



Department
for Transport

STATS19 review

2018 Review

Connecting People and Places

The Department for Transport has actively considered the needs of blind and partially sighted people in accessing this document. The text will be made available in full on the Department's website. The text may be freely downloaded and translated by individuals or organisations for conversion into other accessible formats. If you have other needs in this regard please contact the Department.

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
Telephone 0300 330 3000
Website www.gov.uk/dft
General enquiries: <https://forms.dft.gov.uk>



© Crown copyright 2021

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos or third-party material) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Contents

Introduction	4
Structure of the review	5
Key recommendations for STATS19	9
STATS19 Future data strategy	17
Recommendations for subsequent reviews	19
Questions	20
Annex: Road Safety Factors	21
Annex: STATS19 membership	23

Introduction

Road traffic collision data are essential for informing and monitoring road safety policy at local, national, and international levels. The collection processes and data collected vary amongst local authority and police force areas, reflecting different local road safety requirements and circumstances. However, each local area is required to report the same set of accident records to central government for national purposes. These are popularly known as STATS19 records, after the code number of the collection form.

This review of the STATS19 data collection has been the most comprehensive for a number of years, looking at all aspects of the collection as well as the burden it creates for the police. The review has sought to make recommendations for modifications to STATS19 variables with a view to improving the quality/value of the data to users and to reducing reporting burdens on the police by:

- Identifying areas where the STATS19 specification can be streamlined and modernised in order to reduce burdens, including improving validation at source and therefore overall increase the quality of data collected and speed up the ability to report/ produce findings
- Considering the scope and opportunities for better use of technology, data sharing and matching to modernise road casualty data. This is both with a view to reducing the amount of data needing to manually rather than automatically input by the police, but also to enrich the data available to generate insight to improve road safety interventions.
- Developing a roadmap for any longer-term data changes needed to improve the evidence base for road safety interventions

This is along with technical developments to data collection methods and data linking that might influence future requirements.

Structure of the review

The STATS19 review began in the autumn of 2018 and has run over the last two years. The working group, comprising of members of the police, local authorities, road safety researchers and stakeholders (see Annex D for more details) has considered the need for all aspects of the data, now and in the future, to address gaps in the pillars of Safe Systems methodology to road safety not previously covered by STATS19. The principles underpinning the Safe System acknowledge that:

- People make mistakes which can lead to collisions; however, no one should die or be seriously injured on the road as a result of these mistakes.
- The human body has a limited physical ability to tolerate crash forces – any impact greater than 30km/h increases the risk of dying significantly.
- Road safety is a shared responsibility amongst everyone, including those that design, build, operate and use the road system.
- All parts of the road system must be strengthened in combination to multiply the protective effects and if one part fails, the others will still protect people.

This is along with technical developments to data collection methods and data linking that might influence future requirements.

The working group met on several occasions throughout the review and undertook a number of pieces of research as well as wider discussions on the topics.

The decisions made at the working group were then ratified by the project group and the SCRAS before being put to Ministers in December 2020. These recommendations are set out in the following section. Please note **key facets of the review are highlighted in bold** and any **key areas where stakeholders might like to submit further feedback are highlighted as questions which are in the Smart Survey alongside this report.**

<https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/STATS19review/>

The review group also recommends the removal of the paper form and to require all forces to use digital systems to capture the information. These have been shown to improve the accuracy of the information, especially around the location and with in-built validation of the collision and the timeliness of the information. The future desire is for a timelier release of information, with validated cases passed to DfT around 30 days after the collision has occurred.

Further information on the review or any views of stakeholders can be sent to: STATS19REVIEW@dft.gov.uk

The final changes will be listed in full in the publication of "Reported road casualties Great Britain, annual report: 2020.

User research

In 2018 the Department for Transport (DfT) commissioned Ipsos MORI to undertake qualitative research with users of the STATS19 system. The research aimed to reflect the range of views of stakeholders and coverage of different data collection and management systems involved in the STATS19 system. Firstly, we reviewed the collection, processing, and dissemination of the STATS19 data. Secondly, we explored how the DfT can best attain quality data with minimum burden on the police. Thirdly, we investigated how the DfT could move towards using emerging technology as opposed to paper-based forms.

