. The programme comprises new ambulances with integrated rescue teams, new emergency wards and new dispatch centres. The programme cost is €97 million (US\$ 118.5 mill) for equipment only.

As a response to the weaknesses of the traditional approach, the World Bank is now considering introduction of a new generation of road safety projects. The first such project is being negotiated with Vietnam. It will be a stand-alone road safety project under a separate agreement and not linked to a highway sector project. It

is anticipated that the new road safety project in Vietnam will have a budget of around US\$ 25 million and include support to the sectors of transport, health, police and education. In addition it will include support to the development and implementation of a national crash registration and analysis system and a monitoring and evaluation component.

Against the above background there appears to be a move from first generation road safety project to second generation stand alone major multi-sector road safety projects like the one now being negotiated with Vietnam. The road safety efforts in the transport and the health sectors in Poland could be seen as a step between the first generation and the second generation of projects.

5.2 The World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention

The World report on road traffic injury prevention (The World Report) has been prepared jointly by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004). The official launch took place in Paris on World Health Day 7 April 2004, and was hosted by the French President. A week later, in New York, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly debated the global road safety crisis. The ensuing resolution invited the WHO to act as co-ordinator for road safety issues within the UN system. The General Assembly felt that the World Report and the co-operation between the WHO and the World Bank would provide a more stable and solid basis for road safety work in future than the one provided by the current approach with its transport sector focus.

The World Report presents the most complete and recent figures on deaths and injuries on the roads. It indicates that the number of killed in road accidents worldwide amounts to approximately 1.2 million each year while 50 million are injured. World bank projections indicate that these figures will increase by more than 65 per cent from 2000 to 2020 unless intensified safety interventions are implemented and new commitment to prevention of road accidents are made (World Bank 2004). Unsafe road traffic systems are, therefore, not only a transport sector problem but also seriously harming global public health and development.

Low-income and middle-income countries account for about 85 per cent of road traffic deaths and for 90 per cent of the annual disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost because of road traffic injury (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004). It is anticipated that road traffic deaths will decline by 30 per cent in high-income countries between 2000 and 2020 but increase substantially in low-income and middle-income countries. According to the same source, road traffic injuries was ranked as number nine among the leading courses of the global burden of disease in 1990 measured in DALYs. Without appropriate action, road traffic injuries are predicted to be the third leading cause of disability and injury in 2020.

The World Report emphasises that road safety is a social equity issue. Road crashes have a disproportionate impact on the poor who have limited access to emergency care and face costs and loss of income that can push families into poverty. The economic cost of road accidents varies from 1 per cent of gross national product in low-income countries to 1.5 per cent in middle-income

countries and to 2 per cent in high-income countries. The global cost is estimated at US\$ 518 billion per year. The share of low-income and middle-income countries is estimated at US\$ 65 billion or more than they receive in development assistance (World Health Organization and World Bank, 2004).

The World Report concludes that the costs of road crashes can be substantially reduced because successful programmes in industrialised 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 in line with its growing public health priority in low and middle-income countries. Research and development programmes are inadequate and the implementation of efficient safety measures is not in line with the needs.

The World Report makes a set of six recommendations that can be used as guidelines for national road safety work. Low and middle-income countries that lack sufficient resources to implement the recommendations are encouraged to seek partnerships with international organisations and other relevant entities to assist their implementation. The six key recommendations are:

- (i) Identify a lead agency in government to guide the national road safety effort
- (ii) Assess the problem, policies and institutional settings related to road traffic injury and the capacity for road traffic injury prevention in each country
- (iii) Prepare a national road safety strategy and plan of action
- (iv) Allocate financial and human resources to address the problem
- (v) Implement specific actions to prevent road traffic crashes, minimise injuries and their consequences and evaluate the impacts of these actions
- (vi) Support the development of national capacity and international co-operation

The UN General Assembly has discussed the global road safety crises and the resolution adopted by the General Assembly 14 April 2004 (United Nations 2004) took note of the recommendations in the World Report. It also recognised that many developing countries and countries with economies in transition have limited capacities to address the road safety issues. The resolution underlined, in this context, the importance of international co-operation towards further supporting the efforts of developing countries, in particular, to build capacities in the field of road safety, and of providing financial and technical support for their efforts.

The General Assembly resolution invited the WHO, working in close co-operation with the UN regional commissions, to act as co-ordinator on road safety issues within the UN system. The WHO subsequently accepted this invitation and convened a Global Road Safety Collaboration Meeting in Geneva 1 October 2004 to discuss this opportunity for collaboration.

The above Global Road Safety Collaboration Meeting in Geneva attended by some 50 delegates from the various UN agencies, the UN regional commissions,

the World Bank and a large variety of other stakeholders from civil society discussed the challenges ahead. The meeting agreed on an agenda for facilitation of international co-operation aimed at implementation of the recommendations of the World Report. The meeting also agreed on a set of objectives in this respect, among which assessment of the problem, advocacy, development of guidelines, facilitation of capacity building at the country level and strengthening of global and regional co-ordination.

5.3 Overall Demand for Road Safety Assistance

The assessment of the overall demand for road safety assistance is based on experience from previous road safety work and the new understanding brought forward by the World Report. Experience with traditional and usually minor first generation road safety projects has been less positive than expected. The World report on road traffic injury prevention projects a dramatic increase in road deaths and injuries towards 2020 unless new commitments to prevention of road accidents are made and implemented. The United Nations (UN) General Assembly debate on the global road safety crisis revealed a huge demand for intensified safety interventions in low- and middle-income countries. Against this background it appears that a new, second generation road safety projects are required in middle- and low-income countries.

Most of the road safety interventions needed are not simple ones. They require multi-sector co-operation at the government level of the transport, health, police and education sectors. In addition, input from civil society and the private sector will be required. Resource mobilisation is clearly needed if low- and middle-income countries that face the biggest challenges are going to make substantial progress. In addition to road safety investments, capacity building at government level is urgently needed in such countries to enable governments to address efficiently the complex interventions required. Such capacity building is required prior to that a country can start implementing major new stand-alone road safety projects.

Few low- and middle-income countries have so far introduced road safety efforts that have lead to significant reduction of road deaths and injuries. Awareness raising, capacity building and in very many cases international assistance to major new second generation road safety projects are, therefore, required. If the new US\$ 25 million road safety project, now being negotiated between Vietnam and the World Bank, should form the model for such new road safety projects, the total costs for addressing the global road safety crises will be high and much higher than what is being spent today. Addressing the crises will, in respect of official international development resources, require a substantial increase in the allocations to road safety for multilateral and bilateral development organisations. In addition comes substantial support from civil society and the private sector.

Against the above background it appears that the overall demand for international road safety assistance will increase substantially over the next few years. This will be the case for road safety financing as well as for technical assistance and it seems likely that the demand for GRSP services will increase in the same way.

6 Mobilisation of Requisite Input

Implementing the recommendations of the World report on road traffic injury prevention and following-up on the UN General Assembly resolution of 14 April 2004 will require mobilisation of extensive national and international resources. Efforts will primarily have to be made at the country level but there is also a need for assistance from the regional and the global level.

6.1 The Country Level

The dominant part of the work for addressing the global road safety crises must be carried out at the Country level. Each country and notably the middle- and low-income country, which have to work intensively with improving road safety, will have to confront their specific problems and mobilise national resources. The international community, however, will have an important role to play in assisting middle- and low-income country by contributing to the financing of the efforts and in the sharing and transferring of experience and good practise from neighbouring countries and from developed countries. Input from the international community should be mobilised from many sources, among which:

- Bilateral and multilateral development agencies
- Regional UN agencies and regional programmes aimed at improving road safety
- GRSP
- Civil society and non-governmental organisations
- The private sector

Considering the challenges and financial needs for improving road safety at the country level, co-operation among individual countries and the various regional and global partners is necessary.

6.2 The Regional Level

At the regional level, the UN regional commissions could play an important role in supporting country efforts. One obvious example is the UN Economic Commission for Europe, which has played a leading role in developing and harmonising road traffic legislation in Europe and elsewhere. This includes the basic road traffic legislation as well as a range of subsidiary regulations, among which road traffic signs and signals, vehicle construction and use and control of vehicle overloading.

In Eastern Asia, the Asian Development Bank has launched the ASEAN Road Safety Initiative. This is a regional road safety programme linked to the ASEAN countries. Workshops with public and private sector participation had been held in all countries providing the input for five-years action plans.

In Africa, the UN Economic Commission for Africa and the World Bank have co-ordinated and managed a large transport policy development programme aimed at the Sub-Saharan sub-region. This Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Programme (SSATP) has since the late 1980s played an important role in developing more effective models for policy reform and supported such reforms

in the road sector and other sectors. The annual meeting of SSATP in 2004 has recently discussed and agreed on how to step up road safety efforts in the sub-region. One possibility is the launching of road safety capacity building pilot project in two countries. Such pilot projects could prepare the ground for subsequent second generation road safety projects in Africa.

Also GRSP is considering regional level activities. They would be linked to supporting and developing regional nodes of road safety competence.

6.3 The Global Level

At the global level, two new road initiatives are being discussed. They will be additional to the GRSP partnership activity.

One of the new initiatives is the World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund. This fund is aimed at governments in low- and middle-income countries. Its main objective is capacity building in the public sector by improving the national framework for road safety work through technical assistance and other means. In many countries, capacity building will be a prerequisite for embarking on a multi-sectoral second generation road safety project. The fund could, therefore, become a crucial preparatory facility for negotiating and implementing more effective new road safety projects. A financial framework of US\$ 5 million per year is envisaged at inception. The initiative is still at an early stage

The other new initiative is the Global Road Safety Initiative (GRSI), which is private sector based. It is developed within the context of the ongoing Sustainable Mobility Project of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development. It appears the initiative is reaching a mature stage by now and may be launched in early 2005. Partners in the automobile industry, the oil industry and related industries will support it. It is envisaged that partners may contribute with significant partnership fees, possibly amounting to a total of around US\$ 2 million per year at launch. It is likely that GRSI will link up with the GRSP, for instance by contracting the GRSP secretariat to administer some of its activities and thereby avoiding duplication of efforts.

7 Comparative Assessment of the GRSP Concept

GRSP, which started in 1999, has developed successfully. It has to a large extent performed well, in particular during the last few years, and is now approaching sustainability.

The other main initiatives at the global level are the two described in Section 6.3 above, the World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund and the private sector Global Road Safety Initiative (GRSI) of the Sustainable Mobility Project of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development.

The proposed World Bank trust fund is aimed at governments in low- and middle-income countries and will focus on capacity building in the public domain. It is still at an early stage of development but could when launched provide an effective and necessary preparatory facility for countries that see the need for

stepping up road safety efforts and want to do so through multi-sector internationally supported second generation road safety projects.

The GRSI private sector initiative will obviously focus on areas where the private sector could play a role. Its modus operandi is still to be defined in further detail but it seems likely that it will direct its efforts at support at the country level and presumably to some extent at countries where its partners see interesting market potentials. It will need a secretariat but it seems quite possible that it may want to collaborate with the GRSP secretariat in this respect and avoid the establishing of a fully separate entity for this purpose.

