



Motoring Services Strategy Consultation: Response from CTC, the National Cycling Charity

About CTC: CTC, the national cycling charity, has 70,000 members and supporters. We provide a range of information and legal services to cyclists, organise cycling events, protect the interests of existing and would-be cyclists, and represent cyclists and cycling on issues of public policy.

Founded in 1878, CTC has championed the cause of cycling for well over a century. Our vision is of a healthier, happier and cleaner world, because more people cycle. We want people of all ages, backgrounds and abilities to be able to cycle safely, easily and enjoyably, and we promote all forms of cycling.

www.ctc.org.uk

Introduction

CTC welcomes the opportunity to respond to the *Motoring Services Strategy Consultation*.

As an organisation representing cyclists and would-be cyclists, we take a strong interest in safe driving and vehicle standards. Cycle mileage has grown in Great Britain by around 20% over the last ten years,¹ and the latest *National Travel Survey* suggests that the average person in England made more cycle trips in 2014 than in 2013, as well as cycling more miles.²

As a result, the modern driving experience involves encountering more cyclists more often on the roads, and this clearly needs to be reflected in the training, testing and licensing system.

Road casualty figures show, however, that the risk of cycling is rising more steeply than the levels of cycle use. Both this, and the fact that other vulnerable road users are similarly affected, causes CTC deep concern. According to the latest figures:³

- 2013 saw an increase in the risk per mile per billion passenger kilometres of a fatal or serious cycling injury (KSI) of around 15% over 2008, whereas the risk for car occupants fell by around 28%;
- Pedal cyclist KSI have been rising steadily over the last ten years: the annual average for 2005-2009 was 2,528; in 2014, there were 3,514 cyclist KSI;
- Pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists now account for 60% of serious and fatal road casualties, up from an average of 52% in 2005-9;
- Goods vehicles (excluding light vans) make up only around 3.7% of non-motorway traffic, but are on average involved in around a fifth of cyclists' road deaths per year. They are particular hazard in urban areas.

¹ DfT. *Road Traffic Estimates in Great Britain 2014*. Table TRA0401.

www.gov.uk/government/statistics/road-traffic-estimates-in-great-britain-2014

² Dft. *National Travel Survey 2014*. Tables NTS0303 & 0305. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2014>. Specifically, the NTS suggests that the average person in England last year cycled: 18 trips (14 in 2013); 19 stages (15 in 2013, not far short of the 20 they cycled in 1995/97); and 58 miles (49 in 2013, more than the 46 they rode in 1995/97).

³ Casualty figures from DfT's: *Reported Road Casualties Great Britain* (Tables RAS53001, RAS30001 & RAS40004) www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467465/rrcgb-2014.pdf; Traffic figures from DfT *Road Traffic Estimates in Great Britain 2014*. June 2015. Table TRA0104 (2010-14); <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/road-traffic-estimates-in-great-britain-2014>.

Given this, it is not surprising that 64% of respondents to the latest *British Attitudes Survey* (BAS) agreed that it is too dangerous for them to cycle on the road, the highest level recorded since the question was introduced in 2011.⁴ Women, non-cyclists and older age groups seem to be more worried than anyone else. The BAS has returned similar results year after year, demonstrating how much more needs to be done to tackle both the real and perceived risks that put people off the healthy and environmentally-friendly activity of cycling.

There are a number of factors that are implicated here, including high volumes of motor traffic and the decline in roads policing, but the most relevant to this consultation is the persistently unacceptable level of bad driving:

- STATS 19 analysis suggests that drivers are much more likely than cyclists to contribute to collisions between them: *Focus on Pedal Cyclists 2013* (DfT), for example, says: “*Pedal cyclists were more likely to have no contributory factor recorded in comparison to other vehicles – 50 per cent compared to only 27 per cent.*”

Clearly, the licencing and testing system is one of several governmental functions that need to respond robustly to the increasing risk that cyclists face on British roads and thereby make cycling a more attractive choice of transport for people of all ages and abilities, and at the very least, encourage the 41% of respondents to the BAS who said that they could just as easily cycle the journeys of less than two miles they currently travel by car. As such, this planned transformation of the motoring service agencies must lead to higher driving and vehicle standards and guard against relaxing them in any respect. Most importantly, plans to streamline various processes should not prioritise speed over efficiency, or the need to create safer road conditions.