Ipsos MORI used a case study approach, conducting a series of telephone interviews across eight police forces between January and May 2019. In addition, we conducted a workshop with eight members of the DfT Road Safety Statistics Team.

The table below sets out the roles and organisations engaged with as part of this research

	Back office staff	Roads policing officers	Forensics	Local Authority	Other	Total
Surrey	*Back office staff	Roads policing officer mobile team	Forensic collision investigator	Local authority rep	Business change manager	5
Essex	CRASH supervisor	Roads policing officer x2, roads sergeant	Forensic collision investigator	Local authority rep		6
The Metropolitan Police		Roads policing officer x3, Roads policing sergeant x2	Forensic collision investigator x2		Beat officer	8
Greater Manchester Police	Specialist operations, back office staff	Roads policing officer, roads sergeant	Senior forensic collision investigator			5
Dorset/ Devon/ Cornwall	Collisions and tickets x2	Roads policing officer, roads sergeant x3		Local authority rep x2	Data validator	8
West Midlands	Data validation	Roads policing sergeant	Detective sergeant, Forensic collision investigator		Intelligence analyst, Business support traffic investigation	6
Cheshire	Back office staff, help desk officer	Roads policing constable x2		Local authority rep	Policy and compliance officer	6
Derbyshire	Back office staff	Roads policing sergeant x2	Forensic collision investigator	Local authority rep		5

Initial views of STATS19

Participants had mixed views about the STATS19 system. Overall, they viewed the dataset as comprehensive and valuable, and the form relatively easy to complete. Yet STATS19 was also felt to contain inaccurate data in places, and so needed to be treated with caution.

The extent to which participants were aware of STATS19 depended on their job roles. Those processing and disseminating the data – such as back office staff and local authority representatives – tended to know what STATS19 was and why data was collected. Conversely, those working at the roadside tended to be less aware of why they were collecting data for the STATS19 form.

What worked well?

Back office and local authority representatives thought the STATS19 form was comprehensive. Roads policing officers found the STATS19 form easy to fill in. Police administrative staff thought inputting data from the STATS19 form onto IT systems was straightforward.

Participants using CRASH were positive about it. Back office staff viewed CRASH as a national system that could potentially enable better data sharing between police forces and local authorities.

What didn't work well?

Some data points collected by roads policing officers were considered inaccurate. These data points were: location, direction of travel, and contributory factors. Other data points were thought of as unhelpful. Unhelpful data points had the characteristic of not being relevant to a participant's role or being too subjective – defined as being based on roads policing officers' judgements rather than something that is directly observed.

Many felt data processing took too long. Participants thought STATS19 data entry was duplicated across different job roles within police forces. Those using the IT system NICHE highlighted concerns about how complicated it was to use, the screen layout, and how it captured necessary STATS19 data.

The burden

Double checking data points and deciphering unclear information was time consuming. This was particularly challenging in the context of stretched policing resources – the lack of back office staff, roads policing officers, and police stations.

Emerging technology

There was an appetite for new technology across case study areas and job roles. Positivity about mobile devices centred around roads policing officers' jobs being made easier. Participants thought new technology would lead to the automatic completion of data fields in the STATS19 form.

Public online reporting

The perceived benefits of public online reporting were that it would save time for roads policing officers and back office staff and encourage a broader STATS19 dataset. The main perceived drawbacks of public online reporting were that the data collected would be inaccurate, inconsistent, and undermine existing STATS19 data.

Throughout the review the Department for Transport has been engaged with the Home Office and the police around data coming in via online reporting. It was felt that this work should be part of an ongoing process rather than part of the review. This work is ongoing as Single Online Home continues to develop.

Suggested future improvements

Technological solutions were seen as a way to improve the accuracy and speed of STATS19 data collection. Many thought that location data could be more accurate using GPS and enable on-the-spot data collection. CRASH and PRONTO mobile applications achieve this but the overall quality of location data should be improved for all forces.

