

An Garda Síochána

Oifig Saoráil Faisnéise
An Garda Síochána
Teach áth Luimnigh
Lárionad Gnó Udáras Forbartha Tionscail
Baile Sheáin
An Uaimh
Contae na Mí
C15 DR90



Freedom of Information Office
An Garda Síochána
Athlumney House
IDA Business Park
Johnstown
Navan
Co Meath
C15 DR90

Teileafón/Tel: (046) 9036350

Láithreán Gréasain/Website: www.garda.ie

Bí linn/Join us  

Ríomh-phoist:/Email: foi@garda.ie

Re: Freedom of Information Request 000051-2016 Internal review

Dear

I refer to the appeal which you made under the Freedom of Information Act 2014 (FOI Act) dated 28th April 2016 and received on the 29th April 2016. This letter only refers to your request for the following audit:

- ***Expenditure Review 2014 GoSafe Camera Contract***

An Executive Director, who is a more senior member of staff of this Organisation, has conducted an Internal Review of your Freedom of Information request. His decision on review is an entirely new and separate decision on your request and is explained as such below.

Your request is shown below:

Under the FOI Act I wish to receive copies of the following records:

1) The following 2014 audit reports:

- *Audit of NBCI*
- *Expenditure review 2013 Vehicle Maintenance Contract*
- *Expenditure review 2014 GoSafe Camera Contract*
- *Audit Mayo Division*
- *Review Audit Mayo*

2) The following 2013 audit reports

- *Audit of procurement*
- *Audit of the Serious Crime Review Team following Allegations of Financial Irregularities.*
- *Audit of the Offices of the Regional Assistant Commissioners*

3) *The following 2012 audit reports*

- *Audit of Compensation Claims*
- *Audit of Controls in the Fixed Charge Penalty Office*
- *Audit of Tranman System*
- *Review of CCTV systems*

1. Findings, particulars and reasons for decisions to deny access

The Act allows for certain types of records to be retained by a Public Body without being released under the Act. The Head of a Public Body may refuse to provide records, grant or partially grant access to records or exclude/exempt the record in its entirety by applying different sections of the Act.

In regard to this request, I am to advise you that the Internal Reviewer has decided to **grant** the release of this audit in relation to *Expenditure Review 2014 GoSafe Camera Contract.*

Please find attached a copy of the above audit.

2. Right of Appeal

You may appeal this decision by writing to the Information Commissioner at 18 Lower Leeson Street, Dublin 2. There is a fee of €50 (€15 for medical card holder) for such appeals, other than appeals against a decision to impose a fee.

If you wish to appeal, you must usually do so not later than 6 months from the date of this notification. Should you write to the Information Commissioner making an appeal, please refer to this letter.

Please be advised that An Garda Síochána replies under Freedom of Information may be released in to the public domain via our website at www.garda.ie.

Personal details in respect of your request have, where applicable, been removed to protect confidentiality.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding the above, please contact me by telephone at (046) 9036350.

Yours sincerely,

 **SUPERINTENDENT**
HELEN DEELY
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION OFFICER

24th May 2016

AUDIT REPORT



Quality Assurance Compliance with DPER circular 13/13 Review of the effectiveness of the GoSafe Contract

September 2015

Quality Assurance Compliance with DPER circular 13/13 Review of GoSafe Contract

Introduction

An Garda Síochána are required to complete an annual Quality Assurance Report, which must be signed off by the Accounting Officer, in compliance with the Public Spending Code¹. The Quality Assurance process has five steps:

1. Draw up inventories of projects at the different stages of the project lifecycle
2. Publish information of all procurements in excess of €2m
3. Complete a series of self assessed checklist on compliance with the PSC
4. Carry out a more in-depth check of a selected project
5. Complete a summary report for DPER

This audit is step 4 of the process, an in-depth check on a selected project and the particular project is the contract with the GoSafe Consortium for the provision and operation of safety (speed) cameras.

Background

The audit is to examine the performance of the contract for the Provision and Operation of Safety Cameras. This contract was signed on 20 November 2009 between the Minister for Justice Equality and Law Reform, the Garda Commissioner and Road Safety Operations Ireland Ltd.