If we want to realise the Government’s aims to “*create an environment which encourages walking and cycling, where cycling and walking is the norm for short journeys or as part of a longer journey*”, along with the Prime Minister’s ambition for a ‘cycling revolution’, then it is essential to address both the real hazards faced by cyclists, and the fears that non-cyclists entertain about cycling. Both of these aims have only recently been reiterated by the DfT in *Setting the First Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy* (Dec 2015).⁵

As a general point, this consultation does not acknowledge that by no means everyone is a motorist or has access to a vehicle. We know that 24% of households in England do not have access to a car or a van,⁶ and in some wards in inner city areas, this rises to well over 50%.⁷ In our view, it is important for the DfT not to reinforce the impression that everyone in the country transacts or naturally progresses towards transacting with the agencies as vehicle owners/keepers and drivers. By omitting mention of alternatives to car use altogether, this is exactly what this document does. We trust that the work of the agencies is intended to protect *all* road users, *including those who do not drive*. We therefore believe that the Strategy should explicitly state this fact.

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/british-social-attitudes-survey-2014>

⁵ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/487846/cycling-and-walking-investment-strategy.pdf

⁶ DfT. *National Travel Survey 2014*. Table NTS0205. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2014>

⁷ See map from Imactivate: <http://ow.ly/WHbVu>

Key points

As detailed in our answers to your questions below, for the training, testing and licencing system to protect cyclists and other vulnerable road users more effectively, CTC advocates:

- Integrating cycle awareness training into the instruction and testing of all drivers (response to question 4);
- Improving the driver training and testing process to place more weight on ensuring drivers' appreciation of cycle safety and the reasons for road traffic laws such as speed limits and the prohibitions on mobile phone use (paras 1.5 and 4.5.1);
- To help prepare them better for their test, strongly incentivising candidates to undertake Bikeability training to Level 3, if they have not already done so (response to question 4);
- Making cycle awareness and practical cycle training to Level 3 a core and mandatory element of the training/testing requirements for HGV drivers (response to questions 4 & 7);
- Introducing Graduated Driver Licensing, with concessions for those who have completed Level 3 Bikeability training (para 1.11)
- Accompanying any measures that make it easier to gain licences by stronger mechanisms for losing them, principally through:
 - Stronger roads policing and prosecutions (para 4.4);
 - Considering introducing driver re-testing, particularly for older drivers (paras 1.12 – 1.14); and
 - Partnerships between local authorities, police, Traffic Commissioners, the HSE etc., along the lines adopted by the London Freight Enforcement Partnership (para 12.3).

Response to consultation questions:

User experience

Q1 As we change the practical driving test to ensure it reflects the modern driving experience, what views do respondents have about how we can maintain standards and give candidates clear information about the competencies tested in the driving test?

General comments

1.1 As mentioned in our introduction, levels of cycle use have been rising over recent years, meaning that drivers are more likely to encounter cyclists on our roads. This is a crucial development in the modern driving experience, and it needs to be reflected in the training, testing and licensing system. Equally, the practical driving test should not merely reflect the modern *driving* experience, but the experience of modern road use from all perspectives, whatever mode is chosen.

1.2 As also mentioned in the introduction, however, the risk of cycling has risen more steeply than the growth in cycle use since 2008. We therefore think ‘maintaining’ standards is not the appropriate terminology here. Rather, we need to *raise* standards and maintain them.

1.3 CTC believes that there are a number of elements that need to be included in the practical test to protect vulnerable road users better (see paras 1.7 – 1.9 below). As we also believe that the theory test, and the revision materials/facilities provided for it, are a good way of clearly informing candidates about the competencies examined in the practical test, we include our thoughts on the theory test below too (paras 1.5 – 1.6).

