

PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Fleet Safety Benchmarking: Stage 1 Literature Summary, and Stage 2 Consultation and Framework Development

Research report for the National Road Safety Partnership Program

Project No: 009006

Prepared with support from the Project Team:

Dr Sharon Newnam, Monash University Accident Research Centre Darren Wishart, Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety James Newton, Transport Safety Collaboration and Project Leader

Project Manager: Jerome Carslake, ARRB Group

Sponsored by a grant from the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust



PROJECT DELIVERY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The national fleet benchmarking project has been proposed to provide a user-friendly online benchmarking resource which will provide organisations with an online analysis and summary of fleet performance, road safety cultural maturity and trends over time. The development of the tool involves five stages, with each stage designed to promote active collaboration between government, research and industry. This report describes the methodologies used in completing stages one and two and the resulting feedback from the industry consultation process.

Stage one consisted of conducting an international literature review and establishing industry and researcher review panels to support the successful project implementation. The literature review was peer reviewed by the researcher review panel and submitted to ARRB and the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust. A total of 81 studies/reports were included in the final report that was submitted. The literature review identified many challenges that are involved in establishing a successful benchmarking program.

Stage two consisted of engaging stakeholders through national consultation for the purposes of seeking feedback and input for the development of the benchmarking tool framework, questions and measures. Based on the outcomes of stage one and the input from both the review panels, a public discussion paper was developed and released. This publication was developed and authored by a team consisting of Jerome Carslake from ARRB Group, James Newton from the Transport Safety Collaboration, Darren Wishart from the Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety – Queensland (CARRS-Q), Queensland and Sharon Newnam from Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC), Melbourne. The discussion paper was publicly available from Friday the 12th September 2014 until Friday 3 October 2014.

Subsequent to the public discussion paper, three national workshops were conducted and attended by industry and members of the public. Feedback from participants was sought on the measures and matrix proposed within the discussion paper. The three workshops were hosted in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth on 29 September, 1 October and 3 October, respectively. A total of 73 people representing 52 organisations registered to attend the workshops, where several common themes were identified in the discussions, these include:

- 1. clarity of process is critical to ensure engagement
- 2. measures need to be punctual, industry relevant and meaningful
- 3. data security a high priority
- 4. ensure allowances for mixed fleets and multiple vehicle classifications
- 5. align to standards and compliance requirements
- 6. further Heavy vehicle consultation required to provide clarity around certain elements
- 7. industry-led continuous development of the measures and matrices is critical



PROGRAM

Although the Report is believed to be correct at the time of publication, ARRB Group Ltd, to the extent lawful, excludes all liability for loss (whether arising under contract, tort, statute or otherwise) arising from the contents of the Report or from its use. Where such liability cannot be excluded, it is reduced to the full extent lawful. Without limiting the foregoing, people should apply their own skill and judgement when using the information contained in the Report.



NRSPP

- 8. important to measure the ongoing development of safety culture within organisations
- 9. provide opportunity to build capacity, seek knowledge and share success

Overall, the workshops provided a strong and consistent indication for all participants, and Government, Industry and not for profits, reported significant value in the benchmarking project and a high likelihood that they would utilise the tool if the tool was to be funded, implemented and nationally available. It should be noted that the majority of the groups reported that a half-day workshop was insufficient time for detailed consideration of all indicators and they wished for a full day workshop. This issue highlights the significant level of engagement in this important process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The NRSPP national benchmarking project team would like to acknowledge the strong support and engagement from all stakeholders who have been involved in the successful delivery of the project to date. We would like to thank the researcher review panel, the industry expert panel, and all 73 people that registered to attend the workshops representing 52 different organisations, for their time, efforts and willingness. We would like to thank the National Transport Commission, Transport for NSW, and Main Roads Western Australian for each hosting a workshop, and to Tim Roberts from fleetstrategy who assisted in facilitating the Western Australian workshop.

It is also acknowledge that this project and the completion of stages one and two would not be possible without the grant funds from the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust.





CONTENTS

| FLEE | ET SAFE CONSU | TY BENCHMARKING: STAGE 1 LITERATURE SUMMARY, AND STAGE 2 LTATION AND FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT | 1 |
|------|---|---|------------------|
| PRO | JECT DE | LIVERY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| 1 | ABOUT | THE NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM | 1 |
| 2 | INTROD | | 2 |
| 2.1 | Overviev | w of the NRSPP Benchmarking Project | 2 |
| 2.2 | A Stage | d and Collaborative Approach to Implementation | 2 |
| 3 | STAGE | ONE | 4 |
| 3.1 | Literatur 3.1.1 3.1.2 | e Review Overview of the Literature Review Assessment of Benchmarking Performance Indicators | 4 4 4 |
| 3.2 | Establisl 3.2.1 3.2.2 | nment of Expert Panels Researcher Review Panel Industry Expert Panel | 6 7 7 |
| 4 | STAGE | ТWО | 8 |
| 4.1 | Public D 4.1.1 4.1.2 4.1.3 | iscussion Paper Overview of Discussion Paper Distribution of the Discussion Paper Public Feedback Received | 8 8 9 9 |
| 4.2 | National 4.2.1 4.2.2 | Consultation Workshops Workshop Methodology Feedback from Workshops | 9 10 10 |
| 5 | PROPO | SED BENCHMARKING FLOW DIAGRAM | 15 |
| 6 | PROPO | SED NEW BENCHMARKING MEASURES AND MATRICES | 21 |
| 7 | CONCL | USION | 22 |
| APPE | ENDIX A | REVISED MATRIX – LIGHT VEHICLE FLEET MEASURES AND MATRIX | 23 |
| A.1 | Organisa <i>A.1.1</i> <i>A.1.2</i> | ational Profile Level 1 Level 2 | 23 23 24 |
| A.2 | Level 1 - | - Lead Indicators | 24 |
| A.3 | Level 1 - | - Operational Lag Indicators | 25 |
| A.4 | Level 2 . <i>A.4.1</i> <i>A.4.2</i> | Lead Indicators Lag Indicators | 26 26 30 |
| A.5 | Level 3 - | - Lag Indicators | 32 |

| APPI | ENDIX B REVISED MATRIX – HEAVY VEHICLE FLEET MEASURES | 33 |
|------|--|----------|
| B.1 | Level 1 – Organisational Profile | 33 |
| B.2 | Level 2 – Organisational Profile | 34 |
| B.3 | Level 1 – Lead Indicators | 34 |
| B.4 | Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators | 36 |
| B.5 | Level 2 – Lead Indicators | 36 |
| B.6 | Level 2 – Lag Indicators | 41 |
| B.7 | Level 3 – Lag Indicators | 43 |
| APPI | ENDIX C RESULTS AND SUMMARISED COMMENTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE | 44 |
| APPI | ENDIX D LIGHT VEHICLE FLEET PROFILE QUESTIONS: COLLATED COMMENTS FRO WORKSHOP |)М 47 |
| D.1 | Level 1 – Organisational Profile | 47 |
| D.2 | Level 2 – Organisational Profile | 48 |
| D.3 | Level 1 – Lead Indicators | 48 |
| D.4 | Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators | 50 |
| D.5 | Level 2 – Lead Indicators | 51 |
| D.6 | Level 2 – Lag Indicators | 55 |
| D.7 | Level 3 – Lag Indicators | 57 |
| APPI | ENDIX E HEAVY VEHICLE FLEETS: COLLATED COMMENTS FROM WORKSHOP | 59 |
| E.1 | Level 1 – Organisational Profile | 59 |
| E.2 | Level 2 – Organisational Profile | 60 |
| E.3 | Level 1 – Lead Indicators | 61 |
| E.4 | Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators | 62 |
| E.5 | Level 2 – Lead Indicators | 63 |
| E.6 | Level 2 – Lag Indicators | 67 |
| E.7 | Level 3 – Lag Indicators | 69 |



FIGURES

| Figure 5.1: | Proposed new registration and organisation profile flow diagram | 16 |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 5.2: | Proposed Level 1 – 3 Benchmarking Flow Diagram | 19 |

TABLES

| Table 3.1: | Assessment of benchmarking performance indicators5 | ; |
|------------|--|---|
| | | ć |



1 ABOUT THE NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

The National Road Safety Partnership Program (NRSPP) aims to help Australian organisations develop a positive road safety culture to reduce work-related road trauma and become examples for others to enhance road safety, nationally. This is achieved by building and sharing knowledge of effective strategies, fostering national networks, and collaboration across industry to improve road safety.

In July 2011, the National Transport Commission (NTC) commenced an engagement process with organisations to develop a collaborative approach towards improving Australia's road safety performance. In August 2011, the NTC released the discussion paper 'A Corporate Approach to Transport Safety', which was based on initial consultation with businesses that had previously implemented initiatives on road safety within and beyond their workplaces. This discussion paper revealed corporate Australia's desire for a national collaborative program on road safety that draws on the strengths of existing programs and initiatives, while encouraging better practice, innovation and shared learnings.

The NRSPP was launched on 5 May 2014 by Prince Michael of Kent, Patron for The Commission for Global Road Safety, as part of the UN's Decade of Action for Road Safety Policy and Donor Forum. The NRSPP is hosted by ARRB Group (previously the Australian Road Research Board) and is governed through a national steering committee consisting of Industry organisations and government agencies. The Program is currently funded for the next three years by ARRB, NSW Centre for Road Safety, NSW Motor Accident Authority, the NTC, the South Australian Motor Accident Commission, VicRoads and the Transport Accident Commission.

For more information on the background and the NRSPP please visit: <u>www.nrspp.org.au</u>.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Overview of the NRSPP Benchmarking Project

During the development of the NRSPP and through the initial national consultation processes, it was identified that an industry-based benchmarking process would significantly benefit fleet and safety managers.

The National Fleet Benchmarking Tool is proposed as a core element of the NRSPP. It will allow individual organisations to use the NRSPP website to measure core road safety related functional elements of its operation. Organisations can then analyse their performance through a series of lag and leading indicators, identify opportunities for development, and seek ways to build capacity that will reduce each organisation's road related trauma, risks and costs.

Core objectives

The benchmarking tool is proposed to address the following core objectives:

- To provide a user-friendly online benchmarking resource that will provide organisations with an online analysis and summary of fleet performance, road safety cultural maturity and trends over time, which can be utilised directly for corporate reporting.
- Link to specific road safety-related performance criteria for the benefit of measuring individual and collective road safety progress.
- Link to the overall NRSPP evaluation process.
- Focus on three key areas where organisations are most likely to have accessible input information and data, including organisational profile data, lead indications and lag indications.

For many organisations, this may be the first time road safety has been examined in such a structured manner, or where data collection has been undertaken. The NRSPP has heard from numerous organisations that there is little on how to best collect data, e.g. what to look for, where to start, and how to best analyse the information that has been collected. It is proposed that the benchmarking initiative will provide the tools to enable organisations to achieve these goals, through a secure online platform.

The benchmarking tool will help identify areas of work driving safety concern, and then identify resources available from the rest of the NRSPP program, thereby assisting organisations in making the right changes to counter identified areas. The resources developed include the workplace road safety guide, case studies, vehicle safety guides, policy templates, thought leadership pieces, webinars and a comprehensive knowledge bank. These links will also support key indicators within overall NRSPP program evaluation. Therefore, the tool will have multiple benefits, both to the individual participating organisations, as well as the overall development of the NRSPP.

2.2 A Staged and Collaborative Approach to Implementation

The current grant from the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust has allowed the NRSPP to commence and complete stages one and two of the overall project.

A critical element of the NRSPP is collaboration and ensuring that implementation is led through a robust research foundation. It is with this in mind that the national fleet benchmarking project has been proposed. Each of the individual stages of the project is structured to facilitate active collaboration between government, research and industry, and to ensure that the project has a robust research foundation. There are five key stages in this national fleet benchmarking project, with each designed to build upon the previous stage. This staged process will ensure the successful implementation of the project, from concept through to implementation. The final stages include monitoring and review processes that will ensure the continuous improvement of the tool as it used by organisations. Stages one and two will be undertaken in this project, which includes:

Stage one

- Conduct and submit a literature review of established benchmarking practices and develop recommendations for the NRSPP's benchmarking project.
- On-going monitoring of national and international stakeholder research.
- Identify and engage with core stakeholders for the collaborative development of qualitative and quantitative measures, and establish an industry and researcher expert panel.

Stage two

- Publish a public discussion paper which summarises the learnings from the literature review and the collaboratively developed qualitative and quantitative measures reviewed and agreed by the researcher and industry expert panel.
- Engage stakeholders through national workshops to seek industry feedback on the benchmarking measures proposed in the public discussion paper.
- Develop and publish a national fleet benchmarking framework that addresses stakeholder feedback from the consultation process.