Objective

The Objectives of this audit are:

- To provide assurance to the Accounting Officer to comply with Department of Public Expenditure and Reform circular 13/13.
- To provide an evaluation of the performance of the contract in order to inform the Commissioner and inform a future procurement process.

The audit shall verify whether GoSafe have complied with their contractual obligations.

Scope

- I. The audit reviewed the performance of the GoSafe contract with the objective of obtaining assurance that the contractor

¹ Public Spending Code; Department of Public Expenditure and Reform; Circular 13/13 (November 2013) Expenditure Planning & Evaluation in the Irish Public Service.

- i. Is providing, installing, commissioning and maintaining 'safety' cameras.
 - ii. Is using equipment (detection, recording and data storage) which has "UK Home Office type approval" (HOTA) or equivalent.
 - iii. Is providing before and after speed surveys at locations and frequencies specified by AGS.
 - iv. Is carrying out speed checks at locations, durations and frequencies specified by AGS and that the location, frequency, timing and duration is as specified by AGS based on collision analysis.
 - v. Is processing all data recorded (under this project from the GoSafe and Garda safety cameras) and providing the results to AGS.
 - vi. Is providing performance, auditing and management information to AGS "on a regular basis".
 - vii. Is providing evidence in the format and detail required for Court prosecution.
 - viii. Is providing Court appearances as required.
- II. The Audit also considered:
- i. What were the objectives of establishing such a contract.
 - ii. Are the objectives being met.
 - iii. Lessons learnt.
 - iv. Difficulties arising.
 - v. Costs.
- III. The Scope of the audit took cognisance of the contribution of the safety cameras to road safety. This included consideration of whether it is making a genuine contribution or merely a revenue generating exercise.

Methodology

This audit included:

- Initial research, including reviewing an M.Sc. dissertation by Mr Derek Rafferty.
- Consultation with relevant business units with regard to the delivery of the contract including but not limited to:
 - Superintendent GNTR/Oscam;
 - Procurement Section;
 - Finance Directorate;
 - FCPO;
- Sought documentary and/or visual evidence that the contractor is complying with Scope items I (i to vii).
- Discussion with GNTB regarding the considerations at Scope II(ii) to II(iv).
- Made appropriate enquiries² on whether independent reports on the effectiveness of current operations have been commissioned.
- Reviewed issues experienced and difficulties arising in Court Proceeding.

² Within AGS, with Department of Justice & Equality, of Transport, of Environment, Community & Loc Govt, and the RSA.

Audit Findings

Safety cameras were introduced into Ireland on a nationwide basis from November 2010. Prior to their installation there was no formal cost benefit analysis (CBA) carried out and no CBA has taken place since the cameras were installed. It is also noted that:

- The social acceptance of safety cameras is impacted as the appropriateness of the limits on individual speed zones has not been addressed; this is a matter for local government.
- The general trend in fatalities on Irish roads is downward. Evidence of the contribution of the safety zones to this trend includes:
 - The RSA report³ that in the years 1997 to 2011 speed was a contributory factor in 22% of fatalities and 19% of serious injuries⁴.
 - The locations of the safety zones have been reduced from 30% to 17% of annual casualties; i.e. the initiative has reduced the annual casualty rate by 40% in the enforcement zones.
- While the trend is downward there has been a regrettable increase in the years 2013 and 2014:

Table 1 Persons killed and injured by year

Year	Deaths	Injuries
2006	365	8,575
2007	338	7,806
2008	279	9,758
2009	240	9,742
2010	212	8,270
2011	186	7,235
2012	162	7,942
2013	190	7,069
2014	196	7,420

Source: RSA & Garda Analyst Service

GIAS are satisfied that the service is being delivered by GoSafe. GoSafe provide monthly performance reports to GNTB and these reports are reviewed by GNTB.

Initial research found a dissertation by Derek Rafferty⁵ "Life Savers not Revenue Raisers – Safety Cameras in Ireland: a Cost Benefit Analysis" (Rafferty Report) which was submitted to Trinity College as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science (M.Sc.) in Economic Policy analysis. This dissertation, brought to the attention of GIAS by Superintendent GNTB/Oscam, is attached as an appendix to this report. GIAS reviewed this report and, accepting the veracity of the statistics used, was sufficiently impressed not to recreate the work on which its conclusions were based. The audit included an interview with Mr Rafferty to discuss his findings and observations.

