



Department for  
**Transport**



GOVERNMENT OPERATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

**Operation V79–2008**

**Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

## Foreword

Operation V79-2008 was the third of a series of biennial operations intended to test the scope of compliance in relation to registration, licensing and insurance of motor vehicles. The V79 series are the only Operations which provide a UK wide snapshot of the level of criminal behaviour on our roads and this style of Operation provides an empirical measurement against which the effectiveness of road safety legislation, policies and partnerships may be measured.

Continued evidence of the scale of offending is crucial to measuring the effectiveness of ACPO's declared aim to deny criminals the use of the roads. The use of the data gathered from this Operation, compared with that derived from the previous Operations, allows the effectiveness of police service and agency enforcement and compliance strategies to be measured. Indeed, there has been a significant decrease in the overall level of offending.

While the detection of the offences covered in this Operation is undoubtedly assisted by robust and accurate databases, together with roadside or vehicle mounted ANPR devices, the actual policing skills involved are, in the main, those basic ones of observation and roadside interaction with potential offenders. On most of our roads this basic policing activity does not require specialist skills acquired by costly training which further challenge the finite funding available to the police service.

The level of offending is still unacceptable and the public has a right to expect the police service, in partnership with both central and local government agencies and departments, to employ every effort to decrease the level of offending and increase the margins of safety.



**Richard Brunstrom**  
**Chief Constable**

## **Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Contents</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
(i)	Foreword	2
(ii)	Contents	3
(iii)	Explanatory note	4
1.	Executive Summary	5
2.	Introduction	8
3.	Planning and Administration	11
4.	Tuesday 18 <sup>th</sup> March 2008	16
5.	Results	19
6.	Conclusions	34
7.	Recommendations	38
Appendix 1	DfT Operational Research Unit Report	39

**(iii) Explanatory Note:**

References will be made to the billions of miles travelled. These relate to a billion composed of 1,000 millions.

## 1. Executive summary

- 1.1 On 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 6689 vehicles<sup>1</sup> were randomly stopped as part of the Operation V79-2008. This was the third such road policing Operation carried out by ACPO and ACPOS, in partnership with the Department for Transport (DfT), in the United Kingdom. The Operation enabled the measurement of the level of compliance with documentation, and licensing regulations of drivers and vehicles on the road. The first such check was carried out in March 2004, and the second in March 2006. Valid information was gathered from all 6689 of the vehicle checks.<sup>2</sup>
- 1.2 As the survey was conducted through roadside checks, the measure of offence reflects this method of data collection and refers to **the proportion of distance travelled by non-compliant drivers/vehicles, rather than the proportion of drivers or vehicles which are non-compliant.**
- 1.3 From the sample of vehicles stopped and checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 11.1% of vehicles/drivers were committing at least one offence. 2.6% of vehicles were committing more than one offence. 3.4% of vehicles/drivers had at least one area of serious<sup>3</sup> non-compliance, and 0.5% of checks found more than one area of serious non-compliance.
- 1.4 Figure E1 shows a summary of the results for different vehicle and driver licensing, testing and insurance offences for 2008 and 2006. All offence categories show a significant decrease from 2006 to 2008.

Offence	Rate in 2008 sample	Rate in 2006 sample
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	1.6%
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	1.9%
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	4.2%
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	1.0%	2.0%
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.2%
False Registration	0.0%	0.3%

Figure E1

(n.b. These are the percentages of the total vehicle kilometres travelled)

- 1.5 Figure E2 shows the billion kilometres travelled in 2007, with offences being committed.

<sup>1</sup> Cars, light goods vehicles, minibuses, motorcycles, mopeds, and 'other' vehicles were included. Large good vehicles and passenger carrying vehicles were not included.

<sup>2</sup> 15 of these checks were on non-UK registered vehicles and were removed for the main part of the analysis, leaving an overall valid sample of 6674 vehicles.

<sup>3</sup> Serious non-compliance areas are vehicle excise duty evasion, being uninsured, unlicensed or without a valid MoT test certificate, a stolen vehicle or vehicle using false registration plates.

Offence	Rate in Sample	Billion Kms travelled
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	3.9
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	5.7
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	7.2
Vehicle tax evasion	1.0%	4.7
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.0
False Registration	0.0%	0.0
Incorrectly Registered	3.6%	17.4
Overall non compliance	11.1%	53.0
Serious non-compliance	3.4%	16.2

**Figure E2**

The overall non-compliance rate over kilometres travelled is 53,000,000,000.

- 1.6 The level of full compliance increased from 79.0% in 2006 to 88.9% in 2008.<sup>4</sup> This increase is statistically significant.
- 1.7 The level of compliance on serious offences has increased from 92.5% in 2006 to 96.6% in 2008. This increase is statistically significant.
- 1.8 In addition to these baseline results, the main findings from the analysis were:-
- 3% of driver records were found to be inaccurate; this is similar to the level found in 2006 (3.4%)
  - 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA register; this is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (3.7%)
  - 2.2% of vehicles had illegal registration plates. This is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (5.4%)
  - older vehicles were less likely to have a current test certificate, less likely to have accurate vehicle records or be correctly registered, less likely to be insured or licensed and more likely to be untaxed
  - vehicles aged 1-3 years old were more likely to be compliant overall, and vehicles aged 0-3 years old were also less likely to have a serious non-compliance
  - driving licence and insurance offences have the highest number of additional serious offences (1.50 and 1.43 serious offences, respectively, on average)

<sup>4</sup> The 2006 overall compliance rate quoted in this report has been calculated using the 2008 criteria for overall compliance. Therefore the 2006 overall compliance rate quoted in this report and quoted in the 2006 Operation V79 Report will differ. The criteria difference between 2006 and 2008 is explained further in the IHAC report (appendix 1).

