A NEW NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY 2021 to 2030

REPORT ON CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS ON
POLICY PRIORITIES
AUGUST 2020

OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

Contents

Introduction

A new National Road Safety Strategy for the decade 2021-30 will set the direction of our road safety focus for the next decade with vision zero as a long-term objective. The Strategy will be a national document, agreed by all jurisdictions through the Infrastructure and Transport Ministers Meeting (formerly the Transport Infrastructure Council).

In August 2019, Council committed to developing the new Strategy based on a target of zero fatalities and made road safety a standing item for its meetings. In response to the *Inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020*, Council agreed all that investment for road infrastructure planning, design and construction will require the application of safe system principles and inclusion of safety treatments that align with these principles. They also agreed the existing road network will be improved through prioritisation of mass action programs to reduce road trauma, the process for legislative and regulatory changes for vehicle safety to improve the uptake of new safety technology will be streamlined, road safety capacity will be reviewed, and all jurisdictions will work with local governments to improve engagement and resourcing for road safety.

In November 2019, Council committed to positioning Australia to achieve the vision zero target by 2050 and agreed to the framework of the new Strategy and it be underpinned by safe system principles. Council framed the new Strategy around three key themes: Safe Roads, Safe Vehicles and Safe Road Use. Speed is to be considered within each of the themes.

In June 2020, Council considered a set of proposed policy priorities aimed at responding to our greatest road safety challenges over the next decade and agreed to them being tested further through a consultation process with the road safety community.

Council also agreed to separate targets for the reduction in annual road deaths and the reduction in serious injuries by 2030 and that these will be defined as a percentage per capita to recognise the upward pressure of population growth.

This report details the consultation undertaken on the set of proposed policy priorities, including the process, the feedback received and the implications for the development of the Strategy. It is intended to capture the key sentiments and breadth of views of the stakeholder consultation process.

The feedback received from stakeholders is represented in two parts within this report. Section 1 outlines feedback received specific to each of the proposed policy priorities. In addition to feedback on the proposed policy priorities, a small number of stakeholders raised views or issues related more broadly to the Strategy development or which related to all 11 priorities. This is summarised in Section 2 of the report.

It is important to note that this report is intended to represent the views put forward by stakeholders as part of the consultation process. The issues outlined in Sections 1 and 2 of this report are a reflection of stakeholder views and comments – they do not represent government policy. This report does not represent every comment made by stakeholders individually, rather it aims to broadly represent the issues raised. Similar views have been represented once and are not weighted (within the relevant area of Section 1 or 2), and the report also represents views raised that conflicted with others to reflect the discussion that took place. For example, stakeholders consistently raised that speed management needed to be considered within the Strategy and felt this needed more prominence (represented once in Section 2), however the specific views related to speed management were broad ranging (represented throughout Section 1, where relevant).

Consultation process

In July-August 2020, the Office of Road Safety provided around 70 stakeholder groups with a discussion paper, outlining the 11 proposed key policy priorities for the new Strategy. These priorities were identified as the most important based on evidence from the national road crash data set. They aimed to set our national direction for road safety over the next decade.

To ensure a broad set of views and aligning with the intended social model approach for the Strategy, which recognises that road safety should not be solely viewed as a transport issue, a range of stakeholder groups were invited to participate in the consultation process including key road safety stakeholders, indigenous representative groups, health and education, and professional development groups. Around 50 organisations took up the opportunity to participate in the process. A full list of participating organisations is at **Appendix A**.

The aim of the process was to understand stakeholder views on the priorities, including:

- Their importance and whether this is the right set of priority areas for the new Strategy to focus on
- Which, if any, priorities were seen as being of less importance to focus on
- Evidence that supports the inclusion of other priorities of greater importance

> ## 11 ORIGINAL PRIORITIES
>
> - Infrastructure planning and investment
> - Regional road safety
> - Remote road safety
> - Vulnerable road users
> - Motorcyclists
> - Vehicle safety
> - Heavy vehicle safety
> - High-risk behaviour
> - Enforcement
> - Better post-crash care
> - Workplace related road trauma

Stakeholders were invited to participate in a facilitated group discussion (held online due to COVID-19 restrictions), provide written feedback or to have a one-on-one conversation with the Office of Road Safety (via tele or video conference). Stakeholders who participated in group or one-on-one conversations were also encouraged to provide further detailed feedback or evidence to support their views on the priorities via email.

Forty-two stakeholder groups participated in nine 90-minute, virtual group discussions between 29 July – 7 August 2020. Each discussion was led by an independent facilitator to guide discussion and included between two and nine stakeholder organisations. The Office of Road Safety opened each discussion with an overview of the development of the new Strategy and the consultation process. All participants were provided the opportunity to provide their broad feedback on the proposed set of 11 priorities, before working through views on the individual priorities.