The following stages three to five are currently proposed for implementation once future funding is secured and should be noted as being outside of the current scope of works.

Stage three

- Develop and deliver a secure user-friendly online benchmarking tool for implementation into the NRSPP.
- Pilot benchmarking tool with identified stakeholder groups and seek feedback to confirm not only value for stakeholders by also ease of use.
- Launch the National Fleet Benchmarking Tool for public use.
- Identify and develop international benchmarking linkages.

Stages four and five (12- and 24-month review)

- Monitor and evaluate application of the tool.
- Provide a second- and third-year review of the value of the benchmarking tool and seek industry feedback.

NRSPP

3 STAGE ONE

3.1 Literature Review

Stage one commenced on 18 August 2014 and was completed on 8 September 2014. During this period, the literature review was drafted, reviewed by the researcher review panel and submitted to ARRB Group as the Project Leader on behalf of the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust.

The literature review was led by Lori Mooren from the University of NSW and supported and reviewed by Darren Wishart of the Centre for Accident Research on Road Safety-Queensland (CARRS-Q), Sharon Newnam of Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC), Melbourne and James Newton of the Transport Safety Collaboration. The following provides a summary of the stage one implementation.

3.1.1 Overview of the Literature Review

The literature review was conducted to guide the development of the benchmarking framework for the NRSPP on the most important safety management performance indicators, as well as resources and established programs. The literature search focused on information and materials relevant to safety management and safety benchmarking in the light and heavy vehicle occupational driving context.

An evaluation matrix and selection criteria was used to guide the selection of articles. The selection criterion was developed through a collaboration of the lead researchers involved in the project, and then peer reviewed by the researcher review panel. Searches were conducted through Google Scholar, ARRB Library and University databases using the search terms: safety benchmarking, fleet benchmarking, OHS performance indicators, safety performance indicators, as well as annotated resources held in the author's files. In addition, the bibliographies in some of the resources obtained were examined. Each paper/report was evaluated for relevance, importance and effectiveness (of process or performance measure). Only the references, in academic and grey literature as well as websites that were assessed to be most relevant and helpful, were included in the review. A total of 81 studies/reports were included in the final report.

The results from the literature review covered four sections. The first section discussed the role of benchmarking in operationalising organisational performance, with a particular focus on safety. The second section provided an overview of performance indicators. Lag and leading indicators were defined and critiqued. The discussion on leading indicators included a review of existing models that are designed to prioritise risks and address the likelihood of incidents occurring and the level of consequence. The third section presented a review on existing fleet safety benchmarking projects conducted in the UK, USA and Australia. This section also included a review of existing audit tools used to assess corporate road safety against a set of safety management standards, as shown in Table 3.1. The fourth section is described later in Section 3.1.

3.1.2 Assessment of Benchmarking Performance Indicators

The literature review identified four known benchmarking programs. These programs are described below, while the performance indicators utilised in each of these programs are summarised in Table 3.1.

- 1. Fleet Safety Benchmarking (UK): A fleet safety benchmarking project has been in place in the UK with Department for Transport support since the year 2007. The project allows participation by any organisation, providing tools such as a benchmarking report; best practice guides and case studies; five-minute, 10-question self-audit and feedback (free online); 30-question process benchmarking (for a fee); outcomes benchmarking, proactive and reactive KPI (Key Performance Indicator) comparisons; and a 168-question fleet audit (for a fee).
- 2. Strength in Numbers (Network for Employers Traffic Safety (NETS) USA): This fleet safety benchmark program aims to reduce collisions, injuries and costs. The program is for large and small, private and public and US and international employers. NETS holds annual conferences for members to share good practices, but the organisation will not reveal publicly the performance criteria used in their benchmarking program. Little detail is provided about this program as it is a commercial undertaking where only those participating are advised of the specific indictors used.
- 3. **Trucking Industry Benchmarking (USA):** A comprehensive program managed by the University of Michigan has been developed over the past five years and provides trucking company performance measurements that are reportedly useful for motor carrier management. This program captures most of the essential elements of motor carrier operations with an online system, allowing for efficient data entry and rapid turnaround of benchmark output.
- 4. **AfMA Fleet Safety Benchmarking (Australia):** The Australian Fleet Managers Association (AfMA) provides a safety benchmarking program to members only. Members send in their data and they are rated against all the participants within their industry; for example, manufacturing, media, transport. To be rated, they have to provide data on categories including total number of motor vehicle accidents in a year, number of vehicles in the fleet, number of 'driver at fault' accidents, total cost of claims in the year, and total number of kilometres travelled in the year.

| | Fleet Safety Benchmarking (UK) | Strength in Numbers (NETS – USA) | Trucking Industry Benchmarking (USA) | AfMA Fleet Safety Benchmarking (Australia) |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Validity – do they measure what we want it to measure? | They cover some important safety management areas | Some, like commentary driving, may not be agreed. | They cover nearly everything | Only outcomes are measured |
| Reliability – do they give the same answer regardless of who uses it and in various circumstances? | No. The ten questions are subjective ratings | Many are subjective measures | They are all objective measures | They are all objective measures |
| Sensitivity – do they show sufficient differences over time or across entities being measured? | The indicators are grouped into broad categories | Most of them would | Small company results might vary to a larger degree than large company results | Small company results might vary to a larger degree than large company results |

 Table 3.1: Assessment of benchmarking performance indicators

NRSPP NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY

| | Fleet Safety Benchmarking (UK) | Strength in Numbers (NETS – USA) | Trucking Industry Benchmarking (USA) | AfMA Fleet Safety Benchmarking (Australia) |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Representativeness – do they cover all aspects that are relevant? | Maybe for light, but not for heavy vehicle operators | Vehicle safety and journey planning are missing | Apart from pay, work process and despatch categories, they are all outcome indicators | Only as a check on relative outcome performance |
| Openness to bias – can they be manipulated to show a different result? | Yes, as they are subjective ratings they are subject to bias | Yes, especially if self- assessment is used | Calculating percentages – need to ensure agreed denominators | No, they are objective/factual |
| Cost effectiveness – does the cost of collecting the data outweigh the benefit? | The online questions are quick and easy | Maybe, depending on how much detail is required | The list of indicators is massive | They are easy to measure |
| Effectiveness – are they empirically tested or include a robust evaluation? | Nothing publicly available to provide evidence of the effectiveness | Nothing publicly available but the program continues to grow and develop demonstrated by its annual conference and growing member base | Nothing publicly available to provide evidence of the effectiveness | Nothing publicly available to provide evidence of the effectiveness |

The final section of the literature review addressed the challenges associated with establishing a benchmarking exercise. These challenges include, but are not limited to, the following:

- identifying the most important lead and lag performance indicators
- ensuring consistency in the way indicators are measured
- ensuring accurate data analysis and secure data management
- making the process easy and time-efficient, regardless of organisational size
- establishing the right benchmarking partners to work and learn with
- establishing a trusting relationship with benchmarking partners.

These challenges will be directly addressed in the development of the NRSPP benchmarking tool. It was also noted that benchmarking is not yet widespread in corporate road safety management. Even though there are no agreed safety management systems for corporate road safety, there is enough research evidence to be confident in selecting important data topics and measurement indices for internal and external comparisons.

3.2 Establishment of Expert Panels

The national benchmarking project was identified as having the potential for substantial national challenges and will need to resolve numerous complexities across legislation reform and harmonisation, fleet practices, and the differences in data collection practices. It was, therefore, recommended that two separate expert panels be established to assist in the development process of stage one and two; one consisting of researchers, and the second consisting of industry experts.



3.2.1 Researcher Review Panel

One researcher review panel was established to review the literature review public discussion document and final report. The individual documents were sent to each representative member of the panel and the feedback was received electronically.

The researcher review panel members were identified through the collaborative knowledge of the lead researchers and the NRSPP program manager. From the collective knowledge, a list of academics and researchers was developed, consisting of academics and researchers that were involved in benchmarking and who were well-respected within their fields of expertise. The members of the researcher review panel were formally invited to participate as panel members via email. The researcher review panel were asked to provide review and comment into each of the publically released papers prior to release. These included the Literature Review, NRSPP National Benchmarking Discussion Paper and this Final Report.

Invitations were sent to the following organisations:

- Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety – Queensland (CARRS-Q)
- Transport and Road Safety Research University NSW
- Monash Injury Research Institute (MIRI)
- Interactive Driving Systems
- TRL Ltd

3.2.2 Industry Expert Panel

- SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research (Invited)
- European Transport Safety Council (PRAISE) (Invited)
- Centre for Automotive Safety Research, University of Adelaide (Invited).

One industry expert panel was established to advise on the project methodology, framework, public discussion document and this final report.

All members of the NRSPP Steering Committee were invited to participate from which five responded positively. The Chief Executive Officer from the Network of Employers Traffic Safety (NETS) as well as Director of RoadSafe (UK) were also invited to participate and provided an international perspective.

The industry expert panel consisted of representatives from the following organisations:

- Telstra
- RoadSafe (UK)
- Wesfarmers Insurance
- Zurich Financial Services Australia Ltd
- fleetstrategy

- Coca Cola Amatil
- Western Australian Road Transport Association Inc.
- Network of Employers for Traffic Safety (USA)
- Boral.

ARRB Group

The industry expert panel met via teleconference four times and provided significant input and knowledge into the development of the discussion paper and the workshops. It is highly recommended that for the implementation of stages three to five that the industry expert panel be re-established.

4 STAGE TWO

4.1 Public Discussion Paper

Based on the outcomes of stage one, a public discussion paper was developed and released. The public discussion paper summarised the aims of the NRSPP, presented an overview of the proposed NRSPP benchmarking project strategy, framework, measures and matrix. The discussion paper was publicly available for comment and feedback from Friday 12 September 2014 until Friday 3 October 2014.

The discussion paper was developed and authored by a team consisting of Jerome Carslake from ARRB Group, James Newton from the Transport Safety Collaboration, Darren Wishart from CARRS Q, and and Sharon Newnam from MUARC.

4.1.1 Overview of Discussion Paper

The benchmarking strategy was discussed in context of the Safe Systems approach to road safety and its links to ISO 39001:2012. Elements of these road safety approaches were recognised and included in the proposed benchmarking tool. The proposed benchmarking tool also recognised the need for a hierarchical approach in the development of the measures and the matrix. In this regard, the occupational health and safety hierarchy of the controls model was presented as the foundation for assessing items in relation to risk mitigation or risk management within the workplace.

The public discussion paper presented an overview of three key areas that organisations could provide information and data. These three areas constituted the proposed benchmarking tool and included:

- 1. <u>Organisational profile data</u>: The organisational profile data included information relating to the profile of organisations operating light and heavy vehicles, such as industry type, core business and fleet size, in addition to more detailed information to assist in broader management benchmarking support (e.g., age, gender).
- 2. <u>Lag indicators</u>: The lag indicators were discussed in relation to how organisations could compare their ultimate safety performance. The key lag indicators identified in the proposed benchmarking tool included items such as numbers or rates of incidents, injuries, crash costs, and near misses.
- 3. <u>Leading indicators</u>: The leading indicators were discussed as risk management indicators relevant to: driver risk (i.e. driver behaviour), vehicle risk (i.e. vehicle standards) and journey risk (i.e. trip planning). These indicators were defined as tangible activities existing within good practice fleet safety programs and were aligned directly with the five pillars represented in the United Nations, Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety.

The final sections of the discussion paper presented information on how the benchmarking tool was proposed to work. The three proposed levels of the benchmarking framework consisted of:

- **Table 1:** Organisational profile data
 - Level 1: 10 light vehicle questions / 8 heavy vehicle questions
 - Level 2: 3 identical questions.



- Table 2: Leading indicators
 - Level 1: 8 identical questions
 - Level 2: 25 light vehicle questions / 25 heavy vehicle questions
- Table 3: Lag indicators for organisations operating light vehicle fleets
 - Level 1: 2 identical questions
 - Level 2: 11 light vehicle questions / 16 heavy vehicle questions
 - Level 3: 6 identical questions.

4.1.2 Distribution of the Discussion Paper

The discussion paper was available electronically through the NRSPP. Emails were also distributed through NRSPP affiliated networks and distribution lists. These networks consisted of national, state and local networks including the following:

.

- 33900 The Australian Road Safety Collaboration
- ARRB Group
- Australasian College of Road Safety
- Australasian Fleet Management Association
- Australian Food and Grocery Council
- Australian Logistics Council
- Australian Local Government Association
- Australian Trucking Association

- Cement Concrete and Aggregates Australia
- Grains Council of Australia
- National Road Safety Partnership Program
- NRMA –ACT Road Safety Trust
- Minerals Council of Australia
- Our Community (Not-for-Profit Network)
- State Government Road Safety Agencies
- Western Australian Road Transport Association.