Those processing and analysing the data thought training and educating roads policing officers about how to fill in the STATS19 form would improve data accuracy. They felt that having feedback mechanisms between all these STATS19 contributors would increase everyone's knowledge about what STATS19 was and would be especially useful to improve officers' understanding of why they were collecting the data.

Data sharing agreements were perceived as a way for back office staff to contact local authorities and police departments about completing missing areas on the STATS19 form that had not been filled in.

The DfT Road Safety Statistics Team were keen on having one IT system across all forces in order to simplify the data collection and processing. This would in turn lead to more timely data.

Key recommendations for STATS19

There is a series of recommendations designed to ensure greater alignment between the STATS19 data collection and the Safe Systems road safety methodology. A number of smaller changes to language or code lists will also be made to improve the quality of the information. These will be reflected in the STATS20 and STATS21 guidance and validation rules later in the year.

Scope of STATS19

A key principle of the review has been what is reasonable for an officer to collect at the scene of the collision. As such the methodology for STATS19 focuses on this as a premise for the collection. STATS19 is the definitive source of initial information about the nature of road traffic collisions.

STATS19 continues to cover collisions on the public highway (see location section for more details). Collisions on private land i.e. car parks or fields remain out of scope. **Cases which are later confirmed by a medical professional or coroner to be a suicide or medical episode remain out of scope.**

If collisions become non-compliant with the STATS19 scope (i.e. declared a suicide) they should be removed from reporting, however a reason needs to be given as part of this process. Formalising this would save time for police, local authorities and DfT while allowing a proper decision audit. It could also provide estimates for suicides and medical episodes, the number of which are currently unknown, in future years.

Acts of deliberate violence involving a vehicle, including acts of terrorism, remain in scope of STATS19 and should be recorded.

Collisions meeting the STATS19 criteria should be submitted to DfT irrespective of if they are being reported by a police officer or online by a member of the public.

Future information, for example post a full collision investigation can add insight and should be explored as part of the future data strategy.

Q1. Do you agree the scope of STATS19 remains unchanged as initial judgement of the officer at the scene?

Changes made in the 2008 review

Building on the changes made in the 2008 review we recommend the following should be mandated across all forces:

- The **collection of seat belt data for all severities**
- Reword the **seatbelt variable to include child restraints** for the new specification

- The **recording of helmet worn for cyclist casualties of all severities**
- **Admitted to hospital to be removed**¹ as it is typically used incorrectly with severity reporting

Q2. Do you agree that all forces should collect additional information on:

- a. seatbelts?
- b. cycle helmets?

Injury-based reporting

The move by some forces to using injury-based reporting created a disconnect in the severity of injury information. The Department for Transport worked with the Office for National Statistics (ONS) to assess the impact of this. The ONS Methodology Advisory Service have completed an analysis to quantify the effect of the introduction of new injury based reporting systems (CRASH and COPA) on the number of slight and serious injuries reported to the police, and to estimate the level of slight and serious injuries as if all police forces were using injury-based reporting systems.

Analysis of NHS Digital's Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) determined that the injury-based approach has the possibility to produce something more objective and closer to medical definitions than the severity-based approach.

In addition an injury-based reporting system has the advantage of eliminating the uncertainty in determining severity that arises from the officer having to make their own judgement. This means that the new severity level data observed from systems using injury-based methods are expected to be more accurate than the data from other systems.

As such all forces should collect severity data based on injury lists and the option for simply stating “slight”, “serious” or “killed” should be removed.

The mapping between the injury and severity level are set out in the illustration below.