The discussions were interactive and the Office of Road Safety actively participated in the conversations. As part of these conversations, the Office of Road Safety responded to issues raised by stakeholders, for example by clarifying the intent of a particular priority or by addressing misconceptions and answering stakeholder questions (note that this report does not represent the responses provided by the Office of Road Safety during discussions). A further three stakeholder groups provided written feedback but did not participate in a group or one on one meeting. A number of observers also joined the sessions, including members of the cross-jurisdiction Working Group.

In addition to the group discussions, a further nine organisations held one-on-one conversations with the Office of Road Safety about the priorities or provided written feedback. A number of stakeholders also provided additional evidence or feedback by email, in support of their comments made through discussions.

High-level summaries of each meeting, designed to capture the key issues raised in relation to the priorities were developed and provided to participants.

Consultation outcomes

Overall, there was broad agreement from stakeholders with the set of 11 priorities, with the majority supporting most of the identified priorities as the key areas of focus at a national level, noting that these were the areas where the most gains could be made over the next decade. Some priorities were seen as less important than others as issues of national focus, while it was noted that some may make better sense to be combined with another priority.

There was support for the planned approach to the Strategy, including focussing on a discrete set of priorities, as outlined in the Australian Government's response to the findings of the *2018 Inquiry into the implementation of the National Road Safety Strategy 2011-20*.

Discussions largely focussed on the detail within the priorities and suggested actions to be taken, with key themes emerging across the discussions to be taken forward for the Strategy.

The consultation process identified the following key areas of focus within the Strategy priorities:

- need for improving the national collection and analysis of data across a range of metrics
- investment tied to targeted road safety outcomes over the life of the Strategy
- support to build capability at the local government level
- the development of consistent national frameworks (speed management, connected and autonomous vehicle safety and infrastructure, novice motorcycle riders)
- specialised areas of support for Indigenous Australians
- coordinated enforcement approaches, including technical solutions (mobile phone, seatbelt, speed detection)
- acceleration of regulatory vehicle standards
- a focus on heavy vehicle and driver competency improvements
- separation for vulnerable road users, especially in line with the growth of cycling, micro mobility devices and an exponential increase in serious injuries.

Based on the comments received, it is proposed that nine priority focus areas be taken forward in the draft Strategy, with Indigenous Australians to be added as a standalone area of focus, enforcement and high risk behaviour to be combined, post-crash care to be considered within the remote road safety priority, and motorbike riders to be considered within the vulnerable road user priority.

NINE REFINED POLICY PRIORITIES		
Infrastructure planning & investment	Vehicle safety	Indigenous Australians
Regional road safety	Heavy Vehicle Safety	Vulnerable road users
Remote road safety	Vehicles as a workplace	Risky road use

A small number of stakeholders raised concerns that the discussion paper did not outline how the Strategy would address the inquiry findings, along with those of the subsequent *Review into national road safety governance arrangements*, and sought clarification on how this would be addressed within the Strategy. The Office of Road Safety noted that the intent of the discussion paper was to focus on key policy priority areas for national focus, as opposed to addressing the implementation and governance arrangements of the new Strategy. The purpose of this consultation was to understand whether the 11 identified priorities were the right areas of focus for the Strategy, being the areas where the largest gains can be made nationally. See Section 2 for issues raised outside the purpose of the consultation and the proposed policy priorities circulated for consultation.

Specific issues raised on the proposed priorities by stakeholders are outlined in Section 1. The issues raised will be taken into account in the Strategy development where practicable (including the changes to the priority focus areas

outlined above), noting that some issues raised are not within the scope of the Strategy while others are suggested actions, which may be taken into account in development of Action Plans to support the Strategy.

Section 1 Key issues

Priority: Infrastructure Planning and Investment

Specified objectives

- Focus on planning and design, and influence land use and transport planning to ensure investment improves road safety outcomes
- Address trauma at intersections through design and operations

What we asked

- What data needs to be collected?
- What actions could be taken?

What we heard

Infrastructure planning and investment was seen as a key priority by the majority of stakeholders. Many thought that the priority and its objectives needed to be expanded, including through additional objectives beyond the existing intersection focussed objective.

There was consistent support for safe system principles to be incorporated within infrastructure planning and for safety outcomes to be associated with government investment. In addition, the need to consider road safety outcomes as part of land use planning was supported, with many noting that infrastructure should be designed with the most vulnerable road user as a priority.

A need for further emphasis on speed management was consistently raised within this priority and many raised reduction of speed limits and the use of point to point speed cameras as effective measures.

The need to plan and design infrastructure to accommodate emerging and anticipated vehicle technology was raised by many, for example ensuring compatibility of line markings with lane keep assist technology. Additionally, it was noted that there is potential to collect more data from connected infrastructure, which could provide insight into causal factors for road crashes.