4.1.3 Public Feedback Received

Public feedback was encouraged through email and post. Additionally, the NRSPP website was utilised as a feedback portal through the online discussion forum. The online forum was viewed 121 times during the consultation period; although no feedback was posted to the forum. Three emails including suggestions and comment were received as feedback from the discussion paper, but no formal submissions were received. These levels of response to the discussion papers and online forum have been identified by the NRSPP Steering Committee as not uncharacteristic for industry in relation to similar topics. These levels of feedback align to the previous NRSPP strategy paper and Corporate Safety discussion paper responses and are not reflective of the industry support for the project or the overall NRSPP program.

4.2 National Consultation Workshops

Following the release of the discussion paper, three national workshops were promoted. The workshops were promoted through various communication channels; these included the front pages of the discussion paper, the use of email from distribution lists, online social

networks, direct phone calls to specifically identified stakeholders, and communication through the NRSPP website.

It was recommended that the project facilitates workshops across Australia to seek industry feedback and input. This approach aligned to the consultation process used during the development of the NRSPP program and strategy development processes. The three locations were Melbourne, Sydney and Perth on 29 September, 1 October and 3 October, respectively. Although the NRSPP benchmarking project has been funded from a grant by the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust, it was recommended that Sydney be selected over the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) to maximise stakeholder engagement within the available budget. The three workshops were conducted on behalf of the NRSPP, inviting industry to engage in discussion and provide feedback on the benchmark framework proposed in the discussion paper. The workshops were hosted with the support of the National Transport Commission in Melbourne, Transport for NSW in Sydney, and Main Roads WA in Perth.

A total of 73 people representing 52 organisations attended the workshops, with participants from government and non-government industry sectors. The non-government sectors included peak bodies, fleet associations, and start-up companies through to some of the largest vehicle fleets in Australia. The organisations represented a broad cross-section of organisations with large investments in transport, which included a mix of light and heavy vehicle fleets. The participants that attended the workshop and that were willing to provide fleet size information, ranged from small start-up companies comprising of a few vehicles through to some of Australia's largest fleets, representing vehicle numbers of up to 11,000 vehicle units.

The following diagram shows the percentage breakdown of participant representation from all workshops. It should be note that not all participants wished to be identified therefore the details of participating organisations or participants themselves have been removed.

| Private Sector - Light Fleet | 21% |
|--|-----|
| Private Sector - Mixed Feet (Light & Heavy) | 19% |
| Government (Local, State ,Federal) | 17% |
| Industry Suppliers / Consultants | 17% |
| Private Sector - Heavy Fleet | 14% |
| Researchers | 8% |
| Not for Profit Organisations / Industry Associations | 3% |

|--|

4.2.1 Workshop Methodology

The facilitator provided an introduction outlining the benchmark project, followed by an overview of the aims of the workshop. Participants were then asked to form into groups depending on the profile of their fleet (i.e. light, mixed or heavy vehicles) within their organisation. An NRSPP facilitator joined each group. Each group was provided with a document containing the proposed benchmarking measures and matrix questions relating to either heavy vehicle or light vehicle fleet, depending on which discussion group they joined.



The benchmarking measures and matrix presented during the workshops, including collated and summarised feedback from the three workshops, was used for this report. Light vehicle fleet vehicle measures can be viewed in Appendix D, and heavy vehicle fleet measures can be viewed in Appendix E. Some groups represented mixed fleet operations, therefore considered both the light and heavy vehicle fleet measures and matrices. Participants were instructed to work through the fleet profile questions incorporated within the discussion paper and note amendments or suggestions on the measures and matrix. Each group was then asked to appoint a spokesperson to provide a verbal overview of the group's feedback at the completion of the workshop.

Each participant that attended was also asked to complete a questionnaire containing five questions relating to the benchmark project. The questionnaire and collated feedback has been summarised and used in this report and can be viewed in Appendix C.

4.2.2 Feedback from Workshops

The discussion in the groups reflected the movement in thought processes as participants gained an understanding of the proposed benchmarking tool, including the wider conceptual development of the project and specific feedback on matters such as descriptive language in the questions. The collaborative approach for the consultation process was very well-supported by the participants providing them with a shared ownership of the benchmarking framework. Attendees in the workshops were engaged, passionate and wanted to provide input to a national project, as evident from the lengthy discussions on individual topics. Several themes were identified in the discussions, as follows:

1. Clarity of process is critical to ensure engagement.

Participants were confused about what the benchmark tool would be used for. Firstly, within the groups there was often confusion in relation to the various levels of the fleet profile questions, in that participants were unclear as to how the different levels of questions would function. As the levels and framework were discussed within the groups and clarity was provided from the facilitators, the framework became more easily understood and supported. A proposed benchmarking flow diagram for the tool has been developed and is provided in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2 to assist with clarifying the proposed user's engagement and flow for using the benchmarking tool.

2. Punctual, industry-relevant and meaningful.

It was evident from the workshops that if this benchmarking tool was to be effective and engaging, it needs to be efficient and easy to use. It must also align to nationally understood measures to prevent excessively increasing participants' workloads or having to spend excessive time in finding data that the organisations may not have.

3. Data security is a high priority.

Data infrastructure, data storage security and confidentiality that support the benchmarking process were raised as concerns during the consultation process. Therefore, in stage three and during the development of the infrastructure for the benchmarking tool, data security must be robust and given a high priority. Providing stakeholders reassurance that data will not be lost, accessed by third parties, or be easily identifiable is essential. It is also recommended that non-identifying codes or numbers be provided to individual organisations as organisational name replacements, with the flexibility for larger organisations to register individual business units with separate non-identifiable codes or numbers; therefore, preventing identification due to the organisation's fleet size and distance travelled.

4. Ensure allowances for mixed fleets and multiple vehicle classifications.

There is a need for a detailed vehicle section classification within the organisational profile section so that the benchmarking tool can capture the organisation's fleet. It was recommended that the tool accurately needs to allow for mixed fleet compositions and to provide appropriate subs categories for both light and heavy vehicles within the profile section of the tool.

5. Alignment to standards and compliance requirements.

It was suggested that the process could also assist organisations with ISO certifications or other compliance requirements. It is recommended that the alignment between the benchmarking measures and widely used compliance and/or certification procedures used in the transport and fleet contracts should be clearly laid out.

6. Further heavy vehicle consultation required to provide clarity.

It was evident throughout the workshops that the heavy vehicle measures and matrix would require further industry and expert engagement to seek clarity on five elements identified within the proposed measures. This has been highlighted in the new measures and matrix provided.

7. Industry-led continuous development of the measures and matrix.

It was suggested that benchmark participants be asked at the completion of the year's benchmark process to highlight, discuss and decide on what new items could be included for the following year. For instance, it was suggested that five new items be included each year to build up towards the gradual inclusion of lead indicators enabling organisations to prepare to be able to resource; such areas could include In-Vehicle Management Systems (IVMS), GPS data management, detailed driver training and education, and road and roadside risk assessments. This process would allow for stakeholder feedback and future development, ensuring that the measures were representative of on-the-ground operations and good practice, and not just a quick 'tick the box' process that adds no value to the organisation's operations.

8. Important to measure the ongoing development of the safety culture.

It was generally supported that the benchmarking process should provide performance and management process measures, as well as measure specific outcomes addressing the road safety cultural maturity of the organisation. It was also supported that the safety culture should be included as a benchmarked measure between organisations.

9. Provides opportunity to build capacity, seek knowledge and share success.

Participants also provided feedback indicating that the results of any benchmark process need to be perceived as valuable and to build capacity within the organisation and assist in the development of a safety culture and climate. Therefore it was well noted throughout the workshops, the need to ensure that the reporting elements of the project provides links and opportunities for organisations to compare with other like organisations, build capacity, seek knowledge where required, and share success.

Overall, the workshops provided a strong and consistent indication that participants reported significant value in the benchmarking project and indicated a high likelihood that they would utilise the tool. It should be noted that the majority of the groups reported that a half-day workshop was insufficient time for detailed consideration of all indicators, and they would have preferred a full-day workshop. This issue highlights the significant level of engagement within the workshops during the consultation process.



5 PROPOSED BENCHMARKING FLOW DIAGRAM

One of the key findings from the workshops was that clarity of processes was essential to ensure engagement. The following flow diagrams featured in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2 were created to assist in clarifying a user's engagement and process flow for using the benchmarking tool. It is proposed that this will also assist in the development and implementation of stage three of the overall NRSPP National Fleet Benchmarking Project.

Organisations wishing to participate in the benchmarking process will first need to register their organisation with the program and create a profile. Once the organisation has completed the registration process, they will then be able to participate in the benchmarking process via a secure online portal held within the NRSPP website. Figure 5.1 shows the process for which an organisation would register for using the benchmarking tool' as well as the steps involved in establishing the organisation's profile.

The profiling data is critical to the areas that are accessible. For example, if the organisation only has a heavy vehicle fleet, then the benchmarking tool will only show measures relating to heavy fleet as presented in Appendix B (B.1, B.2). Likewise, an organisation that only has a light vehicle fleet would only see the profile information as presented in Appendix A (A.1, A.2) and if the organisation has a mixed fleet then both Appendix A and Appendix B would be accessible.

The flow diagram within Figure 5.2 shows only three levels (levels 1-3) of the benchmarking framework. The multi-level approach proposed increases in the questioning complexity as the participant works through the process this provides scalability of measures allowing both mature road safety related organisation to gain value from the more complex measure as well as organisation that are just starting to understand road safety fundamentals to both gain value from participation. It was also identified that some small fleet organisations will not require all levels of the measure to manage their fleet.

As the participant moves through the benchmarking process and completes a level they will be able to save their progress, thus allowing them to return to the benchmarking process at a later date or complete their participation. If the participant wishes to complete their participation at any given level, reports can then be generated that benchmark their data against previous years as well as benchmark against like industry to the point that they have completed, as shown in Figure 5.2



Figure 5.1: Proposed new registration and organisation profile flow diagram



Figure 5.2: Proposed level 1 – 3 benchmarking flow diagram

6 PROPOSED NEW BENCHMARKING MEASURES AND MATRICES

The new benchmarking measures have been developed based on the collated feedback and input from the workshop participants. The new matrices and measures can be viewed in Appendix A for light vehicle fleets and Appendix B for heavy vehicle fleets. The matrices identify the indicator (lag or leading) and its associated description and measure. Information is also provided on whether the indicator was support or not based on feedback from the workshops. Some indicators were not supported and comments from attendees from the national workshop have been collated and summarised in the matrices.

The new measures presented in Appendix A and B provides a framework from which the proposed project stage three can be established. The strength of the methodological approach was in adopting an evidence-based framework for identifying risk management indicators. Each measure identified within the matrices has been categorised with a risk management pillar established in the United Nations, Global Plan for the Decade of Action for road safety. In using this approach, the new measures presented in Appendix A and Appendix B have not been prioritised into any order, or defined by the most important measures to ensure a safer road environment; but rather, they reflect the process in which workshop participants were guided in the discussions and their perception of what was seen as most relevant and of most use to industry.

Five elements within the heavy vehicle fleet section have been highlighted and identified as requiring further industry consultation due to complexity across differing state or territory legislation or industry classifications. These elements relate to business classification and operational types, vehicle definitions and classifications, environmental factors and CO₂ emissions, and infringement definitions and classifications, and have been highlighted accordingly in Appendix B.

NRSPP

7 CONCLUSION

The new benchmarking measures and matrix provided, is representative of the collaborative input from industry, research and government agencies providing support for the overall intentions and objectives of the NRSPP. In achieving this task, the NRSPP benchmarking tool has overcome some of the challenges associated with previous benchmarking exercises. In addition to establishing a trusting relationship with benchmarking partners, the evidence-based methodology has allowed us to identify the most important lead and lag performance indicators and ensures consistency in measurement. Through consultation with key stakeholders we have also been able to propose an easy and time-efficient process for implementation and address accurate data analysis and secure data management from the outset.

It should be noted that there are five elements within the heavy vehicle fleet section that require further industry consultation due to the complexity across differing state or territory legislation or industry classifications. These have been highlighted within the matrix tables and relate to business classification and operational types, vehicle definitions and classifications, environmental factors and CO_2 emissions, and infringement definitions and classifications.

The outcomes from the completion of stages one and two, and the development of the new measures and matrices, form the foundation from which stages three, four and five can be further developed in collaboration with industry. Ongoing engagement and collaboration with industry will ensure the development of an industry-relevant and meaningful national benchmarking tool.

It should be noted that the new measures and matrices formulated from the national consultation have not been prioritised into measures that will ensure change, nor have they been defined as the most important measures, but rather, are the measures and matrices that Industry have seen as most relevant.