³ Rafferty Report p6

⁴ In single vehicle collisions, the most common collision type, speed was a cause in 26% of cases.

⁵ Head of Aviation Security Department of Transport ([per LinkedIn](#))

From discussions with GNTB, the Finance Directorate, Procurement Section and the FCPO no major deficiencies in the contract delivery by GoSafe were identified. GoSafe are providing monthly performance reports to GNTB. For June 2015, GoSafe reported that *“with the approval of An Garda Síochána (AGS), GoSafe planned to complete 7,375 monitoring hours and 100 survey hours in June 2015. GoSafe actually completed 7,582 monitoring hours and 125 survey hours (232 hours in excess of target). Court hours in June were 1140.75 billable hours”*⁶. These reports are reviewed by GNTB who liaise and hold regular meetings with GoSafe. GNTB also confirm that they hold regular meetings with the consortium, have access to their equipment register, receive calibration certificates and conduct spot checks on the camera vans⁷. GNTB also confirmed⁸ that they are satisfied with the performance of the camera operators in the courts and where there were any doubts these were brought to the attention of GoSafe who addressed the issue.

GNTB indicated satisfaction with the security of data collected by the GoSafe cameras. The operators have no access to the captured data and it is, GIAS were informed, in a format where any manipulation would be evident.

The safety zones are selected by An Garda Síochána on the basis of collision data and compliance; while the locations of the vans within the zones are selected by the GoSafe Consortium on the basis of the safety of their operators.⁹ There are 727 zones, which are reviewed every two years. An Garda Síochána publishes these sites, with a map, on Garda.ie and this map provides the statistics justifying the location. Using this map, GIAS selected 34 (5%) of these locations and found:

- 15 (44% of sample) were scenes of fatal accidents,
- 22 (65%) were scenes of accidents resulting in serious injuries,
- 6 (18%) were scenes involving multiple collisions involving minor injuries,
- 9 (26%) were scenes of multiple collisions involving fatal, serious and minor injuries.

Research indicates that deaths and injuries have reduced at the GoSafe locations:

Table 2 Annual average deaths/injuries at GoSafe locations

	Annual Average		Change
	2005-10	2011-13	
Deaths	59.33	20.33	39
Serious injuries	104.33	36	68.33
Minor injuries	820	451.67	368.33

Source – Rafferty Report p35

This table indicates a positive impact of the initiative at the specific locations. The trend is also reflected nationally. In the years 2005 to 2010 the average annual casualty rate on Irish roads was 305 deaths and 8,912 injuries¹⁰. The average

⁶ GoSafe Monthly Report June 2015

⁷ Per meeting with GNTB

⁸ Per meeting with GNTB

⁹ Per meeting with GNTB

¹⁰ Source – RSA.ie

annual death rate in the years 2011 to 2013 was 179 persons and the average annual injury rate in the years 2011 to 2012¹¹ was 7,589 persons.

While it is tragic that the number of road deaths has increased in 2013 and 2014 this must be read in context. The year 2012 had the lowest number of road deaths on record and both 2013 and 2014 saw a lower number of fatalities from 1959 to 2010¹². The trend appears to have returned to a downward course; as at 27 July the number of fatalities on Irish roads in 2015 was 89, down from 108 deaths in the same period in 2014¹³.

The trend in serious injuries collisions has also been downward:

Table 3- Serious Injury Collisions

Year	Collisions
2008	610
2009	453
2010	388
2011	333
2012	300
2013	318
2014	

Source: www.garda.ie

Speed enforcement is not the only factor in the reduction of the death rates on Irish roads, other factors must be considered, including:

- Cultural change in relation to drink driving; the trend has been steadily downward, see appendix. The drink driving campaign has been a victim of its own success, however:

Table 4 – Drink driving detections 2008-14

	2008	2011	2013	2014
Driving while intoxicated	18,013	10,579	7,962	7,697
MAT ¹⁴ checkpoints	56,575	70,861	78,290	78,012

Source www.garda.ie

- Improved compliance by road users

Table 5 – General compliance 2008-14

Offence	2008	2011	2013	2014
Mobile phone	41,343	33,422	28,938	30,524
Seatbelts	28,725	15,723	12,024	11,513
Dangerous Driving ¹⁵	9,094	5,296	3,438	2,384

Source www.garda.ie {It is, of course, arguable that there are fewer Gardai on the street detecting such offences}.