Theme	Issue raised
Planning and design	Movement and Place needs to be included as the main framework governing planning for transport infrastructure. This should take account of infrastructure use and the safety features and treatments required. This approach is being applied to an extent in urban and town centre settings, but needs to be extended to regional and remote areas, particularly connecting roads.
	Road planning should consider separating road users by type, to reduce the risk associated with collision. For example, separating heavy vehicles from light vehicles where possible and providing greater separation for vulnerable road users, particularly pedal cycle riders who are often riding on the road mixed with motorised vehicle traffic.
	A hierarchy of infrastructure treatments is needed based on their potential to reduce harm, to provide guidance material for practitioners to implement.

Speed management	Point to point speed cameras to enforce speed limits and promote consistent speed provides significant benefits and should be used more widely.
	Reducing speed limits provides clear road safety benefits and should be considered, particularly on high risk roads.
Prioritising investment	Given that funding may be limited, data is needed to identify where road safety investments are needed and could make the most improvement. This could likely be achieved through matching and analysing existing data sets.
Ensuring road safety outcomes	Funding provided for road projects should be tied to clear deliverables/key performance indicators related to road safety improvements.
Priority coverage	The objectives within this priority specifically call out intersections, however this should be broadened or added to, to take account of other road environments in which trauma frequently occurs.
Accountability/ Governance	The Strategy should clearly articulate what the different levels of government are responsible for delivering (in terms of infrastructure), making it clear who is accountable and can deliver on what.
Business case development	The long-term and far reaching benefits of road safety treatments should be considered in business cases for new/upgraded infrastructure projects (for example lives saved, health and response costs).
Professional development	A need to build capability of practitioners, particularly within local governments, to better understand the safe system approach and how to apply it in practice.
Education	There is a need to educate the wider community on the benefits of safety treatments as part of infrastructure investment, to understand the benefit associated with road works and infrastructure spending.
Data	There is a need to understand the contribution of infrastructure to road crashes. Crash investigations often focus on the primary cause, however there is a need to understand broader contributing factors as they relate to the crash outcome, e.g. what was the condition of the road on which the crash occurred?

Priority: Regional road safety

Specified objective

- Improve the safety outcomes on high-speed regional roads by preventing run off road and head on crashes.

What we asked

- How could we support people in adopting changes to improve safety, given resources are limited for infrastructure treatments?

What we heard

Stakeholders supported regional road safety as one the key priority areas for the Strategy and agreed with the characterisation of the issues within the discussion paper.

While quality of the road network (unsealed roads, limited line markings, no shoulders) was seen as a key contributing factor, it was also acknowledged that due to the length of the road network widespread road safety upgrades would be a significant undertaking with a long timeframe and high costs. The use of a road was also acknowledged as a factor to be taken into account. Discussion focussed on alternative solutions, including grass-roots education with regard to speed and safe road behaviours, use of low cost treatments and speed management, particularly through the use of point to point speed cameras.

Theme	Issue raised
Planning and design	Safety treatments to prevent or reduce the severity of run off road crashes and head on collisions should be prioritised.
	Low cost, high influence treatments should be considered and prioritised, including understanding the incremental safety improvements associated with safety treatments.
	Given the length of regional roads, there is a need to prioritise road upgrades based on risk and road use, such as roads used by service vehicles.
	Infrastructure readiness to be compatible with new vehicle technology is an issue, particularly outside of urban areas.
Education	The need to educate on safe road use and influence change in driver behaviour was raised as a key way to effect change in regional road safety. This needs to be done from a community/local level by people who understand the issues facing a particular community. The social model approach may assist with this, but a concerted focus is required.
	There is a need to include children and youth within road safety education to foster long-term cultural change within communities.
	Access to good driver training is an issue in regional areas, including due to availability and affordability of instructors.
Speed management	Consider reducing speed limits based on risk, noting that there could be more community acceptance for speed limit reduction on high risk roads. Potential impact on businesses due to longer driving times should also be considered.
	The use of point to point speed cameras should be considered as an effective measure.
Heavy vehicles	There is high usage of regional roads by heavy vehicles and this needs to be considered in addressing this priority.
	Statistics and discussion about the number of fatalities and serious injuries from crashes on regional roads involving heavy vehicles per billion vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT).

Vehicles	There is a need to encourage fleet renewal in regional areas, with great potential for newer vehicle technologies to reduce issues prominent in regional areas including head on collisions and run off road crashes.
Professional development	There are skill gaps in some regional councils in relation to planning and delivery of safe road networks, including availability and benefits of low cost treatments
Technology	The use of technology to monitor issues like driver fatigue and alertness is less reliable in regional and remote areas.
Maintenance	Poor road maintenance is a particular issue for motorcycles in regional areas.

Priority: Remote road safety

Specified objective

- Acknowledge the specific issues in remote and very remote areas, including largely unsealed road networks

What we asked

- How might we take into account the different starting points of each jurisdiction to ensure reasonable actions going forward?