It is evident, from the engagement and willingness of both government and non-government participation during the national consultation process, that there is a strong interest in the national implementation of the benchmarking tool. It is therefore recommended that the NRSPP continues to seek funding and support for the development and implementation of stages three, four and five.

NRSPP

APPENDIX A REVISED MATRIX – LIGHT VEHICLE FLEET MEASURES AND MATRIX

A.1 Organisational Profile

A.1.1 Level 1

| Level 1 - Organisational profile | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Profile indicator | Description | Measure | | |
| Industry type | Industry categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | A complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Core business activity | Occupation categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | A complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Fleet owned by the organisation | All light vehicles owned or directly leased by the organisation | Number of vehicles or unknown | | |
| Fleet size (salary sacrificed / salary packaged / novated lease) | A leased vehicle on behalf of an employee, either through salary sacrificing or novated (excluding tool of trade) lease arrangements for the purpose of work-related use | Number of vehicles or unknown | | |
| Fleet size (grey vehicles) | 'Grey fleet' is the term used to describe any vehicles that do not belong to the company, but which are used for business travel or work-related use | Number of vehicles or unknown | | |
| Tool of trade vehicles | Tool of trade vehicle used (excluding novated lease) and/or supplied by the organisation in order for the employee to be able to perform their job/role | Number of vehicles or unknown | | |
| Total distance travelled (total fleet) | | Total kilometres driven in the past financial year (light fleet) or unknown | | |
| Total fuel usage (annual) | | Total litres of fuel used in the past financial year? Or unknown (Petrol & Diesel separated) Classification of electric required (kW used) | | |
| Light vehicle procurement timeframe | | On average, how many years are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease) or unknown | | |



A.1.2 Level 2

| Level 2 - Light vehicle fleet profile | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Profile indicator | Description | Measure | | |
| Driver ages (grouped) | Number of employees in each age group? | Age groups: 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 years & over | | |
| Average age of fleet drivers | | Average age? | | |
| Distribution of drivers | Does your organisation use volunteer drivers? | Yes No | | |
| Distribution of fleet driver gender | Total number as a percentage | Males, Females, Transgender | | |

A.2 Level 1 – Lead Indicators

| Level 1 –Light vehicle fleet leading indicators | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Question | Measure | | | |
| Road safety as an identified | Does your organisation have accountability for maintaining and improving work related road | Yes | | | |
| responsibility within the organisation | safety? | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | | |
| | | No or unknown | | | |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Question | Measure | | | |
| Journey management | Does your organisation identify the need for managing and planning of work related journeys? | Yes | | | |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | | |
| | | No or unknown | | | |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Question | Measure | | | |
| Vehicle procurement | Does your organisation consider the safety rating and safety features of a vehicle in identifying fit | Yes | | | |
| | for purpose? | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | | |
| | | No or unknown | | | |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Question | Measure | | | |
| Road rules | Does your organisation ensure your work-related drivers abide by state and territory mandated | Yes | | | |



| Level 1 –Light vehicle fleet leading indicators | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | road rules? | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | |
| | | No or unknown | | |
| Road safety-related communication | Does your organisation discuss or communicate with individuals, groups or the whole organisation, | Yes | | |
| | road safety related issues or risks? | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | |
| | | No or unknown | | |
| Driver and rider licensing | Does your organisation identify the need to ensure that all drivers (work or commuting) have valid | Yes | | |
| | licences that are appropriate for the class of vehicle? | Yes (identified and being implemented) | | |
| | | No or unknown | | |
| Pillar 5: Post-crash response | Question | Measure | | |
| Incident reporting | Does your organisation have a vehicle incident notification process (e.g. A central phone number | Yes | | |
| | for employees involved in an incident to phone or an in-vehicle form to complete)? | No | | |
| Incident investigation | Does your organisation identify the need and undertake incident investigation where either an | Yes | | |
| | employee and/or organisational vehicle is involved? | Yes - organisational vehicle-related only | | |
| | | Yes – insurance claim | | |
| | | No (or unknown) | | |

A.3 Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators

| Level 1 - Operational lag indicators | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Lag indicators | Description | Measure |
| Infringements | Infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation (speeding, red light, drink driving, other) | How many infringement notices have been received or notified in the past financial year? |
| Vehicle crash | Vehicle crash is any impact type incident involving a road registrable vehicle which resulted in damage to any vehicle or property or injury to person. (All crashes including non-insurance related) | How many crashes were reported in the past financial year, directly associated with work-related travel? |



A.4 Level 2

A.4.1 Lead Indicators

| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---|--|---|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Question | Measure |
| Road safety as an identified accountability within the organisation | Does your organisation identify accountability for maintaining and improving work-related road safety? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Are responsibilities allocated to a specific position, including responsibilities for reporting? Note: For small organisations, there may not be many levels, therefore apply the scale from senior management to lower levels accordingly | Rate on scale from 1 – 5, where responsibility for road safety lies at (5) highest level of management (e.g. board level) – (1) lower management (e.g. junior management) |
| Communication of road safety | Does your organisation ensure that road safety is communicated, understood, and that this information is accessible to all employees at all levels? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Performance targets | Does your organisation set and document key performance indicators and road safety targets for improved organisational road safety performance? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Performance target Reviews | Are regular performance reviews conducted to assess progress and make improvements to achieve the desired focus on results? | No or unknown |
| Communication of road safety or fleet- related data across departments | Within the organisation, is data shared across the different departments (e.g. HR, OH&S, fleet management, finance)? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Professional associations / coordination | Does your organisation have involvement in industry associations to support the organisation's awareness of good practice? | Yes – Active member / Yes – Non-Active member No |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---|---|--|
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Question | Measure |
| Journey management (policy and procedures) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented relating to (1) Identification and use of safe road networks / Ausrap road assessments; (2) points of contact; (3) environmental conditions; (4) high risk areas identified; (5) identified rests times and locations; and (6) fatigue management? | No or unknown Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, No or Unknown) for each (1 – 6) |
| Journey management (accountability and approval) | Are driving journeys verified and approved by (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager, (3) other? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown If Yes - (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager, (3) other (please specify) |
| Journey management (identifying and reporting risks) | Does your organisation have a system for identifying and reporting of risks for future journey management plans? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Question | Measure |
| Vehicle procurement (policy and procedure) | Does your organisation specify the safety rating and safety features of vehicles it acquires? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Vehicle procurement (elements of policy and procedures) | Does your organisation specify through policy and procedure, consider safety rating (ANCAP) when identifying fit-for-purpose vehicles? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown If Yes - 5 star ANCAP rated only 5 star ANCAP rated preferred and where possible – <i>fit-for-purpose</i> 4 star ANCAP rated or above Less than 4 star ANCAP rated is acceptable Less than 4 star ANCAP rated is acceptable when no other suitable vehicle is available with a higher rating. |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---|---|---|
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Question | Measure |
| Safe driving policy and procedures | What work-related road safety policies and procedures are developed and available within the organisation? (1) Driver selection and induction, (2) speeding, (3) fatigue, (4) mobile phone limiting, vehicle use, (5) passengers (6) drugs/ alcohol, (7) safety equipment, (8) licence requirements, (9) First aid, (10) Other please list) Does your organisation have policies and/or procedures to ensure safe driving and abiding by state or territory road rules? Does your organisation have policies and/or procedures to ensure the safety of employees as pedestrians or cyclists while at work? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, yes identified and being implemented, no or unknown) for each (1 – 8) Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Induction policy and procedures | Does your organisation undertake any vehicle induction processes? Does the organisation's induction program cover: (1) vehicle use (including the use of pooled vehicles), (2) appropriate driving behaviour, (3) legal checks, (4) driving requirements, (5) fitness to drive, (6) hands-on training to help new drivers be safe, (7) pedestrian and cycling safety? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, yes identified and being implemented, no or unknown) for each (1 – 7) |
| Induction policy and procedures (Beyond the workplace) | Does your organisation undertake induction for employee's family members that use organisational registered vehicles? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Road safety awareness , education and training | Does the organisation provide training, education and/or awareness training and education? Does the organisation provide training, education and/or awareness training and education for: (1) high risk drivers, (2) competency requirements, (3) vehicle use, (4) driving environments, (5) leadership training, (6) awareness/education sessions? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Road safety communication | What mechanisms are used to communicate driving safety within the organisation? Toolbox talks Emails Intranet Notice boards Safety alerts Other (please list) | Tick appropriate boxes |
| Driver mandatory screening/testing | Does the organisation provide mandatory driver screening/testing? How often are the following mandatory checks undertaken? 1 Drugs 2 Alcohol 3 Fatigue 4 Eye checks Other (please list) | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) None or unknown Weekly Monthly Annually Random When alerted or suspected Not undertaken |
| Pillar 5: Post-crash response | Question | Measure |
| Incident reporting (procedure) | Does the organisation have a documented procedure for vehicle incidents? Does the organisation's vehicle crash/incident procedure include: (1) notification process, (2) forms for collecting details and crash information? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown If yes - Tick appropriate boxes |
| Incident database management | Does the organisation have a system for collecting and analysing vehicle incident-related data? What kind of information does the database record: (1) driver demographics, (2) vehicle details, (3) at fault, (4) location, (5) cause of crash, (6) task, (7) time of day, (8) other vehicles involved? Others (please list) | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, yes identified and being |

| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | implemented, no or unknown) for each $(1 - 8)$ |
| Incident investigation (elements of policy and procedure) | Does the organisation have documented incident investigation policies and procedures? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Does your organisation (31) investigate root cause analysis, (2) define levels of investigation | No or unknown |
| | process, (3) consider third party/passenger feedback, (4) investigate feedback loop to the organisation? | Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, yes identified and being implemented, no or unknown) for each $(1 - 4)$ |
| | Is feedback provided about the investigation for future learning? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Recovery and rehabilitation (regional | If your organisation has driving-related activities in regional and remote locations, does the | Yes |
| and remote locations) | organisation have adequate emergency care (rapid retrieval and movement to hospital care facilities)? | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| | | Not Applicable |

A.4.2 Lag Indicators

| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|--|---|---|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Infringements (speeding infringements) | Speeding infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated speed limits. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have multiple speeding infringements in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (seatbelt use infringements) | Seatbelt infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated seatbelt usage | How many seatbelt infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have multiple seatbelt infringements in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (mobile phone infringements) | Mobile phone infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated mobile phone usage while driving. | How many mobile phone infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have multiple mobile phone infringements in the past financial year? |



| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|--|---|--|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Infringements (impaired driving infringements) | Impaired driving infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of driving impairment regulations. | How many impaired driving infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have multiple impaired driving infringements in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (red light infringements) | Red light infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation in not stopping at a red traffic light intersection. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have multiple speed infringements in the past financial year? |
| Vehicle incidents (frequency and | Measured by incident definition: | How many reversing incidents in the past financial year? |
| incident types) | Reversing Damage while parked/unreported damage | How many vehicles damaged while parked in past financial year? |
| | Rear-end | How many rear-end incidents in the past financial year? |
| | Failure to give way Parking | How many failures to give way incidents in the past financial year? |
| | Lane change merging | How many parking incidents in the past financial year? |
| | | How many lane change merging incidents in past financial year? |
| | | How many drivers have had multiple vehicle-related incidents in the past financial year? |
| Vehicle incidents (incident costs) | Incident costs are vehicle damage repair costs (exclusive of administration, legal, resource costs) | What is the total vehicle repair cost of incidents in the financial year? or unknown |
| Vehicle incidents (at fault) | "At fault" incidents, whereby the primary vehicle designated at fault is the organisation's vehicle (in contrast to another vehicle). | How many at fault incidents in the past financial year? or unknown |
| | | How many drivers have had multiple vehicle-related at fault incidents in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Vehicle incidents (lost time injuries) | A lost-time injury is defined as an occurrence that resulted in a fatality, permanent disability, or time lost from work of one day/shift or more. | How many lost time injuries have been reported due to a road- related injury in the past financial year? or unknown |
| | | How many drivers have had multiple vehicle-related lost time injuries in the past financial year? or unknown |



009006-

| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|--|--|--|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Vehicle incidents (number of vehicle incident related workers compensation claims) | Vehicle-related incidents where workers compensation has been claimed. | How many vehicle incident-related workers compensation claims have been initiated in the past financial year? or unknown How many drivers have multiple vehicle-related workers compensation claims in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Road safety communication | When a driver has been in a crash / incident or committed an offence, what happens? (1) Interviewed by own line manager (2) Interviewed by fleet manager (3) Counselling – specialist – fleet manager (4) Remedial training. | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) Nothing or unknown Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, Nothing or Unknown) for each (1 – 4) |

A.5 Level 3 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed light vehicle - lag indicators | | |
|--|---|--|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Policy and procedure compliance (lag indicator supporting each individually identified lead indicator measure) | Measuring compliance is an important part of road safety management; therefore, it is recommended that each identified policy and/or procedure in the above lead indicators requires a compliance measure. This question is to be replicated for each identified policy and/or procedure (e.g. mobile phone use). | Confirm, with evidence, the level of compliance for all levels of employment Less than 50% or unknown More than 50% less than 80% |
| Policy and procedures reviews | It is recommended that road safety policies and procedures are periodically reviewed to ensure they are up-to-date with technology and good practice. | Policy and procedures are reviewed: Every 12 months Every 2 years 3 years or more Not specified or not reviewed |



| Detailed light vehicle - lag indicators | | |
|--|---|---|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Personnel accountability (lag indicator supporting the individually identified | Ensuring accountability for the assigned responsibilities is a critical element of road safety management and implementation. This question is to be replicated for each identified lead | Confirm, with evidence, accountability for personnel compliance of assigned responsibilities. |
| lead indicator within personnel | indicator where personnel accountability is identified. | Personnel are always held to account |
| accountability for compliance) | | Personnel are sometimes held to account |
| | | Not held to account or unknown |
| Near misses | Does your organisation record near miss vehicle incidents? | How many near misses have been reported in the past financial |
| | What defines a near miss? | year? |
| | How is this information reported or recorded? | |
| Cost of vehicle incident-related workers compensation claims | | What is the total cost of vehicle incident-related workers compensation claims in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (parking infringements) | Parking infringement notifications received by the organisation in regard to company registered vehicle notices from illegal parking of a vehicle; this can indicate a relationship to 'damage while parked' incidents. | How many parking infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |

This forms the end of the proposed benchmarking framework for the light vehicle fleet measures and matrix.



