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Forward by Mary Williams OBE, chief executive, Brake

The old saying “what gets measured, gets bettered” is never truer than when it comes to fleet safety. To manage and reduce road risks effectively, it is essential for managers to have an accurate picture of those risks.

Even if they have not been involved in a serious crash in recent years, most companies that regularly use roads experience bumps, scrapes and near misses. In the wrong place, at the wrong time, they can be fatal. Measuring and monitoring the day-to-day bumps and scrapes, and putting well thought out interventions in place are therefore moral responsibilities, which help protect businesses against legal and regulatory action. They also make sound financial sense: leading fleet managers estimate that the ‘hidden’ costs associated with crashes can be up to eight times the apparent cost of the crash to their business.

This project has provided a small, but nonetheless exciting step forward in enabling organisations to compare information about their policies and procedures, and use data collected to benchmark their performance against others and identify areas for improvement. We have been encouraged by the enthusiasm this has generated in organisations of all sizes to ‘up their game’.

Benchmarking is clearly an effective tool in encouraging good fleet management. We hope that further funding will become available, to allow Brake and Interactive Driving Systems® to refine and simplify the benchmarks developed through this project, to make them even more user-friendly. In the meantime, we would encourage anyone responsible for managing people who drive for work to log on to the website, find out how their processes and data measure up against industry leaders and take up the challenge of beating them at their own game.

Summary, outcomes and key recommendations

Fleet safety benchmarking is not new, with previous projects having been undertaken in the UK and Australia during the 1990s.

This report reviews the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Project (www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net) that has been in place in the UK with Department for Transport support over the last two years.

The project allows participation by any organisation, providing the following tools:

- Benchmarking report, best practice guides and case studies.
- Five-minute, 10-question self audit and feedback.
- 30-question process benchmarking.
- Outcomes benchmarking.
- Proactive and reactive KPI (Key Performance Indicator) comparisons.
- 168-question fleet audit.

There have been many positive outcomes from the project, including:

- Wide and extensive media coverage for fleet safety issues.
- 500+ organisations, operating well over 600,000 vehicles, completed the 10-question fleet audit.
- 50+ organisations entered full benchmarking data.
- Many participant organisations used the project to help make and support the business case for implementing or improving fleet safety interventions.
- Many used the 10-question audit to show senior managers the gaps in their system, and use it to leverage funding.
- Others used the 10-question audit to compare different divisions within their company, or different companies within their holding group – as an initial ‘gap analysis’ status review.
- At least two large organisations used the project to identify gaps in their legal compliance which they were able to move towards closing.
• One organisation that benchmarked process and outcomes against other similar organisations for the first time – allowing it to make the financial, leadership and reputational business case for a significant investment in fleet safety – has reported back that it is already beginning to reduce its collision rate and costs.
• A number of participant organisations have moved on from online benchmarking to undertaking detailed ‘face-to-face warts and all benchmarking’ with other participant organisations, spending days working closely together.
• Several high-profile participants, including BT, Royal Mail, Centrica, Nestlé and Wolseley have began to engage in community road safety programs – partly as a result of comparing their programs with other participants. This has included initiatives in local schools, family member programs, young driver schemes and a number of other initiatives – all of which are of benefit to road safety in general.

Overall, we believe that the project has provided excellent value for money for the Department for Transport’s Challenge Fund program, and offers a great deal of potential for further development to continue to engage organisations to implement proactive and effective fleet safety initiatives. There is scope to improve some of the KPIs, and to expand the project globally, as well as develop further its reach into the UK fleet market.

1. Introduction to benchmarking

The academic definition of benchmarking is the ‘continuous process of measuring products, services or practices against industry leaders’. When it is used in the context of business management, benchmarking is typically a comparison of practices and performance between companies (or divisions of the same company) to gain new insights and identify improvements.

Benchmarking can focus on process (the policies and procedures an organisation has in place) and outcomes (data on sales figures, or the quantity or quality of the products or services the organisation provides).

In the case of fleet safety benchmarking, process benchmarks generally relate to fleet safety management policies and procedures, while outcome benchmarks relate to key performance indicators on crash data and the costs associated with crashes. The Fleet Safety Benchmarking Project covered both process and outcomes.

Benchmarking fleet safety process and outcome data allows fleet managers to identify opportunities for improvement by assessing their performance against other organisations. It allows managers to introduce countermeasures where standards are not as high as other organisations and assess their effectiveness.

The remainder of this report describes the background to the project, and its outcomes, in detail.

2. Background to the fleet safety benchmarking project

In order to be able to benchmark performance, organisations must have meaningful data to compare with each other. In the absence of national reporting and recording regulations on work-related road safety (whether RIDDOR, transportation or health surveillance), the level and quality of data collected by organisations varies hugely. In fact, poor and incomparable data has been a recurring barrier to success in almost every study and research project aimed at effective monitoring, improvement and evaluation of work-related road safety.

The fleet safety benchmarking project grew out of discussions in 2004-5 on how to overcome this barrier in order to make meaningful comparisons of organisations’ fleet safety performance. These discussions were led by Interactive Driving Systems® and involved Brake, the road safety charity, and a number of organisations widely recognised as being industry leaders in setting fleet safety
standards— including British Telecom, Wolseley, Initial-Rentokil, Centrica, Royal Mail, Zurich and others.

It was hoped that if the barrier of poor data could be overcome, it would assist Interactive Driving Systems® and Brake in identifying where industry as a whole could improve its fleet safety practices, as well as providing tailored information to individual organisations about where their own fleet safety practices were lagging behind industry leaders.

After initial informal discussions, it quickly became apparent that even among these industry leaders, incomparable data was likely to be a problem unless a standard set of very clearly defined key performance indicators (KPIs) were agreed as benchmarks. A pilot group was formed to discuss and agree KPIs which could be reported by a wide range of organisations, enabling as wide a group of organisations as possible to benchmark their data against each other. This pilot group eventually became the steering group for the full DfT project.