¹ This has already been done for those forces using the CRaSH system

Severity based assessment

Severity Code	Severity	injury code	Most Severe Injury	CRASH Police Forces only
1	Killed	1		1 Deceased
2	Serious	2		5 Broken neck or back
3	Slight	3		5 Severe head injury, unconscious
		4		5 Severe chest injury, any difficulty breathing
		5		5 Internal injuries
		6		5 Multiple severe injuries, unconscious
		7		6 Loss of arm or leg (or part)
		8		6 Fractured pelvis or upper leg
		9		6 Other chest injury (not bruising)
		10		6 Deep penetrating wound
		11		6 Multiple severe injuries, conscious
		12		7 Fractured lower leg / ankle / foot
		13		7 Fractured arm / collarbone / hand
		14		7 Deep cuts / lacerations
		15		7 Other head injury
		16		3 Whiplash or neck pain
		17		3 Shallow cuts / lacerations / abrasions
		18		3 Sprains and strains
		19		3 Bruising
		20		3 Shock
		21		Any* Other injury

Location

Location is key to the value of the STATS19 data and while it has improved over time it can be improved further. The review recommends the use of the **Ordnance Survey Highways Layer** as the basis for location, to release the STATS19 dataset with the 13-digit reference (6 easting, 7 northing), and to release further location data for analysis by users.

Journey purpose

Journey purpose was discussed in detail given the high level of under-recording within the data, especially for certain modes. It is also the most challenging area of the collection for an officer to know at the scene of a collision. The group agreed it had value, and no viable source was available as an alternative, but needed to be improved. **The renamed categories for journey purpose are to align with DfT National Travel Survey terminology:**

- Journey as part of work
- Commuting to/from work
- Education and educational escort
- Personal business or Leisure
- Emergency vehicle (blue light) on response

Q3. Do you agree that journey purpose should be maintained and its terminology aligned with the DfT National Travel Survey?

Vehicle types

Vehicle types are an important part of STATS19 – and they need to be relevant to emerging trends and technology while keeping the information manageable. The review recommended that where possible **the Vehicle Registration Mark (VRM) should be taken to allow for linking to DVLA for validation and supplementary information** (this will include Automated Vehicle flag from April 2021). This can be done as part of in-built validation within digital systems and as a way of validating and adding additional information once the data is received by DfT.

In order to future-proof the collection for new and emerging technology, particularly around the area of active travel, additional information is to be collected

- **A new category of “powered personal transporter device”** – to include, but not exclusive to, e-scooters etc.
- For “other” category collect new information on number of wheels, power source and expand free text to 500 characters

It is important not to be too specific about new and emerging vehicle types so as not to exclude future technological developments

Q4. Do you agree that a new category of powered personal transport device be added to the vehicle list?

Contributory factors

Based on user research with a group of police forces and statistical analysis of the current contributory factors it was felt that there should be a different focus and they could be strengthened by reducing and reorganising them to align to the Safe Systems approach. As such they are being renamed as **Road Safety Factors** with the focus on the information contributing to actions that what can be taken to improve road safety. This has **reduced the list from 79 to 36 factors and new codes will be allocated** (see Annex B for more details). In addition to the new structure, the group has recommended that:

- At least one factor should be completed for each participant (vehicle or pedestrian) in a collision
- That three to six factors be recorded overall
- The assessment of "likely" or "possible" is to remain. Although the group accepted these are often pooled together for analysis the ability to distinguish between them may be helpful to an officer at the scene.

The Road Safety Factors must be ordered and presented consistently in all digital systems used to collect STATS19 data. A list will be provided to ensure this.

Q5. Do you agree that a new set of Road Safety Factors be collected, that have been reduced to remove duplication or unused categories, and that align with the Safe System pillars?

Online reporting

Online self-reporting is part of a wider project for digital public contact called Single Online Home funded by the Home Office. This exists to allow people involved in road traffic accidents to report the collision to the police online should they choose to do so rather than having to physically report it at a police station. The introduction of online self-reporting may have affected the number of non-fatal (and particularly slight) casualties reported. See [Reported Road Casualties of Great Britain](#) for more details.

The STATS19 review recommends that there is a way to distinguish between those cases reported by a police officer who has attended the scene or spoken to those involved, or by a member of the public. This requires further validation of the existing variable to capture this to ensure it is completed.