APPENDIX BREVISED MATRIX – HEAVY VEHICLE FLEET MEASURES

B.1 Level 1 – Organisational Profile

| Level 1 - Heavy vehicle fleet profile | | |
|---|---|--|
| Profile indicator | Description | Measure |
| Industry type | Industry categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | The complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here |
| Core business activity | Further consultation required with SafeWork Australia and NTI to ensure national harmonisation of business definitions | The complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here |
| Core transportation environment | Aligned to heavy vehicle organisations, geographical zoning of operations | Rural/Remote Regional centres Metropolitan Interstate |
| Fleet size (heavy and rigid vehicles) | Further consultation required with NTI and industry to ensure national harmonisation of heavy vehicle definitions and classifications | Number of vehicles or Unknown |
| Fleet size (trailer units) | | Number of vehicles or unknown Percentage of hire vehicles |
| Total fuel usage (annual) | | Total litres of fuel used in the past financial year, or unknown |
| Total distance travelled | Total distance travelled only, detailed breakdown in Level 2 profile data areas | Total kilometres driven in the past financial year, or unknown |
| Heavy vehicle procurement timeframe | | On average, how many kilometres are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease)? |
| Heavy vehicle trailer procurement timeframe | | On average how many kilometres are trailer units kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease)? |


B.2 Level 2 – Organisational Profile

| Level 2 – Heavy vehicle fleet profile | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Profile indicator | Description | Measure |
| Driver ages (grouped) | How many workers in each age group? | Age groups |
| | | 15–24, |
| | | 25–34, |
| | | 35–44, |
| | | 45–54, |
| | | 55–64, |
| | | 65 years & over |
| Average age of fleet drivers | | Average age? |
| Distribution of fleet driver gender | Total number as a percentage | Males |
| | | Females |
| | | Transgender |
| Distribution of drivers | Does your organisation use volunteer drivers? | Yes |
| | | No |
| Total distance | Detailed breakdown | Further consultation required with industry to define. |
| | Definition of main vehicle descriptions to be | |
| Environmental factors | Does your organisation measure biofuels, add blue consumption? | Further consultation is required with industry to ensure industry led environmental factor definitions and measures are nationally harmonised |



18/11/2014

B.3 Level 1 – Lead Indicators

| Level 1 – Heavy vehicle fleet leading indicators | | |
|---|--|--|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Question | Measure |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Does your organisation recognise its responsibilities under law for providing its employee's with a safe work environment in relation to road safety? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Question | Measure |
| Journey management | Does your organisation manage and plan for work-related journeys? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Question | Measure |
| Vehicle procurement | Does your organisation seek the highest possible safety features in the vehicle when procuring fleet? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Question | Measure |
| Road safety | Does your organisation ensure your work-related drivers abide by state and territory mandated road rules? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Road safety-related communication | Does your organisation discuss or communicate with individuals, groups or the whole organisation, road safety-related issues or risks? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Driver licensing | Does your organisation identify the need to ensure that all drivers (work or commuting) have licences that are valid in Australia and appropriate for the class of vehicle used? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |



| Level 1 – Heavy vehicle fleet leading indicators | | |
|--|---|---|
| Pillar 5: Post crash response | Question | Measure |
| Incident reporting | Does your organisation have a vehicle incident notification process? (e.g. A central phone number | Yes |
| | for employees involved in an accident to phone, or an in-vehicle form to complete) | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Incident investigation | Does your organisation identify the need and undertake incident investigation where either an employee and/or organisational vehicle is involved? | Yes / Yes – but organisational vehicle related only / No or unknown |

B.4 Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators

| Level 1 – Heavy vehicle fleet lag indicators | | |
|--|--|--|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure |
| Infringements | Infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation (speeding, red light, drink driving, other) | How many infringement notices have been received or notified in the past financial year? |
| | | Need to seek further industry and professional clarifications to define infringements to ensure national harmonisation of definitions and measures |
| Vehicle incident | Vehicle incident is any impact type incident involving a road registrable vehicle which resulted in damage to any vehicle or property, or injury to a person. (All incidents including non-insurance related). | How many incidents were reported in the past financial year? |



B.5 Level 2 – Lead Indicators

| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---|--|---|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Question | Measure |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Does your organisation identify accountability for maintaining and improving work-related road safety, which are documented through policy and procedures and allocated to specific positions, including responsibilities for reporting. | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Are responsibilities allocated to a specific position, including responsibilities for reporting? Note: For small organisations, there may not be many levels; therefore, apply the scale from senior management to lower levels accordingly. | Rate on scale from 1–5, where responsibility for road safety lies at (5) for the highest level of management (e.g. board level) and (1) for lower management (i.e. junior management) |
| Communication of policies and procedures | Does your organisation ensure that road safety is communicated, understood, and that this information is accessible to all employees (and contractors where appropriate) at all levels? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Communication of policies and procedures | Does your organisation have an internal consultation process that allows drivers to have input into safety management? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Performance targets | Does your organisation set and document its own key performance indicators and road safety targets for improved organisational road safety performance | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Performance target reviews | Are regular performance reviews conducted to assess progress and make improvements to achieve the desired focus on results? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Communication of road safety or fleet related data across departments | Within the organisation, is fleet and road safety related data shared across the different departments (eg. HR, OH&S, fleet management, finance) for the benefit of reducing risk and identifying concerns? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Professional Associations / Coordination | Does your organisation have involvement in industry associations to support the organisations awareness of good practice? | Yes – Active member / Yes – Non-active member No |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|--|---|--|
| Sub-contractor auditing | Does your organisation undertake auditing of subcontractors to ensure compliance with appropriate road safety laws, legislative requirements and company safety requirements? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) No or unknown |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Question | Measure |
| Journey management (policy and procedures) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented? | Yes Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | (1) identification and use of safe road networks / Ausrap road assessments, (2) emergency and key | No or unknown |
| | organisational phone numbers, (3) environmental conditions, (4) high risk areas identified, (5) identified rest times and locations, (6) build in flexibility (i.e., process for delays, loading), (7) engage and apply to sub-contractors? | Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, No or Unknown) for each (1 – 7) |
| Journey management (accountability | Are driving journeys verified and approved by: (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager (3) other? | Yes / No |
| and approval) | | If Yes - (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager, (3) other |
| Journey management (identifying and | Does your organisation have a system or process for identifying and reporting of journey risks for | Yes |
| reporting risks) | future journey management plans? | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Question | Measure |
| Vehicle procurement (policy and | Does your organisation specify through policy and procedure, the minimum safety feature | Yes |
| procedure) | requirements of a vehicle in identifying fit for purpose? | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Venicle procurement specifications consider the safety features, including: | No or unknown |
| | Compatible truck and trailer units | |
| | Integrated seat helt/suspension seat | |
| | Anti-lock Braking System (ABS) | If Vac Tick appropriate bayes |
| | Flectronic Braking System (FBS) | I Tes – Tick appropriate boxes |
| | Electronic Stability Control (ESC) | |
| | Airbags | |
| | FUP (Front Underrun Protection) | |
| | Side and Rear Underrun Protection | |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Lane Assist | |
| | Adaptive Cruise Control | |
| | Event recording cameras | |
| | Blind spot camera coverage | |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Question | Measure |
| Safe driving policy and procedures | What work related issues are included by the organisation's road safety policy: | Yes |
| | (1) Driver selection and induction, (2) speeding (3) fatigue, (4) mobile phone in vehicle use, (5) | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | passengers, (6) drugs / alcohol, (7) safety equipment, (8) licence requirements, (9) use of safe roads in journey planning, (10) first aid, (11) load restraints? | No or unknown |
| | Other (please list) | Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, No or Unknown) for each $(1 - 11)$ |
| Induction policy and procedures | Does your organisation undertake any vehicle induction processes? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Does the organisation's induction program cover: (1) vehicle use (including the use of pooled | None or unknown |
| | vehicles), (2) appropriate driving behaviour, (3) legal checks, (4) driving requirements, (5) fitness to | |
| | drive, (6) hands-on training to help new drivers be safe, (7) pedestrian and cycling safety – vehicle blind spots. | Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, No or Unknown) for each $(1 - 7)$ |
| Road safety awareness, education | Does the organisation provide training, education and/or awareness for : | Yes |
| and training | (1) high risk drivers, (2) competency requirements, (3) vehicle use, (4) driving environments, (5) | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | leadership training, (6) awareness/education sessions, (7) chain of responsibility, (8) safe load restraint, (9) vehicle safety checking and maintenance checking? | No or unknown |
| | | Tick appropriate boxes (Yes, Yes identified and being implemented, |
| | | No or Unknown) for each (1 – 9) |
| Road Safety Communication | What mechanisms are used to communicate driving safety within the organisation? | Tick appropriate boxes |
| | Toolbox talks | |
| | Emails | |
| | Intranet | |
| | Notice boards | |
| | Safety alerts | |
| | Other (please list) | |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Driver mandatory screening/testing | Does the organisation provide mandatory driver screening/testing? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | How often are the following mandatory checks undertaken? | None or unknown |
| | (1) Drugs | |
| | (2) Alcohol | Weekly |
| | (3) Fatigue | Monthly |
| | (4) Eye checks | Annually |
| | Other (please list) | Random |
| | | When alerted or suspected |
| | | Not undertaken |
| Near misses | Does your organisation record near miss vehicle incidents? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Pillar 5: Post-crash response | Question | Measure |
| Incident database management | Does the organisation have a system for collecting and analysing vehicle incident-related data? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Incident reporting (procedure) | Does the organisation have a documented procedure for vehicle incidents? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Does the organisation's vehicle crash / incident documentation include: | No or unknown |
| | (1) notification process, (2) forms for collecting details and crash information? | |
| | | If yes - Tick appropriate boxes |
| | | |
| Incident database management | Does the organisation have a system for collecting and analysing vehicle incident-related data? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | What kind of information does the database record: (1) driver demographics, (2) vehicle details, (3) | No or unknown |
| | at fault, (4) cause of crash, (5) location, (6) environmental factors i.e. day of week, weather, time of | |
| | day etc., (7) others (please list)? | If yes - Tick appropriate boxes |

| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| Incident investigation (elements of | Does the organisation have documented incident investigation policies and procedures? | Yes |
| policy and procedure) | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | Does your organisation (1) investigate root cause analysis, (2) define levels of investigation | No or unknown |
| | process, (3) consider third party/passenger feedback, (4) investigate the feedback loop to the organisation? | If yes - Tick appropriate boxes |
| | Is feedback provided about the investigation for future learning? | Yes |
| | | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | | No or unknown |
| Recovery and rehabilitation (regional | If your organisation has driving-related activities in regional and remote locations, does the | Yes |
| and remote locations) | organisation have adequate emergency care (rapid retrieval and movement to hospital care | Yes (identified and being implemented) |
| | facilities)? | No or unknown |
| | | Not applicable |