A comparison of GRSP and the two new initiatives shows several disparities. GRSP is the only existing body and it has been operating successfully for five years. It has performed well according to our evaluation and it has a potential for adopting its operation to meet the new challenges. The GRSI may be launched early next year and the World Bank trust fund possibly later in 2005.

The two new initiatives will aim at different targets. The World Bank's fund will be directed towards governments and the building of capacity in the public sector. The GRSI will as a private sector organisation hardly be in a position to direct its efforts at governments. It will have to work through its partners in the target countries and possibly also to some extent through civil society organisations. It could to some extent also work through GRSP, and the partnership approach of GRSP may be useful for GRSI as a measure for project delivery.

In this perspective, the GRSP partnership approach differs substantially from the approaches of the new initiatives. In one way, it could be said that the GRSP approach is somewhere in the middle as it addresses government and the private sector as well as civil society. This approach will be useful also in the light of the new road safety challenges where mobilisation of resources and competence from all three tiers of society will be needed. In fact, GRSP could be seen as a useful conduit between the two new initiatives.

GRSP has proved to be a professionally strong organisation. It does not appear that any of the new initiatives will aim at developing any in-house professional competence. They may to some extent rather want to draw on GRSP's professional competence.

GRSP and the two new initiatives appear to have highly different aims and their modes of operation will be different. They could rather be seen as complementary organisations than competing bodies. In fact, GRSP appears able to bridge the gap between the two other organisations. On the other hand, GRSP and the new initiatives may to some extent be seen as competitors in respect of financial resources. The World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund is expected to request funding from donors and most likely also from those that today support GRSP. Similarly, the Global Road Safety Initiative depends on funding from the private sector including some of the companies that today subscribe to GRSP today.

Against the above background, it seems likely that GRSP with continued support and adjustments to its mode of operation could develop into a shape where it would fit well with the new global road safety challenges as well as playing an useful role at the regional and country level.

8 Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Conclusions

The main conclusion of the review of GRSP output in the period 2000 – 2004 is that GRSP has initiated a wide range of useful road safety activities at the global level and in the ten focus countries. This includes GRSP secretariat road safety promotion through conferences, knowledge sharing by means of a well functioning website with a knowledge base, a newsletter and a considerable number of publications. Large numbers of activities and projects have been generated in the focus countries. Focus country activities in 2004 amount to approximately US\$ 4 million or three times the current budget of the GRSP secretariat in Geneva.

The review of performance reveals that GRSP activities are relevant and address global and country level road safety policies in a meaningful way. Generally, GRSP activities appear effective as they address the objectives defined. It should be noted, however, that objectives are formulated in quite general terms. Two weaknesses are noted. One concerns the difficulties in generating road safety activities in some focus countries, e.g. in South Africa where the current activity level is low. The other weakness relate to the ability to demonstrate good practice in focus countries when few proper evaluations of projects are undertaken.

It is difficult to assess the efficiency of GRSP operations as the evaluation framework has not allowed for in depth investigation of this issue and some data in this respect have not been available. The information gathered, however, indicate that efficiency is fairly good at the secretariat level and possibly also at the country level. Furthermore, it appears that the GRSP secretariat has developed into a professionally strong entity.

Also impacts have been difficult to assess, mainly because comprehensive evaluations of GRSP projects are missing. Only one project has been formally evaluated. There are, however, indications of positive effects in some focus countries, notably Hungary (one evaluation carried out), Brazil, India, Poland and Thailand.

The GRSP has a well functioning secretariat and what seems to be a sound financial basis. It appears that the organisation is moving rapidly towards organisational and financial sustainability. Sustainability at the country level is, however, not assured yet. Two countries, India and Thailand, appear to have achieved sustainability. Another two countries, Brazil and Poland may be close to reaching sustainability and focus at this stage on how to take the final step in this direction. For four countries, Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary and Romania sustainability has not yet been secured. The same applies to South Africa where sustainability may be at risk. Finally, in Vietnam, operations are only starting up now

A number of lessons have been learned during the evaluation team's reviewing of experience, among them: The World Bank and other international development agencies are indispensable road safety partners. National branches of international

corporate partners appear to be vital catalysts for building focus country networks and transferring knowledge. When introduced at the national level, it is of vital importance that GRSP fits into the present pattern of road safety organisations. GRSP operations may be easier to develop if there already is a well functioning National Road Safety Committee with extensive activities and government support. Impacts of focus country activities cannot be properly documented unless comprehensive evaluations become a standard component of such activities. This, however, will require clear guidance and possibly additional support from the GRSP secretariat.

Two new global initiatives are now being planned, the World Bank Global Road Safety Trust Fund and the private sector Global Road Safety Initiative (GRSI) of the Sustainable Mobility Project of the World Business Council on Sustainable Development.

A comparison shows that the proposed World Bank trust fund is aimed at governments in low- and middle-income countries. Its main role will be capacity building in the public domain. It is still at an early stage of development but could when launched provide an effective facility for multi-sector internationally supported second generation road safety projects. The GRSI private sector initiative will obviously focus on areas where the private sector could play a role. It will need a secretariat but it may want to collaborate with the GRSP secretariat in this respect and avoid the establishing of a fully separate entity for this purpose.

GRSP is the only existing body and it has been operating successfully for five years. It has performed well and it has a potential for adopting its operation to meet the new challenges. The two new initiatives will aim at different targets. GRSP and the two new initiatives appear to have highly different aims and modes of operation will be different. They could rather be seen as complementary organisations than competing bodies. On the other hand, GRSP and the new initiatives may to some extent be seen as competitors in respect of financial resources.

Introduction of the two new global initiatives appears as a challenge to GRSP. It seems, however, likely that GRSP based on its current performance and professional strength and with continued support and adjustments to its mode of operation could adapt well to the new global road safety challenges.

The possible adjustments to the GRSP mode of operation could on the one hand be based on a systematic assessment of the emerging challenges in respect of the changes in demand for policy advice and programme assistance as outlined in Chapter 5 above and the two planned new global initiatives as outlined in Chapter 6. Such assessment of the changing global road safety situation would, on the other hand, provide a more systematic framework for an in depth review of the weaknesses identified by this evaluation, notably the need for better structured and more operational objectives and a more systematic approach to evaluation of GRSP activities, particularly at the focus country level. Such review could also lead to a discussion of possible adjustments to the basic GRSP tri-sector approach in the light of the emerging challenges.

8.2 Recommendations

The conclusions of the evaluation show that GRSP has developed successfully. It has performed quite well, in particular during the last few years, and is now approaching sustainability at the global level. With continued support and some adjustments to its mode of operation, it could easily develop further to fit well with the new global road safety challenges as well as playing a useful role at the regional and country level. The comparison of GRSP with the two new global initiatives shows they have highly different aims and the modes of operation will also be different. They should rather be seen as complementary organisations than competitors, although they to some extent may be competitors in respect of financial means.

The GRSP organisation will have an important role to play in the light of the new understanding of the global road safety crises. The new GRSI private sector initiative may choose to use GRSP for some secretariat functions as a means to supporting country activities. The partnership approach is useful and a continued balance between government, private sector and civil society partners is considered important. Further support from international development agencies is therefore required. The output and possible future impact of GRSP seem to justify the financial support from the various groups of partners.

Against the above background, it is recommended that Sida continue supporting GRSP for a new period of three to five years. Two adjustments to the GRSP mode of operation are recommended to rectify weaknesses identified during the evaluation. One concerns the definition of objectives. A clarification and clearer structuring of objectives, including measurable operational targets, could enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of GRSP. The other recommendation concerns the ability to demonstrate good practice in focus countries, which today is weakly developed. More emphasis should be given to evaluating and analysing the effects of road safety interventions in the focus countries systematically.

In addition, it is suggested that GRSP as soon as possible consider the need for adjustments to its current mode of operation. This should be based on a systematic assessment of the emerging challenges, notably the changes in demand for road safety policy advice and programme assistance and the planned new global road safety initiatives. Such assessment would also provide a solid framework for an in depth review of objectives and operational targets and a useful input to developing a system for systematic evaluation of GRSP's own activities.

References

- Bertin-Jones, M. (2003)
An integrated, market-based approach to vehicle safety in road transport.
Paper to Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc. Conference, April 2003
- Elvik R. & Vaa T. (2004)
The Handbook of Road Safety Measures. Elsevier Ttd., Oxford
- FIA Foundation in association with GRSP (undated)
Seat belt campaign toolkit. Researched and Compiled by TRL. FIA
Foundation for the Automobile and Society. London, probably 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2001 a)
Annual Report. Geneva, June 2001
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2001 b)
Moving ahead:emerging lessons. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2002)
Annual Report. Geneva, June 2002
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2003)
Annual Report. Geneva, June 2003
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)
Annual Report. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
Constitution and Operating Modalities. Steering Committee Meeting June 2004, Attachment K. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
GRSP Business Plan 2004. Progress monitor - end of May 2004. Steering Committee Meeting June 2004, Attachment F. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)
GRSP Projects. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 e)
GRSP News. Issue 12 May 2004. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 f)
Summary - GRSP Business Plan Goals 2004. Steering Committee Meeting June 2004, Attachment E. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 g)
Website. Geneva, June 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 h)
GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 i)
GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Document 21. Geneva
- Lauridsen, H., editor (1984)
First African Road Safety Congress, Nairobi 1984. Compendium of Papers. UN Economic Commission for Africa and Institute of Transport Economics (TOI)
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2002)
Evaluation of Business Partners for Development. London, June 2002
- The Red Cross/EU Office (undated)
Road Safety and First Aid for Children. Good Practise Guide. Prepared for the European Red Cross Road Safety Campaign 2003-2004 by The Red Cross/EU Office (in association with Toyota Motor Europe and supported by the European Commission). Brussels
- United Nations (2004)
Improving global road safety. Resolution 58/289 adopted by the General Assembly, 14 April 2004. New York
- World Health Organization and World Bank (2004)
World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention. World Health Organization. Geneva
- World Bank (2004)
Transport Note No. TN-1. <http://www.worldbank.org/transport/publicat/tr-notes.htm> Wasington, D.C., April 2004

Note: Country specific references appear under each country in Annex 3

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Sida Support to the Global Road Safety Partnership Terms of Reference

Background and Justification

The Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) was initiated by the World Bank (WB) in 1999 under the umbrella of the World Bank's Business Partners for Development (BPD) programme. Through a global partnership involving business, civil society and governments working for sustained reduction of road accidents, the goals are to improving road safety conditions in developing and transition countries where the toll of road deaths and injuries are disproportionately high.

The members of GRSP are called 'partners' and they may belong to the Programme at the global and/or national level. The former guide the direction of the overall GRSP Programme and the latter work together to develop and support specific projects in focus countries.

While the overall goal of GRSP is targeted on achievement of road safety improvements in developing and transition countries (mainly in the so called focus countries), the means of achieving this goal are through helping to build capacities of local institutions and by enhancing the ability of professionals and communities and through the development of partnerships in the private and voluntary sectors as well as the research community.

The overall objectives of GRSP are:

- Awareness raising of traffic safety gains among key decision makers aiming at creating partnerships between governments, regional organisations and the private sector;
- Strengthening of the capacity of partners through training in international best practices;
- Co-ordination and involvement amongst all agencies to make best use of their partnerships and strengths;
- Systematic analysis of data emphasising that road safety programmes to be based on cost-effectiveness and scientific methods;
- Strategic research for filling the gaps in existing databases and co-ordinating research activities as much as possible in order to share relevant results and avoid duplication.