1.4 Any concerns that making the driving test more rigorous would tempt more people to drive unlicensed should be addressed by strengthening traffic police numbers and law enforcement.

Theory and hazard perception test

1.5 As the current driving test relies heavily on multiple choice, it is possible for candidates to learn the answers without necessarily understanding *why* a particular response is correct. Even correct answers do not guarantee that the candidate is a considerate driver who genuinely appreciates the needs of other road users. It is important, therefore, to incorporate questions that check that a candidate understands the reasons behind lower speeds, why hand-held mobile use is banned at the wheel etc. As mentioned below in our response to Q4, this needs to be thoroughly inculcated during the training process.

1.6 Also, while young drivers are often able to control vehicles well and have fast reactions, their ability to identify potential hazards and assess risk may be poor. Over-confidence can also give them the impression that they are better able to avoid a hazard than they actually are. Hazard perception training/testing is therefore vital, and much greater weight should be given to it. It is the best way for a candidate to demonstrate that they actively think about and appreciate the likely impact of their driving manoeuvres and the safest way of carrying them out. *To ensure that candidates are thoroughly examined on their ability to interact safely with cyclists, the test should include a greater number and variety of scenarios involving cyclists.*

Practical test

1.7 Candidates must be able to demonstrate that they understand the needs of cyclists and pedestrians and can drive considerately in their presence. Expanding the independent driving section of the test would give examiners more opportunity to assess how a candidate reacts when driving in areas where cyclists are likely to be, and to check that their behaviour is indeed considerate and responsible.

1.8 We believe that the most effective way of educating trainees about cyclists, and preparing them to demonstrate their understanding during their test, is through cycle awareness training and practical cycling lessons (see our response to Q4 below).

1.9 As mentioned above, 20 mph speeds limits are now more common in the UK. Candidates should therefore be tested on their ability to drive considerately and safely at lower speeds.

Post-test

1.10 To maintain higher standards, CTC believes that agencies should regulate drivers post-test much more proactively.

1.11 **Younger drivers:** CTC believes that some form of *graduated driver licencing* should be introduced to reduce the risk that younger drivers pose both to themselves and others. This could, for example, include:

- Requiring learner drivers to complete both a minimum learning period of at least 12 months; and a minimum number of hours of driving lessons under professional instruction. Every learner should record all their hours at the wheel, whether under unpaid supervision or professional instruction, in a logbook.
- A ban on carrying passengers at night for a certain period, to protect young people in particular;
- Increasing the period after passing their test during which drivers lose their licence after six points (rather than the normal 12 points) from two years to three years, and requiring them to take an extended retest.

Concessions should be given to those who have completed Level 3 Bikeability training, however (see paras 4.6ff), e.g. by reducing the minimum number of lessons required, or time spent driving before the test.

1.12 **Older drivers:** The current licensing/renewal system does not necessarily detect people whose eyesight, medical fitness or alertness has declined over time, let alone those who have accumulated bad habits, forgotten their driver training, or simply not kept up with changes to the Highway Code.

1.13 CTC believes that the Government should seriously consider introducing a system that is far less reliant on self-declaration and, instead, automatically calls in all drivers for a practical and theoretical re-test at regular intervals. Through this, drivers should be asked to demonstrate that they are aware of the prevailing rules and that they still meet the required driving standards. Those who fail should be expected to engage in refresher training. This system would also help the authorities identify those whose medical fitness fails the set criteria.

1.14 It seems likely that re-testing older drivers may be particularly beneficial in road safety terms, although the optimum frequency of re-testing for all age groups should be based on research and evidence, e.g. in the case of older drivers, on when reaction and hazard-perception skills typically start declining.

Q2 Driving tests might be offered from a wide range of venues. What factors should be considered in deciding on these?

2.1. All venues need to ensure that they offer an environment in which candidates can be tested on their ability to drive safely in the presence of cyclists and pedestrians, and at lower speeds, including 20 mph.

