

# You

## 1. Supply (used for contact purposes only) your:

name?	<input type="text" value="Shalini Kumar"/>
email address?	<input type="text" value="Shalini.Kumar@ciht.org.uk"/>

## 2. Are you responding: \*

- as an individual? (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')
- on behalf of an organisation?

## Organisation details

### 3. What is your organisation name?

### 4. What is the purpose of your organisation?

### 5. What is the size of your organisation?

- Up to 250 employees
- Over 250 employees

We expect an RCIB would request data and information from:

- police forces
- coroners
- other arms length bodies
- insurance companies
- other relevant organisations and individuals involved in the investigation of road traffic collisions

**6. If a RCIB was established, do you think it would need access to data held by your organisation to investigate causes of road collisions?**

- Yes
- No (Go to 'Organisational details')
- Don't know (Go to 'Organisational details')

Why?

CIHT does not gather data related to road collisions.

## Organisation data time

If an RCIB is established it may ask organisations to share with it information such as, but not limited to recorded, electronic, photographic and video data and investigatory reports.

**7. How much time, in minutes, do you estimate it would take your organisation to provide data for an RCIB each year?**

0

## Organisation details

8. Do you think your organisation would need to spend time familiarising itself with working with an RCIB, should a branch be established?

- Yes
- No (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')
- Don't know (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')

Why?

CIHT would welcome working with RCIB and gain insight to the findings and investigations to share lesson learnt to inform our 14, 000 members working with the highways and transportation sector.

CIHT believe the four E's of Road Safety – Engineering, Enforcement, Education and Emergency – remain a vital way of thinking about improving safety outcomes on roads. On the point around education, CIHT would welcome working with government to develop further training for professionals on road safety, taking advantage of the reach offered via digital training.

## Staff working with RCIB

9. What number of staff within your organisation would need to spend time familiarising themselves with an RCIB, should a branch be established?

10

10. How much time, in minutes, do you estimate it would take your organisation to familiarise itself with an RCIB?

70 hours

## Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals

We are proposing examining the case for establishing an independent body, the Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB), to coordinate and analyse road collision information, investigating in

greater depth the causes of selected road traffic collisions (RTCs).

Significantly more people are killed or injured on UK roads than on any other form of transport - with profound human and economic costs. Yet road transport is the only major mode of travel that does not have an independent body to investigate RTCs.

Policymakers and law enforcement agencies are able to draw on a substantive data landscape for their existing investigatory activities in this area – with sources including [STATS19 \(opens in a new window\)](#), [RAIDS \(opens in a new window\)](#), CRASH, Forensic Collision Investigation (FCI) reports, and Prevention of Future Deaths (PFD) reports.

The aim of an RCIB would be to conduct thematic investigations, drawing on all available evidence, to make recommendations to the relevant organisations to mitigate or prevent such incidents in future.

**11. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the creation of a new independent body, the Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB), to coordinate the investigation of road traffic collisions?**

- Strongly agree (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')
- Agree** (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')
- Neither agree nor disagree (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals')

## Disagree with creation

**12. Do you think that road traffic collision investigation should:**

- be completed by the existing accident investigation branches?
- another option?

**13. Why are you against the creation of a RCIB?**

**14. As you are against creation of this body and the rest of this survey is about its implementation you may now either: \***

- continue answering the survey questions?
- go to the final comments section? (Go to 'Final comments')

## **Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) proposals**

It is proposed that an RCIB would have three main responsibilities. These would be to:

1. have a singular focus on analysing the causes of collisions
2. look for patterns emerging from the data, across police and highway authority boundaries where this data is currently only examined locally
3. make independent safety recommendations for action

We anticipate safety recommendations from an RCIB being used to inform decisions made by relevant statutory oversight bodies as to whether enforcement action is required. It is proposed that an RCIB would not, however, apportion blame or liability, unless that was necessary to achieve its objective of improving safety.

**15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the three suggested responsibilities?**

- Strongly agree (Go to 'Other responsibilities')
- Agree (Go to 'Other responsibilities')
- Neither agree nor disagree (Go to 'Other responsibilities')
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to 'Other responsibilities')

Why?

## **Disagreement with responsibilities**

**16. With which of the proposed responsibilities do you disagree RCIB should be responsible for?**

- Having a singular focus on analysing the causes of collisions
- Looking for patterns emerging from the data, across police and highway authority boundaries where this data is currently only examined locally
- Making independent safety recommendations for action

## Other responsibilities

**17. Are there any other responsibilities that you believe an RCIB should have?**

- Yes
- No (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) powers')
- Don't know (Go to 'Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) powers')

## Different responsibilities

**18. What other responsibilities?**

CIHT believe that consideration should be given to the RCIB to be able to have legal powers to seize evidence and compel witness cooperation if required, to provide greater evidence and in-depth knowledge for proceedings which have halted as a result of police limited resources. In addition, particular focus should be given to the use of quantitative data analysis in the review of collisions, such as vehicle telemetry data, which police forces currently do not have resource to acquire and analyse.