GRSP is currently involved in ten focus countries: Vietnam, Thailand, India (Bangalore), Ghana, South Africa, Costa Rica, Brazil, Poland, Romania and Hungary. GRSP expects to expand its Programme to include additional focal countries in the near future.

On 8 May 2000 Sida and GRSP signed the initial agreement by which Sida undertook to provide financial support to GRSP covering e.g. funding of a GRSP advisor, executive road safety training and inputs into knowledge sharing activities. As from July 2000 to December 2004 Sida has supported the GRSP financially by some MSEK 10,5 in total.

Scope and Purpose of the Review

The aim of the exercise is to:

1. Review the main outputs and activities since July 2000 in the light of the Programme's objectives, with an emphasis on the current phase, which started in July 2002.
2. Review the pro and cons of the GRSP concept and the modalities of action. The review will look into possible effects of recently proposed future changes in the mode of operation.
3. Review the existing demand relating both to policy advice and Programme assistance. The review will examine trends in demand and will try to define adequate levels of expertise and financial resources necessary to cope with this demand.

The evaluation will result in:

1. Following the visit to the GRSP Annual Meeting in June 2004, a brief 'inception report' setting out the methodology of the review and the approach (incl. need of international follow-up visits). This report as well as the first draft report will be discussed with Sida.
2. A second draft report, to which also GRSP will be invited to make comments. Consolidated comments will then be submitted by Sida.
3. A final evaluation report in hard copy as well as an electronic version.

In the context of the above, this assignment will include, but not be limited to the following detailed activities:

- Review the concept and design of the original project document but concentrate on the current programme document (2002-2004) within the context of the Sida support.
- Review the extent to which the Programme has had an impact on the issues addressed in the constitutional framework.
- Assess the comparative advantage of the Programme in relation to other similar activities (in particular financed by ADB and WB).
- Assess the procedures and strategy developed to address the problems, as well as the effectiveness of solving them. This will include an assessment of whether the established objectives are achievable and whether the relationship between the objectives, the outputs, the activities and the inputs is logically and reasonably defined, given the resources available.
- Assess the selection and identification of national partners (users of the Programme's output) and whether the objectives and outputs were identified in verifiable terms.
- Assess the quality, timeliness and responsiveness of the Programme to changes in the operating environment and demand for its services.

- Examine the extent to which the Programme is producing the anticipated outputs, their quality and how they have been utilised by the partners, including an overall assessment of GRSP's efficiency in delivering its services.
- Identify factors, which have facilitated or deterred the realisation of the Programme's objectives, as well as lessons learned (positive and/or negative) from experiences gained during the implementation of the Programme.
- Assess the significance and immediate effects on specific target groups, as well as the more long-term effects in terms of relevance, viability, and sustainability of Programme activities, highlighting any problems and unforeseen effects in the process.
- Examine within the framework of the Programme the situation for mobilising requisite inputs (release of funds), incl. recruitment of the focus country advisors as well as the professional inputs of the steering and executive committees.
- Based on the findings of the review, make recommendations regarding the feasibility of a future phase (3-5 years), including sources of financing, execution modalities, intervention strategies and lessons learned particularly with respect to sustainable effects of the Programme outputs in the target countries.

Practical Arrangements, Timetable and Itinerary

The services of a highly qualified independent reviewer/consultant will be acquired for the work described above.

The consultant will have a sound understanding of approaches and practices in the areas of transport investments and traffic safety. Other requirements include an excellent knowledge of English as well as ability to write clearly and concisely.

The consultant will review the different strategy documents, project documents, annual and progress reports prepared by GRSP. The consultant will meet and have discussions as deemed required with individual GRSP-officers and/or government and business representatives.

Implementation

A review of the documentation provided by Sida or otherwise obtained. Following participation in the open part of the GRSP Annual Meeting in June 2004 the consultant will prepare of an inception report. The inception report will also propose the estimated budget allocation within the total financial frame of SEK 314 000 excl. added value tax.

The inception report will e.g. outline the possible need of study visits and meetings with core country representatives, GRSP Steering Committee members and Executive staff.

Reporting

A first draft report will be prepared and discussed with Sida at the end of September 2004.

A Second Draft Report will be submitted to Sida and GRSP, not later than two weeks after receipt of Sida's verbal comments to the First Draft Report. The Final Report will be submitted to Sida and GRSP not later than two weeks after receipt of their consolidated comments on the Second Draft Report.

Annex 2: List of Persons met and interviewed

Sida

Mr. Lars Karlsson, Senior Project Manager (Transport)

Mr. Gösta Werner, Project Manager

Ms. Ervor Edman, Road Safety Adviser

World Bank

Mr. Nigel Ingx, SSATP Program Manager

Mr. Richard Scurfield, Sector Leader (Transport)

Mr. Tony Bliss, Senior Road Safety Specialist

World Health Organization

Dr. Etienne Krug, Director Injuries and Accident Prevention

Dr. Meleckidzedek Khayesi, Technical Officer Road Traffic Injury Prevention

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Mr. Ibrahim Osman, Director Policy and Relations Division

Asian Development Bank

Charles M. Melhuish, Lead Transport Sector Specialist

Department for International Development, UK

Alistair Wray, Head of Profession, Infrastructure Group, Policy Division

Colin Ellis, Senior Transport Adviser

Ann Doherty, Adviser, Programme Management Unit

Yogita Maini, Research Adviser, Infrastructure Group, Policy Division

Lyndon Mendes, Adviser, Infrastructure Group, Policy Division

TRL Limited, UK

Chris Baguey, International Road Safety Specialist

International Center for Alcohol Policies, Washington, D.C.

Brett Bivans, Director of Partnership Development

General Motors Corporation, Public Policy Center, Detroit

Tayce A. Wakefield, Executive Director Environment and Energy

GRSP Secretariat

David Silcock, Chief Executive
Rikke Rysgaard, Programme Officer
Peter M. W. Elsenaar, Senior Advisor
Michael Bernhard, Advisor
José Cardita, Advisor
Andrew Downing, Advisor
Katleen Elsig, Advisor
Michael A. Winnett, Advisor

GRSP Focus Countries

Persons interviewed and met for the purpose of preparing the country briefs are listed in Annex 3 under each country.

Annex 3: Focus Country Briefs

Annex 3: Focus Country Briefs

Contents

Country	Page
Brazil	1
Costa Rica	5
Ghana	9
Hungary	12
India	16
Poland	19
Romania	24
South Africa	27
Thailand	30
Vietnam	33

GRSP Brazil

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government: (Local)</i>	<p>Sumaré: Municipal Departments: Education, Environment, Transportation and Health, Road Police, State Hospital of Sumaré</p> <p>Limeira: Municipal Departments: Education, Transport, Social welfare, UNICAMP,</p> <p>Jacarei: Infra-structure Secretariat, Sports Directorship, Cultural Foundation Casa Viva Vida, Education and Sports Municipal Secretariat</p> <p>Juiz de Fora: GETTRAN, Military police, Federal police, Directorate of central regions, National Oil Company - Petrobras</p>
	<i>NGOs:</i>	<p>Sumaré: Rotary, Associacao dos Condutores Escolares, Motoristas de Transporte Escolar</p> <p>Limeira: Limeira's Engineers and Architects Association, Limeira's Commercial and Industrial Association, Attorney Brazilian Association, Limeira</p> <p>Jacarei: Rotary, Associacao dos Condutores Escolares, Motoristas de Transporte Escolar</p> <p>Juiz de Fora: COMSET, Escoterios, Associação de Veiculos Antigos</p>
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	<p>Sumaré: Autoban, Ediotora Kalimera, DaimlerChrysler (Mercedes-Benz), D Paschoal, Companhia Teatral Himaid, etc.</p> <p>Limeira: 3M, Ciação Limeirense, Pápido Sudeste, Grupo Ripassa, Germanica (Volkswagen), COTALI (Volkswagen), DILIVESA (Ford), Winner (Honda), TRANSITUS, HIHAPPY, TRW Automotive,</p> <p>Jacarei: Honda, Data-City, Photosensors, Rodrigo Gas Station, Somos Publishing House, JJ Vehicles, Banespa Bank, SESTRAN, Summer Winter</p> <p>Juiz de Fora: TV Panorama, MRS Logistica, Colégio Academia de Comercio, Colegio Metodista Grenbery</p>
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	<p>DRSAS partly completed</p> <p>Dynamic Road Safety Assessment Systems (DRSAS) including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Expansion of PAA/GRSP to new regions 2) Road safety education programmes in schools 3) Safety project for school bus drivers and taxi drivers <p>Road safety ceremonies (awards given to actors promoting safety)</p> <p>Safety measures for pedestrians (traffic lights, pedestrian crossings etc.)</p> <p>DRSAS partly completed, partly ongoing</p>
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	<p>DRSAS still ongoing</p> <p>Crash reduction targets</p> <p>Develop 2004 PPA programme</p>
	<i>Planned:</i>	<p>Development of strategy for sustainability</p> <p>Proceed to other regions/towns with GRSP/PPA</p>
Budget:	US\$ 1,000,000 (Source: GRSP 2004 d)	
Location:	Three towns in the state of Sao Paulo (Sumaré, Limeira, Jacarei) one town in the state of Minas Gerais (Juiz de Fora)	

2 Background and Objectives

The high number of vehicles on the roads combined with factors such as poor road quality and general disregard for traffic laws result in roughly 1 million crashes and the annual loss of some 50,000 lives on Brazil's roads.

GRSP initiated activities in Brazil at the end of 2000. The relevant road safety problem and the country's size were given great consideration in devising a strategy for GRSP involvement.

Consultations with potential public and private sector and civil society partners resulted in the development of an action plan targeting specific cities with a road safety problem and a high commitment to improving the situation. The cities are Jacareí, Limeira and Sumaré in São Paulo State and Juiz de Fora in Minas Gerais State.

GRSP began in 2002 to assist the selected towns launch a three-year road safety improvement plan based on the "Proactive Partnership Approach" (PPA). Key components of the approach include:

- 1) An annual public award system for organisations and operators achieving defined levels of road safety performance.
- 2) A workable performance assessment system based on:
 - Proactive process indicators, which relate to the completion of road safety actions and the establishment of award systems;
 - Reactive road safety situation indicators using agreed road crash and injury rates.
 - The utilisation and encouragement of partnerships in road safety activities through policy statements and the inclusion of partnership indicators in the performance assessment system.

The PPA monitors the delivery of specific projects outlined in the annual road safety plan. Important features of the "dynamic road safety assessment systems" (DRSAS) are a public declaration of the safety levels achieved by the responsible organizations, the awarding of annual honour certificates of bronze, silver and gold according to the levels achieved and finally an assessment of the joint impact of these measures.

In each participating city a memorandum of understanding has been signed by the "Prefeito" (City Hall President) and the GRSP Latin America advisor, José Cardita, confirming the commitment of the city to reducing the number of road crashes and related fatalities and injuries. In each city, the GRSP approach has been integrated in the town's road safety management and is supported by a GRSP City Committee and Coordinator. The Committee is dedicated to changing the "road safety culture" by applying the above approach.