B.6 Level 2 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|--|---|---|
| Indicator | Definition | Question / Measure |
| Infringements (speeding infringements) | Speeding infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated speed limits. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (seatbelt Use infringements) | Seatbelt infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated seatbelt usage | How many seatbelt infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (mobile phone infringements) | Mobile phone infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated mobile phone usage while driving. | How many mobile phone infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (impaired driving infringements) | Impaired driving infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of driving impairment regulations. | How many impaired driving infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |
| Infringements (red light Infringements) | Red light infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation in not stopping at a red traffic light intersection. | How many red light infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? |



| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|---|--|---|
| Indicator | Definition | Question / Measure |
| Vehicle crashes (frequency and crash types) | Measured by crash definition: Reversing Damage while parked/unreported damage Rear-end Failure to give way Parking Lane change merging Loss of load Overturning Pedestrian/vulnerable road users Run off road Head-on | How many reversing crashes in the past financial year? How many vehicles damaged while parked in the past financial year? How many rear-end crashes in the past financial year? How many failures were there to give way crashes in the past financial year? How many parking crashes in the past financial year? How many lane change merging crashes in the past financial year? How many losses of load incidents in the past financial year? How many overturn crashes in the past financial year? How many pedestrian / vulnerable road user crashes in the past financial year? How many run off the road crashes in the past financial year? How many head-on crashes in the past financial year? How many drivers have had multiple vehicle crashes in the past financial year? |
| Vehicle crashes (crash costs) | Crash costs are vehicle damage repair costs (exclusive of administration, legal, resource costs) | What is the total vehicle repair cost of crashes in the financial year? or unknown |
| Vehicle crashes (at fault) | "At fault" crashes, whereby the primary vehicle designated "at fault" is the organisation's vehicle (in contrast to another vehicle) | How many at fault crashes in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Vehicle crashes (lost time injuries) | A lost-time injury is defined as an occurrence that resulted in a fatality, permanent disability, or time lost from work of one day/shift or more. | How many lost time injuries have been reported due to a road-related injury in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Vehicle crashes (number of vehicle crash related workers compensation claims) | Vehicle related incidents were works compensation has been claimed | How many vehicle crash-related worker compensation claims have been initiated in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Multiple employee incidents | Employees involved in more than one crash in the determined timeframe | How many employees have been involved in more than one vehicle crash in the past financial year? |

| Detailed Operational lag indicators | | |
|--|---|---|
| Indicator | Definition | Question / Measure |
| Truck wear and maintenance cost (relevant to the individual truck classifications selected in the organisation profile) | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Trailer units wear and maintenance cost (relevant to the individual trailer classifications selected in organisation profile) | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Truck tyre repair / replacement cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Trailer units tyre repair / replacement cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Total tonnage carried | Annual total cartage (tonnes) | What is the total cartage (tonnes) in the past financial year? or unknown |
| Near misses | Recorded near miss reports, vehicle incidents | How many near misses have been reported in the past financial year? |



B.7 Level 3 – Lag Indicators

| Level 2 Detailed lag indicators | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Lag indicator | Description | Measure | | |
| Policy and procedure compliance (lag indicator supporting the individually identified lead indicators) | Measuring compliance is an important part of road safety management; therefore, it is recommended that each identified policy and/or procedure in the above lead indicators require a compliance measure. This question is to be replicated for each identified policy and or procedure (e.g. mobile phone use). | Confirm, with evidence, the level of compliance for all levels of employment Less than 50% or unknown More than 50% less than 80% More than 80% | | |
| Policy and procedures reviews | It is recommended that road safety policies and procedures are periodically reviewed to ensure they are up-to-date with technology and good practice. | Policy and Procedures are reviewed: Every 12 months Every 2 years 3 years or more Not specified or not reviewed | | |
| Personnel accountability (lag indicator supporting the individually identified lead indicator within personnel accountability for compliance) | Ensuring accountability for the assigned responsibilities is a critical element of road safety management and implementation. This question is to be replicated for each identified lead indicator where personnel accountability is identified. | Confirm, with evidence, accountability for personnel compliance of assigned responsibilities. Personnel are always held to account Personnel are sometimes held to account Not held to account or unknown | | |
| Cost of vehicle crash-related workers compensation claims | | What is the total cost of vehicle crash-related workers compensation claims in the past financial year? | | |



APPENDIX C RESULTS AND SUMMARISED COMMENTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following provides a summary of the five questions that workshop participants were asked to complete before leaving the workshop. Of the 73 registered participants, 31 questionnaires were received of which the following results and feedback have been summarised in a non-prioritised order.

Question 1

Would you use a benchmarking tool, such as this, within your organisation?

Yes = 28, No = 1, Don't know = 2

Question 2

How can a benchmarking project, such as this, assist your organisation in advancing work-related road safety?

- As a safety-related business we would like to lead by example, need to be an example!
- Ensuring industry has a standard expectation
- Quantitative matrix to guide improvements and set targets, gap analysis
- To promote to client fleet organisations as an improvement tool
- The project would change driving culture towards safer driving
- Share information and learning
- Additional Auditing and compliance information
- All data in a centralised location & able to compare with other organisations
- Support current policies and procedures and provide statistical factors

- Uniformity and consistency with implementation
- It's a one stop shop to allow access to all information in one point
- Good guideline to assess current practices within organisation and to other companies
- This would assist in making sure all contractors have the right requirements to move our freight
- Ability to assess our systems/processes/procedures against good practice and access resources to assist in closing gaps
- Help shape vehicle/driving policies
- Standardisation
- This would allow us to measure our strengths and weaknesses, as well as learning from each other's experiences.

Question 3

What would you see or perceive as critical barriers to the use of a national fleet benchmarking tool?

- Ease of use, small business may not have available data
- Compliance vs voluntary ownership
- Stays up-to-date and relevant

.

- Complexity of data required to answer some questions, time required
- Participation from organisations that fail to see vehicle safety as important
- Getting organisations to participate
- Complexity of transport industry, difficulties with comparing like to like
- Senior management commitment
- Accuracy and integrity of data
- Getting the foundations right
- Including too many questions initially
- Jurisdictional control and buy-in
- Company size

- Fiscal reality of implementation and selling the financial benefits to business owners
- Getting organisations to accept and use it
- Ambiguity in questions, language used not easily understood by industry
- Overly time-consuming to complete
- Relevance to my business and sensitivity of tool to be matched to my business
- Promotion of tool, need state employed reps
- Small database (number of organisations)
- Leader support.

Question 4

What are the priority key measures that will assist an organisation on the journey to reducing its road-related risk?

- Acknowledging risks, analysis of incidents, company culture
- Monitoring, communication, sharing lessons learned, understanding risks
- Resources, higher level management buy-in
- Establishing vehicle use, risk management system, engaging drivers in the process
- Leadership, culture of incident reporting, data collection, performance management system
- Lag crash data
- Accept that it is a problem
- Driver behaviour
- Education
- Audits
- Feedback
- Savings in dollars
- Improvement in lost time injury results
- Fatigue

- Driver retention rate
- Incidents per million km's
- Risk assessment
- Contractor involvement
- Awareness
- Safe roads / maintenance
- Safer vehicles
- Safer operators
- Fit for purpose
- Cultural change
- Streamlined and consistent procedures
- Standard fleet requirements and vehicles available for purchase and use
- Drivers (attitude, behaviour and capability)
- Policies and procedures
- Create a direct responsibility for road safety
- Focus on communication and

NRSPP

.

- Speed
- Driver assessment
- Driver training
- Injury rate
- At fault crash rate

Question 5

What is important for your organisation to be measuring?

Lead Indicators = 11, Lag Indicators = 0, Both = 19

education

- Individual responsibility that is backed by managers
- Driver competency/attitude.

NRSPP

APPENDIX D LIGHT VEHICLE FLEET PROFILE QUESTIONS: COLLATED COMMENTS FROM WORKSHOP

D.1 Level 1 – Organisational Profile

| Level 1 - Organisational profile | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Indicator | Description | Question/measure | no support | |
| | Light fleet profile | | | |
| Industry type | Industry categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | A complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Core business activity | Occupation categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | A complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Fleet size (owned or leased) by the organisation | All light vehicles owned or directly leased by the organisation | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | Reword: Collapse these 3 fleet questions into one. |
| Fleet size (salary sacrificed / salary packaged / novated lease) | A leased vehicle on behalf of an employee, either through salary sacrificing or novated lease arrangements | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | |
| Fleet size (grey vehicles) | 'Grey fleet' is the term used to describe any vehicles that do not belong to the company, but which are used for business travel | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | |
| Tool of trade vehicles | Tool of trade- vehicle registered and supplied by the organisation in order for the employee to be able to perform their job role | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | Include: A passenger vehicle category (novated/supplied), make/model/type |
| Total distance travelled (total fleet) | | Total kilometres driven in the past financial year (light fleet) or unknown | | Ensure consistency in calculation method |
| Total fuel usage (annual) | | Total litres of fuel used in the past financial year, or unknown | | Exclude this item |



| | | Support/ | |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| Description | Question/measure | no support | |
| | On average, how many years are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease) or unknown | | |
| | Include: | | |
| | | | Items on venicle maintenance and servicing |
| | | | Items that ask for distribution of fleet (% light % heavy) |
| | Description | Description Question/measure On average, how many years are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease) or unknown | Description Question/measure On average, how many years are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease) or unknown Image: Comparison of the sold of the so |

D.2 Level 2 – Organisational Profile

| Level 2 - Organisational profile | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Indicator | Description | Organisational profile | no support | |
| | Level 2 Light vehicle fleet profile | | | |
| Average age of fleet drivers | | Average age? | | |
| Driver ages (grouped) | How many employees in each age group? | Age groups: 15–24, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64, 65 years & over | | Estimate rather than categories |
| Distribution of fleet driver gender | | Males Females | | Estimate rather than categories |
| | | | | Comment: This could be level 3 data |



D.3 Level 1 – Lead Indicators

| Level 1 –Light vehicle fleet leading indicators | | Support/no | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Description/definition | Measure | support | |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Does your organisation have responsibilities assigned to employee(s) for maintaining and improving work- related road safety | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: Define the person responsible and identify existence of physical contract. Include: Does the CEO value road safety culture? Does the organisation have a road safety induction program? Role of family when driving a leased vehicle Licence checks Define road safety |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Journey management | Does your organisation identify the need for managing and planning work-related journeys | Yes / No or unknown | | Include: fatigue |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Vehicle procurement | Does your organisation consider the safety rating and safety features of a vehicle prior to purchase? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: Does your organisation consider the safety rating and safety features of a vehicle in identifying fit for purpose? |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Mobile phone use | Are staff, at all levels of the organisation, allowed to use a mobile phone while driving? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: Define mobile phone use (hands-free/hands-held) |
| Road safety related communication | Does your organisation discuss or communicate with individuals, groups or the whole organisation, road safety related issues or risks | Yes / No or unknown | | |



| | Level 1 –Light vehicle fleet leading | indicators | Support/no | Comments from the workshops |
|-------------------------------|--|---|------------|---|
| Driver and rider licensing | Does your organisation identify the need to ensure that all drivers (work or commuting) have valid licences that are appropriate for the class of vehicle | Yes / Yes – work related only / No or unknown | | |
| | | | | Additional items to include: Fitness to drive Familiarisation with the vehicle Pre-journey fatigue level Policies on health, drug, alcohol use Distractions (maps, touchscreens, food/drink) |
| Pillar 5: Post-crash response | Description / Definition | Measure | | |
| Crash reporting | Does your organisation have a vehicle crash notification process? (e.g. A central phone number for employees involved in an accident to phone or an in vehicle form to complete) | Yes / No | | |
| Crash investigation | Does your organisation identify the need and undertake crash investigation where either an employee and/or organisational vehicle is involved | Yes / Yes – but organisational vehicle related only / No or unknown | | Include: Does your organisation rely on insurance data? Does your crash investigation process conduct a root cause analysis? Include: Define levels of investigation process |
| | | | | Include a pillar on speed management |



- 48 -

009006-

D.4 Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators

| Operational lag indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| | Level 1 Operational Lag indica | ators | | |
| Infringements | Infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation (speeding, red light, drink driving, other) | How many infringement notices have been received or notified in the past financial year? | | |
| Vehicle crash | Vehicle crash is any impact type incident involving a road registrable vehicle which resulted in damage to any vehicle or property or injury to person. (All crashes including non-insurance related) | How many crashes were reported in past financial year? | | Include: Does your organisation include commuting crashes in their definition of a work-related driving crash? |
| | · | | | Additional items to include: Does your organisation have a system to collect information on near misses? Does your organisation have a reporting culture of at-fault? |