What we heard

Stakeholders agreed that remote road safety should be included as a key priority for the Strategy and that remote and regional road safety should be considered separately. While acknowledging that a number of the road safety issues faced in regional areas are issues for remote areas as well, there are additional and specific issues related to remote road safety.

Many stakeholders raised the need for more of an understanding of the issues, where the risks are and what has been proven to work well.

The need to consider remote Indigenous communities was also raised, with a desire for the Strategy to have a greater focus on this group and to acknowledge the specific issues, risks and barriers faced for Indigenous communities.

Theme	Issue raised
Knowledge base	There is a need to gain deeper understanding of the issues contributing to remote road safety and where successes have been achieved. This will assist in developing plans for addressing remote road safety.
	Need to understand the starting points for different areas, what their infrastructure baseline is and how works can be prioritised, what the risks are and who faces them.
Indigenous Australians	There is a need to focus on road safety for Indigenous communities, particularly in remote areas, and understand the specific issues faced and identify ways to work with communities to address them.

Heavy vehicles	There are specific issues presented for heavy vehicles in remote and regional areas, including infrastructure needs (e.g. rest stops), climate conditions (e.g. weather such as extreme temperatures) and the different industries/vehicle types operating in these areas.

Priority: Vulnerable road users

Specified objective

- Support for vulnerable road users in areas with high levels of pedestrian and cycling activity

What we asked

- What are the gaps in our coverage of this priority area?
- What actions could be taken?

What we heard

Vulnerable road users were seen as a clear priority for the Strategy.

The consultation process identified gaps in the coverage of this priority area. The priority needs to be expanded to account for the various types of vulnerable road users, beyond focussing on pedestrians and cyclists in urban areas. This includes micro-mobility users, for example people on e-bikes, scooters, skateboards etc.

A number of stakeholders also raised the increasing number of vulnerable road users associated with the Gig economy, for example delivery workers on bikes and e-bikes. It was noted that the highest demand for these services is during peak hours and in times of poor light (e.g. dinner delivery), and sometimes in adverse weather conditions, like rain, where consumers may opt for meal delivery. There will also be a need to address both short and long term disruption that may lead to an increase in vulnerable road users, for example the likely increase in vulnerable road users and micro-mobility devices contributed to by COVID-19 pandemic, including through higher demand for delivery services and increased active transport/reduced use of public transport.

Infrastructure planning and design was another key area of focus for discussion, ensuring vulnerable road users are catered for within road design and separating them from road traffic where possible.

Speed management was consistently raised, noting the reduction in severity of crash impact at lower speeds.

The social model approach was seen as particularly valuable for this priority, noting its linkages to health and place making/land use planning.

Theme	Issue raised
Priority coverage	There is an exponential increase in micro-mobility users associated with the Gig economy, which has been compounded by increasing use of these services due to COVID-19 restrictions.
	The vulnerable road user group is increasing and broadening to include more types of road users, including e-bikes, e-scooters and other micro-mobility devices.
	Traffic management and road workers should be included within the vulnerable road user category.
	The priority currently focusses on urban areas and should be expanded to consider vulnerable road users in regional and remote areas.

	Different vulnerable road users have different needs and should be considered separately within the Strategy and for funding allocation, for example pedestrians, cyclists, young children and low speed vehicle run overs.
Planning and design	Corridor design should consider separation for vulnerable road users to avoid the risk of collision with both light and heavy vehicles.
	Vulnerable road users should be given greater priority in infrastructure design, rather than focussing on vehicle traffic.
	Traffic calming measures should be considered to protect vulnerable road users, particularly in urban areas.
	Consider infrastructure changes such as countdown timers at crossings and scramble crossings.
Speed management	Consider reducing speed limits to 30 km/hr in areas of high pedestrian (and other vulnerable road user activity) to reduce risk of fatality and severity of injury for vulnerable road users.
	Speed limit reduction to 10 km/hr on shared paths and in shared spaced within car parks.
Heavy vehicles	Significant construction work in urban areas results in increased interactions between construction associated traffic, including heavy vehicles and pedestrians. There are a number of ways to understand and address this issue to improve safety, including through encouraging/regulating contractual requirements around road safety, education, traffic management and vehicle technology.
	There are a number of vehicle safety features and technologies that assist with protecting vulnerable road users from collision with heavy vehicles, however there are barriers for their use in Australia including not regulating use or regulations that prevent use (e.g. vehicle width).
Education	There needs to be a concerted effort to educate all road users on sharing the road with others, to encourage road users to understand the risks and how their behaviour contributes to risk. Need to foster a culture that the road is for all, in keeping with the social model approach.
Technology	Increased uptake of technologies such as autonomous emergency braking and motion sensor detection systems could help to protect vulnerable road users.
Social model	The social model approach could be applied to addressing issues relevant to vulnerable road users, including incorporating health aspects associated with active transport and land use planning to prioritise vulnerable road user needs.

Priority: Motorcyclists

Specified objective

- Address risks specific to motorcyclists

What we asked

- What are the gaps in our coverage of this priority area?