By early 2006, a framework of KPIs had been agreed and Interactive Driving Systems® developed an internet-based program to enable the pilot group to upload initial data to a password-protected page on its website. Zurich Global Corporate Europe (which had been pioneering benchmarking practices between its own fleet clients) and BT (a leading member of the pilot group) agreed to fund the publication and distribution of a report on benchmarking in general, including the initial findings from the pilot group discussions (Murray 2007).

However, additional funding was needed to be able to develop the program further and establish what the pilot group had identified as being the most efficient way of benchmarking fleet safety data. This involved the development of a project-specific website which would allow any organisation to submit data and obtain an anonymous comparison of their performance against that of other organisations, on a range of process and outcomes KPIs.

Brake submitted a joint bid with Interactive Driving Systems® for a small amount of ‘seed-corn’ funding from the Department for Transport’s Challenge Fund for a fleet safety benchmarking project to develop such a website and was awarded a grant of £17,580 from April 2006.

The project’s stated aim was ‘to improve work-related road safety data at an organisational level through a free benchmarking website for fleet managers, providing accessible on-line benchmarking information and data relating to crash rates, risk management practices and appropriate safety interventions where hazards are identified’.

2.1. Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking report and summary of previous research

The Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking report (Murray 2007), summarised the findings of previous fleet safety benchmarking projects, including research published at the University of Huddersfield, such as the findings of a DfT-funded Company Vehicle Incident Reporting & Recording (CoVIR) project.

The report noted that in the USA, collision statistics for heavy commercial vehicles have been benchmarked using SafeStat, a national auditing database run by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration; while in Australia, insurance-led benchmarking programmes have received much positive media and industry attention. In the UK, however, the only research projects that had been undertaken were small-scale projects at the University of Huddersfield in the 1990s.

The Huddersfield research was undertaken to investigate a number of issues:

- Many organisations had limited information about the collisions involving their vehicles, making it impossible to evaluate the effectiveness of any interventions or negotiate with their insurer over rising premiums.
- Even where data was available, it had major limitations and gaps—with significant scope identified for the improvement of collision reporting and recording.
• The issue of data, and recording it correctly, was a recurring theme for academics, industry observers and practitioners alike. Data visibility was seen as the starting point for developing needs-based targeted safety improvement interventions for company vehicles as part of the process of managing work-related road safety.

• It was widely felt that a benchmarking project could help ‘force’ better crash reporting, recording and data management by helping participants identify gaps in their existing processes.

The research confirmed that these concerns were valid. Many organisations held poor-quality data about the safety of their fleets and large variations between organisations were found even at the most basic level of determining what, in fact, constituted a crash. The wide variation in the results of these projects were often almost as much due to differences in data reporting, recording and availability as they were due to differences in safety performance.

A Department for Transport-funded project, Company Vehicle Incident Reporting and Recording (Murray 2003), developed data collection structures and incident definitions that allowed comparable data to be collected, and several of the participants in this project began to benchmark against each other informally, which eventually led to the formation of the Interactive Driving Systems®, BT and Brake work-related road safety benchmarking group being established in 2004.

2.2. Interactive Driving Systems®, BT and Brake benchmarking group

The Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking report (Murray, 2007) outlined the initial informal discussions from the Interactive Driving Systems®, BT and Brake work-related road safety benchmarking group, which involved a number of recognised industry leaders in fleet safety, many of whom were also Interactive Driving Systems® and Brake corporate supporters.

The group’s discussions quickly focused on the crux of the problem: how best to improve the quality of data reported and recorded by organisations in order to enable meaningful benchmarking between organisations to take place. The barriers to meaningful benchmarking discussed by the group included:

• The definition of a collision – some participants included all collisions in their statistics, others only above a certain cost or insurance excess, or third party only.
• The amount, quality, level and validity of the data available.
• Exposure data – some participants did not have any, some measured it in miles, others in kilometres.
• Some had better data and systems than others. Often the best organisations at collision reporting and recording appeared to have higher rates than less diligent organisations.
• Participant ability to follow the instructions on benchmarking questionnaires.
• Completeness of data – making assumption-free analysis almost impossible.

A full description of the group’s discussions is available in the Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking report (Murray, 2007).

2.3. Summary of lessons taken forward into the fleet safety benchmarking project

1. Benchmarking is potentially an extremely important tool in improving fleet safety, as long as issues surrounding poor and incomparable data can be overcome.

2. Industry leaders are more than willing to share their experience of using benchmarks for free, for the benefit of industry as a whole. The development of the project will provide them with a unique way of disseminating that experience and developing industry standards.

3. It is crucial that the benchmarking service provided by the website to fleet managers is free to end-users. This helps to encourage organisations that have a small or non-existent
budget for fleet management to collect and submit their own data for analysis as well as organisations which already collect and analyse data internally.

4. The KPIs used as benchmarks by the project should be designed to raise awareness of key aspects of fleet safety risk management by highlighting key data for fleet managers to collect and analyse.

5. KPIs must be appropriate for a wide range of industries and easily accessible by any fleet manager from an early stage in the project. KPIs should be well-defined, but the data should not be too difficult to collect, as this would prevent some organisations from being able to submit data.

6. Extremely clear definitions must be used to describe the data to be entered on the website for different KPIs, to ensure that comparable data is submitted by different organisations.

7. Data submitted to the website should be anonymous when viewed by other organisations, to encourage all organisations to submit accurate information.

3. Fleet safety benchmarking project aims and objectives

Benchmarking safety performance against others is important for many reasons:

- Around the world poor, and incomparable, data remains a recurring barrier to success in almost every study and research project aimed at effective monitoring, improvement and evaluation of occupational road safety.
- Benchmarking against others generates many good ideas.
- It helps make the ‘business case’ for safety internally.
- Statistics gained from monitoring drivers helps with refresher training, which helps reduce crashes.
- Information gained from benchmarking can help improve fleet efficiency by providing data on best routes and time on customer sites.
- Measuring and monitoring process and outcomes leads to improvements – what gets measured, gets bettered. This underpins many fleet safety improvements.
- Benchmarking against others forces better crash reporting, recording, KPIs and quality of data.
- It allows countermeasures to be needs-based and enables managers to evaluate effectiveness as part of a continuous improvement process.
- It gives greater corporate confidence by ensuring that organisations are ‘keeping up with the Joneses’.
- Benchmarking helps ensure compliance with health and safety regulations, ‘duty of care’, O’Licence requirements, RIDDOR reporting and other legal requirements.
- It helps participant managers protect their scorecard/bonus.
- By helping to make the case for investment in fleet safety, benchmarking helps protect individual managers and organisations against accountants looking to cut costs, high insurance premiums and prosecution under civil and criminal law.