3 GRSP Activities

In each of the four towns an annual action plan is prepared which combines measures of outputs (eg project delivery) with measures of outcomes (eg reductions in crash rates) and a rewarding system using gold, silver and bronze awards for the participating organisations (schools, transport companies etc.)

In all four towns there is a so-called Dynamic Road Safety Assessment Systems (DRSAS) including three main goals:

- 1) Expansion of PAA/GRSP to new regions
- 2) Road safety education programmes in schools
- 3) Safety project for school bus drivers and taxi drivers

Also in all towns there are arranged specific road safety ceremonies with awards to actors promoting safety. Another general feature of GRSP activities in Brazil is a strong focus on safety measures for pedestrians (traffic lights, pedestrian crossings etc.).

Specific projects in the single towns include:

Sumaré:

Traffic Orientation Plan,

Limeira:

Installation of road signs

Juiz de Fora:

Access ramps

Black spot treatments

Road marking

Installation of road signs

Pedestrian protection facilities

Jacarei:

Installation of road signs

Access slopes for disabled

Black spot treatments

2 campaigns; Bike riders' week and Traffic week

Police enforcement; Radar and red light cameras

Asphalt renovation

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The safety problems selected, primarily protection of pedestrians and school children are highly relevant in Brazil, where accidents involving pedestrians constitute a major proportion of serious road accidents.

4.2 Effectiveness

The GRSP approach, through the PPA seems to have been successful in Brazil. The idea of having Road Safety Ceremonies with awards to those contributing to reducing accidents is probably a good one. There are also many actors involved, Public, Private and NGOs indicating that the approach has been successful.

4.3 Efficiency

Efficiency is hard to estimate, but given the fact that the measures adopted in general have documented favourable road safety effects, it is reason to believe that the GRSP activities in Brazil are cost-effective.

4.4 Impact

It is difficult to estimate the impact of GRSP/PAA activities in Brazil because relevant statistics give a somewhat mixed picture for the different towns. Furthermore, the GRSP activities have not been evaluated so one is restricted to using general accident statistics for the different towns/areas to estimate effects. There is, however, reason to believe that the activities have a favourable impact on road safety, given the measures adopted. The best development in road safety seems to have been achieved in Juiz de Fora with substantial reductions in fatalities and serious injuries combined with an increase in the number of vehicles in the period 2001-2004. Also in Sumare there has been a decrease in accidents and an increase in the number of vehicles.

In Limeira accident figures have generally not been much reduced, but some risk figures have (serious injuries per vehicle) According to GRSP reports accident figures for Limeira may be somewhat incorrect due to certain staff problems in 2003.

In Jacarei, accident figures are generally not available in the documents consulted. Although it cannot be concluded decisively that GRSP activities have contributed to the positive development in road safety in three out of four towns, there is reason to believe that this is the case.

4.5 Sustainability

Given the fact that road safety seems to be improved and that many actors are involved, there is reason to believe that GRSP/PAA road safety initiative will continue. Sustainability is, however, not secured and is at the moment an important focus of GRSP activities in Brazil.

5 Lessons Learnt

Reward ceremonies with awards to those contributing to increased road safety seem to be a good idea that may be adopted in other regions/countries.

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Mr. Carlos Henrique Leal, Presidente do Comitê do GRSP, Superintendente da Agência de Transporte e Trânsito de Juiz de Fora – GETTRAN/JF

Mr. Jorge Alfredo Franco Lima, Secretário do Comitê do GRSP, Agente de Trânsito, Coordenador do SISCAT – Sistema de Controle de acidentes de Trânsito em Juiz de Fora

Mr. José Cardita, Advisor GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)

GRSP visit report Brazil, Edition II, 7-13. April 2004.

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)

GRSP visit report Brazil, Edition II, 2-5. February 2004.

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)

GRSP Achievements – August 2004, document 21.

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)

GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

Global Road Safety Partnership (not dated)

Proactive Partnership Approach in Sumaré, Power Point presentation

Global Road Safety Partnership (not dated)

Proactive Partnership Approach in Limeira, Power Point presentation

Global Road Safety Partnership (not dated)

Proactive Partnership Approach in Jacareí, Power Point presentation

Global Road Safety Partnership (not dated)

Proactive Partnership Approach in Juiz de Fora, Power Point presentation

Global Road Safety Partnership

GRSP Website <http://www.grsroadsafety.org>. Geneva, August 2004

GRSP Costa Rica

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	Ministries of Transport, Health, Education, and National Road Safety Council (COSEVI), CCSS (National Social Insurance)
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Red Cross, FIA foundation, INS (National insurance institute), Costa Rica Automobile Club
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Shell, 3M
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Road safety improvement plan, seat belt campaign
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Establish local road safety councils (COLOSEVIS) and Safe schools, Award ceremonies
	<i>Planned:</i>	Implementation of safety project
Budget:	US\$ 517 000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 c)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

The Costa Rican government considers road crashes a public health problem. The economic costs of road crashes in Costa Rica are estimated at 2.3 per cent of the GNP. Between 1981 and 1990 the number of motor vehicles increased by 63 percent and the population by 30 per cent. From 1991 to 2000 the number of motor vehicles increased by 132 percent while the population increased by 30 per cent. These rates continue to characterise motorisation and population growth in Costa Rica. The fatality rate in road crashes in terms of 100,000 inhabitants improved from 2000 to 2001 (1.9 per cent reduction) and from 2001 to 2002 (0.7 per cent reduction).

Nevertheless the number of crashes is still rising. In 2002 there were 68,804 road crashes with 673 fatalities (322 died "in situ") and 2,783 serious injuries. In 2001 there were 64,797 road crashes with 668 fatalities (353 died "in situ") and 2,914 serious injuries. In 2000, 59,496 road crashes occurred with 670 fatalities (336 died in situ), 2,562 serious injuries and 13,507 light injuries. In 2000 there were some 1,500 road crashes per 100,000 inhabitants and 17 fatalities per 100,000 inhabitants (8.5 of these were in "situ" deaths). Per 1,000 road crashes in 2000, there were 11 fatalities (5.6 of these were in situ). In terms of injuries, there were 65 serious and 342 slight injuries/100,000 inhabitants or 33 serious injuries per 10,000 motor vehicles and 174 light injuries. Pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle passengers are particularly at risk of dying or being injured due to a road crash.

The Consejo de Seguridad Vial (COSEVI), the National Road Safety Council, is the main national organisation addressing road safety issues. The President of the Council is the Minister for Public Works and Transport. The Council has four executive departments: traffic engineering, road safety education, traffic police and public transport.

The Council tracks the total number of road crashes. The statistics are rather comprehensive and include not only fatalities "in situ" but also the total number of fatalities. The Council has a history of strong commitment to road safety. However, a new approach was sought in 2000 as the number of crashes began to rise. A new road safety improvement plan was defined in 2000 and is gradually being implemented across the country

There are numerous government, private sector and civil society organizations involved in road safety in Costa Rica. Overall, road safety is co-ordinated by the Ministry of Transport and Public Works. Information and statistics on road crashes are provided by three entities:

- Consejo de Seguridad Vial (National Road Safety Council)
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos (National Statistics Bureau)
- Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Transportes (Ministry of Transport and Public Works)

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP began working with the Costa Rican government in 2000. The organization's first activity was to support the COSEVI with the development of a five-year national road safety improvement plan. The plan is linked to a pro-active partnership approach (*cf. Brazil*). The plan was launched in 31 cantones (judged by COSEVI to be the poorest road safety performers) and should be implemented in all 81 cantons by 2005.

The actual implementation of the plan was slowed by a series of political events (presidential elections 2002)

The plan targets geographic areas (the local administrative districts, "Cantones") and specific target groups such as transport companies, schools and drivers. The plan is based on a system of continuous assessment of road safety performance, with a proportion of the specific projects within the plan being developed on a partnership basis.

The plan foresees the establishment and training of local road safety boards, COLOSEVIS (Consejos Locales de Seguridad Vial). The aim of these boards is to maintain the road network, promote good road safety behavior and to enforce the traffic laws. They also support the municipalities on road safety issues.

Schools are an integral part of the road safety plan. Specific goals include creating "Escuela Segura", or Safe School, improving safety amongst school bus drivers, increasing road safety awareness by school children and greater responsibility for safety amongst teachers and parents.

An annual assessment process is built into the plan. Achievements are measured by a combination of process indicators (such as delivering a training course to school bus drivers) and output indicators (such as reduced numbers of casualties on school journeys). An element of competition and reward is built in, allowing operators or schools to achieve status for good performance.

COLOSEVIS (Local Road Safety Councils)

GRSP is assisting the establishment of local road safety councils (COLOSEVIS), which organise road safety efforts and implement road safety programs on the local level. GRSP's support includes advice pertaining to the dynamic road safety assessment systems (and related partnerships). The COLOSEVIS will be established in all 81 cantones. Once these systems are fully operational, a competition among COLOSEVIS related to the general improvement of the road safety situation (based on collected data) will ensue

"Centros Educativos Seguros" (Safe Schools)

The national plan foresees the active involvement of the local school systems. GRSP is assisting the establishment of "dynamic road safety assessment systems"

enabling schools to participate in the government led road safety initiative, termed "Centros Educativos Seguros" (Safe Schools).

Empresas Seguras" (Safe Road Transport Companies)

Transport companies are also targeted by the national plan as vital in order to improve the general health of road safety in Costa Rica. GRSP is assisting the establishment of "dynamic road safety assessment systems" enabling road transport companies to participate in the government led road safety initiatives. Transport companies involved in road safety improvement efforts are termed "Empresas Seguras" (Safe Road Transport Companies).

Participating companies presently include: Coronado, Alajuelito, DELDU, PIPASA, DOS PINOS, POZUELO.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The projects of GRSP Costa Rica are in line with national policy on road safety and appear relevant.

4.2 Effectiveness

The activities of GRSP Costa Rica are aimed at the objectives defined. There are, however, implementation problems. GRSP has not managed to involve all relevant partners/actors and progress is slow.

4.3 Efficiency

It is not possible to estimate efficiency at this stage.

4.4 Impact

Up until now, the main GRSP activities have been concentrated on building up the relevant organisations (local road safety councils and safe schools) and the possible impact on road accident development is not yet materialized.

One seat belt campaign has been carried out, but the impact is impossible to estimate at present. According to GRSP the campaign resulted in the re-instatement of a seat-belt wearing-law. If the law is also enforced, there is reason to expect a positive safety effect.

4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability of the GRSP in Costa Rica is not secured. There seems to be some problems with implementation of concrete safety projects.

5 Lessons Learnt

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Mr Jose Cardita, Advisor GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Global Road Safety Partnership (2003 a)

GRSP visit report 30th September – 3rd October. Geneva

- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
GRSP country report – Costa Rica 1st April 2004. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)
GRSP Website. <http://www.grsproadsafety.org>. Geneva, August 2004

GRSP Ghana

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	National Road Safety Commission (NRSC), Ghana Highways Authority, Motor Traffic Transport Police, Driver Vehicle Licensing Authority,
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Red Cross, Attitudes Ghana, Campaign against indisciplined driving in Ghana (CAIDIG), Safe Journey Network (SAJONET), Road Safety Youth Group
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Shell, 3M, Guinness Ghana, Toptech Drive Consult, Total Elf
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Ashiaman community project 1 st stage, Driver training manual, National Christmas road safety campaign 2003, child road safety projects
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Ashiaman community project 2 nd stage
	<i>Planned:</i>	Drinking and driving project, Community education programs, Driver Voluntary Code of Conduct, School crossing refurbishment, School Education Programme, Alcohol Regulation in Transport Companies
Budget:	\$ 87,000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 c)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

GRSP Ghana is a national initiative and its activities in Ghana are managed through an NGO that was registered in September 2000 and launched in November 2000. The NGO works closely with and supports the lead government agency, the National Road Safety Commission (NRSC). Its prime objective is to facilitate the building of tri-sector partnerships with the common goal of improving road safety.

