Mission

“The International Road Federation (IRF) delivers world-class knowledge resources, advocacy services, and continuing education programs which together offer a global marketplace for best practices and industry solutions.”

- 1948: Established in Washington DC
- 1949: Fellowship Program
- 1952: 1st IRF World Meeting
- 1975: Membership opens to governments
- 2001: Created GRAAs
- 2016: Rebranded as “IRF Global”
- 2017: Global Proficiency Programs
- 2018: 70 Years of Service
A Global Footprint

Members in 77 countries
IRF Fellows in 119 countries

www.IRF.global
An Effective Road Advocate

- Certified Training
- International & Regional Congresses
- Scanning Tours
- Industry Matchmaking

- Technical & Regional Committees
- Industry Awards
- Policy Statements
- IRF Fellowship Program

www.IRF.global
Delivering Sustainable Investments in Road Safety

(via Road User Charging)
Belgium
France
What are we trying to achieve?

- Improve current levels of road deaths and serious injuries?
- Cover funding shortfall and/or ‘nudge’ individual travel behavior?
- Deter road users from non-essential journeys (*i.e. in peak times*)?
- Ensure **efficient utilisation** of the existing infrastructure and/or include environmental costs in current pricing model?
- “Make those foreign drivers pay!” (too)?

Public road infrastructure needs to be *adequately funded and maintained* by public authorities (*investments should urgently be directed to road safety management, bottlenecks, missing links, inter-modal connections, ITS…*)
Who will pay?

- Private vs. professional drivers? ‘Polluter pays’ vs. ‘User pays’?
- (Road) transport underpins the economy & society as a whole – everyone is a road (freight) ‘user’!
- (Road) freight transport operators do not always have the freedom to decide when to use the road network and which roads to take
- Cost of congestion (for the drivers) is already “internalised” through time loss, extra fuel consumption, unproductive working hours...

All transport modes should pay their true costs (*eventually offset against their societal benefits*)
How to spend (extra) income?

- “Revenue neutrality” for public authorities vs. “cost neutrality” for (average) road users?
- Extra revenues from road tolls and user charges should be ‘earmarked’ to road transport projects (*revenue hypothecation*).
- Mitigation at source: low-noise high-grip road surfacing, effective signs & road markings, safety & noise barriers, energy absorbing safety features etc. (‘cross-subsidisation’ only if any surplus left and if it provides direct alternatives to users of the same trajectory – thus it would indirectly benefit these road users).
Gaining user acceptance

- Congestion is a **local** problem, needs **local** solutions
- Reduction (‘overhaul’) of current taxes on vehicles & fuel vs. reduction of labor taxes (or both?) – **not** at exactly the same time as introducing road user charging (cf. *EU rules on discrimination*!)
- Current lack of **interoperability** – operators need to sign contracts with different service providers (*multiplication of administrative fees, OBUs/tags, bills, maintenance services etc.*) → EU action needed
- Transparency, pro-active communication and timely consultation (*on rates, increases, spending of revenue etc.*) is key to **user acceptance**!
Transparency and publicity is key!

• Publicity for the (road) funding and/or environmental objectives, integrity of enforcement equipment and transparency of back-office processes towards drivers and the public are required to create and maintain public support.

• The wider public has to understand the background and benefits of the scheme, and needs to be continuously informed about the results in terms of predefined goals: increased road maintenance, improved mobility (time is money!), less accidents, noise and pollution.

• This prevents drivers and users from perceiving such tolling schemes as simply a tax or revenue generation program – prioritise visible safety investments!
Join us in 2018!