The Fleet Safety Benchmarking project aimed to allow participants to achieve these and a range of other benefits by:

- Improving work-related road safety data at an organisational level and developing a benchmarking website accessible to fleet managers.
- Providing accessible on-line information and data relating to crash rates, risk management practices and appropriate safety interventions where hazards are identified.
- Allowing participants to submit data and obtain an anonymous comparison of their performance against that of other organisations, on a range of KPIs, such as the frequency of safety audits and risk assessments for drivers, numbers of crashes and crash costs.
The projected outputs or objectives for the project were to:

- Discuss, agree and capture standardised industry benchmark KPIs, promote their use and provide advice for fleet managers on how they can use benchmarking data to help to prevent their drivers from being involved in crashes.
- Raise awareness of the key aspects of risk management by highlighting key data for fleet managers to collect and analyse.
- Encourage all organisations with employees who drive for work, whatever their size and turnover, to report, record and analyse their crash, incident and ‘near-miss’ data, by providing an easily-accessible tool to measure their work-related road safety.
- Raise the profile of road risk management as a whole as a key issue of public concern among journalists, the public, community leaders, organisations and at Government level (not least for the Government’s own vehicle and driver exposure).
- Reduce road casualties. Drivers at work are estimated to be involved in a quarter to a third of road crashes and organisational interventions to improve safety have the potential to play a huge role in road casualty reduction.

4. Development of the project benchmarks

By the start of the fleet safety benchmarking project, the majority of the obstacles to the pilot group successfully benchmarking their data against each other had been overcome. While some refinement was still needed, the group had managed to agree definitions for a set of criteria on work-related road safety processes and systems; proactive (pre-collision) key performance indicators (KPIs); and reactive (post-collision) KPIs.

Some initial data had been entered by members of the group onto a password-restricted page on the main Interactive Driving Systems® website. Programming had been developed by Interactive Driving Systems® to process any benchmarking data entered onto the website automatically, providing an instant comparison against data from other organisations that have already submitted their data.

The funding provided by the Department for Transport enabled Interactive Driving Systems® and Brake to work with the pilot/steering group to refine the benchmarking criteria, further develop the benchmarking program, and create a project-specific website, with its own web address, www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net (see Appendix 1).

4.1. Ensuring accessibility

Brake and Interactive Driving Systems® were keen to ensure that the benchmarking project was accessible to as many organisations as possible. While efforts were made to ensure that all benchmarks were relevant to a wide range of types of organisation and clearly written, in plain English, it was also felt important to give potential participants an introduction to the potential benefits of benchmarking, without requiring them to invest a lot of time and effort in collating data.

With this in mind, and the help of the pilot group, a short 10-question audit was developed to act as a draw to the website and more detailed benchmarking program (Appendix 2).

The questions contained in this short audit cover a range of areas relating to fleet safety and provide a broad-brush overview of how the organisation’s fleet safety practices compared to other organisations. Importantly, to encourage participation, the questions developed and approved by the pilot group were ones which any fleet manager, risk manager or health and safety manager should be able to answer about their organisation without having to look up any data or check the ‘small print’ of their policies. Equally importantly for busy managers, the audit takes just minutes to complete. On successful completion it provides an immediate score, anonymous comparison against all other participants as well as good practice feedback on each question.
It was decided that the 10-question audit should act as the entry point filter for organisations wanting to participate in the full Fleet Safety Benchmarking Project in a secure password protected environment, which covered processes in the form of a more detailed 30-question audit, outcomes data and KPI recording.

4.2. Refining the benchmarking criteria

The criteria for the 30-question process audit, was developed in close discussion with the pilot group (See Appendix 7).

For the outcomes data, particular attention was paid to ensuring that the data entered by different organisations was comparable. Where there was any possibility for confusion or possible need of clarification of exactly what data was being sought, an in-depth definition of the data or reporting method required was agreed by the pilot group and a button was added to the question on the website, which could be clicked to reveal further information.

Each question was discussed by the pilot group, to ensure that the data would be useful, but that the definitions would not exclude organisations unnecessarily.

Examples of the definitions developed by the pilot group include:

- **Question 2a. How many people drive on work business?**
  - Definition: (For work vehicle drivers include everyone who is eligible to drive, including contractors, agency staff and family members. For own vehicles driven on work business include cash-for-car and non-cash-for-cars users of private vehicles even if only occasional business use.)

- **Question 4. Please enter your collision / claim / incident rate per 100,000 miles for each of the following vehicle types.**
  - Definition: (Include all single vehicle and third party incidents, claims and collisions involving fatalities, injuries and asset damage irrespective of fault, blame or avoidability involving vehicles covered by your organisation’s insurance premium or self insurance scheme. Exclude fire, theft, vandalism, glass damage and damage identified at time of vehicle sale.)

- **Question 5. Please define which of the following incident descriptions are included in Question 4 and what % of your total collisions / claims / incidents they make up in total (100%).**
  - Definition: (Different organisations monitor different levels of incident. The aim of this question is to allow participants to compare like with like.)

- **The audit applies to:**
  - All full/ part-time employees, contractors, sub-contractors, temporary/ agency staff, suppliers, customers, family members and visitors.
  - All vehicle types, including cars, trucks, vans and buses, irrespective of ownership.

With hindsight, one of the difficulties experienced was that the project aimed to ‘please’ everyone in the pilot group, making the data entry process over-intricate in some places, rather than being directive about what data was required. A lesson for future benchmarking projects is that it is important not to over-complicate the data collection process.

5. Website development decisions

5.1. Web pages for project members and non-members

When setting up the project website, Brake and Interactive Driving Systems® discussed how to structure the site with the pilot group. The website needed to fulfil several objectives, including: protecting the anonymity of organisations benchmarking their data; ensuring that the data entered
onto the site was from legitimate organisations; encouraging participation in the project; and providing useful, but less detailed, benchmarking information and case studies to any organisation, regardless of whether or not they were participating in the project.