Ghana's basic road safety indicators (estimates) for 2000 are: 73 fatalities/10,000 vehicles (according to NRSC 5 year Strategy Document, 2001 to 2005) and 8 fatalities/100,000 inhabitants. Actual numbers might be higher due to inaccurate statistics. One of the current objectives of the NRSC is to develop a reliable road accident data system.

In the past, road safety activities have been carried out within the Ministry of Roads and Transport by individual departments: Ghana Highways Authority, Department of Urban Roads, Department of Feeder Roads, Driver Vehicle Licensing Authority together with the National Road Safety Commission. In addition, the Global Road Safety Partnership has founded an NGO (GRSP Ghana NGO) to support the program of the NRSC and to develop tri-sectoral safety initiatives (in partnership with the private, public and civil sectors).

A 5-year national road safety strategy was launched in August 2001. The primary components of the strategy have been allocated to various government agencies. GRSP Ghana has been written into the plans as the umbrella NGO, for all who are involved in road safety. It is envisaged that GRSP Ghana will draw together the various road safety NGO's and involve them in the project activities.

Denmark is funding road safety activities in Ghana through Danida, which provides nearly 70 per cent of the NRSC budget. UK's Department for international development (DfID) is also contributing to road safety work in Ghana.

A number of *private sector* organisations in Ghana involved in road transport, among which vehicle manufacture, vehicle maintenance, traffic management,

driver training and the oil industry are interested in proactively improving road safety. Some are already directly involved. A number of businesses not directly related to road transport also actively participate in road safety, such as the National Insurance Commission and Ghacem. Private sector organisations are not, however, limited to those located in the country. GRSP Ghana NGO is working to link international organisations into the programme. DfID has supported the production of a driver training manual (Safe Driving Manual) and the "Promoting Road Safety through Community Education programmes" (an exercise where the community will be assisted to identify and solve accident problems).

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society groups such as churches, rotary clubs and youth organisations also contribute to road safety. In Ghana there are relatively few such organisations working exclusively to promote safer roads. NGOs and businesses have been active, but have not yet co-ordinated their efforts. One international NGO has organised road safety information programs through drama and dance and Shell has introduced driver training and incentive programs for company and subcontracted drivers. Church and community groups are active in Ghana but there has not been much effort focused on road safety. A child safety scheme was developed in the early 1990s with business sponsors. More recently the Emerging Leaders for Development Group (ELD) drew up a program for social development including a major road safety component.

The objectives of GRSP Ghana are the same as the general GRSP objectives. That is (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society (NGOs) and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP Ghana has been presented with a number of opportunities to develop projects in the road safety sector but has not yet been successfully able to deliver against time. Given the need to build local capacity in project management, a series of workshops were facilitated for local partners by the GRSP advisor.

Recent reports from the GRSP advisor in Ghana indicate that activities now are in progress with substantial collaboration with Shell and Total Elf.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The projects of GRSP Ghana are in line with national policy on road safety and appear as clearly relevant.

4.2 Effectiveness

The activities of GRSP Ghana are aimed at the objectives defined. There have been implementation problems, however, and GRSP has not yet managed to instigate many road safety projects. There are indications of improvements in 2004.

4.3 Efficiency

It is not possible to estimate efficiency at this early stage of GRSP work.

4.4 Impact

So far, few safety projects have materialized. Accordingly, the impact of GRSP activities on road safety is at best quite limited.

4.5 Sustainability

GRSP in Ghana is organised as a separate NGO, GRSP Ghana with own staff and thus one important condition for sustainability is in place. However, specific safety projects have materialised only to a very limited degree.

5 Lessons Learnt

It is too early to say much about lessons learned.

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Mr. Jack Lewis, Executive Secretary, GRSP Ghana

Mr. Justice Amegashie, Technical Director; GRSP Ghana

Mr. Mike Winnett; Advisor, GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Amegashie J. (2002)

Memorandum of understanding, Partnership initiative, Community relations project, Phase 1.

Global Road Safety Partnership (2001)

"Forging links for a safer transport future" Aide Memoire on visit to Ghana 6th Mission 24th August to 5th September 2001, by Mike Winnett

Global Road Safety Partnership (2003)

GRSP Visit Report, 23rd October – 6th November 2003. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)

Back to office report (BTOR) GHANA 18th – 31st March 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)

GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)

GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

King R. and Kumasi K (2004)

Perceptions of the residents of Ashaiman of problems of road safety (Draft Report)

National Road Safety Commission (2002)

NRSC Annual Report 2002

GRSP Hungary

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	Ministry of Economy and Transport (MET), National Police
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Magyar Autoklub, Institute of Transport Sciences (KTI)
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Hungarian Advertising Association, Transporters Association (NiT), Shell, 3M
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Black spot improvements, Heavy vehicle safety seminar
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Seat belt campaign
	<i>Planned:</i>	Contour markings of trucks (pending)
Budget:	€ 210,000 in 2004 (Seat belt campaign). Completed projects € 23,000 (both in 2002)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

The GRSP partnership in Hungary was initiated in 2000. It is based on partners from government, civil society and the private sector but has no traditional Non-governmental Organisation (NGO) partners. Its secretariat is located in the Ministry of Economy and Transport (MET).

The road traffic situation in Hungary is characterised by an increase in the vehicle fleet, particularly the last few years. The number of vehicles was 2.4 million in 1990, 2.8 million in 1990 and 3.3 million by the end of 2003. Parallel to this the number of deaths and injuries on the roads increased from 39,428 in 1990 to 23,898 in 2000 and to 27,953 in 2003. After a considerable reduction in the number from 1990 to 2000, the number of deaths and injuries has increased 17 per cent the last three years.

There is no national road safety organisation in Hungary and no road safety section in the Ministry of Economy and Transport. There is an inter-ministerial committee at State Secretary level that prepares the annual road safety programme. There is also a committee vested in the police, the National Accident Preventive Committee (OBB). A police general chairs the OBB, whereas the co-chairman is from the Ministry of Economy and Transport. The present committee was set up by decree in 1992 but its predecessor commenced work 20 years earlier. OBB has also committees in the counties. Its annual budget is Ft 400 million (or € 1.6 million) of which half is allocated to the national level and the other half to the county level. OBB carries out three to four campaigns per year of which the September campaign directed at school children is considered particularly important.

Law enforcement is somewhat limited in Hungary today. According to OBB, Austria, which is similar to Hungary in size and population, may have eight times more law enforcement equipment than Hungary. It does not appear that the Ministry of Health, social security and insurance companies are very interested in road safety work in Hungary. There is no World Bank or other internationally supported major road safety project in Hungary. Compared to other GRSP countries in the region, it appears that the current extent of road safety work in Hungary is quite limited.

The objectives of GRSP Hungary are the same as the general GRSP objectives. That is (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society (NGOs) and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP Hungary's first project was a black spot improvement project in 2001 and 2002 (€ 20,000). Three black spots were identified, analysed and countermeasures were introduced. Before and after surveys carried out by the Institute of Transport Science (KTI) showed positive effects at all three sites, namely reduced speed, better lane keeping and somewhat calmer traffic flow. Accident numbers went down after the improvements, however, real effects can only be established after another couple of years.

The second GRSP project was a heavy vehicle safety seminar in 2002 (€ 3,000). The seminar was led by Shell and aimed at implementation of safety management in road haulage.

A major safety belt campaign is now being carried out. It is the biggest GRSP project so far with a budget of € 210,000. Several partners support it. Use of seat belts is mandatory in Hungary and the police will strengthen law enforcement during the campaign.

In addition to the above three, a project concerning contour marking of heavy freight vehicles has been planned. Implementation has, however, been postponed as new harmonised regulations in this respect, which are to be prepared by the European Commission, are pending.

The GRSP activity level in Hungary is rather low. Private sector partners see the limited government focus on road safety as a limiting factor. If government support to road safety were stronger, the private sector involvement would also increase. In addition, the campaign activities carried out by OBB appear to be of the same category as possible GRSP campaigns. The two organisations may therefore in some sense be seen as competitors.

The current organisational arrangement of GRSP Hungary is not considered viable in a longer time perspective. It is anticipated that the future organisation will be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee of GRSP Hungary.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The three projects of GRSP Hungary are in line with national policy on road safety and appear as clearly relevant.

4.2 Effectiveness

The activities of GRSP Hungary are aimed at the objectives defined. They appear partly effective. The first objective is achieved through the partnership approach with some success, whereas the second is partly achieved through safety work that in a longer time perspective might lead to sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads. However, the current GRSP activities are quite limited.

4.3 Efficiency

The information collected does not give any clear indication on the cost-effectiveness of the GRSP road safety work in Hungary. However, there is no reason to believe that efficiency is lower than in similar countries. The secretariat also appears to be efficient although it is only on a part time basis.

4.4 Impact

The effects of the black spot improvement have been analysed. They include speed reduction and possibly also reduction in accident numbers. The latter can, however, only be verified after more time has elapsed. No effects of the ongoing seat belt campaign have so far been documented.

4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability of the GRSP Hungary is not secured. The future organisation will, therefore, be discussed shortly by the local GRSP committee.

5 Lessons Learnt

It appears that the low activity level of GRSP Hungary to some extent may be linked to the limited focus on road safety in government. The absence of a National Road Safety Council may also make GRSP operation more difficult. The untraditional arrangement with a National Accident Preventive Committee (OBB) vested in the police may also make GRSP operation more complicated as both organisations at least to some extent may have similar aims and in some situations even may see each other as "competitors".

6 Other

List of Persons met and interviewed

Dr. Ferenc Kovács, Deputy State Secretary Transport, Ministry of Economy and Transport and Chairman of GRSP Hungary
Mr. Péter Vasi, Secretary of GRSP Hungary
Dr. Péter Lányi, Senior Counsellor and Head of Unit, Public Roads Department, Ministry of Economy and Transport
Dr. László Ruppert, Managing Director, KTI Institute for Transport Science
Dr. Péter Holló, Head Road Safety Division, KTI Institute for Transport Science
Mr. László Czeglédi, Chief Quality Management, KTI Institute for Transport Science
Mr. Csaba Kiss, Lieutenant Colonel, Secretary OBB - National Accident Prevention Committee (Traffic Police)
Mr. László Kovács, Director Club Magazine, Hungarian Automobile Club
Mr. László Hegyesi, Chief Editor Club Magazine, Hungarian Automobile Club
Mr. John W. Kieffer, Managing Director, 3M Hungária Ltd.
Mr. László Kampik, Director, 3M Hungária Ltd.
Ms. Ágota Bérces, Sales Supervisor Traffic Safety Systems, 3M Hungária Ltd.
Mr. Sandor Lendvai, Distribution and Logistics Manager Central and Eastern Europe, Shell Europe Oil Products
Mr. Peter Elsenaar, Senior Advisor, GRSP Geneva
Mr. Michael Bernhard, Advisor, Advisor

List of Documents reviewed

Global Road Safety Partnership (2003 a)
Back to Office Report from Meeting between GRSP, the Hungarian Automobile Club and the FIA Foundation. Verona, 23 October 2003.