D.5 Level 2 – Lead Indicators

| Level 2 Detailed risk management leading indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Description/definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Responsibilities assigned to employee(s) for maintaining and improving work- related road safety which are documented and allocated to specific positions, including responsibilities for reporting | Yes / No | | Include: An item on culture (link with safety climate items) |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | What is the highest level of employment that has an identified responsibility for road safety? Senior executive (board level) Senior management Superintendent Manager / Supervisor Other (please specify) | The list of staff levels will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process: (1) highest level of management – (5) lower management | | Reword: Open-ended question on position in organisation |
| Communication of policies and procedures | Does your organisation ensure that policies and procedures and communicated , understood and accessible to all employees at all levels ? | Yes / No | | Reword: Does your organisation have policies and procedures and then, ask question regarding communication |
| Performance targets | Does your organisation set and document its own key performance indicators and road safety targets for improved organisational road safety performance? | Yes / No | | |
| Performance target reviews | Are regular performance reviews conducted to assess progress and make improvements to achieve the desired focus on results? | Yes / No | | |
| Communication of road safety or fleet related data across departments | Within the organisation, is data shared across the different departments (e.g. HR, OH&S, fleet management, finance)? | Yes / Yes but not always / No | | |



| | Level 2 Detailed risk management leadi | ing indicators | Support/ | Comments from the workshops |
|--|---|---|----------|---|
| Professional Associations / Coordination | Does your organisation have involvement in industry associations to support the organisation's awareness of good practice? | Yes – Active member / Yes – Non-Active member No | | |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Description/definition | Question/measure | | |
| Journey management (policy and procedures) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented? | Yes / No | | Comment: Should this be fatigue specific? |
| Journey management (elements of policy and procedure) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented relating to: (1) identification and use of safe road networks / Ausrap road assessments, (2) points of contact,.(3) environmental conditions, (4) high risk areas identified, (5) identified rests times and locations? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |
| Journey management (accountability and approval) | Are driving journeys verified/approved by (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager | Yes / No If Yes - (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager | | |
| Journey management (identifying and reporting risks) | | | | Include: Scheduling times |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Description/definition | Question/measure | | |
| Vehicle procurement (policy and procedure) | Does your organisation have documented vehicle procurement specifications, consider the safety rating and safety features (Heavy Vehicles) of a vehicle prior to purchase? | Yes / No | | Reword: overlap with next question |
| Vehicle procurement (elements of policy and procedures) (light vehicles) | Vehicle procurement specifications, consider the safety rating (ANCAP) | ANCAP Safety ratings 5 star only 5 star preferred and where possible 4 star or above | | |



| Level 2 Detailed risk management leading indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Safe driving policy and procedures | What work-related road safety policies and procedures are developed and available within the organisation: (1) driver selection and induction, (2) speeding, (3) fatigue, (4) in vehicle mobile phone use, (5) passengers, (6) drugs/ alcohol, (7) safety equipment, (7) licence requirements, (8) use of safety network (9) first aid Other (please list) | Does your organisation have policies and procedures relating to: The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Suggestion: Speeding should have its own pillar Include: Item that mentions abiding by road rules Comment: Fatigue as a separate issue |
| Induction policy and procedures | What steps are undertaken in any vehicle induction process? Does the organisation's induction program cover: (1) vehicle use (including the use of pooled vehicles), (2) appropriate driving behaviour, (3) legal checks, (4) driving requirements, (5) hands-on training to help new drivers be safe? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Include: Driver/behaviour capability |
| Road safety awareness , education and training | Does the organisation provide training, education and/or awareness for: (1) high risk drivers, (2) competency requirements, (3) vehicle use, (4) driving environments, (5) leadership training, (6) awareness/education sessions? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |



| | Level 2 Detailed risk management leadi | ng indicators | Support/ | Comments from the workshops |
|---|---|--|----------|-----------------------------|
| Road Safety Communication | What mechanisms are used to communicate driving safety within the organisation? Toolbox talks Emails Intranet Notice boards Safety alerts Other (please list) | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |
| Driver mandatory screening/testing | How often are the following mandatory checks undertaken? Drugs Alcohol Fatigue Eye checks Other (please list) | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |
| Pillar 5: Post crash response | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Crash database management | Does the organisation have a system for collecting and analysing vehicle crash-related data? | Yes / No | | |
| Crash database management (Elements of database) | What kind of information does the database record: (1) driver demographics, (2) vehicle details, (3) at fault, (4) cause of crash. Others (please list) | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Reword: Split elements |
| Crash reporting (procedure) | Does the organisation have a documented procedure for vehicle crashes? | Yes / No | | |



| | Level 2 Detailed risk management leading indicators | | | Comments from the workshops |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Crash reporting (elements of procedure) | Vehicle crash/incident documented including: (1) notification process, (2) forms for collecting details and crash information | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |
| Crash investigation (policy and procedure) | Does the organisation have documented crash investigation policies and procedures? | Yes / No | | |
| Crash investigation (Elements of Policy and Procedure) | Does the organisation have documented crash investigation policies and procedures? | Yes / No | • | |
| Recovery and rehabilitation (regional and remote locations) | If your organisation has driving-related activities in regional and remote locations, does the organisation have adequate emergency care (rapid retrieval and movement to hospital care facilities)? | Yes / No / Not Applicable | | |



D.6 Level 2 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed operational lag indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| | Light vehicle fleet | | | |
| Infringements (speeding infringements) | Speeding infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated speed limits. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (seatbelt use infringements) | Seatbelt infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated seatbelt usage | How many Seatbelt infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (mobile phone infringements) | Mobile phone infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated mobile phone usage while driving. | How many mobile phone infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | ~ | |
| Infringements (impaired driving infringements) | Impaired driving infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of driving impairment regulations. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (red light Infringements) | Red light infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation in not stopping at a red traffic light intersection. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |



| Detailed operational lag indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|---|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| Vehicle crashes (frequency and crash types) | Measured by crash definition: Reversing Damage while parked/unreported damage Rear-end Failure to give way Parking Lane change merging | How many reversing crashes in the past financial year? How many vehicles damaged while parked in the past financial year? How many rear end crashes in the past financial year? How many failures to give way crashes in the past financial year? How many parking crashes in the past financial year? How many lane change merging crashes in the past financial year? | | Include: Item on avoidable crashes/at fault crashes |
| Vehicle crashes (crash costs) | Crash costs are vehicle damage repair costs (exclusive of administration, legal, resource costs) | What is the total vehicle repair cost of crashes in the financial year? or unknown | | |
| Vehicle crashes (at fault) | "At fault" crashes whereby the primary vehicle designated "at fault" is the organisation's vehicle (in contrast to another vehicle) | How many at fault crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Vehicle crashes (lost time injuries) | A "lost time" injury is defined as an occurrence that resulted in a fatality, permanent disability, or time lost from work of one day/shift or more. | How many lost time injuries have been reported due to a road-related injury in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Vehicle crashes (number of vehicle crash related workers compensation claims) | | How many vehicle crash-related workers compensation claims have been initiated in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Multiple employee incidents | Employees involved in more than one crash in the determined timeframe | How many employees have been involved in more than one vehicle crash in the past financial year? | | |



D.7 Level 3 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed lag indicators | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| Policy and procedure compliance (lag indicator supporting the identified lead indicators) | Measuring compliance is an important part of road safety management; therefore, it is recommended that each identified policy and/or procedure in the above lead indicators requires a compliance measure. This question is to be replicated for each policy and/or procedure (e.g. mobile phone use) | Confirm, with evidence the level of compliance for all levels of employment Less than 50% or unknown More than 50% less than 80% More than 80% | | |
| Policy and procedures reviews | It is recommended that road safety policies and procedures are periodically reviewed to ensure they are up-to-date with technology and good practice | Policy and procedures are reviewed: Every 12 months Every 2 years 3 years or more Not specified or not reviewed | | |
| Personnel Accountability (lag indicator supporting the identified lead indicator personnel accountability for compliance) | Ensuring accountability for the assigned responsibilities is a critical element of road safety management and implementation. This question is to be replicated for each identified lead indicator where personnel accountability is identified. | Confirm, with evidence, accountability for personnel compliance of assigned responsibilities. Personnel are always held to account Personnel are sometimes held to account Not held to account or unknown | | |
| Near misses | Does your organisation record near miss vehicle incidents? What defines a near miss? How is this information reported or recorded? | How many near misses have been reported in the past financial year? | | |
| Cost of vehicle crash-related workers compensation claims | | What is the total cost of vehicle crash- related workers compensation claims in the past financial year? | | |



| Detailed lag indicators | | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|--|--|------------|--|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | | |
| Infringements (Parking Infringements) | Parking Infringement notifications received by the organisation in regard to company registered vehicle notices from illegal parking of a vehicle; this can indicate a relationship to "damage while parked" incidents. | How many parking infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | | |
| | | | | Include: Level 3 leading indicators Passenger involvement – reporting-investigation Public involvement-reporting-investigation | |



APPENDIX E HEAVY VEHICLE FLEETS: COLLATED COMMENTS FROM WORKSHOP

E.1 Level 1 – Organisational Profile

| Level 1 - Heavy fleet profile | | Support/no support | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Industry type | Industry categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | The complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Core business activity | Occupation categories obtained from SafeWork Australia | The complete list will be available as a drop down menu and inserted here | | |
| Fleet size (heavy vehicles and tractor units) | | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | Include: Tractor size needs to be defined (>4.5 – 12 tonne GVM/GCM, 12+) Include: Item for light trucks/vans |
| Fleet size (trailer units) | | Number of vehicles or Unknown | | |
| Total fuel usage (annual) | | Total litres of fuel used in the past financial year? Or unknown | | |
| Total distance travelled | | Total kilometres driven in the past financial year (Light Fleet)? or unknown | | |
| Heavy vehicle procurement timeframe | | On average how many kilometres are vehicles kept before they are disposed of (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease). | | |
| Heavy vehicle trailer procurement timeframe | | On average, how many kilometres are trailer units kept before they are disposed (e.g. sold, auctioned, end of lease). | | |
| | | · | | Items to be included: |
| | | | | Total hours worked |
| | | | | Kilometres per person hours (12 tonne+/12 tonne-) |
| | | | | A breakdown of driving conditions (% of urban vs % of rural driving) |
| | | | | Night/interstate driving |
| | | | | Age of business |
| | | | | Are you a leading premise for the purposes of the HVNL fatigue laws? |



| Level 1 - Heavy fleet profile | Support/no support | Comments from the workshops |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | - If so, do you have rest facilities available for drivers? Are you |
| | | enrolled in NHVAS, TruckSafe? |
| | | Items for sub-contractors |
| | | Size-owned fleet |
| | | Comments: |
| | | Need to define heavy vehicle fleet (e.g., >4.5 tonne) |

E.2 Level 2 – Organisational Profile

| Level 2 – Heavy fleet profile | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Indicator | Description | Organisational profile | no support | | |
| Average age of fleet drivers | | Average age? | | | |
| Driver ages (grouped) | How many employees in each age group? | Age groups 15-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 years & over | | Reword: replace employees with workers (as per definition in the worker act) | |
| Distribution of fleet driver gender | | Males Females | | Include: Category for transgender | |
| | • | | | Items to be included: Environmental factors/measures (Co2, biofuels, blue consumption) Vehicle maintenance scheduling Category for volunteer and hire vehicles Indigenous drivers | |



PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

E.3 Level 1 – Lead Indicators

| Level 1 – Heavy vehicle fleet leading indicators | | | | Comments from the workshops |
|---|--|---------------------|------------|---|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Description/definition | Measure | no support | |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Does your organisation have responsibilities assigned to employee(s) for maintaining and improving work-related road safety? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: This items does not identify accountability. Also suggested to include a role of a person (e.g. CEO) "Does your organisation have accountability assigned?" And "Does your organisation know and understand the |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Description/definition | Measure | | roles and obligations under COR?" |
| Journey management | Does your organisation identify the need for managing and planning of work-related journeys? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: "Does your organisation manage and plan (take out 'identify the need')" Comment: Need to define journey management |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Vehicle procurement | Does your organisation consider safety features of a vehicle prior to purchase? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: Irrelevant to heavy vehicles. "Does your organisation consider safety features of a vehicle" or "Does your organisation purchase vehicles according to safety ratings/features?" Include: "Is your fleet audited?" |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Mobile phone use | Are staff, at all levels of the organisation, allowed to use a mobile phone while driving? | Yes / No or unknown | | Reword: This category could be reworded and specific behaviours removed "Does your organisation have a minimum standard for driving behaviour?" Include: Level 2 – hands free/Level 3 –conditions (length of call) |
| Road safety-related communication | Does your organisation discuss or communicate with individuals, groups or the whole organisation, road safety-related issues or risks? | Yes / No or unknown | | |



| Level 1 – Heavy vehicle fleet leading indicators | | | | Comments from the workshops |
|--|---|---|------------|--|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Description/definition | Measure | no support | |
| Driver licensing | Does your organisation identify the need to ensure that all drivers (work or commuting) have valid licences that are appropriate for the class of vehicle? | Yes / Yes – work related only / No or unknown | | Include: Need to capture overseas issues Reword: Competency and capability |
| | Include: Fitness to drive | | | |
| Pillar 5: Post-crash response | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Crash reporting | Does your organisation have a vehicle crash notification process? (e.g. A central phone number for employees involved in an accident to phone or an in-vehicle form to complete) | Yes / No | | Reword: Change crash to incident Include: Need a definition for crash reporting |
| Crash investigation | Does your organisation identify the need and undertake crash investigation where either an employee and/or organisational vehicle is involved? | Yes / Yes – but organisational vehicle related only / No or unknown | | Reword: Does your organisation undertake crash investigation (take out 'identify the need') Reword: change crash to incident |
| | | | | Include: Audit of sub-contractors |