It was decided that the best way to achieve all of these objectives was to set up an open-access part of the website, for non-members, and a password-restricted part of the website for members who had signed up to participate in the project.

The open-access pages at www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net include:

- best practice case studies on existing members of the project, detailing how they have improved safety through risk assessment, crash recording and analysis
- the Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking Report (Murray, 2007) and more recent documents (Murray and Keeler, 2008)
- an information sheet for fleet managers on reporting and recording crash data, produced by the Fleet Safety Forum
- the 10-question audit, which also acts as registration for the project (Appendix 2)
- results to date from the 10-question audit

It was felt particularly important to include case studies on the website to inspire organisations to take steps towards improving their fleet safety and demonstrate potential benefits across a range of organisations. Case studies were sourced from industry leaders, most being winners of Brake’s Fleet Safety Forum Awards and other award schemes. Some, such as BT and Wolseley, were not only Fleet Safety Forum Awards winners, but also clients of IDS who had been involved in the initial benchmarking group and were among the first organisations entering their data (at www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net).

The restricted-access pages include:

- the 30-question process audit, and a data capture area where participants enter their benchmarking data (Appendix 3)
- benchmarking results in a series of tables and graphs
- access to a detailed 168-question best practice Safety Health and Environmental audit (Appendix 4)
- minutes of benchmarking meetings (Appendix 7)
- useful links to other websites
- a feedback form

5.2. Data protection, privacy, safe harbour and cross-marketing

Given the recent sensitivity over the security, transportation and transfer of sensitive data, all participant data has been stored and protected in line with Interactive Driving Systems’ data security policy (shown at www.virtualriskmanager.net/main/legalnotices/en.php).

All data entry and transfer has been via a secure password-protected website, to which access was filtered by a monthly process.

No sensitive participant data has been made available, visible or accessible to any other participant, other than in an anonymous, general, form.

Many existing clients of Interactive Driving Systems® have already participated in and benefited from the Fleet Safety Benchmarking project. The project marketing, however, was purposefully left to Brake, and under no circumstances used the project to directly ‘cross-sell’ commercial products.
6. Participation

6.1. Encouraging involvement in the project

To encourage organisations to access the website, complete the 10-question audit and sign up for the project, Brake carried out media and marketing work to promote the project.

Brake produced a marketing flyer for the project and distributed more than 140,000 copies by post, email and other networking cascades. Several key organisations, including Interactive Driving Systems® distributed the flyer to their contacts. This marketing assistance was provided at no cost to the project through organisations which regularly support Brake’s charitable work in this way. (Please see Appendix 5 for a copy of the flyer and list of organisations that helped to distribute it.)

Interactive Driving Systems®’ clients and Fleet Safety Forum subscribers also received copies of the Work-Related Road Safety Benchmarking Report (Murray, 2007), which promoted the web address for the project.

Additional marketing was carried out through listings on websites and circulating copies of reports to members of the Occupational Road Safety Alliance (ORSA) and other similar networks.

Media work was carried out by Brake, by issuing press releases to its extensive fleet safety media contacts, to raise awareness of the project and encourage organisations to participate. One clear advantage of this work being led by Brake, as an independent national charity, and funded by government, was that the project was accurately portrayed in the media as a research-led, not-for-profit exercise to improve fleet safety, rather than as a marketing gimmick to attract commercial customers. This undoubtedly led to more interest in the project than would have resulted if it had been delivered by a commercial company alone.

Brake issued five press releases to market the project and it received a good level of positive media coverage, including the front page of leading UK fleet publication Fleet News. (More information on media work carried out; including a couple of sample cuttings are available in Appendix 6.)

6.2. Project reach

The above marketing process led to an extensive ‘reach and touch’ for the project, including:
- Thousands of ‘hits’ on the project website (www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net).
- A prominent position achieved on ‘Google’ (Appendix 6) and other similar search engines.
- Very wide cascading by industry and professional bodies from all over the world.

7. Project findings

7.1. Process benchmarking: the 10-question audit

As a starting point, the 10-question audit allows simple analysis and benchmarking of processes against industry (Figure 1). Fleet managers entering their data into the audit get immediate feedback via email and within a few weeks receive an invitation to join the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Group and enter their full process and outcomes data in the anonymous, password-protected section of the website.
The latest results of the 10-question fleet audit can be seen on the open-access part of the fleet safety benchmarking project’s website (www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net). The amber and red areas of the graph show where participants felt there were gaps in their fleet safety policies, processes and procedures.

Figure 2 shows that the 479 participants (at August 2008) operated over half a million vehicles, at an average fleet size of 1,085 – ranging from a maximum of 90,000 to a minimum of one. 64% of participants operated cars in their fleet, fewer operated buses, vans and trucks.

Further analysis (Figure 3) shows more detail on the sizes of the participants’ fleets, with 44 having less than 10 vehicles, and 10 having more than 10,000.
Due to the very low budget available, the project was mainly marketed via the trade press (Appendix 1), the internet and email. To allow future fleet safety initiatives to be targeted, participants were asked where they heard about the project (Figure 4). The fact that a quarter of the participants heard about the project via email is partly a reflection of the fact that email was one of the main communication channels, but may also provide a pointer to how to promote similar projects in future. A better level of funding support would allow other communication channels to also be explored.

**Figure 4: Where participants heard about the benchmarking project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where heard about the project</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet supplier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPFM benchmarking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal mailing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk management advisor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade press</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data not collected (in early weeks of project)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.2. Process benchmarking: the 30-question audit**

The 30-question fleet audit (Appendix 3) is on the password-protected section of the website. More than 50 organisations have entered data. It includes questions on the type of fleet, incident numbers and types and expands on the information provided through the 10-question audit.