New additions - accepted as part of the review

There are two new variables proposed to improve STATS19 or to reflect recent legislative changes.

- a. New drug tests conducted to mirror the breath test question (2.23)
- b. Road-side recovery working to be added to section on pedestrian road worker (3.19) to cover: Not applicable, road maintenance / utility worker, emergency service worker, vehicle recovery / breakdown worker, Not known

New additions - rejected as part of the review

There are a number of new additions that were proposed as part of the STATS19 review that have been rejected as they were either:

- Not possible to collect / not reasonable to assume a police officer would know
- Would add considerable burden to the collection
- Would not be of sufficient quality to add value to the collection
- There are better existing sources of the information

The variables considered, but rejected on one or more of the grounds above were:

- a. Breath tests to be collected for all models of transport where a police officer believes alcohol to be a factor

Rejected as it was felt to be covered by the Road Safety Factors. Results of breath tests are recorded in some systems already and the group felt this should be explored first to see what value is added before making mandatory.

b. Capture deaths as a result of a road traffic collision after 30 days

The current methodology to include deaths occurring up to 30 days after a road traffic collision is an international [World Health Organisation convention](#). The recommendation is that this remains to allow figures captured through STATS19 to be compared with other countries.

c. Information on trailers

This was felt to already be covered in section 2.6 - towing and articulation - of the STATS19 form

Ethnicity

There have been requests over the years to collect ethnicity of road traffic casualties. The previous review noted this already exists in some police systems but is not a mandatory part of STATS19, but did not propose to add it to the collection.

When ethnicity is collected the preferred method is by self-declaration, however there are a number of challenges to collecting this information in this way at the scene of a collision. In cases of fatalities this is not possible nor in most cases of serious injury. In these cases, the only available method of collection would be to base it on police perception or that of witnesses. This risks a biased or possibly even inaccurate collection of information, which may in turn result in misinformed decisions being made.

Were it to be collected, in order to ensure a robust and transparent collection ethnicity would need to be marked as either being self-reported or arising from police/witness perception where this is not possible. This would again add additional burden above and beyond the collection of the ethnicity categorisation itself, which would conform to the standard ONS list.

Due to these limitations, this review has rejected ethnicity for inclusion in STATS19. This is despite noting that demand for this information does exist.

Q6. Do you agree that ethnicity should remain out of scope of STATS19?

Deletions and amendments from STATS19

The working group discussed a number of possible deletions or amends to code lists in STATS19. These were based on the fact that they are:

- Poor value or quality
- Available in other parts of the form
- Can be better obtained from other sources
- Not reasonable for the police to know at the scene of a collision

Items to be deleted are:

- a. Direction of travel (compass points) to be removed for pedestrians
- b. Parish from the geographic list
- c. Drop section 1.22 (weather) leave as a road safety factor and look to take information from other sources as part of the Future Data Strategy
- d. Remove section 3.9 as we are using injury-based reporting
- e. Remove section 1.25 as covered in the Road Safety Factors
- f. 1.24 remove defective road surface as a Road Safety Factor

Items to be amended are:

- g. Section 1.23 - road surface condition - amend flood to “standing water or flood”
- h. Section 1.26 change title to “source of data collected
- i. Section 1.25 - drop as covered in Road Safety Factors - keep section 2.12

Reporting language in the publication

Previous reviews have considered the language used as part of STATS19 and how appropriate the use of the term "accident" is in relation to collisions. Previous work for an earlier review had concluded the word accident should be retained for the purpose of these statistics. The argument being around the definition of the word "accident" and its use in the legislation governing the collection of the statistics.

Chambers' dictionary defines the word accident thus:

n. ac'cident, that which happens: an unforeseen or unexpected event: a chance: a mishap: an unessential quality or property: unevenness of surface.

The legislation states:

The Road Traffic Act 1988 refers to road traffic accidents (RTAs) and to road traffic casualties (RTCs). It obliges local authorities to study road accidents and makes no reference to crashes, collisions or incidents.