¹¹ Injuries for 2013 and 2014 were not published on RSA.ie or the CSO.ie.

¹² At Appendix X is a table, provided by the RSA, of Road Deaths in Ireland 1959 to 2009.

¹³ Source www.garda.ie

¹⁴ Mandatory Alcohol Testing

¹⁵ Source www.garda.ie but there is the following notice “there is a 6 month delay for unpaid Section 51a fixed charged notices to be included in the figures”

- Improved road network – however, with the recession while the road network is substantially unchanged the condition of the roads, due to the reduction in funding for maintenance, can be expected to have deteriorated to some degree.
- Improved car safety.

The GoSafe initiative has been compared to fishing in a “goldfish bowl”¹⁶. A recent press release by An Garda Síochána revealed:

- 90% of detections were more than 10km/h over the speed limit.
- 10% of detections were made between 1 – 9 km/h above the posted speed limit.
- 79% were made between 10 and 29 km/h above the posted speed limit.
- 11% of detections were for speeds in excess of 30 km/h above the limit.
- 50km/ zones worst for speeding offences, nearly half of all speeding offences in this zone.¹⁷

A report by the Safety Camera Project Board (SCPB) – “Review of Future Provision of Safety Cameras April 2015” also points to the success of the safety camera initiative. The SCPB is comprised of representatives of the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, the Road Safety Authority, the National Roads Authority, An Garda Síochána and is chaired by the Department of Justice and Equality. In preparing their report the SCPB acknowledge that they had regard to the recommendations by the Public Accounts Committee and a dissertation by a student (Derek Rafferty) in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of M.Sc. in Economic Policy Studies (Rafferty Report). The SCPB report informs us that “*GoSafe implements international best practices and standards including Health and Safety Management OHSAS 18001; Environment Management Systems ISO 14001 and Quality Management ISO 9001. The company has invested heavily in the best and most reliable equipment and systems, implemented international best practices and embraced a commitment towards continuous improvement utilising Lean Six Sigma principles and methodology*”¹⁸. The SCPB reports that the results of speed surveys show a sustained improvement in compliance with speed limits with the introduction of the safety cameras.

In his dissertation Mr Rafferty informs us that his research included interviews with An Garda Síochána, the Department of Transport, the Road Safety Authority, the National Roads Authority, and the UK Department for Transport and Transport Scotland. The Rafferty Report is the only Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to have been conducted on the safety camera initiative. He informs us that an early attempt at a comprehensive CBA on safety cameras was undertaken in the UK in 1996 by Hooke et al¹⁹. Examining all the likely costs and benefits of a safety camera regime they concluded that an amount of five times the initial investment was returned after one year and a return of more than 25 times is achieved after five years. They found that accidents had fallen by 28% at safety camera sites. A further study by Professor

¹⁶ Irish Independent reporting Judge McBride published 4 December 2014

¹⁷ www.garda.ie

¹⁸ SCPB Report page 3

¹⁹ Andrew Hooke, Jim Knox, David Portas – Police Research Group

Richard Allsop OBE²⁰ (2010) found that the number of fatal and serious collisions near 551 fixed safety cameras in the UK dropped by 27% after the cameras were put in place.

During the course of his research no negative studies were discovered by Mr Rafferty and he expressed the view that if any published negative studies existed, they would have received a high degree of publicity, considering the ongoing controversial nature of the debate surrounding safety cameras, in high income countries.

A critical part of the analysis in the Rafferty Report was an assessment of the effectiveness of safety cameras in reducing the numbers of deaths and injuries on Irish roads. The costs of installing and operating safety cameras were contrasted with the monetary value of benefits brought about by their presence on the Irish road network. The author found that the operational costs of running safety cameras in Ireland are more than double the fine income they generate and was satisfied that these cameras do save lives in a cost effective way. The report does include a sensitivity analysis.