2.2. Given the current threats of obesity, climate change and air pollution, we believe that promoting active travel alternatives to driving is a far better use of Government energy than making the driving test more convenient.

Q3 We are interested to hear whether respondents would be willing to pay extra for more flexibility of driving test slots, both in terms of timing and location.

3.1 We have no comment to make on this point.

Q4 What could be done to ensure that candidates are better prepared for their practical test?

General comments

4.1 We note that one of the main purposes of the consultation is to look at ways to boost pass rates for the practical driving test. If this does indeed result in both better prepared candidates and better and safer drivers, this goal is to be applauded. However, we believe that boosting the pass rate should be a subsidiary aim. *The primary aim should be to produce safer drivers.*

4.2 We also note that the DfT is considering offering a financial incentive to encourage learners to sit their test when they have a better chance of passing. We support any measure (incentive-based or otherwise) that is likely to produce better and safer drivers, but suggest that this could be better achieved through raising the standards required to pass the test, and by introducing graduated driver licencing (see para 1.11 above), and by strengthening road traffic law and enforcement, either instead or in addition to the measures proposed.

4.3 *From a cycling point of view, safer drivers mean those who know exactly what puts cyclists at risk and/or intimidates them, and who understand cyclists' behaviour.* Unfortunately, few cyclists would agree that all drivers behave considerately or responsibly towards them. 'Near misses' are too frequent and, as mentioned in our introduction, statistics show that the risk of actual injury for cyclists is growing. It follows that candidates need to be far more thoroughly trained and tested on the competencies required to drive safely in the presence of cyclists.

4.4 Any measures to make it easier for drivers to gain their licences should be accompanied by moves to strength the mechanisms by which they could lose them if they commit an offence. The Government therefore needs to take steps to:

- Reverse the drop in traffic police levels (down by 37% from 2002/3-2013/14, from almost 7,000 uniformed officers down to just 4,356);¹
- Ensure that bad drivers are effectively prosecuted and, as a result, disqualified for an appropriate length of time;
- Encourage partnership working between all the agencies involved in traffic law enforcement (the London Freight Enforcement Partnership is a good example – see para 12.3).

These moves would not only help remove more bad drivers from the roads, but also make people less likely to drive badly in the first place: more traffic police and a greater likelihood of prosecution/disqualification are powerful deterrents.

CTC's views on improving traffic law and enforcement are covered in our online briefing at: <http://www.ctc.org.uk/campaigning/views-and-briefings/traffic-law-and-enforcement-overview>

Training in responsible road use and cycle awareness

4.5 References to vulnerable road users are scattered throughout the *Car and Light Van Driving Syllabus*, but CTC believes that both it and the *National Standards for Driving* need a specified amount of time spent covering specific modules on:

- 4.5.1 **Responsible attitudes to road use and the reasoning behind the rules:** Learners are likely to make better sense of the rules and the law on road safety if they are thoroughly trained in the reasons behind them, e.g. on the dangers of using a mobile phone at the wheel, drink/drug driving, and speeding etc. Knowing *why* rules exist makes it easier

to remember and follow them, not just for the immediate purposes of the test, but whilst driving afterwards.

4.5.2 Cycle awareness training: This module should explain *how* and *why* to drive safely around cyclists, e.g. to look out for cyclists at all times, but to take particular care at junctions where three quarters of collisions with cyclists take place; and to give cyclists plenty of space when overtaking because close overtaking is intimidating, doesn't allow for any wobbling or swerving, and can cause unsteadiness. This module should also explain cycling manoeuvres that might otherwise puzzle or annoy drivers, e.g.:

- That cyclists are advised to make themselves as noticeable as possible by not riding in the gutter (and, thereby, also avoid gullies, potholes etc.);
- That cyclists ride 'in the middle of the road' when passing stationary vehicles to avoid being 'doored';
- That, by moving into the middle of a lane, cyclists might try to stop a driver overtaking them when it is clear to them that it is unsafe to do so.

