RSS 2015 ASSESSMENT TOOL

As custodian of the Road Safety Strategy 2015, CCMTA is responsible for ensuring that the strategy framework remains relevant and up-to-date. This support tool assists in the assessment of initiatives by:

- Identifying the characteristics of initiatives being considered.
- Identifying performance measures, where available.
- Identifying evaluations or cost benefit/cost-effective analysis, where available.
- Mapping the initiatives within the RSS 2015.

SECTION ONE: Recommended Initiative
Initiative Title:
Synopsis:
Applicable uses according to target group[1]:
Applicable uses according to causal factor[2]:
Applicable uses according to strategies[3]:

SECTION TWO: Performance Measures	Yes	No
1. Were any evaluations, cost/benefit analyses, or cost effectiveness analyses conducted?		
2. If yes, please indicate the author, title, source, and/or web-link where the cost-benefit/cost-effective analyses can be located.	**Works Cited**	
	Scope of the Problem	
	Evidence	

---

[1] **Key Target Groups**: Young drivers, High-risk drivers, Medically-at-risk drivers, Vulnerable road users (pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists), Motor carriers, General population

[2] **Key Causal Factors**: Impaired driving (alcohol, drugs, fatigue, distraction), Speed and aggressive driving, Occupant protection, Environmental factors

[3] **Strategies:** Education/training, Communication/awareness, Police/legislation/regulation, Enforcement, Road infrastructure, Technologies, Information/data/research, Linkages

SECTION THREE: Evidence		LEGEND	EVALUATION
3. How would you rate the research-based evidence that might support this initiative?	Demonstrated to be effective by one or more high-quality evaluations with consistent results (systemic review, multi-centre studies)	☆☆☆☆☆	
	Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations	☆☆☆☆	
	Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources	☆☆☆	
	Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results	☆☆	
	Limited or poor-quality evaluation evidence (descriptive studies, case studies, expert opinion, studies of poor methodological quality)	☆	

SECTION FOUR: Scoring and Recommendation	PROVEN Must have at least 4-5 stars for question 3	PROMISING Must have at least 2-3 stars for questions 3	NOT ACCEPTED No evaluations, cost/benefit analyses, or cost effectiveness analyses
4. It is recommended that this initiative, best practice, and/or countermeasure be attributed the following rating with respect to including it into the RSS 2015 inventory.			

September 2014