E.4 Level 1 – Operational Lag Indicators

| Operational lag indicators | | | Support/ | Comments from the workshops |
|----------------------------|---|---|------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | no support | |
| Infringements | Infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation (speeding, red light, drink driving, other) | How many infringement notices have been received or notified in the past financial year? | | Reword: Remove drink driving and clarify terminology for infringements Include: Need a definition of infringements Comment: Policy on access and how data is recorded |
| Vehicle crash | Vehicle crash is any impact type incident involving a road registrable vehicle which resulted in damage to any vehicle or property or injury to person. (All crashes including non- insurance related) | How many crashes were reported in past financial year? | | Reword: Change crash to incident Include: Need a definition of crash/incident |
| | Include: Direct notices – non-conformance (internal audit) | | | |

- 62 -



E.5 Level 2 – Lead Indicators

| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | | Support/ no support | Comments from the workshops |
|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| Pillar 1: Road safety management | Description/definition | Question/measure | | |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | Responsibilities assigned to employee(s) for maintaining and improving work related road safety which are documented and allocated to specific positions, including responsibilities for reporting | Yes / No | | Include: Near miss estimate (i.e., any incident that could have occurred) |
| Road safety as an identified responsibility within the organisation | What is the highest level of employment that has an identified responsibility for road safety? Senior executive (board level) Senior management Superintendent Manager / Supervisor Other (please specify) | The list of staff levels will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process: (1) highest level of management – (5) lower management | | Reword: Remove the category for superintendent. Other categories would not be consistent across organisations. Comment: Where are the actions allocated within these levels? |
| Communication of policies and procedures | Does your organisation ensure that policies and procedures are communicated, understood and accessible to all employees at all levels? | Yes / No | | Reword: This item needs to be preceded by one asking about the existence of policies and procedures. Include: Define the process for new and existing workers Process for sub-contractors Review and update of communication |
| Performance targets | Does your organisation set and document its own key performance indicators and road safety targets for improved organisational road safety performance? | Yes / No | | Include: An item asking "What are the performance targets?" |
| Performance target reviews | Are regular performance reviews conducted to assess progress and make improvements to achieve the desired focus on results? | Yes / No | | |
| Communication of road safety or fleet - related data across departments | Within the organisation, is data shared across the different departments (e.g. HR, OH&S, fleet management, finance)? | Yes / Yes but not always / No | | Include: Driver input into safety management (i.e., internal consultation) |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | | | Comments from the workshops |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Professional Associations / Coordination | Does your organisation have involvement in industry associations to support the organisation's awareness of good practice? | Yes – Active member / Yes – Non-Active member No | | |
| | | | | Include: What is your annual maintenance budget? |
| Pillar 2: Safe roads and mobility | Description/definition | Question/measure | | |
| Journey management (policy and procedures) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented? | Yes / No | | Include: Do you build in flexibility (i.e. process for delays, loading) Sub-contractors and journey management |
| Journey management (elements of policy and procedure) | Does your organisation have a journey management policy and procedure documented relating to: (1) Identification and use of safe road networks / Ausrap road assessments, (2) points of contact,.(3) environmental conditions, (4) high risk areas identified, (5) identified rests times and locations? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Include: Pre-journey management policy (i.e. trip plans) Include: Reference to IR, OHS, legislation and other Include: Lone worker systems |
| Journey management (accountability and approval) | Are driving journeys verified/approved by (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager | Yes / No If Yes - (1) line manager, (2) fleet manager | | |
| Journey management (identifying and reporting risks) | | | | |
| Pillar 3: Safe vehicle | Description/definition | Question/measure | | |
| Vehicle procurement (policy and procedure) | Does your organisation have documented vehicle procurement specifications, consider safety features of a vehicle and/or trailer unit prior to purchase? | Yes / No | | Reword: These questions are irrelevant for heavy vehicles. Suggestions - "Does the vehicle fit the intended use?" "Does your organisation conduct a risk assessment of whether vehicle is suitable?" |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | | Support/ no support | Comments from the workshops |
|--|---|---|------------------------|--|
| Vehicle procurement (elements of policy and procedures) (heavy vehicles) | Vehicle procurement specifications consider the safety features including: Appropriate performance and capability for task required Compatible truck and trailer units Integrated seat belt/suspension seat Anti-lock Braking System (ABS) Electronic Braking System (EBS) Electronic Stability Control (ESC) Airbags FUP (Front Underrun Protection) Side and Rear Underrun Protection Lane Assist Adaptive Cruise Control | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Reword: Safety features will change rapidly and the tool will need to be continuously updated. Comment: Should we break these features into active and passive? Include: Drowsiness monitoring equipment |
| Pillar 4: Safe road users | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Safe driving policy and procedures | What work-related road safety policies and procedures are developed and available within the organisation? (1) driver selection and induction, (2) speeding, (3) fatigue, (4) In vehicle mobile phone use (5) passengers, (6) drugs/ alcohol, safety equipment, (7) licence requirements, (8) use of safety network, (9) first aid. Other (please list) | Does your organisation have policies and procedures relating to::list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Include: Load restraint, maintenance, services, traffic management and competency assessment |
| Induction policy and procedures | What steps are undertaken in any vehicle induction processes? Does the organisation's induction program cover: (1) vehicle use (including the use of pooled vehicles), (2) appropriate driving behaviour, (3) legal checks, (4) driving requirements, (5) hands-on training to help new drivers be safe? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Comment: Fuel usage is a good indication for the driver |
| Road safety awareness , education and training | Does the organisation provide training, education and/or awareness for: (1) high risk drivers, (2) competency requirements, (3) vehicle use, (4) driving environments, (5) leadership training, (6) awareness/education sessions? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |



| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | | Support/ no support | Comments from the workshops |
|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Road Safety Communication | What mechanisms are used to communicate driving safety within the organisation? Toolbox talks Emails Intranet Notice boards Safety alerts Other (please list) | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | |
| Driver mandatory screening/testing | How often are the following mandatory checks undertaken? Drugs Alcohol Fatigue Eye checks Other (please list) | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Include: Medical check mandatory for the driver |
| Pillar 5: Post crash response | Description/definition | Measure | | |
| Crash database management | Does the organisation have a system for collecting and analysing vehicle crash-related data? | Yes / No | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident |
| Crash database management (elements of database) | What kind of information does the database record: (1) driver demographics, (2) vehicle details, (3) at fault, (4) cause of crash, Others (please list)? | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident Include: Root cause |
| Crash reporting (procedure) | Does the organisation have a documented procedure for vehicle crashes? | Yes / No | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident Include: Does it conform to Workplace Health and Safety? |
| Crash reporting (elements of procedure) | Vehicle crash / incident documentation includes: (1) notification process, (2) forms for collecting details and crash information | The list will be finalised pending feedback from this consultation process | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident |
| Crash investigation (policy and procedure) | Does the organisation have documented crash investigation policies and procedures? | Yes / No | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident |


| Level 2 - Detailed leading indicators | | Support/ no support | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Crash investigation (elements of policy and procedure) | Does the organisation have documented crash investigation policies and procedures? | Yes / No | | Reword: Change the word crash to incident |
| Recovery and rehabilitation (regional and remote locations) | If your organisation has driving-related activities in regional and remote locations, does the organisation have adequate emergency care (rapid retrieval and movement to hospital care facilities)? | Yes / No / Not Applicable | | |
| | | | | Include: Mandatory drug and alcohol testing item Return to work process |

E.6 Level 2 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed lag indicators | | Support/not | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | support | |
| Infringements (speeding infringements) | Speeding infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated speed limits. | How many speeding infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (seatbelt Use infringements) | Seatbelt infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated seatbelt usage | How many seatbelt infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (mobile phone infringements) | Mobile phone infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of regulated mobile phone usage while driving. | How many mobile phone infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Infringements (impaired driving infringements) | Impaired driving infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of driving impairment regulations. | How many impaired driving infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |

| Detailed lag indicators | | Support/not | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | support | |
| Infringements (red light infringements) | Red light infringements are notifications received by the organisation in regard to a company registered vehicle for breach of legislation in not stopping at a red traffic light intersection. | How many red light infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |
| Vehicle crashes (frequency and crash types) | Measured by crash definition: Reversing Damage while parked/unreported damage Rear-end Failure to give way Parking Lane change merging | How many reversing crashes in the past financial year? How many vehicles damaged while parked in the past financial year? How many rear-end crashes in the past financial year? How many failure to give way crashes in the past financial year? How many parking crashes in the past financial year? How many lane change merging crashes in the past financial year? | | |
| Vehicle crashes (crash costs) | Crash costs are vehicle damage repair costs (exclusive of administration, legal, resource costs) | What is the total vehicle repair cost of crashes in the financial year? or unknown | | |
| Vehicle crashes (at fault) | "At fault" crashes whereby the primary vehicle designated "at fault" is the organisation's vehicle (in contrast to another vehicle) | How many "at fault" crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Vehicle crashes (lost time injuries) | A "lost time" injury is defined as an occurrence that resulted in a fatality, permanent disability, or time lost from work of one day/shift or more. | How many "lost time" injuries have been reported due to a road related injury in the past financial year? or unknown | V | |



| Detailed lag indicators | | Support/not | Comments from the workshops | |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | support | |
| Vehicle crashes (number of vehicle crash related workers compensation claims) | | How many vehicle crash related workers compensation claims have been initiated in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Multiple employee incidents | Employees involved in more than one crash in the determined time frame | How many employees have been involved in more than one vehicle crash in the past financial year? | | |
| Tractor unit / truck wear and maintenance cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Trailer units wear and maintenance cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Tractor unit / truck tyre repair / replacement cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Trailer units tyre repair / replacement cost | Annual total cost | What is the total vehicle repair cost due to crashes in the past financial year? or unknown | | |
| Total tonnage carried | Annual total cartage (tonnes) | What is the total cartage (tonnes) in the past financial year? or unknown | | |



E.7 Level 3 – Lag Indicators

| Detailed lag indicators | | Support/not | Comments from the workshops | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | support | |
| Policy and procedure compliance (lag indicator supporting the identified lead indicators) | Measuring compliance is an important part of road safety management; therefore, it is recommended that each identified policy and/or procedure in the above lead indicators requires a compliance measure. This question is to be replicated for each identified policy and/or procedure (e.g. mobile phone use) | Confirm, with evidence the level of compliance for all levels of employment Less than 50% or unknown More than 50% less than 80% More than 80% | | |
| Policy and procedures reviews | It is recommended that road safety policies and procedures are periodically reviewed to ensure they are up-to-date with technology and good practice | Policy and procedures are reviewed: Every 12 months Every 2 years 3 years or more Not specified or not reviewed | | |
| Personnel accountability (lag indicator supporting the identified lead indicator personnel accountability for compliance) | Ensuring accountability for the assigned responsibilities is a critical element of road safety management and implementation. This question is to be replicated for each identified lead indicator where personnel accountability is identified | Confirm, with evidence, accountability for personnel compliance of assigned responsibilities. Personnel are always held to account Personnel are sometimes held to account Not held to account or unknown | | |
| Near misses | Does your organisation record near miss vehicle incidents? What defines a near miss? How is this information reported or recorded? | How many near misses have been reported in the past financial year? | | |
| Cost of vehicle crash related workers compensation claims | | What is the total cost of vehicle crash related workers compensation claims in the past financial year? | | |



| Detailed lag indicators | | | Support/not | Comments from the workshops |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Indicator | Definition | Question/measure | support | |
| Infringements (parking infringements) | Parking infringement notifications received by the organisation in regard to company registered vehicle notices from illegal parking of a vehicle; this can indicate a relationship to 'damage while parked' incidents or risk of limited safe parking areas / rest areas within the journey | How many parking infringement notices have been received in the past financial year? | | |