Although not yet mandatory, cycle awareness modules along these lines have already been developed for professional drivers of lorries, buses etc., e.g. <http://www.cycletraining.co.uk/our-services/for-drivers.html>

4.5.3 Driving at lower speeds: More and more local authorities are recognising that lower speeds help make road conditions less hostile for pedestrians, cyclists and would-be cyclists. Now that 20 mph limits are proliferating in the UK, all learners would benefit from instruction in how (and why) to drive at lower speeds.

4.6 Including all the above suggested modules in the training process would necessitate more practice for learners, a factor that is likely to reduce the crash risk after their test, as the draft *Motoring Services Strategy* itself says.

Practical Bikeability cycle training

4.7 All students approaching the age at which they are permitted to learn to drive would benefit from Level 3 Bikeability training. This should build, ideally, on Level 1 & 2 training given (again, ideally) earlier in their school career at an age at which their attitudes to road safety are easier to influence.

4.8 Level 3 in particular covers complex road junctions and road positioning, and provides direct experience of how all road users behave. Also, because it offers personal insight into cycling on the road, it is an especially effective means of conveying how cyclists need drivers to interact with them.

4.9 Thus, Level 3 gives young people a useful head-start, helps prepare them better for their driving test should they ever take one and, in turn, boosts pass rates. It should also help produce better and safer drivers.

4.10 Practical training for teenagers could also make them more aware that cycling is an option for life rather than a mode of transport to neglect once (and if) they learn to drive. This would not only give them a useful alternative, especially for short local trips, but also contribute to cycling safety: the more drivers who are and remain cyclists, the more likely it is that they will understand their needs.

4.11 Also, peer pressure is likely to become less of a problem the more young people understand vulnerability and the consequences of their actions behind the wheel. In fact, it has a better chance of becoming a beneficial force, i.e. by encouraging responsible rather than reckless driving and sensation-seeking, and influencing the 'social norm'.

4.12 Students who have successfully completed Level 3 training could, perhaps, be offered a discount on their test.

4.13 *Unfortunately, Level 3 Bikeability training is not yet routinely available in schools/colleges on a sufficient scale.*

4.14 Practical cycle training, preferably to Level 3, should be mandatory for driving instructors and all other professional drivers, particularly of lorries and other large vehicles. For those with disabilities that prevent them from cycling, suitable alternatives to practical cycling training should be developed.

Other ways of ensuring that learners are better prepared

4.15 Parents and others involved in the unpaid supervision of learner drivers should be encouraged to take up refresher driving courses. Again, this would help improve the quality of a candidate's driving practice outside their hours of formal tuition.

4.16 Given that the high cost of adding 17/18 year-olds to an insurance policy may be deterring existing drivers from taking learners out for practice sessions, and leading to more candidates sitting their test with only formal driving lessons behind them, it may be useful to encourage the industry to offer cheaper insurance rates to cover supervised learners, and 'supervised only' temporary insurance. This would help encourage more practice outside formal instruction in, potentially, a wider range of driving conditions (e.g. rain, wind, fog, snow, in the dark etc.).

Q5 What opportunities and risks would respondents see in alternative delivery models for aspects of the practical test?

5.1 We note that the Government is looking into the possibilities of establishing partnerships with other organisations in order to meet the continued strong demand for the practical test. We welcome the statement that this "*will not compromise road safety*", but trust that everything will be done to ensure that the DVSA has the resources it needs to meet the extra workload. If not, standards may well be compromised.

5.2 If examiners from private sector companies are used, therefore, they should be monitored robustly to make sure that the quality of their service is assured.

Q6 What factors are likely to attract potential partners to provide a practical driving test service?

6.1 We have no comment to make on this point.

Q7 What are the most important linkages we should make to streamlining the LGV driver licensing process, while ensuring standards are maintained?

