Effective Measures on Drink Driving in the EU
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ETSC Aims:

• to identify and promote research-based measures with high safety potential

• to provide impartial advice on transport safety to policymakers across the EU
Small Secretariat in Brussels (11 staff)

- 34 member organisations
- Experts contributions in all modes (more than 150 leading EU independent experts)
- funding from CEC, membership and sponsors
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It is safe to Drink and Drive

And the earth is flat

The question is therefore: is there a “safe” level

And pigs can fly

“An eighth of a pint for the road?”
Why have a maximum BAC limit of 0.8 mg/ml?

PACTS paper – By Prof. R. Allsop
65 lives and 230 serious injuries each year is the human cost to UK of 0.8 BAC limit
How enforcement be improved

- Increase subjective risk of detection
- Improve sanction systems
- Selective enforcement
- Rehabilitation programmes
- Demerit point systems
- Concentrate on essential areas only such as speeds, drink driving and use of seat belts
- Use mass media to support enforcement
- Data led operations based on monitoring systems
- More effective use of information technologies (IT)
Conclusion: 
In all enforcement the key issue is how to increase the subjective risk of detection / perceived probability of getting caught for violations

“For God’s sake Acton, slow down. Speed camera!”
Increasing the risk of enforcement

- Random breath tests
- Blanket enforcement
- Roadside evidential testing
• Wide-spread support for existing legislation among European road users

• the majority of drivers favour similar legal requirements across countries, the preferred standard often being the one in their own countries

• There is strong public support for more police enforcement of traffic regulations. The level of general support ranges from 60% to 80% across the EU countries
• 22% supported current levels of sanctions, 56% were in favour of more severe penalties for traffic violations in their countries.

• **Conclusion:**
  
  *There is wide public support for more effective enforcement among road users*
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Traffic Law Enforcement across the EU
An Overview

ETSC Compendium on enforcement
PARIS June 2006
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2003 vs 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legal BAC limit</th>
<th>Enforcement intensity % of inhabitants</th>
<th>% deaths caused by drivers over the legal limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.2 mg/ml</td>
<td>high - 17%</td>
<td>about 10% (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.5 mg/ml</td>
<td>high - 34.5%</td>
<td>16% (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.5 mg/ml</td>
<td>high - 12.3%</td>
<td>18% (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.8 mg/ml</td>
<td>low - 4.7%</td>
<td>14% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.8 mg/ml</td>
<td>low - 1</td>
<td>17.5% (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.8 mg/ml</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.8 mg/ml</td>
<td>low 5.3%</td>
<td>40% (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increasing the subjective risks of enforcement…