A number of stakeholders noted that addressing motorcyclist safety is a challenging priority and there a few levers available to make improvements, most of which may fall within other priorities.

Education was a key focus for discussion, both for motorcyclists and for drivers of other vehicles. Within this, education and training for motorcyclists sharing the road with heavy vehicles was specifically raised.

Consideration of motorcyclists within infrastructure and planning, improved protective equipment and safety technologies, and addressing safety through licensing requirements were also raised.

Theme	Issue raised
Education	Hazard perception training for both motorcycle riders and vehicle drivers to provide greater understanding of the risks associated with motorcycles. For motorcyclists this is about understanding and managing their own risks.
	Support for increased safety campaigns around sharing the road with motorcycles.
Technology	Important not to rely too heavily on safety technologies for motorcyclists, noting that rider skills, education and behaviour will make the largest safety difference.
	The Strategy should promote the use of best practice safety equipment and protective wear (beyond helmets) and also encourage uptake of improvements to safety equipment and protective wear, for example jackets with airbags.
Planning and design	Infrastructure design needs to take account of motorcycles, be built to accommodate motorcyclist needs and be mindful not to present hazards.
Licensing	Licensing was noted as the largest policy lever to make safety improvements for motorcyclists.

Priority: Vehicle safety

Specified objective

- Enhance the safety standards of new vehicles and increase awareness of the safety of the existing vehicle fleet

What we asked

- How do we capture and reflect emerging vehicle technologies over the life of the new Strategy?

What we heard

Vehicle safety was agreed as a high priority, noting the potential reduction in road crashes, deaths and serious injuries associated with a safer fleet.

Many stakeholders raised the process for mandating new vehicle safety technologies through the Australian Design Rules, suggesting that improvements need to be made in the speed of this process, along with reducing barriers to the introduction/use of new technologies presented by the regulatory system.

The age of the vehicle fleet was raised, with stakeholders advocating for mechanisms to encourage fleet age reduction and therefore increase overall vehicle safety.

Stakeholders also observed the need to educate drivers on the benefits and use of new technologies, noting that safety gains would be highest when consumers understood how to best use safety features.

The need to take into account the changing vehicle fleet was also raised, including accounting for likely changes over the life of the Strategy and emerging trends, such as increased prevalence of micro-mobility vehicles.

Theme	Issue raised
Regulation	The length of the process to introduce new Australian Design Rules that mandate vehicle safety features and technology was raised by a number of stakeholders, advocating for more safety technologies to be mandated sooner.
	Decrease barriers for technologies implemented in other countries to be introduced in Australia.
	Advocacy for harmonisation with the United Nations Working Party 29 regulations and EU regulations.
	Need to consider emerging trends and risks in child restraints to ensure regulation continues to address safety issues.
Fleet	Mechanisms should be considered to reduce fleet age, resulting in safer vehicles, including reducing fleet age for at risk drivers such as young drivers and those in lower socioeconomic areas.
	The Strategy should consider the likely change to the vehicle fleet and technologies over its 10-year span, forward plan for regulating these changes and the flow on effects to this and other priorities, for example infrastructure planning and investment. This includes connected and automated vehicles and the potential for increased data collection.
	Suggestion to mandate a minimum safety star rating for new and imported vehicles.
	The priority should address the range of new vehicle types within the Australian market, including micro-mobility vehicles.
Technology	Penetration of new technologies into the vehicle fleet was raised as a priority, either through mandating use or through consumer focussed systems (e.g. ANCAP star ratings).
	Safety technologies have significant potential to improve road safety, however there is a need to educate drivers/consumers on their benefits and how to use them.
	Infrastructure readiness to be compatible with new vehicle technology is an issue, particularly outside of urban areas, for example unsealed roads present high risk and are not compatible with technology such as lane keep assist.
Data	New vehicles and technologies offer potential for increased vehicle-generated data collection. Collecting such data could provide greater understanding of causal factors, as well as the role of technologies in reducing crash severity.

Priority: Heavy Vehicle safety

Specified objective

- Improve safety of, and around heavy vehicles

What we asked

- What would make the biggest difference in reducing heavy vehicle involvement in crashes?

What we heard

Heavy vehicle safety was agreed as a key area of focus for the Strategy. A number of the issues raised in relation to this priority were also raised in relation to the vehicle safety priority, including the regulatory process for mandating fitment of safety technologies, reducing barriers to usage of new technology where it is not mandated and reduction of fleet age.

A need to better understand the risk factors associated with heavy vehicle crashes was raised, noting that increased data collection and detailed crash investigations could provide a greater knowledge base and understanding of priorities for addressing heavy vehicle safety.

Education for all road users on how to safely interact with heavy vehicles was consistently raised by stakeholders.

Suicide by truck was acknowledged as a particular issue for the heavy vehicle industry, with stakeholders commenting that further understanding of the extent of the issue is needed to determine how best to address it.