7.1 We note that one of the motivations behind streamlining the LGV driver licensing process is to address the shortage of LGV drivers. It is very important to CTC that any streamlining – whatever form it takes – does not lead to yet more risk on the roads for cyclists from HGVs and construction vehicles in particular.⁸

⁸ In research published in 2013, TRL found that: "When fatal collisions with cyclists involving HGVs in London are considered, it can be seen that rigid vehicles (which are more likely to be associated with construction than are articulated vehicles) make up 89% of the fatalities from 75% of the distance travelled; articulated vehicles are responsible for 11% of the fatalities from 25% of the distance driven. When the freight task is also considered this

7.2 The risk that lorries pose to cyclists is significant:⁹

- In Britain, goods vehicles (excluding light vans) make up only around 3.7% of non-motorway traffic, but are on average involved in around a fifth of cyclists' road deaths per year;
- In urban areas, heavy goods vehicles make up just over 2% of non-motorway traffic, and are involved in about a quarter of cyclists' deaths;
- In London in 2014, HGVs accounted for only 4% of all traffic, but 55% of cyclist and 12% of pedestrian deaths. Also in London, 21 of the 44 cyclist fatalities between 2011-13 (inclusive) were as a result of a collision with a lorry, and ten of these involved a collision with a left-turning lorry;
- A cyclist is much more likely to die if they are in collision with a lorry than if they are in collision with a car: on average, cyclists are killed in around a fifth of serious injury collisions involving HGVs, compared to just over 2% of serious injury collisions with cars.

7.3 There have been all too many collisions involving cyclists and lorries in which the driver has infringed the regulations (e.g. on drivers' hours) and/or committed a dangerous or careless driving offence. While it is clear that in some cases operators should not have hired the driver in question in the first place, CTC believes that the licencing system has also failed as a safeguard. For example:

- In July 2013, Toby Wallace and Andrew McMenigall were killed on the A30 in Cornwall. The lorry driver involved was exhausted after working two consecutive eight-hour shifts, as he was both repairing and driving lorries for operator Frys Logistics. The driver was convicted on two counts for causing death by dangerous driving.¹⁰
- Also in 2013, London cyclist Alan Neve was killed by an uninsured and unlicensed lorry driver with five previous driving bans who was nonetheless working for lorry operator AJ Drummond. The driver was convicted of causing death by careless driving.¹¹

7.4 It seems clear, therefore, that the existing licencing process and the agencies involved are not protecting vulnerable road users effectively, or preventing operators from hiring drivers who are likely to put others at risk. For this reason, all streamlining proposals need to be thoroughly evaluated to ensure that they will raise and improve standards and compliance, rather than weaken them. At the very least, the system should ensure that LGV drivers are aware of their responsibilities and fulfil them and, if not, neither issue nor renew their licences.

7.5 One other point to note is that vehicle design and safety equipment to alert lorry drivers to cyclists and pedestrians outside their driving cab, is advancing all the time. Some of this (e.g. additional mirrors), makes driving HGVs in particular more complex and challenging. Moreover, the Government has recently invited drivers to adopt higher speeds by raising the speed limit for lorries of 7.5 tonnes plus from 40 mph to 50 mph for single carriageways, and from 50 mph to 60 mph for dual carriageways. It is important, therefore, to make sure that drivers have the skills to match such developments, and that the licencing process and all the required tests and re-tests verify that every driver has the necessary competence and

analysis becomes much more stark, with rigid vehicles involved in 89% of the fatalities but only 54% of the freight lifted (tonnes) or 27% of the freight moved (tonne km); articulated vehicles are involved in 11% of the fatalities despite lifting approximately 46% of the freight (tonnes) or 73% of the freight moved (tonne km), on journeys to, from and within London." TRL. *Construction logistics and cyclist safety*. 2013. <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/construction-logistics-and-cyclist-safety-summary-report.pdf>

⁹ Please see CTC's campaigns briefing on goods vehicles for full references for these figures: http://www.ctc.org.uk/sites/default/files/file_public/goods-vehicles4qrvv.pdf

¹⁰ <http://www.roadjustice.org.uk/case-study/two-cyclists-killed-a30-cornwall-crash-have-been-named-020713>

¹¹ <http://www.roadjustice.org.uk/case-study/lorry-driver-arrested-after-cyclist-dies-london-crash-150713>

responsible attitude. The ongoing, periodic training that drivers are already obliged to undertake to keep their Certificate of Professional Competence should also cover this.