Upon reviewing the evidence for this decision, the working group agreed that "accident" should remain in line with the legislation.

However, the emphasis of STATS19 is to assist the police and road safety practitioners to understand what has occurred and to mitigate, where possible.

Data processing and dissemination improvements

The Road Safety Statistics Team have worked throughout the review to improve the way information is disseminated to users.

The new data download tool covers information on accidents and casualties and can be found at: <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/custom-downloads/road-accidents>

STATS19 Future data strategy

The review has considered what information should be considered and made available alongside STATS19 to address some of the current limitations of the data.

Data linking to maximise completeness while minimising burden

There are a number of areas of STATS19 that could potentially be taken from existing sources and linked to STATS19 once the main dataset is compiled by the Department for Transport. As part of the future data strategy these should be explored with recommendations made for the next review.

These include:

Weather – with accurate time and location, weather variables can be drawn from an API and merged into the STATS19 records. This will reduce the burden and allow for more detailed and accurate information to be collected. There are a number of weather APIs but work will be needed to map the information available to the categories used for STATS19 now and test their viability.

Speed – there is no free to access national speed limit database so speed is based on the police officer knowledge of the area. Going forward the actual speed limits as well as average speeds for the location should be drawn into the system.

Accident description – some local authorities make use of the accident description (as free text) to understand the details of the collisions and causation. These could be valuable for future research and we should explore how to get redacted versions of this information. Automatic redaction is already applied to witness statements and reports for CRASH forces.

DVSA - information from DVSA is already matched to STATS19 as part of the DFT validation process. More of this information could be extracted and released as part of the publication.

DVLA - information on drivers / riders is used by the police to confirm identify. Information such as date of driving test passed could be used to provide a proxy for level of experience.

Data linking to other data sources

The remit of STATS19 means that it is the initial assessment of a collision by a police officer. As such information about the vehicles and participants after this point is

unknown. There are a number of sources that could be explored in order to gather further insights, specifically about post-crash care.

Hospital Episode Statistics

As part of the STATS19 review new work was undertaken to match to NHS Digital's Hospital Episode Statistics. This was to validate the quality of the severity reporting. Going forward this linked data could also provide new insights into post-crash care.

TARN

The Trauma Audit and Research Network (TARN) is the National Clinical Audit for traumatic injury and is the largest European Trauma Registry, holding data on over 800,000 injured patients including over 50,000 injured children. Linking STATS19 to TARN, if possible, could provide new insights into post-crash care.

Recommendations for subsequent reviews

There have been a number of areas discussed as part of this review that should be taken forward in future years. This is because there is not enough information to make a robust decision on these at this time, or they will impact post the timescale of the delivery of this review.

These are:

Automated vehicle data

While these vehicles are in development for use on public roads there has not yet been agreement about what information will be supplied to the police in the event they are involved in a collision.

Collisions on private land

At present the scope of STATS19 is limited to public land - see section on geographic scope for more details. There are potential changes in the insurance market what may highlight a need for more information on collisions on private land. However, at this stage the scope of any legislative change that might impact Great Britain is unknown therefore we cannot make this decision as part of this review.

Damage only collisions

Damage only collisions fall outside of the scope of STATS19 as no injury occurs and are unlikely to always have a police officer attend. As such alternative sources of information need to be considered.

Work with the insurance industry has shown that high level estimates on damage only collisions are available, but without the detail needed to apply them in a road safety context.

Further work would be needed to explore if this data could add value to the road safety evidence base.

Forensics Collision Investigation

As STATS19 is based on officer perception at the scene of the collision it excludes information that may come to light following a full collision investigation. This information may provide new insight or show differences to the data in STATS19, as highlighted in the [PACTS report on seatbelts](#). Future reviews should consider how this data can be systematically obtained and analysed, without adding a burden to the police, to expand the road safety evidence base.

Questions

The following questions are set to stakeholders following the generation of the STATS19 recommendations by the working group.

Q1. Do you agree the scope of STATS19 remains unchanged as initial judgement of the officer at the scene?