Theme	Issue raised
Regulation	The length of the process to introduce new Australia Design Rules that mandate heavy vehicle safety features and technology was raised by a number of stakeholders, advocating for more safety technologies to be mandated sooner.
	Decrease barriers for technologies implemented in other countries to be introduced in Australia.
	No blame, detailed investigations into heavy vehicle crashes should be undertaken to provide a greater understanding of the risks and causal factors.
	Acknowledging and rewarding good safety practices by heavy vehicle operators and drivers could have a strong impact on safety, for example the Performance Based Standards and National Heavy Vehicle Accreditation Scheme.
Planning and design	Corridors with high usage of heavy vehicles should be designed accordingly, to reduce heavy vehicle safety risks as well as risks to other road users, for example separation from vulnerable road users.
	Changes to wire rope barriers should be considered, to prevent rollover of heavy vehicles.
	Consider implementation of Construction Logistics and Cyclist Safety (CLOCS) standards to protect vulnerable road users.
Chain of responsibility	The whole supply chain needs to be responsible and educated on heavy vehicle safety, often the pressures or conditions placed on drivers by others in the supply chain are major contributors to safety issues.

	Chain of Responsibility legislation should be broadened to consider the responsibilities of the wider supply chain and a wider range of issues, such as age and safety of the heavy vehicle fleet.
Fleet	Mechanisms should be considered to reduce the heavy vehicle fleet age, resulting in safer heavy vehicles and greater penetration of safety technologies.
	Consider how fitment of safety equipment can be incentivised for heavy vehicle owners and operators.
Priority coverage	Fatigue should be included as in issue within the priority.
	The priority should have a greater focus on multi-vehicle crashes involving a heavy vehicle, to balance with the focus on single-vehicle crashes. As part of this, it should be highlighted that that the truck driver is not at fault for the majority of multi-vehicle heavy vehicle crashes.
Education	There is an ongoing need to educate other road users about how to share the road with heavy vehicles.
Data	Increased data collection and analysis is required to understand the extent of heavy vehicle safety issues, the causal factors and contributors. A number of operators currently collect data, however this is not available at a national level.

Priority: High-risk behaviour

Specified objective

- Address high-risk road use

What we asked

- How do we engage the average driver in understanding risk?

What we heard

Stakeholders supported the inclusion of this priority and its intent, however throughout the consultation it was made clear that the language required refinement to more broadly capture the types of behaviours and issues of focus within the priority. The Office of Road Safety clarified through discussions this priority was not to address extreme and reckless behaviour (characterised as intentional disregard for the law), but activities many Australians (the 'average driver') do not identify as high risk (driving at inappropriate speeds e.g. 'just a little over', driving while fatigued, distracted or inattentive, overcrowded vehicles and walking near or on roads after drinking alcohol or illegal drug use).

One of the strongest themes in discussing this topic was the need for cultural change and education about what constitutes risky behaviour, along with what the risks and consequences are. This was supported by a need to understand the motivators behind drivers engaging in risky behaviour.

Stakeholders commented that while enforcement is a key part of addressing illegal behaviour, there is also a need to reinforce positive behaviours and reward good driving. It was also noted that drivers are increasingly engaging with risks around distraction (e.g. mobile phone use), particularly younger drivers.

While there were seen to be advantages with vehicle technology to monitor and warn drivers about risky behaviour, it was also noted that the increasing prevalence of technology within cars can pose additional risks through distraction.

Theme	Issue raised
Education	Cultural change is needed to educate the community on what constitutes risky behaviour.
	Risky road use should be addressed for young drivers (e.g. through driver training programs), helping learners to understand what the risks are, what constitutes risky behaviour and what the consequences are (e.g. the long-term consequences of serious injury/trauma).
	There is a need for a community driven approach to calling out and reducing acceptance of behaviours that put others at risk.
	There should be a culture of reinforcing safe behaviours through reward and praise, rather than punitive measures.
	In order to influence behaviour change, we need to understand the motivators of behaviour and why people are engaging with a level of risk.
	There is a need to understand the level of cognitive impairment for some older drivers and the road safety risks it may present to them and others.
Priority coverage	Terminology within the priority and its title need to be adjusted to clearly reflect the problem we are trying to address and help drivers to understand that everyday behaviours can present road risk.
	The focus of the priority is currently on detection of risky behaviours, but should equally focus on prevention.
	The behaviour being referred to within the category should be defined, noting that some research suggests that increase/decrease in risk within 5 km/h of the speed limit is not enough to result in any change in the number of casualty crashes.
Technology	There is a need to address increasing technology-based distraction and the culture that engaging with technology while driving is acceptable, particularly in young drivers.
	Technology should be used to detect risks, collect and analyse data, automate enforcement and monitor drivers' engagement with risky behaviour.
Heavy vehicles	There is a need to understand and address what contributes to heavy vehicle drivers engaging with risk, for example pressures from other areas within the supply chain.
	Work to understand how fatigue and distraction monitoring technologies can detect and address these risks for heavy vehicle drivers.
Indigenous Australians	There are barriers for some Indigenous communities around access to a driver's license, rescindment of licenses and driving unlicensed, which conflict with cultural and community pressures around driving.