For example, the question from the 10-question audit on whether the organisation has a Safety Health and Environmental Management (SHEM) policy in place which includes clear objectives and a commitment to improving driver safety performance over time becomes the six questions on different aspects of the organisation’s SHEM policy shown in Figure 5.
As in the 10-question audit, the amber and red areas of the graph show where participants felt there were gaps in their current system. Clearly, many of the participants have written fleet safety policies in place, less than half annually audit and improve the policy to make sure it remains up-to-date. Less than one in five participants reported undertaking vehicle, driver and journey based risk assessments (as recommended in the HSE/DfT guidance on Work Related Road Safety) – another important area of opportunity.

Similarly, a single question on driver well-being in the 10-question audit becomes four questions on different aspects of driver well-being in the 30-question audit (Figure 6). This suggests that while most participants have provisions in place to manage mobile phone use by drivers, there appear to be significant gaps in the management of driver health and eyesight, driving hours/fatigue and drug/alcohol use.
Organisations completing the 30-question audit gain anonymous access to other organisation’s data as soon as they have completed the process. This allows them to identify areas of opportunity for improving their risk management processes and policies.

7.3. The 168-question audit

Once they have entered the benchmarking data, participants can also gain access to the full 168-question online fleet audit. It focuses on process as well as internal and external outcomes benchmarks, following a similar structure, but in more detail, to the 10 and 30-question audits. Participants receive feedback and recommendations in relation to their overall score and, where appropriate, specific feedback on particular questions and sections of the audit. To date, 20 project participants have gone on to complete the full audit. A screen grab from the full audit is shown in Appendix 4.

7.4. Outcomes benchmarking

Outcomes benchmarking focused on several areas, with participants entering their data via the secure password protected website shown in Appendix 1.

Questions were asked on the following areas:
- Type of organisation. Figure 7 shows that a quarter of participants were in the transport and logistics sector.
- Vehicle numbers and types – including car, van, truck, bus, etc.
- Driver numbers and types – including commercial, car, van and occasional drivers.
- Percentage of drivers, vehicles and journeys risk-assessed.
- The collision, claim and incident rate per 100,000 miles for each vehicle type (Figure 8). This allows participants to directly compare their collision, claim and incident ratios with others.
- Type and levels of collisions recorded, in part to help ensure that effective comparisons could be made.
- Proportions of avoidable and unavoidable collisions.
- Proactive and reactive KPIs used, to identify how participants were monitoring their performance (Figures 9 and 10).
Government agencies appear to be under-represented in Figure 7, suggesting they could do more to lead by example, and the logistics sector over-represented – perhaps not surprising given that vehicle use is part of their core business and that commercial drivers face high exposures to the risks on the road.

**Figure 8: Average collision data, by vehicle type**

Figure 8 shows average participant collision outcomes data. Some the data in Figure 8 appears very high compared to previous projects, particularly the collisions per vehicle per annum. The limited funding resources available made it impossible to review the data in detail with individual participants – and is an area requiring further study. It also suggests that a slightly different way of asking that particular question could be considered for future projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Average per 100,000 miles</th>
<th>Average per vehicle per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid Trucks</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated Trucks</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 9 and 10 focus on the proactive and reactive, pre- and post-collision KPIs, identifying the extent to which participants currently monitor them. It appears that there are many areas of opportunity for participants to extend and improve their monitoring programs.
Figure 9: Proactive pre-crash KPIs

Figure 10: Reactive post-crash KPIs
8. Examples of how the benchmarking project was used by participants

Several participants have told us how the initiative had helped their fleet safety program develop.

- Many used the 10-question audit to show senior managers the gaps in their system, and use it to leverage funding.
- Others used the 10-question audit to compare different divisions within their company, or different companies within their holding group – as an initial gap analysis status review.
- Two large organisations used the project to identify gaps in their legal compliance which they were able to move towards closing.
- One organisation that benchmarked process and outcomes against other similar organisations for the first time – allowing it to make the financial, leadership and reputational business case for a significant investment in fleet safety – has reported back that it is already beginning to reduce its collision rate and costs.
- A number of participant organisations have moved on from online benchmarking to undertaking detailed ‘face-to-face warts and all benchmarking’ with other participant organisations, spending days working closely together.
- Several high profile participants, including BT, Royal Mail, Centrica, Nestlé and Wolseley have began to engage in community road safety programs – partly as a result of comparing their programs with other participants. This has included initiatives in local schools, family member programs, young driver schemes and a number of other initiatives – all of which are of benefit to road safety in general.

Despite these successes, there are several lessons and limitations from the project.

9. Project lessons and limitations

9.1. Lessons learnt from the project

The main lessons learnt are that there is an appetite for a free, simple to use, Fleet Safety Benchmarking initiative that has many potential benefits for participant drivers, managers, organisations, industry and society.

While many of the difficulties in collecting comparable data have been overcome by the effort put into developing and defining the KPIs used on the website, it is impossible to fully guarantee the quality of outcomes data submitted to the website – particularly due to the low levels of funding available. However, results to date are encouraging and have provided many organisations, including the industry leaders in the pilot group, with useful benchmarks on their process and performance.

The project has benefited hugely from the expertise of industry leaders, provided free of charge, and from additional resources committed to development of the project and analysis of data by Interactive Driving Systems® and Brake. The results are an accessible service that has been able to be used by a wide range of organisations – mostly from the UK, but a significant number from overseas too.

9.2. Limitations of the project

The major limitation of the project has been that of funding. The ‘shoestring’ budget available for the project to date has only allowed Interactive Driving Systems® and Brake to provide minimal marketing, support, data verification, and follow-up action with organisations.

Given this limitation, to achieve the following outcomes can only be seen as a major success:
- Wide and extensive media coverage for the fleet safety issue.
- 500+ organisations completed the 10-question fleet audit.
• 50+ organisations entered full benchmarking data.
• Many participant organisations used the project to help make and support the business case for implementing or improving their fleet safety.

To maximise the impact of the project, it would have been beneficial to have had sufficient resources to be able to provide individual participants with reminders to enter data, verification follow-up and support to gain the maximum benefit possible from their benchmarking results.

There is huge scope for the project to be taken further, encourage wider participation and develop support services to assist organisations in implementing appropriate interventions once they have identified areas for action through benchmarking their data. The project has also identified a global demand for a ‘free to user’ multi-lingual version of the audit, supported by a slimmed-down version of the process and outcomes benchmarking.