Global Road Safety Partnership Hungary (2003 b)
Business Plan for the 2004 GRSP Seat Belt Campaign in Hungary. Budapest, November 2003

- Global Road Safety Partnership (2003 c)
Memorandum of Understanding between GRSP, the FIA Foundation and the Magyar Autóklub. A National Seat Belt Campaign in Hungary.
Geneva, December 2003.
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)
Report (to the) Press Conference April 2004. Launch of the Hungarian Seat Belt Campaign, Pully, Switzerland. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
GRSP Visit Report, Hungary, 5 – 8 April 2004.
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
GRSP Visit Report, Hungary, 8 – 10 June 2004.
- Global Road Safety Partnership Hungary (undated)
The Effect of New And Better Traffic signs (and) Better Visibility at Blackspots. Budapest, Updated September 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership Hungary (2004)
Resource Allocation Scheme for the 2004 GRSP Seat Belt Campaign. Draft. Budapest
- Kovács, Z. (2000)
Road Safety Campaign in Hungary. Paper to the AIT/FIA Road Safety Conference, November 2000 in Paris. Hungarian Automobile Club. Budapest
- Magyar Autóklub (Hungarian Automobile Club) (2001)
GRSP Program in Hungary. Budapest
- National Accident Preventive Committee - OBB (Traffic Police) (2003)
Road Accidents Involving Personal injuries, 2003. Budapest

GRSP India

1 Overview

Objectives:	"Bangalore Suraksha Sanchara" (Road safety drive) Road safety programme in Bangalore	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	The state of Karnataka, Police, the City Corporation, the Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation (BMTC). the National Institute for Mental Health and Neurosciences (NIMHANS)) World Bank
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Bangalore Agenda Task Force (BATF), Citizens' Road Safety Group (CIROS), International Centre for Alcohol Policies (ICAP), Society for Alcohol related Policy Initiative (SASPI), International Federation of Red Cross And Red Crescent Societies, Friends for Life (FLF)
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Infosys, 3M, Shell, BP, 3M, GM, DaimlerChrysler, Honda, Suzuki have all expressed interest in becoming partners, but the formal status is not clear by time of writing.
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Campaign against drinking and driving Safe routes to school (1 st phase completed) Lane discipline pilot project Karnataka State Highways Improvement Project – Road Safety Component (black spot study audit – 12 sites) Road safety plan Drink driving campaign
	<i>Ongoing: (not always clear whether project is GRSP or BATF/ ongoing or planned)</i>	Upgrading of accident and causality information systems with software from TRL, UK Black spot treatment Road safety school education Traffic calming schemes Project to increase visibility of trucks and buses Project on safe zones and safe routes to school Helmet wearing campaign Footpath upgrading Drink drive campaign Update road safety management strategy City Road Safety Plan Annual Partnership Road Safety plan Road safety workshop program Motorcycle helmet law campaign Blackspot programme Road safety action plan produced, needs ratification GRSP/AIPF action plan (to promote partnerships and projects)
	<i>Planned:</i>	Helmet wearing campaigns Visibility of ambulances (co-operation with 3M)
Budget:	US\$ 935,000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 d)	
Location:	City of Bangalore in Karnataka State	

2 Background and Objectives

The GRSP partnership in India is based on a previously established partnership – The Bangalore Agenda Task Force (BATF). GRSP brought road safety in as a new issue for BATF in 2001.

There is currently a lack of government capacity to deliver road safety and there is no safety unit within the City Corporation. There are road safety councils at the national and the state level but there appears to be a need for revitalisation. There is a road safety facility within the World Bank supported Karnataka State Highway Improvement Project

The objectives of GRSP Bangalore are the same as the general GRSP objectives. That is (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society (NGOs) and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP India has been involved in a large number of activities, among which:

- Safe routes to school
- Drink-drive campaign
- Junction improvements
- Indirinagar TC (traffic calming?)
- Cornwell Rd TC (traffic calming?)
- Footpath upgrade
- Helmet wearing campaign
- Upgrade of crash info
- Automated enforcement centres
- Establish road safety NGO
- Develop road safety plan
- Revitalise road safety committee

It is not always clear whether project is under GRSP or BATF or a joint operation as the programme is deliberately branded as Suraksha Sanchara (safety drive) to avoid ownership issues.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The safety measures selected, especially drink driving campaign supported by police enforcement, improvement of road infrastructure, and increased helmet wearing (if possible) appear all relevant and effective road safety measures in general (see for instance Elvik and Vaa 2004).

4.2 Effectiveness

The focus on drunk driving, helmet wearing, visibility of vehicles, safer routes to school all seem relevant to reduce the road accident problem. The effect of the campaign against drunk driving will be evaluated by NIMHANS, a WHO collaborating centre.

Given the fact that drunk driving constitute a substantial part of road accidents, and that two-wheelers constitute a major part of transport means, it seems likely that the choice of safety measures to cope with drunk driving and lack of helmet wearing is effective.

4.3 Efficiency

It is by the time of writing not possible to quantify the efficiency of the safety measures selected.

4.4 Impact

There is reason to believe that the safety measures selected affects road safety positively. Campaigns are however seldom very effective, and in order to ensure impact, a helmet wearing law, enforced by the police would be preferable to just a helmet wearing campaign. Given the fact that police enforcement is part of the effort to reduce the drink driving problem, there is reason to believe that this effort will give results.

According to the GRSP visit report 23-26 May 2004, the project "Safer zones" has already had effect on the Old Madras road, still an evaluation study will be carried out.

4.5 Sustainability

As mentioned, GRSP in Bangalore has taken advantage of the partnership organisation BATF already operating. Road safety has been put on the agenda, and GRSP activities have been recognised by the State of Karnataka in which Bangalore is located.

5 Lessons Learnt

In Bangalore the GRSP idea of bringing together governmental, non-governmental and private sector to work to achieve public goals had already been adopted by BATF. There is reason to believe that this facilitated the establishment of GRSP and the focus on road safety.

The campaign against drinking and driving in Bangalore is supported by increased police enforcement. It is of major importance that the police co-operate in such campaigns in order to make them effective.

Co-operation with the police can, however, be difficult as exemplified by the helmet campaign. This campaign is in two stages: advocacy of legislation; and publicity for users. Effort is centred on phase 1, due to the complexity of the current legal position in the State of Karnataka. National legislation allows States to grant exemptions (intended for religious reasons) and in Karnataka State this exemption is based on a machine's power limit, which is effectively interpreted by the police to exempt all motorcycles, including their own! It is therefore necessary first to revise the law, and engage the police services, before a major impact can be expected.

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Mr. M. N. Reddi, IG Police, Bangalore
Andrew Downing, Advisor, GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Elvik R. & Vaa T. (2004)
The Handbook of Road Safety Measures. Elsevier Science

Global Road Safety Partnership Bangalore (2004 a)
June Report. Bangalore

Global Road Safety Partnership India (2004 b)
Terms of Reference for GRSP India. Bangalore

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)
GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

GRSP Poland

1 Overview

Objectives:	Act as a broker for road safety: help in establishing partnerships and promote a multi-sectorial approach of road safety and promote sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	National Road Safety Council, Roads Department, Ministry of Health, Rescue Centre Lublin
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Polish Red Cross, WHO Liason Office, Motor Transport Institute (ITS), University of Gdansk (Civil Engineering Department)
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	BP Polska, DaimlerChrysler Polska, Renault Poland, Michelin, 3M Poland, Shell Poland, Foundation for Social Communication
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	16 projects
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	8 projects
	<i>Planned:</i>	1 project
Budget:	Completed projects: € 501,700. Ongoing projects: Possibly € 306,200100,000 - € 150,000	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

The GRSP partnership in Poland was initiated in 2000. It is based on partners from Government, civil society/non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the private sector. GRSP is closely linked to the National Road Safety Council (NRSC) and the part-time GRSP Co-ordinator is located in the council.

The road safety situation in Poland has improved the last years. The number of fatalities was 7,333 in 1990, 6,294 in 2000 and 5,640 in 2003. Parallel to this the number of vehicles has increased with more than 80 per cent from 9.0 million in 1990 to 16.3 million in 2003.

The National Road Safety Council was established in 1993. The council was strengthened and given legal status through an amendment to the Road traffic Act in 2002, which also included Regional Road safety Councils in each of the 16 regions. A National Road Safety Programme, GAMBIT 2000, was adopted by government in 2001. Road safety work has been supported through two major programmes under the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Ministry of Health respectively. The first programme is linked to a World Bank supported road sector programme under which PLN 44 million (€ 10 million) has been allocated to the road safety component in the current phase (Roads 2). During the next phase (Roads 3) € 5.7 million will be allocated to road safety. Physical improvements of hazardous road stretches have been important in Roads 2 and will continue under Roads 3. In addition comes EU support to construction of 50 roundabouts.

The Ministry of Health programme, which commenced in 1999, comprises rescue services (new ambulances and integrated rescue teams, 250 emergency wards in local health care centres and 170 dispatch centres), which are of general benefit to health and significantly contribute to the reduction of road traffic deaths and injuries. The budget is PLN 427 million (€ 97 million) for equipment. In addition come plans for procurement of 18 helicopters estimated at PLN 200 million (€ 44 million).

The objectives of GRSP Poland are to promote co-operation of civil society and business partners with government in the cause of road safety, to carry out GRSP projects in line with NRSC road safety goals and to act as a broker for road safety

by assisting in establishing partnerships and promote a multisectoral approach to road safety.

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP Poland has been very active since 2000 and worked with a large number of projects. The list of projects (with budget) figures comprises the following:

Completed projects

- Partners on the road (drawing contest), US\$ 60,000
- Fit for a kid I, II and III (child seat campaigns), total US\$ 180,000
- A Degree driver I and II (driver competition to be completed September 2004), budget figures not public
- Improving visibility and safety at 5 black spots, PLN 350,000 (€ 80,000)
- Improving safety at black spots (traffic engineering measures), PLN 490,000 (€ 129,000)
- Improvement of night visibility of heavy goods vehicles (marking and information campaign), PLN 60,000 (€ 14,000)
- Workshop on safety of heavy goods vehicles, budget not known
- Introduction of 50 km/h speed limit in Warsaw (information campaign), € 20,000
- International road safety seminars in 2000, 2002 and 2004 (GAMBIT – National Road Safety Programme), budget unknown
- Production and printing of the booklet “Road Safety Myths and Reality”, PLN 120,000 (€ 27,000)
- Development of national safety information system (SIS), PLN 6,000 (€ 1,400) plus 12 man-months of in-house work at Motor Transport Institute (ITS)
- UDS – Black boxes for motor vehicles. PLN 100,000 (€ 23,000)
- World Health day 2004, WHO, budget unknown
- Don't get mad (International Road safety Week information campaign), PLN 48,000 (€ 10,900) incl. in-house work
- Workshop for the Transport Committee in Parliament, budget unknown
- Workshop for the insurance industry, budget unknown

Current projects

- Safety for all (information campaign education programme), The overall budget for PR is PLN 1 million (€ 227,000). The budget for specific projects is, however, classified
- Promotion of the booklet “Road Safety Myths and Reality”, budget unknown
- Certification and identification of reflective elements, PLN 32,000 (€ 7,300)
- Supporting structures with passive safety features (collapsible structures), PLN 80,000 (€ 18,000)
- Application of reflective materials on black spot signs, PLN 80,000 (€ 18,000)
- Head safe in helmet (information campaign), budget unknown
- Rescue system improvement strategy, US\$ 40,000 (WHO grant), (€ 32,700)
- Don't get mad (before and after study), PLN 36,000 (€ 8,200)

Planned projects

- Contour marking of heavy goods vehicles

The GRSP budgets for the 16 completed projects totalled € 501,700. In addition come considerable in-house work that has not been costed. Similarly, the budgets for the eight ongoing projects may amount to a total of € 306,200 plus in-house work. The budget figure for the biggest current project “safety for all” is, however, classified so the total may rather be in the range of € 100,000 – € 150,000.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The 24 completed or ongoing projects of GRSP Poland are in line with national policy on road safety and appear as clearly relevant.