Planning and design	Road environment and infrastructure can sometimes lead to risky behaviour. Consider user centred design to encourage safe behaviour.

Priority: Enforcement

Specified objective

- Coordinate enforcement strategies to lower road safety risk

What we asked

- How do we gain acceptance of technology-based enforcement tools?

What we heard

Enforcement was seen as less of a focus area and not agreed with as being a standalone priority. Stakeholders noted that issues related to enforcement could largely be considered within the high-risk behaviour priority.

Consultation with organisations representing Indigenous Australians raised a number of issues related to enforcement, however these also related to other road safety and broader social considerations.

Theme	Issue raised
Priority coverage	Enforcement as a top priority for national focus does not seem to fit or have the same need attached to it as a number of other priorities.
	Consider options beyond the punitive approach to provide information and feedback to drivers.
	Enforcement should not be seen as a stand-alone activity, especially for speed. It needs to be integrated with road engineering, behaviour change programs, etc.
Technology	There is a need to increase and encourage acceptance of technology-based enforcement techniques.
	Technologies can be used to create a controlled environment in line with laws, for example alcohol interlock.
	High levels of enforcement are required to make a significant difference, which may be assisted by use of new technologies.
Indigenous Australians	A lack of access to justice often leads to people being imprisoned and their license revoked due to a series of fines for small infringements.
	There is a need for targeted education, awareness and intervention at the community level, supporting local empowerment within communities for following and enforcing rules. Unlicensed driving, or overloading a vehicle may be deemed acceptable within communities due to broader pressures, such as a need for transporting family members long distances for medical treatment when public transport is infrequent and expensive (for example from Alice Springs to Yuendumu).

Priority: Better post-crash care

Specified objective

- Focus on improvements outside major cities

What we asked

- What do we need to do to make a difference in regional and remote communities?

What we heard

Better post-crash care was seen as an issue within regional and particularly remote areas, however stakeholders questioned whether it should be considered as a standalone priority focus for the strategy. Broadly, it was noted that the post-crash response system works relatively well in Australia, with improvements to be made in remote and regional areas to improve response time.

The consultation sessions had less discussion on better post-crash care than on other proposed priority areas. Points made included the potential for technology such as automatic crash notification systems or e-call to improve location identification, particularly in regional and remote areas, and therefore response time. Stakeholders also suggested looking at ways to involve the broader community, through response education and use of private or third party resources where available.

Theme	Issue raised
Priority coverage	Post-crash care is an issue in remote areas, however may not be a standalone focus issue for the Strategy.
	Metro, remote and regional are very different in relation to post-crash care. A better understanding of the stages of response and what can be done in regional and remote areas to address them would be helpful.
	For post-crash response, the whole chain of the response should be considered to understand what could help at different points within the response.
Capacity	Improvements to capacity and resources for regional and remote hospitals to deal with road trauma would assist in response.
	Look at what infrastructure, facilities and resources are available in the community or leverage third parties to help with response, beyond the health care system, for example training for community members, properties with helicopters or motoring clubs.
Technology	Technologies, such as automatic crash notification systems and eCall, offer great potential to improve response times especially for remote areas.
	Further research is needed on the application of such technology and its effectiveness.
Social model	Noted that improvements for post-crash care would require a broader approach than road safety and work across various areas of government, including infrastructure and health.

Priority: Workplace related road trauma

Specified objective

- Reduce workplace related road trauma

What we asked

- How do we get this priority built into an organisation's value chain?

What we heard

Significant support was received for the Strategy to have a priority focus area related to workplace road safety. Stakeholders commented that this is a significant issue, which has not been considered previously within national road safety, and noted that focussing on this issue could make a marked difference to road safety outcomes. Limited issues were raised in relation to the priority, with stakeholders noting that the issue was covered well.

Discussion raised examples of work previously done in this area, including Austroads workplace guide developed in collaboration with the Heads of Workplace Safety Authorities.

It was also noted that achieving cultural change with regard to road safety in workplaces would have a flow on effect to the broader community, raising awareness of road safety issues and encouraging workers to bring the practices put in place in the workplace to their personal driving.

Theme	Issue raised
Priority coverage	The priority should draw on previous work done in relation to workplace related road trauma by Austroads in collaboration with the Heads of Workplace Safety Authorities
	Grey fleets (privately owned cars used for business purposes) should be specifically mentioned within this priority, as an area of limited focus previously.
	Workplace related crashes may be underestimated. Statistics show that about 30 per cent of travel is work related, which if extrapolated to the road toll would mean about 400 fatalities are work related.
	Use of safety management systems to put in place and monitor workplace road safety practices/policies.
	Promoting the potential cost savings as a result of improving road safety for a workplace would assist in businesses engaging with this issue.
Social model	Cultural change to make road safety a priority within workplaces will overtime have a flow on effect to the broader community, raising awareness of road safety.