In order to achieve such outcomes, further funding is now required.

10. Recommendations and areas for further work

10.1. General recommendations

Our experience suggests that it is crucial that the online Fleet Safety Benchmarking website remains free to end-users, particularly in the current climate of economic uncertainty. This will continue to encourage organisations that have a small or non-existent budget for fleet management to collect and submit their data – with a view to focusing on and investing in road safety.

10.2. Fleet safety benchmarking research and practice

Several steps need to be undertaken to maximise the existing and ongoing outcomes from the project, including:

• Revising some of the questions and material in the light of the experience gained to date.

• Updating the system to collect 2008 / 2008-09 data.

• More work needs to be done to clean up and verify data that has already been submitted to the website, including clarifying a small proportion of entries where data appears to have been entered erroneously. Ideally this follow-up work should take place on a business by business level, with tailored advice on recording and reporting data being made available where necessary.

• Funding allowing, a detailed participant evaluation survey, to investigate how organisations have used their benchmarking results, and how this has benefited their organisation is required to be undertaken. This should include an investigation of why some organisations which completed the 10-question audit have not submitted further data, so that a continuation of the project can work to overcome any barriers to participation.

10.3. Recommendations for fleet safety managers

Many participant organisations in the project to date have gained a range of positive outcomes from the project.

We believe that existing participants can continue to gain further benefits, and that many new participants could also be encouraged to join the program if they can be persuaded of the benefits. Such engagement can only be good for road safety in general.
Further funding to extend the distribution channels for the project more widely could allow a much wider reach and touch for the program. One particular example is to engage more government-owned fleets. Such fleets make up a significant proportion of the total vehicle fleet in the UK – but appear to be massively underrepresented in this project and other fleet safety initiatives.

10.4. Recommendations for Government

Brake and Interactive Driving Systems® strongly recommend that the Government provides further funding for the project and incorporates fleet safety benchmarking as part of its post-2010 road safety strategy.

We also believe that the fleet, health and safety, procurement and other managers of the government fleet should also be encouraged, engaged, cajoled or coerced to be more proactive in fleet safety, and participating in this project would be a very good starting point to allow them to benchmark their performance against each other and the private sector.

During the lifetime of the project there has been a rapidly increasing amount of interest in fleet safety worldwide, including the US-led NETS fleet safety benchmarking program, the NIOSH global road safety for workers project, GRSP initiatives and the strong Fleet Safety theme in the United Nations Road Safety initiative.

Supporting the fleet safety benchmarking project further offers the potential to position the UK at the centre of all these, and a range of other global initiatives – which will help to support the recent UN resolution on road safety, and the forthcoming ministerial conference on road safety.

11. Conclusion

The Fleet Safety Benchmarking Project has been a success on a shoestring budget, including the following outcomes:

- Several pilot meetings.
- Several well attended project meetings and conference calls.
- Excellent media coverage.
- www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net established including free reports, guidance, links, 10 question fleet audit entry point to project and secure benchmarking platform for both process and outcomes.
- 500+ organisations, operating 600,000+ vehicles, have successfully completed the 10 Question audit and received feedback on their responses – which is the gateway into the project for most participants.
- 50+ have entered the benchmarking data for their fleet.
- 20+ have completed the full 168 question project audit.
- 10 detailed participant cases covering Johnson & Johnson, Zurich, Royal Mail, CEVA Logistics, Suckling Transport, Roche Australia, Wolseley UK, Centrica/British Gas, Nestlé and TNT Express all available online.
- London-based workshop attended by 40+ participants and research report published including detailed ‘benefits’ based case studies from BT, Wolseley UK and Royal Mail.
- Identified project limitations, areas for improvement and opportunities for wider expansion.
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Appendix 1 – www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net snapshots

Homepage of the website

Non-members’ menu page
10-question audit results – accessed from the home page and non-members menu page
Appendix 2 – 10-question audit

The 10-question audit developed through the project acts as the entry point for organisations wanting to participate in the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Project.

The audit asks broad-brush questions on a range of areas relating to fleet safety. Importantly, to encourage participation, these are questions which any fleet manager, risk manager or health and safety manager should be able to answer about their organisation without having to look up any data or check the ‘small print’ of their policies. Equally importantly for busy managers, the audit takes just minutes to complete.

Once participants have completed the audit, they automatically receive feedback on their results and are registered as a member of the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Group.

Although the audit is short, it can still provide a valuable insight into the ‘safety’ of the organisation’s vehicles and drivers, demonstrating the potential benefits of further benchmarking.

The following is taken directly from www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net
Appendix 3 – 30-question audit

Once participants have registered for the project, they receive a username and password which allow them to access the members’ part of the website and enter more detailed data on their organisation, fleet exposure, road safety processes and key performance indicators in a 30-question audit.

The following sample page from the 30-question audit is taken directly from www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net.
Appendix 4 – 168-question audit

Introduction

The following Fleet Audit helps your organisation start to identify any gaps and opportunities in your organisation’s existing fleet risk management approach.

We take you through a series of statements on the following areas to arrive at a thorough assessment, that can be used to make changes and implement sound risk management policies for the future:

- Policy and risk assessment
- Legal compliance
- Organisational leadership and culture
- Travel/in mobility planning
- Driver recruitment, selection and induction
- Driver supervision, monitoring, assessment and training
- Driver wellbeing
- Vehicle selection, checking, maintenance and security
- Safety and fuel management information
- Safety and fuel KPIs.

Failure to properly control any of these areas can lead to increased safety, environmental and operational costs. Our aim is to help you minimise costs and make your organisation more effective and cost efficient.

Driver Health

An appropriate wellbeing programme is in place for new and existing staff, including health, stress and fatigue management, and drug, alcohol and mobile phone use.

Vehicles are ergonomically suited to drivers, minimising the risk of musculoskeletal disorders such as back pain, with drivers given guidance on good posture/posting position.

Drivers understand that they must immediately inform line management of any health or wellbeing issues affecting their ability to drive safely.

Managers can prevent an employee from driving if they consider them to be unfit to do so.
Appendix 5 – marketing flyer

Fleet managers: join the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Group for FREE

FLEET SAFETY BENCHMARKING
www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net

Road risk management is rapidly developing. Is your company keeping up?