In concluding his report, Mr Rafferty observed that Safety cameras are not revenue raisers but are life savers and he considered that his Report demonstrated that the use of safety cameras has generated substantial net benefits to Ireland. Putting a monetary value on the deaths/injuries avoided, Mr Rafferty calculated that from the first year of their operations the overall monetary value of the benefits they delivered far exceeded their costs; this was the case even when his sensitivity analyses used the more pessimistic assumptions.

Mr Rafferty reflected that the results of his CBA may allow proposed investment in safety cameras to be better benchmarked against other proposed investments in road safety. In the long run safety cameras should be a victim of their own success as their continued presence should actually lead to a greater national speed compliance culture with an apparent reduced return on investment.

Table 6 summarises the payments and receipts associated with the GoSafe system:

Table 6 GoSafe system Receipts and Revenues (€m)

	2011	2012	2013	2014
Payments to GoSafe (incl VAT and Court Costs)	15.8	15.6	17	17.2
Receipts generated from the GoSafe system	7.4	4.6	4.4	6.6

Source: AGS

These are direct receipts and do not include the societal benefit arising from the contribution to road safety

²⁰ Made an OBE in 1997 for services to traffic management and road safety and is a Fellow of the Royal Academy of Engineering

The dissertation by Mr Rafferty and the report by the SCPB are attached as appendices.

Conclusions

GIAS note that, with the exception of the Rafferty Report, there was no CBA on the safety camera initiative before or after their introduction. It would have been appropriate for a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) to have been conducted before the decision to proceed with the programme. GIAS recognises the excellent work done by Derek Rafferty but considers that it should not have been left for an individual undertaking a dissertation to conduct a CBA. GIAS also recognise that, as with this report, the report by the SCPB relies extensively on Mr Rafferty's work.

Mr Rafferty in turn relied to a more than minimal extent on various international reports. This may be a weakness but considering the ongoing controversial nature of the debate surrounding safety cameras internationally, if the analyses on which these reports are based could have been refuted²¹ they would have been.

In their report the SCPB is "*recommending that provision be made in the contract to anticipate the phasing out of these (i.e. the Garda ROBOT vans) vans, with the service they provide being built into the future network contract*"²². This follows from a similar recommendation by the Garda Inspectorate. GIAS have been informed by GNTB that the Garda ROBOT vans are reaching the end of their lives and the proposal is not to replace them but to build the necessary flexibility into the next outsourced safety camera contract.

In addition to their contribution to road safety, both the contracted GoSafe (and the Garda ROBOT) vans have the further advantages of:

- Free up Garda resources to attend to other policing matters.
 - Information gathering, the potential to provide intelligence on travelling criminals.
- These arguments could, of course, be also made for fixed cameras.

The cameras in the GoSafe vans are understood to be very sophisticated and their use could be extended to capture other infringements, for example tax discs. However, GNTB are anxious that the public accept the cameras as a road safety measure and not a revenue generating exercise.

The GoSafe contract runs for a duration of 5 years from date of service commencement (16 November, 2010), with the option to extend for one year subject to a downward price review. The SCPB, which oversaw the award of the contract, has examined of the question of taking up this 12 months extension, incorporating the conclusions of a cost-benefit analysis, and a final decision will be made in this

²¹ Refuted in a scientific manner that is.

²² SCPB Report page 10

Garda Internal Audit Section

regard in the near future. The Board is also to consider and make recommendations on the future provision of a safety camera network following the conclusion of the current contract²³.

Niall Kelly

Head of Internal Audit
9th September 2015

²³ DPER letter 4 March 2015

ABBREVIATIONS

AGS	An Garda Síochána
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
FCPO	Fixed Charge Processing Office
GNTB	Garda National Traffic Bureau
GoSafe	GoSafe consortium has been contracted to operate safety cameras on our roads on behalf of the Garda organisation
HOTA	Home Office Type Approval, a testing and certification process by the Home Office in the United Kingdom that speed cameras must pass before evidence from them can be admissible in UK courts
NRA	National Roads Authority
Rafferty Report	a dissertation by economist Derek Rafferty on Safety Cameras in Ireland for his MSc
RSA	Road Safety Authority
SCPB	Safety Camera Project Board, comprised of representatives of the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport, the Road Safety Authority, the National Roads Authority, An Garda Síochána and is chaired by the Department of Justice and Equality