4.2 Effectiveness

The activities of GRSP Poland are aimed at the objectives defined. They appear clearly effective. The first key objective is achieved through the partnership approach, which in Poland is highly successful. The second is at least partly achieved through safety work that in a longer time perspective might lead to sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

4.3 Efficiency

The information collected does not give any quantitative indication on the cost-effectiveness of the GRSP road safety work in Poland. However, the approach seems successful and has led to an extensive list of projects in Poland. The secretariat appears to be quite efficient although it is only on a part time basis.

4.4 Impact

The effects of the various projects have not been documented but may to some extent have contributed to the reduction of road deaths in Poland the last few years.

4.5 Sustainability

This first period of GRSP operations in Poland, although sustainable, offers limited opportunities for action. Sustainability of the second phase of GRSP Poland is now being sought and the transformation of the organisation has been included as an activity in the National Road Safety Programme, GAMBIT, for 2005 not yet secured. The future organisation is, however, being discussed and a specific proposal in this respect will be considered by the local GRSP committee in October 2004. The proposed arrangement involves an organisation called the Responsible Business Forum (RBF) that could be a host for GRSP in future. RBF has the character of a Non Governmental Organisation.

5 Lessons Learnt

The effectiveness of the GRSP approach seems positively linked to the well-structured road safety work in Poland. Furthermore, the high activity of government road safety work appears attractive for private sector participation in GRSP.

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Mr. Krzysztof Jamrozik, GRSP Co-ordinator and Project Co-ordinator NRSC
Mr. Milton Bertin Jones, Road Safety Program Co-ordinator, NRSC
Ms. Mirosława Mirońska, Ministry of Health
Ms. Paulina Miśkiewicz, WHO Liaison Officer
Mr. Karol Kowalski, Foundation for Social Communication
Ms. Maria Dąbrowska-Loranc, ITS
Mr. Grzegorz Telecki, Renault Poland
Ms. Luiza Pasierowska, MEDIX Public Relations (for Renault Poland)
Ms. Karolina Szamatek, CONSTANS PR (for Renault Poland)
Peter Elsenaar, Senior Advisor, GRSP Geneva
Kathleen Elsig, Advisor, GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Downing, A., Elsig, K. (2002)
Multisectoral and Partnership Approaches to Road Safety: Case Studies of Poland and Hungary June 2002 (World Bank Study). Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (undated)
Terms of Reference. GRSP Coordinator Poland. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)
Back to Office Report from Visit to Poland 1- 4 January 2004. Edition II. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
GRSP Visit Report, Poland 27 - 30 January 2004. Edition II. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
Back to Office Report, Poland 27 - 30 January 2004. Edition II. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)
GRSP Visit Report, Poland 1- 4 June 2004. Edition II. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 e)
2004 Country Program for Poland 06/04 update. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 f)
2004 Country Program Partner Overview, Edition II. Visit Report Annex D. Geneva, August 2004

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 g)
Architects Workshop, GRSP Poland. Version 3. Geneva, 11 August 2004

Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (Undated)
Project Plan. Warsaw, probably 2003

Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (Undated)
Final Project Evaluation: "A" Degree Driver. Edition I. Warsaw, probably 2003

Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (Undated)
Final Project Evaluation: Before and after Study of IRSW. Edition I. Warsaw, probably 2004

- Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (Undated)
Final Project Evaluation: "Don't get mad IV IRSW Campaign. Edition I.
Warsaw, probably 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (Undated)
NGO Partnership Questionnaire. Summary of responses. Warsaw,
probably 2004
- Global Road Safety Partnership Poland (2004)
Minutes of Meeting of Polish GRSP Committee 10 May 2004. Warsaw
- Global Road Safety Partnership Polish Committee (2004)
2004 Program. Warsaw
- Motor Transport Institute – ITS (2003)
The State of Road safety on Polish Roads 1993 – 2002. Warsaw, August
2003
- National Road Safety Council (2004)
Poland: Road Safety Overview. Warsaw, August 2004
- Secretariat of the National Road Safety Council (2004 a)
National Road Safety Council Brochure. Warsaw
- Secretariat of the National Road Safety Council (2004 b)
Summary of major Programmes and Projects. Warsaw, September 2004

GRSP Romania

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	Interministerial Council on Road Safety (ICRS), Ministry of Public Works,, Transports and Housing (M.L.P.T.L), Romanian Road Transport Authority (ARR) National Road Administration (NAR), Romanian Auto Register (RAR), National Traffic Police, General Inspector of Military Fire Brigade, Polytechnic University of Bucharest, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Polytechnic University of Timisoara. City Hall Bucharest, Bucharest Public Transport Company,
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Red Cross, WHO, Automobile Club Romania (ACR), UNTRR (Road Hauliers Union), Romanian Association of International Road Transport, Automotive Manufacturers and Importers Association, Transport research institute – Incertrans, Ronald Mc'Donalds Foundation, ARTRI (Romanian Association for International Transport), SIAR ((Romanian Society of Automotive Engineers)
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Michelin, Shell, 3M, Hertz. Vesta investments, Helvespid, Transport insurance company – Asitrans, Daimler-Chrysler Auto rom, Petrom, Deawoo, Emergency Reanimating and Readjusting (?) Mobile Services, Tachonan Service – Oradea; Ansic-Cluj; Mercury Promotions, Ifoled, ITS Romania, Nissan Romania, Ogilvy, Ecosens,
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Campaigns to improve visibility of slow traffic at night, of long and heavy vehicles at night, of emergency vehicles, and of selected black spots. Safety education for children, Road safety week, world health day, safety conference Brasow, safety awareness campaign Constanza,
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	PHARE project on black spots, improvement of road signs, road safety action plan, Safety education for children, cooperation with World Bank on potential highway project
	<i>Planned:</i>	Black spot treatments, information campaigns, safety education for school children, seat-belt campaign, information/campaign concerning railway crossings
Budget:	US\$ 191,000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 c)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

The GRSP partnership in Romania was initiated in 2000. It is based on partners from Government and the private sector as well as civil society and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

There is a national road safety organisation in Romania, the Inter-ministerial Council on Road Safety (ICRS) with GRSP Romania as a sub-committee. In future, GRSP may be organised as a “federation”, i.e. a civil society organisation or a NGO.

The European Union supports road safety work in Romania through a project under the Phare programme. This includes road safety audits and safety measures in “linear villages”, i.e. highway sections with buildings next to the road on either side and with direct access. In addition, the World Bank has funded road safety training.

The objectives of GRSP Romania are the same as the general GRSP objectives. That is (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society (NGOs) and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

3 GRSP Activities

There is a long list of activities and projects that have been carried out by GRSP Romania:

- Road safety action plan instigated
- Road Safety Audits within the framework of the EC Phare Project.
- Safety measures in “Linear villages” within the framework of the EC Phare Project.
- Improving visibility of slow traffic at night
- Improving visibility of long vehicles at night
- Improving visibility of emergency vehicles
- Improving visibility of black spots
- Road safety education for children, several projects
- Speed awareness project among truck drivers by use of tachographs and speedretarders
- Meeting Parliament – GRSP February 2004
- Road safety professional education – training program by SIAR
- World health day 2004 (WHO)
- Road safety week by ECE
- Annual Road Safety Conference, the latest in Brasow April 28-30, 2004
- National introduction of emergency telephone number 112.
- Volunteer tire checks at fuel stations
- Safety awareness campaign Constanza and safer pedestrian crossing campaign Brasow, both in 2003.

The budget for activities in 2004 is estimated at US\$ 191,000 (Global Road Safety Partnership 2004 b).

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The safety problems selected, primarily “visibility-measures” in cooperation with 3M, traffic safety education for children and black spot treatment are in general all relevant in order to reduce the number of road accidents in Romania

4.2 Effectiveness

The GRSP idea of bringing together governmental, non-governmental and private sector to work to reduce road accidents seems to have been quite successful in Romania. Many organisations and companies participate in GRSP in Romania and many projects have been initiated.

4.3 Efficiency

Given the fact that budget figures as well as reliable estimates of effects of the GRSP initiatives have not been provided, it is not possible to state the degree of efficiency. However, the measures selected are relevant and to a large extent financed by private companies. Thus for the governmental bodies dealing with road safety issues in Romania, there is reason to conclude that the GRSP initiatives have been efficient.

4.4 Impact

Road accidents in Romania have declined throughout the period 2001-2003. It is however, not possible to conclude what impact the GRSP-initiatives have had for the road accident reductions.

4.5 Sustainability

There GRSP activities are to some degree institutionalised in Romanian transport and road safety policy, as GRSP is a sub-committee under the ICRS. A road safety action plan has been developed and there is reason to believe that the relevant Romanian sector ministries and road authorities will focus on road safety issues in the future.

5 Lessons Learnt

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Ms. Lustina Diaconu, Assistant Advisor, GRSP Romania

Mr. Peter Elsenaar, Senior Advisor, GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

Elsenaar, P. (2004)

Romania. Power point presentation at GRSP annual meeting 2004

Global Road Safety Partnership (undated)

Romania Interministerial Council of Road Safety – ICRS, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing – MLPTL and Romanian Road Transport Authority – ARR. Bucharest, probably 2003

Global Road Safety Partnership (2003)

Annual Report. Geneva, June 2003

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)

Annual Report. Geneva, June 2004

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)

GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)

GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

NEA Transport research and training (2003)

Evaluation Road Safety Course in Busteni, Romania 17-21 June 2003. Report to Peter Elsenaar. NEA Transport research and training, Rijswijk, July 2003.

The PHARE Project RO 0107.11

Proposal to create a Federation of Institutions and organizations working on Road Safety and Traffic engineering in Romania (FIRS).