Fleet Safety Benchmarking is a completely FREE scheme co-ordinated by the Fleet Safety Forum, a division of road safety charity Brake, and international risk management specialists Interactive Driving Systems®. It aims to help companies effectively manage occupational road risk, working to prevent the 16 deaths and 116 serious injuries that result from at-work driving crashes every week.

It can help you to:

- carry out effective self-audits relating to your fleet safety policies and procedures
- anonymously benchmark your company’s crash data and safety standards with other organisations
- network with other fleet managers

Why should I get involved?

Crash analysis, audits, and benchmarking are crucial to effectively managing road risk, helping you assess your fleet safety processes and policies and identify potential improvements. Companies that manage road risk and reduce company crashes benefit from:

- fulfilling their legal duty of care to employees and communities in which they operate
- improving staff morale and reducing staff turnover and sick-leave
- reducing costs from vehicle and staff down-time, repairs, loss of business and increased insurance premiums
- developing a reputation as a company that cares about its workforce, local communities and providing a quality service to customers

TURN OVER TO FIND OUT HOW TO GET INVOLVED

Brake
the road safety charity
www.brake.org.uk

Interactive Driving Systems

fleetsafetyforum

Department for Transport
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Who can get involved?

Anyone with responsibility for a company fleet of any vehicle type can benefit from this scheme, as long as they have at least 20 drivers or vehicles that are used for work purposes. It does not matter whether the vehicles are owned by the company or employees.

How do I get involved?

Log on to www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net to:

- find out why crash analysis and benchmarking is so important to running a safe fleet
- access best practice case studies about other fleet operators
- download a free guidance sheet by the Fleet Safety Forum on Reporting and Recording Crash Data
- complete a quick 10-question self-audit to identify any gaps in your fleet safety processes and policies
- sign up to the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Group completely FREE of charge

Once you have joined the Group, you will be issued with a username and password, enabling you to access the password-restricted part of the website.

This part of the website includes several tools to help you manage occupational road risk, including a benchmarking form, enabling you to anonymously compare your crash data and safety procedures with other companies, plus 30 and 168 question self-audits enabling you to assess the safety of your drivers, vehicles, journeys and management policies.

You will also be invited to get involved in seminars to share ideas and best practice.

Who organises the Fleet Safety Benchmarking Group?

It is co-ordinated by the Fleet Safety Forum and Interactive Driving Systems®, and funded by the Department for Transport.

Interactive Driving Systems® is an award winning “research-led” provider of global fleet risk management solutions. Since 1995, it has been helping clients to: identify their most ‘at-risk’ drivers; minimise their risks of fatalities, injuries and asset damage; comply with legal requirements; and enhance their brand reputation through safety. To find out more, go to www.virtualriskmanager.net, email support@virtualriskmanager.net or call 01484 400399.
More than 140,000 hard copies and email versions of the flyer were sent out through the following organisations:

- Brake – flyers sent to Fleet Safety Forum subscribers and other Brake contacts, including companies enquiring about the Fleet Safety Forum Awards, requesting free literature from the Fleet Safety Forum, or attending Fleet Safety Forum events
- Interactive Driving Systems® – flyers sent to clients and other key contacts
- ADF Ltd
- Alcolock GB
- ANC Express
- Association of Car Fleet Operators North West
- Association of Professional Transport Managers and Operators
- Churchill H&S Advisory Service
- Coach and Bus Weekly
- Electronic Media Ltd
- Fleet Support Group
- Freight Transport Association
- Freight Transport Review
- GB Tachopak
- Northgate
- Road Operators’ Safety Council
- Road Rescue Recovery Association
- RoadSafe
- Safe And Fuel Efficient Driving scheme
- Suckling Transport
- Transport News Brief

Additional marketing was carried out through listings on websites and circulating copies of the seminar report to members of the Occupational Road Safety Alliance (ORSA).
Appendix 6 – selection of marketing and media coverage

The project has received good media coverage, including the front page of leading UK fleet publication Fleet News.


Media coverage achieved included articles in:
- Fleet News – 29.07.06, 19.04.07, 21.06.07, 06.12.07, 13.12.07 x3, 24.01.08
- Commercial Motor – 03.08.06, 14.06.07
- Motor Transport – 24.01.08
- Work Place Law – 13.04.07
- Newslink – May 07
- ADI News – June 07, July 07
- Driving Magazine – July 07
- Freight Industry Times – summer 07
- Fleet Van – 01.11.07
- Business Car magazine – 23.04.07
- Health Fleet Management magazine – 23.07.07
- www.roadtransport.com – 13.06.07
- Auto Industry News – 25.06.07
- Post magazine – 30.07.07
- Professional Van and Light Truck magazine – November 07

DfT website highlights fleet safety failings

Concerns have been raised that a third of fleet operators are failing to meet their safety obligations to drivers.

The findings come from a benchmarking website launched in April 2007 that has analysed results from 170 fleet managers so far. The Fleet Safety Benchmarking project is run by the Fleet Safety Forum, a division of road safety charity Brake, in partnership with risk management company Interactive Driving Systems.

It is funded by the Department for Transport (DfT) and allows companies to anonymously compare their fleet safety procedures and crash data with other companies.

Statistics generated by the site revealed that only 47% of companies have a Safety, Health and Environmental Management policy (SHEM) and only 44% are optimising work schedules and travel requirements to minimise road risks and encourage drivers to keep within the speed limit.

Only 38% had a system to maintain driver records.


Media coverage achieved included articles in:

- Fleet News – 20.07.06, 19.04.07, 21.06.07, 06.12.07, 13.12.07 x3, 24.01.08
- Commercial Motor – 03.08.06, 14.06.07
- Motor Transport – 24.01.08
- Work Place Law – 13.04.07
- Newslink – May 07
- ADI News – June 07, July 07
- Driving Magazine – July 07
- Freight Industry Times – summer 07
- Fleet Van – 01.11.07
- Business Car magazine – 23.04.07
- Health Fleet Management magazine – 23.07.07
- www.roadtransport.com – 13.06.07
- Auto Industry News – 25.06.07
- Post magazine – 30.07.07
- Professional Van and Light Truck magazine – November 07

Brake launches safety benchmarking website

22 April, 2007

Brake launches a fleet safety benchmarking website to coincide with the United Nations Global Road Safety Week.