7.6 We would also like to see the Government thinking more creatively about other ways to address the LGV driver shortage – promoting alternatives to road freight, for example.

7.7 CTC's briefing on goods vehicles outlines a number of other measures that we believe would help tackle the risk that lorries pose to cyclists and pedestrians https://www.ctc.org.uk/sites/default/files/file_public/goods-vehicles4qrvv.pdf

Q8 Do respondents believe that the on-road and manoeuvring components of the LGV driving test could be conducted separately and be of benefit to the haulage industry?

8.1 Naturally, we are more concerned that the on-road and manoeuvring components of the LGV driving test are of primary benefit to road safety, rather than to the haulage industry. Any decision on whether to conduct these tests separately should bear this in mind.

Q9 We would be interested to hear suggestions on how the Drivers Medical Service might resolve cases more quickly.

9.1 The Drivers Medical Service plays an important road safety role and, again, its efficiency must not be compromised for the sake of speed.

Q10 What more can we do to meet the needs of users, so that vehicle testing services could continue to meet industry's needs?

10.1 No comment

Q11 Would an expansion in the number of LGV testers to include private sector testers be welcomed? Does industry have the appetite and capability to provide such an expansion?

11.1 If examiners from private sector companies are used, they should be monitored robustly to make sure that the quality of their service is assured.

Q12 Is there an appetite amongst LGV/PSV operators to be involved in an 'earned recognition' enforcement scheme? What more do you think DVSA could do to process vehicles more quickly during roadside checks?

12.1 In CTC's view, any proposed 'earned recognition' scheme must be based on strict standards and reflect the needs of vulnerable road users. It should, for example, require compliance with the *Construction Logistics and Cyclist Safety standard (CLOCS)*,¹² or the equivalent.

12.2 Adequate resources also need to be in place to make sure that such a scheme is rigorously enforced and that operators' compliance is regularly checked and monitored.

12.3 The London Freight Enforcement Partnership, between TfL, the police and the DVSA, is a good example of a joint intelligence-led initiative set up to tackle rogue freight operators.¹³ CTC believes that partnership schemes like this should be encouraged and actively supported elsewhere, and that, overall, the DVSA needs to work more closely with the police, Health and Safety Executive and Traffic Commissioners.

¹² www.clocs.org.uk/standard-for-clocs/

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-partnership-targets-unsafe-drivers-and-operators-in-london>

12.4 We do have a number of reservations about an 'earned recognition' scheme:

- We do not think that processing vehicles 'more quickly' should be its primary aim. Its main goal should be to process vehicles more efficiently and, equally, to reduce the risk that LGV/PSVs pose to other road users.
- We are also concerned that an earned recognition scheme might lead to complacency, either from the operator or the DVSA (i.e. by becoming overly relaxed about road-side pull-overs simply because the operator has demonstrated a history of compliance). While we agree that enforcement targeted at the seriously and serially non-compliant is effective and a good use of resources, we would not welcome a marked reduction in, let alone exemptions from, checks on others, even if their record is exemplary.

Q13 Are there other ways in which DVSA could better target enforcement on non-compliant operators?

13.1 CTC believes that it is important to make sure that the vehicles of non-compliant operators should not be allowed on the roads. This means that they should never be contracted by organisations who typically make use of lorry services (e.g. councils, supermarkets etc.). Access to Operator Compliance Risk Scores (OCRS) would make it far easier for clients to show due diligence by avoiding operators with poor safety records. For this reason, CTC urges DVSA to publish OCRS.

13.2 Such an arrangement would also mean that the DVSA would enjoy an additional resource: organisations who hire lorry services would also be checking that operators are safe, resulting in fewer dangerous vehicles on the road and, in turn, reducing the number of road-side checks necessary.