CIHT believe that the STATS19 database require improving the accuracy of data collated. CIHT support the PACTS STATS19 review and believe this review can be applied to the RCIB. The review calls for the DfT to improve:

- collecting information on seat belt and helmet wearing in slight injury collisions;
- continuing to collect information on journey purpose and aligning it with National Travel Survey;
- adding a category of “powered personal transporter device” to the vehicle list – to record e-scooters etc;
- rationalising the contributory factors collected and grouping them under the five Safe System pillars

## 19. Why do you think RCIB needs these responsibilities?

This will allow for in-depth knowledge, maximising learning opportunities and to reduce future risk by informing relevant organisations that can then implement change

## Road Collision Investigation Branch (RCIB) powers

Drawing on the provisions of existing accident investigation branches (AIBs) we would expect an RCIB to need the core powers of:

1. notification of fatal and serious collisions
2. carrying out investigations through access to existing records and primary involvement where necessary
3. preservation of evidence
4. co-operation with existing organisations
5. disclosing evidence
6. publication of reports and making recommendations

## 20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal that the RCIB should have the stated investigative powers?

- Strongly agree (Go to 'Agreement of powers')
- Agree (Go to 'Agreement of powers')
- Neither agree nor disagree (Go to 'Other investigative powers')
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to 'Other investigative powers')

## Disagree with investigative powers

**21. With which of the following powers do you disagree that the RCIB should have?**

- Notification of fatal and serious collisions
- Carrying out investigations through access to existing records and primary involvement where necessary
- Preservation of evidence
- Co-operation with existing organisations
- Disclosing evidence
- Publication of reports and making recommendations

Why?

---

(After answering go to 'Other investigative powers')

## Agreement of powers

**22. Why?**

With the RCIB having investigative powers and the objective of gaining an in-depth understanding of incidents and their causation allows for maximise learning opportunities and to reduce future risk.

## Other investigative powers

**23. What other investigative powers, if any, do you think an RCIB should have and why?**

There are complexities with defining adequate funding. Often, investigations risks being halted as they may have difficulty securing adequate resources to continue, meaning safety learning opportunities are currently being missed.

CIHT believe recommendations should include further insight into the root causes and underlying issues behind cause of accident contributing greatly to developing effective safe systems interventions and initiatives.

CIHT believe consideration should be given to the RCIB to investigate with preventative powers to limit scale, risk of harm and emerging risks. This could explore improving driver behaviour and drivers understanding of how new interventions on roads affect them is a critical task.

## Investigative criteria

Given the scale of collisions on the roads, we intend for an RCIB to focus primarily on thematic investigations drawing on evidence across multiple cases, rather than on individual incidents. We propose that an RCIB would base its investigation on the following criteria of:

- scale – factors impacting a large number of fatal or serious collisions (as opposed to more minor collisions and near misses)
- risk of harm – collisions impacting those who might sustain the greatest risk of harm including children, the elderly, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians
- emerging risks – new technology or behaviour without an established evidence base

24. In your view how important is it that an RCIB base investigation criteria on the:

	Very important	Important	Neither important nor unimportant	Unimportant	Very unimportant
scale?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
risk of harm?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
emerging risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Why?

CIHT believe that all the criteria mentioned above is very important to focus primarily on thematic investigations.

With the rise in use of micro-mobility, e-scooters need to be considered under the emerging risk criteria. As mentioned earlier improving the accuracy of data collated for STATS 19 would provide findings supporting evidence of emerging risks – new technology or behaviour without an established evidence base.

**25. Are there other criteria you think should be included?**

- Yes
- No (Go to 'Impact on people')
- Don't know (Go to 'Impact on people')

## Other criteria

**26. What other criteria?**

While the delivery of a RCIB is recommended, there can be future implications if not defined clearly. The RCIB should provide transparency in their proceedings, outlining how the investigation will be conducted, detailing scope of investigations and the methodologies in which judgement and findings are formed. This is important to define as the RCIB will co-operate with existing organisations and have an input into road safety interventions required.

## Impact on people

**27. What impact, if any, do you think an RCIB would have on victims of road collisions and their families? Respond with as much detail as possible.**

## Other comments on the RCIB

**28. Supply any other comments on the potential creation of an RCIB you wish to make.**

CIHT have long advocated for improvements in road safety and recognise the ongoing work the government have contributed in order to reduce road casualties. CIHT believe that road collision investigation needs to look deeper into the reason why collisions are happening and the proposed RCIB can assist with this.

CIHT supports the use of the word collision within the consultation. Through the delivery of the RCIB, the government should set out and advocate for consistency with the terminology used for road safety, the word collisions should be used as opposed to accidents.

In the instance of road safety there is still not defined metrics, standards and terminology causing inconsistency in approaches and uniform responses to road collision investigation.

## Final comments

29. Any other comments?

CIHT calls for the government to develop a long-term road safety strategy to emphasise national targets required to provide focused priorities in road safety. It is important that road collision investigation findings are identified, root causes and recommendations are shared in line with a long-term road safety strategy.