GRSP South Africa

1 Overview

Objectives:	Save lives and prevent crashes. Promote public/private partnership	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	National Department of Transport (NDoT), National Roads Agency, some Provinces.
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Automobile Association of SA, Arrive Alive, Drive Alive, CSIR (National Research Laboratory), Soul City
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	BP Southern Africa, The South African Breweries, NAAMSA (importers of motor vehicles), DaimlerChrysler, Ford/Volvo, 3M South Africa, Road Freight Association
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	PIARC Durban exposition, GRSP SA Busines Plan 2004, Child education and training project Eldorado Park
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Child education – Kempton Park, Night time visibility projects, Junior traffic training centres,
	<i>Planned:</i>	
Budget:	US\$ 40,000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 f)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

There are approximately 6 million licensed drivers and 7 million registered vehicles in South Africa (3 million passenger cars, 32 thousand busses and 1.6 million commercial vehicles). Traffic safety is regarded as a serious problem with over 500,000 traffic accidents annually of which 48,000 are fatal or lead to serious injury (More than 10,000 deaths and over 50,000 injured). The annual increase of road accidents noted in 1995 was 6.5 per cent and in 1996, 3.8 per cent. The national government has set up a Road Traffic Management Strategy (RTMS), which was launched in July 2000.

GRSP South Africa National Committee (GRSP SA) was established in July 2000 and was in 2003 registered as a NGO in South Africa. The objectives are to save lives and prevent crashes and in parallel to promote public/private partnership.

3 GRSP Activities

GRSP South Africa is currently facing problems. Some road safety activities have been carried out but the contribution from GRSP SA has been rather limited. Operations were suspended from March 2004 onward, waiting for filling in the new directions of the in May 2004 new elected national Government. Appointment of a new chairperson in GRSP SA in October 2004 followed by introduction of plans for new partnership programmes might give hope for increased activity in the future.

Based on the documentation received, it is difficult to differ between road safety project initiated outside GRSP and those initiated by GRSP. Some "GRSP activities" would probably have been implemented even without GRSP.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The projects of GRSP SA seem to be in line with national policy on road safety and appear as relevant.

4.2 Effectiveness

The activities of GRSP SA are aimed at the objectives defined. There are, however, implementation and organisational problems and GRSP has not yet managed to instigate many road safety projects.

4.3 Efficiency

It is not possible to estimate efficiency at this stage of GRSP operations.

4.4 Impact

So far, few safety projects have materialised. Accordingly, the impact of GRSP activities on road safety is at best quite limited.

4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability for GRSP SA is not secured.

5 Lessons Learnt

There appear at this stage to be problems related to convincing national authorities of the possible added value of GRSP activities in South Africa. These problems seem to be partly a result of GRSP perceived as competing with the National Department of Transport concerning Public Private Partnership (PPP). There are also co-operation problems within the GRSP organisation

One possible lesson to be learned is that the GRSP initiative seems to be more successful when they operate more locally in large and diversified countries – as in Brazil and India than on national levels as in South Africa. The South Africa experience shows that GRSP might be considered redundant at the national level, and even as a possible threat to the authorities' PPP initiatives.

Another experience from South Africa that might be generalised concerns the use of resources. It appears that extensive resources may be required to handle administrative and organisational issues at the national level. With a more local focus, it may perhaps easier to accomplish and concentrate on concrete safety projects.

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Bethrum Dzonzi, GRSP South Africa, DaimlerChrysler South Africa
Feryal Domingo, GRSP South Africa, BP Southern Africa
Dr. Peter Venter, GRSP South Africa, CSIR Transportek
Peter Elsenaar, Senior Advisor, GRSP Geneva

Documents reviewed

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)
GRSP Visit Report, 29th April – 4th May 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
GRSP Country Report – South Africa – 4th April 2004. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
Minutes of the Executive Meeting 2004-01-22. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)

Considerations on future of GRSP in South Africa as of June 10 2004 to be discussed. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 e)

GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Document 21. Geneva

Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 f)

GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004

GRSP Thailand

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	Transport Safety Bureau (TSB) which sorts under the Ministry of Transport (MOT), Department of Highways (DOH), Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation (DPM),
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Thai Health Promotion Foundation (THPF), Don't Drive Drunk Foundation (DDF), Thai Red Cross Society (TRCS),
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Road Accidents Victims Protection Company Ltd. (RAVP), Shell, Volvo, 3M, GM, DaimlerChrysler, Honda, BP, Thai Petroleum
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Establishment of Thailand Accident Research Centre (TARC) Campaigns against drinking and driving. Helmet campaign Vehicle visibility project Child occupant safety/ safety belts campaign Safe zone project at 14 schools Vehicle visibility project
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Thailand Accident Research Centre (TARC) Helmet and headlights campaign Mobile Kids (child road safety)
	<i>Planned:</i>	World Bank funding of TARC, Study of accident costs, Road safety campaigns at schools, Television and radio campaigns. Vehicle visibility project – ambulances Safe school, zone projects to be expanded
Budget:	US\$ 820,000 in 2004 (Source: GRSP 2004 d)	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

The GRSP partnership in Thailand was initiated in 2000. It is based on partners from Government and the private sector and non-governmental organisations. (NGO) partners. By March 2004 more than 30 partners participate.

GRSP in Thailand is organised as a separate foundation TGRSP (since March 2004) with close co-operation with transport and road authorities, international organisations (World Bank) and the private sector. The World Bank is involved through a highway sector loan, which also includes funding for road safety.

The objectives of TGRSP are the same as the general GRSP objectives. That is (i) promotion of partnership between business, civil society (NGOs) and government, and (ii) sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads.

3 GRSP Activities

TGRSP has carried out a large number of activities, among which the following:

- Police checks (alcohol testing and speed) at major holidays.
- Banning alcohol commercials on TV and radio between 05:00 and 22:00.
- Banning sales of alcohol on fuel stations during the Songkran Festival April 2004
- Banning use of hand-held mobile phones while driving
- Driver and rider education programmes
- Road safety education for children
- Community project on safe routes to school

- Helmet wearing campaigns (50,000 helmets distributed)

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

The safety measures selected, in particular helmet wearing campaigns and police control are considered relevant in respect of government and international policy on road safety.

4.2 Effectiveness

The GRSP idea of bringing together governmental, non-governmental and private sector to work to reduce road accidents seems to work rather well in Thailand. Many organisations and companies participate in GRSP in Thailand and a number of projects have been started. The measures selected, in particular helmet wearing campaigns and police control are potentially effective in order to reduce the number of road accidents in Thailand

4.3 Efficiency

Given the fact that reliable estimates of effects of the GRSP initiatives have not been provided, it is not possible to establish the degree of efficiency. However, the measures selected are relevant and to some extent financed by the private sector. Thus, funding additional to government budgets has been raised and it seems likely that GRSP initiatives could be considered efficient.

4.4 Impact

It is difficult to estimate the impact of GRSP-activities in Thailand. The Handbook of Road Safety Measures (Elvik & Vaa 2004) clearly documents that the measures chosen, especially police controls and helmet wearing have safety effects. It is, therefore, likely that the GRSP activities have had an accident-reducing effect.

4.5 Sustainability

As GRSP activities in Thailand are organised and funded by the foundation TGRSP, employing local staff and finding hosting agreement with government planning offices, it seems reasonable to conclude that the activity is sustainable. According to reports, road safety issues are of growing concern, due to economic and traffic increase, so the road safety issue will probably be even higher on the agenda in the future.

5 Lessons Learnt

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Ms. Pissmai Khanobdee, Member and Treasurer of TGRSP, Shell
Mr. Andrew Downing, Advisor GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

ADB-ASEAN Regional Safety Program (undated)
Country Report: CR 09. The Status of Road Safety in Thailand

- Elvik R. & Vaa T. (2004)
The Handbook of Road Safety Measures. Elsevier Science
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 a)
Back to Office Report: Thailand Jan 2004. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 b)
Visit Report: Thailand. February 2004. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 c)
GRSP Achievements – August 2004. Geneva
- Global Road Safety Partnership (2004 d)
GRSP project estimated values. Geneva, August 2004
- Thailand Global Road Safety Partnership (2002)
Terms of Reference for Thailand Accident Research Centre. Bangkok, 20 August, 2002

GRSP Vietnam

1 Overview

Objectives:	Promotion of partnership and sustainable reduction of death and injury on the roads	
Partners:	<i>Government:</i>	World Bank
	<i>Civil Society:</i>	Asia Injury Prevention Foundation (AIPF), World Bank, UNICEF, Handicap International, The Viet Nam Red Cross, The French Red Cross may become partners.
	<i>Private Sector:</i>	Shell, BP, 3M, GM, DaimlerChrysler, Honda, Suzuki have all expressed interest in becoming partners, but the formal status is not clear by time of writing.
Activities:	<i>Completed:</i>	Viet Nam hosted the second GRSP/ASEAN road safety seminar in 2003. GRSP participated in ADB/ASEAN road safety workshop to update Action Plan in Feb 2004
	<i>Ongoing:</i>	Road safety action plan drafted but not yet approved GRSP/AIPF action plan (to promote partnerships and projects)
	<i>Planned:</i>	Helmet wearing campaigns Safe fleet campaign ASEAN Viet Nam workshop First aid card Road Safety Forum (non government)
Budget:	Not available	
Location:	National	

2 Background and Objectives

GRSP first visited Vietnam in 2000, and activities are still in preparation in collaboration with the World Bank. Asia Injury Prevention Foundation (AIPF) has from July 2004 taken on the role as GRSP's local partner and co-ordinator. Legislation to form a consultative council under the National Traffic Safety Committee (NTSC) was drafted in March 2004 enabling GRSP, NGO and the private sector to work with the government on road safety issues.

3 GRSP Activities

There are currently no GRSP projects but there are road safety activities funded by AIPF, ASEAN/ADB and the World Bank. Many of these activities will continue within the GRSP framework.

4 Evaluation by Core Criteria

4.1 Relevance

It is too early to establish relevance of GRSP activities in Vietnam. The planned strong focus on helmet wearing as a safety measure seems, however, to be particularly relevant, as motorcycles constitute approximately 95 per cent of motor vehicles and about 70 per cent of road accidents.

4.2 Effectiveness

The GRSP idea of bringing together governmental, non-governmental and private sector to work to reduce road accidents has not yet materialised in Vietnam and it is too early to say anything about effectiveness, efficiency and impacts.

4.3 Efficiency

See comment under 4.2 Effectiveness.

4.4 Impact

See comment under 4.2 Effectiveness.

4.5 Sustainability

Too early to establish.

5 Lessons Learnt

According to "Back to office report" (GRSP 2004 a) there seems to be some problems involved in establishing the GRSP partnership in Vietnam. These are believed to be a consequence of Vietnam's political system and government caution about reasons for the private sector becoming involved in road safety

6 Other

List of Persons interviewed and met

Ms. Do Tu Anh, GRSP Vietnam Co-ordinator

Mr. Tony Bliss, Senior Road Safety Specialist, World Bank

Mr. Andrew Downing, Advisor GRSP Geneva

List of Documents reviewed

ADB-ASEAN ROAD SAFETY PROJECT TA NO. 60-77-REG

The Road Safety Situation in Viet Nam (Draft). February 2004

Elvik R. & Vaa T. (2004)

The Handbook of Road Safety Measures. Elsevier Science.

GRSP (2004 a)

Back to Office Report: Vietnam Jan. 2004. GRSP, Geneva

GRSP (2004 b)

Visit Report: Viet Nam (28.2-9.3. 2004). Prepared by Andrew Downing.
GRSP, Geneva