13.3 In order to be of value to contractors, however, OCRS need to offer an accurate and detailed reflection of an operator's compliance. CTC therefore suggests that the scheme should be reviewed and overhauled as necessary to ensure that it is a robust and worthwhile measure of compliance in all respects.

Q14 What would be the best way(s) to ensure that commercial users are kept abreast of developments in the agencies?

14.1 No comment

Digital services

Q 15-19

General comments

15.1 CTC believes that all digital services offered by motoring agencies could, potentially, be better used to disseminate messages about responsible and safe road use. It would be an efficient, low cost and far-reaching means of keeping all drivers and fleet operators up-to-date with the prevailing rules, with clear information on the importance of complying with them. In the case of self-declaration, for example, it could explain how vital it is to be truthful and the possible consequences of failing to disclose certain conditions. Naturally, the more accessible digital services are, the more impact such messages are likely to have. We therefore welcome all measures, such as assistance in libraries and APIs etc., to make them easier to use for everyone.

Data sharing

15.2 We also welcome plans to examine how the vast amounts of data held by the motoring services about drivers and vehicles could be shared across government to improve enforcement capabilities. All agencies involved in traffic law enforcement (including the police, HSE, Traffic Commissioners and agents of the justice system), should have ready access to information about suspected or identified offenders so that they can take any necessary action without delay and fulfil their individual duties in a co-ordinated and concerted manner.

Q20 – 21 Efficiency

Costs and charges

16.1 We agree that the amount charged to the user should accurately reflect the cost of the service. Fees for individual drivers should only be reduced if the cost of providing the service goes down, and not for any other reason, social or economic. It would be unfair of the Government to subsidise any services used by motorists and thereby encourage driving when investment in more sustainable and healthier forms of transport is inadequate, patchy and stretched, as is the case with cycling. (We do see that there may be fair case for offering differential fees to SMEs, however, as long as it is at the expense of larger organisations and not the taxpayer).

16.2 We agree with the concept of transferring some more of the burden of enforcement costs to fees for services.

16.3 We also welcome the suggestion that some of the financial penalties of criminal road traffic law could be applied to some of the significant drivers' hours and tachograph falsification offences committed by non-UK based offenders, as well as to the UK offenders who are already covered by the current arrangements.

Q22 – 24 Agency transformation

17.1 No further comments

Deregulation

18.1 We note that the DVSA is seeking approval for its staff to prohibit a vehicle where the driver does not have the appropriate licence, a process that currently necessitates calling the police to take action. We support this idea. It appears to be a time-efficient approach, both in terms of speeding up the process of removing a prohibited vehicle from the roads, but also helping to free up more police time for other vital traffic law enforcement duties.

18.2 We do not, however, support the idea of abolishing the need for bus drivers to keep a manual record of their driving time. Duty records kept by employers for payment reasons do represent an externally validated record, of course, and it is important to keep them. Nevertheless, a driver's own account is not only a useful back-up, but also a way of impressing them personally with the importance of complying with the domestic drivers' hours regulations. It also means that they do not have to depend so much on their employers to ensure they are not in breach, or in danger of breaching, the rules, and helps them know when to alert their employer. For this reason, the Government should look at making the manual record a useful tool for improving compliance, rather than abolishing it.



18.3 Also, we do not support the proposal to allow ADIs who have lapsed from the register to re-enter by successfully completing the standards check rather than re-qualifying. We understand that the standards check simply assesses an instructor's ability to teach pupils. Given the responsible role that ADIs fulfil with regard to safe driving practices, we believe that they should demonstrate that their own driving ability is up to standard and be required to re-qualify.

7/1/2016

Contact: Cherry.allan@ctc.org.uk / 01483 238326

¹ Home Office. *Police workforce, England and Wales, 30 September 2014*. Feb 2015. Table 6.
www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-england-and-wales-30-september-2014-data-tables .