Section 2 (overarching feedback – outside 11 priorities circulated for consultation)

Separate to specific feedback on each of 11 priorities, some stakeholders raised broad issues related to the Strategy's development and implementation.

A number of these sat broadly across the proposed priorities, for example most stakeholders raised the need for greater data collection and public reporting in relation to a range of road safety measures as well as the need for speed management to be more broadly represented across the 11 priorities. Stakeholders also discussed the social model approach and were interested to understand how it would be implemented, including the range of organisations that would be involved.

A small number of stakeholders also raised issues unrelated to the 11 priorities, including how the Strategy would address the findings of the *Inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy 2021-30* and the subsequent review into governance arrangements. While governments have already responded to these pieces of work, the Strategy will clearly set out how the actions to support the priority areas will be delivered and reported on. These issues were not explicitly addressed within the 11 priorities, however the paper distributed to support the consultation outlined that transport ministers had previously agreed a range of items related to the Strategy in response to the inquiry and review, including that the Strategy would be framed around the three key themes of Safe Roads, Safe Vehicles and Safe Road Use, with speed to be considered within each of the themes, and that it would focus on a discrete set of policy priorities.

Theme	Issue raised
Data	There is a need to broaden national data collection and make data available to the public to provide a wider picture of the landscape and issues. This includes: • Further collection and reporting of causal factors • National serious injury data – consistent national definition and data collection • Reporting more broadly than crash data, for example star rating of roads
Governance	The new Strategy needs to clearly articulate how it will address governance issues identified by the *Inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy 2011-30* and the subsequent review into governance arrangements.
	The Commonwealth's role in the Strategy's implementation needs to be clearly defined.
Fatalities and serious injuries	Within all priorities, there seems to be a disproportionate emphasis on fatalities over serious injuries. This needs to be more balanced, particularly as advances in medicine and vehicle safety mean a reduction in fatalities over time and likely increase in serious injuries.
Safe system approach	The safe system approach should form the basis and structure of the Strategy and the priorities are not all sufficiently linked to the safe system pillars.
	The Safe System approach is a good starting point, however is insufficient to properly address road safety. The Strategy should consider other safety regimes which reach beyond engineering

	(infrastructure treatments), education and enforcement to embrace risk management, safety management systems and safety culture as the means of managing risks to safety.
The social model	Significant support for the social model approach, however there is a need to more clearly articulate the intention of the social model approach, its linkages to the priorities and identify how it will be implemented.
Speed management	The outline paper lacked a mention of speed management, which was seen as relevant to the majority of priorities. As one of the safe system pillars and a key factor in road safety, speed management needs to be included in the Strategy.
COVID-19	Almost all groups raised the pandemic and its potential impact on road safety, given the decrease in private vehicle use and public transport and the increase in cycling, walking and other forms of active and passive transport in recent months. It was also noted by a small number the rapid collection and reporting of regular data related to the pandemic could be applied to road deaths and serious injuries, assisting to educate the broader community on the extent of the issue.

Appendix A: Participating stakeholder organisations

- Amy Gillett Foundation
- ANCAP
- Associate Professor Jeremy Woolley
- Australasian College of Road Safety
- Australasian Trauma Society
- Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency (ANZPAA)
- Australian Automobile Association
- Australian Bicycle Association
- Australian Driverless Vehicle Initiative
- Australian Mobile Telecommunications Association
- Australian Motorcycle Council
- Australian Road Rescue Organisation
- Australian Road Research Board
- Australian Road Safety Foundation
- Austroads
- Bicycle Network
- Boomerang Training Solutions
- Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety
- Centre for Automotive Safety Research
- Cycling and Walking Australia and New Zealand
- Dr John Crozier
- Engineers Australia Transport Australia Society
- Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries
- Georgina Josephine Foundation
- Heavy Vehicle Industry Australia
- Inala PCYC
- Infrastructure Australia
- Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia (IPWEA)
- iRAP
- Kidsafe
- Monash University Accident Research Centre
- National Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation
- National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (NHVR)
- National Road Safety Partnership Program
- National Transport Commission (NTC)
- National Transport Insurance
- North Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency
- Pedestrian Council of Australia
- Roads Australia
- Royal Australasian College of Surgeons
- Safer Australian Roads and Highways (SARAH) Group
- South Australian Aboriginal Engagement Commissioner
- The George Institute
- Toll Group
- Towards Zero Foundation
- Traffic Management Association of Australia
- Transport Certification Australia
- Truck Industry Council
- Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine
- We Ride Australia
- Western Australian Centre for Road Safety Research
- Youthsafe