Q2. Do you think that all forces should collect additional information on:

- a. seatbelts?
- b. cycle helmets?

Q3. Do you agree that journey purpose should be maintained and aligned with the DfT National Travel Survey?

Q4. Do you agree that a new category of "powered personal transporter device" be added to the vehicle list?

Q5. Do you agree that a new set of Road Safety Factors be collected, that have been reduced to remove duplication or unused categories, and that align with the Safe System pillars?

Q6. Do you agree that ethnicity should remain out of scope of STATS19?

Annex A: Road Safety Factors

These have been designed to focus on the things that can be addressed to improve road safety. However, there is the acceptance that these do not cover Post Crash Care. The new groups and codes are set out below. A matrix between the old contributory factors and new road safety factors has been produced.

Behaviour or inexperience

- B1 Failed to comply with traffic sign/signal
- B2 Disobeyed double white lines in centre of road
- B3 Driver / rider did not stop at junction
- B4 Ineffective observation by driver/rider, cyclist, pedestrian, equestrian
- B5 Learner or inexperienced driver/rider
- B6 Passing too close to cyclist, horse or pedestrian
- B7 Vehicle door opened in path of pedestrian, cyclist horse

Distraction or impairment

- D1 Affected by alcohol
- D2 Affected by drugs
- D3 Driver/rider too tired to drive/ride safely
- D4 Uncorrected or defective eyesight
- D5 Illness or disability (mental or physical)
- D6 Using mobile device
- D7 Distraction in or outside of vehicle

Non-motorised road users (i.e Pedestrian, cyclist or equestrian)

- P1 Wrong use of pedestrian, cyclist, equestrian crossing facility
- P2 Cyclist entering road from pavement
- P3 Risk taking behaviour in carriageway
- P4 Careless or in a hurry
- P5 Pedestrian, cyclist, equestrian hard to see

Roads

- R1 Deposit on road
- R2 Slippery surface due to weather
- R3 Driver/riders view obscured by stationary or parked vehicles
- R4 Drivers/rider view obscured by road layout, vegetation, buildings or signs
- R5 Drivers/rider vision affected by adverse weather or dazzle

Speed

- S1 Exceeding speed limit
- S2 Travelling too fast for conditions
- S3 Following too close
- S4 Dangerous or reckless driving/riding
- S5 Driving too slowly for conditions including inexperience with vehicle or driving on left

S6 Vehicle used in course of crime

Vehicles

- V1 Defective tyres
- V2 Other vehicle defects
- V3 Overloaded or poorly loaded vehicle or trailer
- V4 Driver view obscured or blind spot
- V5 Not using lights in dark or inclement weather

Factors confirmed to have been deleted

101 Poor or defective road surface
104 Inadequate or masked road markings or signs
105 Defective traffic signals -
106 Traffic calming
107 Temporary road layout (e.g. contraflow)
108 –Road layout (bend hill, narrow road)–
110 Slippery inspection cover or road marking
205 Defective or missing mirrors
309 Vehicle travelling along pavement
402 Junction restart
403 Poor turn or manoeuvre
404 Failed to signal or misleading signal
408 Sudden braking
409 Swerved
410 Loss of control
705 Dazzling headlights
709 Visor or windscreen dirty scratched etc
801 Crossing road masked by stationary or parked vehicle
901 Stolen vehicle
903 Emergency vehicle on a call
999 Other

The factors listed above have been removed as they meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Used in a very low number of cases
- Are captured elsewhere in the STATS19 form
- Have been combined with another factor in the new system
- Judged not to be reasonable for the police to know at the time of completing the STATS19 form

Annex B: STATS19 membership

Department for Transport, Transport Scotland and Welsh Assembly

Police forces: Essex, Metropolitan Police, West Yorkshire, North Wales, West Mercia

Local authorities and Transport for London

External bodies:

Highways England / AECOM

Motor Insurance Bureau

RAC Foundation

Transport Research Laboratory (TRL)

University College London

Road Safety Great Britain (RSGB) / Agilysis

Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport (ADEPT)