



**SafetyCube**

**Economic Efficiency Evaluation (E<sup>3</sup>)  
of Road Safety Measures –  
Results from the SafetyCube project**

**Wouter Van den Berghe, Heike Martensen, Stijn Daniels**

**Vias institute**



Co-funded by the Horizon 2020  
Framework Programme of the European Union



# How to prioritise road safety policy measures?



# Methods for prioritisation



Effectiveness

What will be the reduction in the number of accidents / injuries / fatalities?

Cost-effectiveness

How many deaths will be avoided per unit cost of the measure?

Cost-utility

What will be the cost per QALY when implementing the measure?

Cost-benefit

Do the benefits exceed the costs of implementing the measure?

Multicriteria

Which factors should be considered for deciding on a particular measure?

# Focus on Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)



- In a CBA, the benefits and drawbacks – both expressed in monetary terms – derived from the implementation of a road safety measure are compared.
- It is necessary to assign a monetary value to the impacts of measure. This can be controversial since a monetary value is given to human life.
- In a CBA analysis, it is possible to account for – positive and negative – side effects, eg environmental or mobility impacts
- Two indicators can be used for prioritisation
  - *Benefit-Cost ratio*
  - *Net present value*

# Economic efficiency evaluation: what do you need?



## Info on measures

### Effectiveness

saved crashes  
- per severity category

### Time horizon

### Costs of measures

## *Economic assessment*

### *Cost Benefit Analysis*

- *Net present value  
(benefits – costs)*
- *Cost benefit ratio  
(benefit / costs)*

## Info per country

### Crash costs

- severity category

### Discount rate

# E<sup>3</sup> method



## Input

- Measures and measure costs
- Effectiveness of the measures
- Crash costs

## Calculations

- Benefits
- Costs and benefits per year

## Output

- Costs + benefits (present values)
- Prevented crashes
- Socio-economic return
- Costs per prevented crash

## Extra analyses

- Sensitivity analyses
- Penetration rate
- Side impacts
- Long term trends





	A	B	C	D
1	<b>COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS</b>			
2				
3	<b>Costs (present values)</b>			
4	One-time investment costs	311 070	EUR	
5	Recurrent costs	179 122	EUR	
5	Total costs excluding side-effects	490 192	EUR	
7				
8	Side-effects	-	EUR	
9	Total costs including side-effects	490 192	EUR	
0				
1				
2	<b>Benefits</b>			
3	Prevented Casualties	521739	EUR	
4				
5	<b>Socio-economic return excluding side-effects</b>			
6	Net present value	31 548	EUR	
7	Cost-benefit ratio	1.1		
8				
9	<b>Socio-economic return including side-effects</b>			
0	Net present value	31 548	EUR	
1	Cost-benefit ratio	1.1		
2				
3	<b>Break-even cost for measure (per unit)</b>	521 739	EUR	
4				
5				
6	<b>COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS</b>			
7				
8	<b>Prevented casualties</b>			
9	Fatal	0.1		

# Current status



- Documentation of the methodology, allowing a standardised methodology for CBA analyses for road safety measures
- Background data available
  - *Standardised data on crash costs (per country, and for EU)*
  - *Conversion tools for costs (PPP and indexation)*
  - *Effectiveness measures available through SafetyCube DSS*
- Concept version of E<sup>3</sup> tool developed (in Excel), including user manual and reporting template available
- Cost-Benefits analyses are currently being undertaken using and documented for some 30 measures related to education, campaigns, enforcement, infrastructure and vehicle technology

# Example 1: Section control systems



- Effect estimates from the meta-analysis by Høye (2014), supplemented by cost estimates in Owen et al. (2016) and target crash estimates in Montella et al. (2012).
- The resulting best estimate of the benefit-to-cost ratio is 19.5 which means that the benefits clearly outweigh the costs.
- The sensitivity analyses show that this measure remains cost-effective in all scenarios, even in the worst case scenario.

## Input values

Fatal injury crash reduction: 56%  
Serious injury crash reduction: 56%  
Slight injury crash reduction: 30%  
PDO only crash reduction: 30%

Implementation cost: 68323 €/km  
Annual cost: 6832 €/km

Affected nr. of crashes per year:  
Fatal crashes: 0.08  
Serious injury crashes: 0.60  
Slight injury crashes: 0.45  
PDO crashes: 2.41

# Sensitivity analysis section control



Scenario	Input values	B/C ratio
Low measure effect	Fatal injury crashes reduction: 42% Serious injury crashes reduction: 42% Slight injury crashes reduction: 24 % PDO only crashes reduction: 24%	14.7
High measure effect	Fatal injury crashes reduction: 66% Serious injury crashes reduction: 66% Slight injury crashes reduction: 36% PDO only crashes reduction: 36%	23.0
Low measure cost (-50%)	Impl. cost: 34162 €/km Annual cost: 3416 €/km	39.1
High measure cost (+100%)	Impl. cost: 136646 €/km Annual cost: 13665 €/km	9.8

# Example 2: Alcohol interlock programme



- An existing cost-benefit analysis on the effect of an alcohol interlock program in the Netherlands (SWOV, 2009) was revisited.
- The resulting best estimate from the E<sup>3</sup> calculator of the benefit-cost ratio (BCR) is 10.9 which means that the benefits substantially exceed the costs.
- The sensitivity analysis shows that while the BCR is sensitive to changes in the underlying assumptions, the ratio remains higher than 1, which means that the measure remains economically efficient.

# Next steps



- E<sup>3</sup> tool to be integrated in the final version of the SafetyCube DSS.
- Planned possibilities for the users
  - *Study the documented CBA analyses*
  - *Use such analyses as a basis for own analyses (overruling certain input values and run the calculations again)*
  - *Do a CBA analysis starting from a zero – i.e. providing all input values yourself (including values on side effects if relevant)*
- For more information
  - Heike Martensen, [heike.martensen@vias.be](mailto:heike.martensen@vias.be)
  - Stijn Daniels, [stijn.daniels@vias.be](mailto:stijn.daniels@vias.be)
  - Annelies Schoeters, [annelies.schoeters@vias.be](mailto:annelies.schoeters@vias.be)
  - Wouter Van den Berghe, [wouter.vandenberghe@vias.be](mailto:wouter.vandenberghe@vias.be)