The site allows companies to anonymously benchmark their fleet’s accident data and safety levels with those of other companies.

The site also offers independent advice on best practice for reporting and recording crash information. Brake also publishes a monthly newsletter and has a discussion area for members and includes links to other related sites.

See fleet.safetybenchmarking.net for more info.
The project has also been widely networked – which can be seen by undertaking a Google search on ‘Fleet Safety Benchmarking’.

The project website itself gets top listing, but the top 100 ‘hits’ for the search term include mentions of the project on the following websites:

- www.brake.org.uk – Brake’s website, several mentions
- www.virtualriskmanager.net – Interactive Driving Systems® website, several mentions
- www.qbeeurope.com – professional insurance company, operating across Europe
- www.alanboswell.com – motor fleet insurance company, operating across the UK
- www.fleetnews.co.uk – online version of print article
- www.nurs.co.uk – fleet insurer Norwich Union Risk Services
- www.tmanhs.com – online version of Health Fleet Management print article
- www.iota.org.uk – Institute of Transport Administration website
- www.roadsafe.com – UK road safety organisation
- www.dft.gov.uk – mention in road safety minister’s speech
- www.roadtransport.com – news website
- www.driver247.com – car enthusiasts’ and professionals’ website
- www.activedriveringsolutions.com – UK fleet driver training services company
- www.autoindustry.co.uk – online version of Auto Industry News print article
- www.dft.gov.uk/drivingforwork - DfT micro-site for at-work drivers and managers
- www.postonline.co.uk – online version of insurance industry magazine print article
- www.firstvehicleleasing.co.uk – UK leasing company online newsletter
- www.freightbestpractice.org.uk – DfT micro-site for freight operators
- www.larsoa.org.uk – UK road safety officers association website
• **www.srsl.biz** – company offering liability risk management for UK insurers
• **www.businesscar.co.uk** – online version of Business Car magazine article
• **www.drivers.com** – Canadian driver training and driver behaviour specialist company
• **www.ciltuk.org.uk** – UK Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport website
• **www.drivingforbetterbusiness.com** – DfT-funded business champion project website
• **www.sussexsaferroads.gov.uk** – UK local road safety partnership
• **www.vanandlighttruck.co.uk** – online version of Professional Van and Light Truck magazine article
• **http://search.arrow.edu.au** – search engine for Australian University research repositories (Benchmarking seminar report listing, under Queensland University of Technology)
• **www.michigan.gov** – US state government traffic safety newsletter for employers
• **www.geolibrary.org** – global environmental and occupational health e-library
Appendix 7 – steering group meeting minutes

Pilot group meeting - Tuesday 22 May 2007, Wolseley UK, in Leamington Spa

Participants: Interactive Driving Systems®, Royal Mail, Ceva Logistics (formerly TNT), Wolseley UK, Sanofi Avensis
Apologies: Apologies were received from over 50 organisations. A further five organisations did not want to proceed further in the project than undertaking the 10 Question Fleet Audit available at www.fleetsafetybenchmarking.net

Summary of outcomes and action points:
All participants presented their latest initiatives.

To date 162 participants have completed the 10-question audit and 35 have entered their full data into the system.

The data inputted into the system was reviewed in detail. There was discussion about definitions and it was agreed to make several amendments to the system.

The review of the data showed large variances in participant collision rates.

The review of the process data showed that many participants have gaps in their systems.
- Only 20% of participants currently undertake vehicle driver and journey risk assessments.
- 69% of participant organisations did not have a travel plan.
- 42% did not include safe driving in their recruitment process.
- Only a minority of participants focused on driver wellbeing.

This led to a discussion among participants, who took away a range of ideas about the data itself and ways to close gaps in their own procedures. One participant has gone on to undertake the detailed fleet safety audit as part of the program, and another is about to. Another is in the process of launching its driver risk assessment, monitoring and improvement program.

Finally, it was agreed that reminders should be sent to encourage others to participate, and that new organisations completing the 10-question audit should be batched and sent invitations to join on a monthly basis.

Pilot group telephone conference call, Monday 26 February 2007

Participants: Interactive Driving Systems®, British Telecom, Royal Mail, Suckling Transport, Centrica, Ceva Logistics (formerly TNT), Zurich, NETS, PWC, Rentokil
Apologies: Brake, Stagecoach UK Bus, Astra Zeneca, Initial-Rentokil, Cory Environmental, Wincanton, Pfizer, TNT Express UK & Ireland, Nestlé Waters, Wolseley UK

Aims of meeting: The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Department for Transport Benchmarking Project, reach final agreement on the process and outcomes benchmarks to use based on a pre-circulated paper and set a date for a face to face meeting of the benchmarking group.

Summary of outcomes and action points:
All participants introduced themselves, and then discussed the benchmarks in detail. It was agreed that the online form for data collection should have 4 sections:
- Organisational details and data period.
- Fleet exposure and incidents.
- Work-related road safety processes and systems.
- Key performance indicators.
The following key points emerged:
- Vehicle type definitions should be tightened.
- Collision type definitions should be set out clearly.
- Costs should be removed.
- OCRS score should be included for commercial vehicles

Pilot group meeting - Thursday 30 November 2006, Birmingham

Participants:
Interactive Driving Systems®, ESB, British Telecom, Wolseley UK

Summary of outcomes and action points:
All participants agreed that the benchmarking process should continue in early 2007.

Agreed that process was important as well as data, and participants at the next meeting should all be asked to undertake a short presentation on process initiatives as well as data outcomes.

As in previous meetings, the discussion focused on exactly what data to collect. All participants felt that the data collection process should be kept as simple as possible, with very basic KPIs such as:
- Collisions per vehicle
- Collisions per 100,000 miles
- Breakdown by vehicle type - car, truck, van bus
- Process/ audit questions

It was felt that the process questions should not be too detailed to put off participants, approximately 30 questions – but that if participants wanted a more detailed process based audit then this should be available too.