- 38.9% of unlicensed drivers were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped)
- checks on motorcycles were more likely to find incidences of non-compliance than checks on cars; checks on motorcycles and light commercial vehicles were more likely to find incidences of serious non-compliance than checks on cars
- checks on major urban roads found a higher rate of non-compliance
- drivers aged 22-45yrs old were more likely to be non-compliant overall, while drivers aged 46-80yrs were more likely to be compliant
- drivers aged 22-35yrs were more likely to have a serious non-compliance whereas drivers aged 60-70yrs were less likely to have a serious non-compliance
- males were more likely to have a serious non-compliance than females, e.g., male drivers were less likely to be licensed or insured
- checks on non-UK drivers driving UK registered vehicles were significantly more likely to reveal an incidence of non-compliance than checks on UK drivers.\*

(\* The authors of this report could find little to indicate whether this is from ignorance of UK legislation or deliberate intent to avoid compliance. This is exactly the same case as with UK licence holders as the holder of a UK driver's licence need not necessarily be a UK citizen and, even if they are, either may have a limited knowledge of the legislation relating to motor vehicle use or a deliberate intent not to comply with legislation.)

## **2. Introduction**

2.1 This report is to be read in conjunction with the Roadside Check Results report prepared by the DfT In House Analytical Consultancy (IHAC). That report (referred to from this point as the IHAC report) contains a full account of the sampling methodology, the relevant confidence factors for various stages of the data sampling and analysis. The synopsis of sections of the IHAC report contained herein (particularly in Section 5 'The Results') are sufficient for an overview of compliance rates but consideration of future compliance and enforcement strategies would best benefit from detailed study of the IHAC report. The complete IHAC report forms appendix 1 of this report.

2.2 The two previous V79 Operations took place in March 2004 and March 2006. Both of those Operations were collaborations between ACPO, ACPOS, DfT and Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (defra). defra was invited to participate in V79-2008 but advised ACPO and DfT that, "whilst the information gleaned as a result of 2004 and 2006 has been useful, the location, dates and times which suit DfT and the police are not necessarily the best with regard to the detection of possible deliberate illegality on animal health and welfare issues". The conclusions of the V79-2006 report had indicated this stance and suggest an Operation mounted in late autumn would best suit defra.

### **2.3 Terms of Reference**

To carry out a pre-determined number of vehicle stop checks on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008 and using the data achieved in the results of Operations V79-2004 and V79-2006; identify and measure the level of compliance in respect of :-

- vehicle registration, insurance, licensing and test certificates
- driver licensing

2.4 The objectives for the Operation were to achieve a nationwide (United Kingdom) random check of compliance in respect of driver licensing and vehicle insurance, testing and registration. The accuracy the data held on the DVLA database, MOT test certificate database and Insurance databases were also to be assessed.

2.5 The partners were:-

- Department for Transport (DfT)
- Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO)
- Association of Chief Police Officers for Scotland (ACPOS)

2.6 Strategic planning and funding identification took place during the late summer and the autumn of 2007 and involved DfT, ACPO and ACPOS.



Participating forces would be able to use funding provided by DfT. In respect of this, North Wales Police agreed to act both as the fund-holder and paymaster for the police service, and as the co-ordinator for ACPO and ACPOS.

- 2.7 Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008 was proposed by ACPO, and agreed by ACPOS and DfT as the date most suitable to undertake the V79-2008 exercise. This allows a like for like comparison in respect of seasonal traffic variations and influences.
- 2.8 Once the strategic organisation and date for the Operation had been agreed, and the funding identified, invitations to participate were sent by ACPO to police forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and by ACPOS to police forces in Scotland.  
(NB. Any future reference to ACPO in this report includes ACPOS)
- 2.9 All police forces wishing to participate were asked to identify liaison officers who would be responsible for both the administration of the Operation within their organisation and for liaison with ACPO. All UK forces with road policing responsibilities agreed to participate.
- 2.10 Lessons learned from the V79-2004 and V79-2006 had emphasised the need for local planning and organisation, and during early February, five regional meetings were held in Dorset, London, West Mercia, North Yorkshire and Glasgow. Liaison officers from virtually all participating forces attended these meetings where they were briefed on the Operation, organisational structure and funding mechanisms.

### 2.11 Funding

The Operation was principally funded by DfT with some participants absorbing limited costs. The level of funding enabled the police service to ensure their involvement was not to the detriment of their 'business as usual' activity on that day, and in some cases, allowed for extra operational work once the aims of this Operation had been completed.

### 2.12 Report Authors

R. Tutt (IHAC) P. March (IHAC)	Analysis of V79 DfT element data and comparison with V79-2006 data
I. Debbage (ACPO) K. Gibbs (IHAC)	Overview and consolidation

### 2.13 Acknowledgements

The organisers and co-ordinators of V79-2008 wish to acknowledge the assistance of all police officers and police staff who played any part in the Operation.

2.14 Special thanks are also given to Dorset, North Yorkshire, West Mercia and Strathclyde forces for their assistance in the planning and briefing stage of the Operation, and to the Essex Police, Mobile Support Division, for the provision of a postal accommodation address, document storage during the collation of data and also for the trialling of the roadside check sheets used in this Operation.

### **3. Planning and Administration**

- 3.1 V79-2008 was intended to, once again, test the scope of compliance in relation to registration, licensing and insurance of motor vehicles. Continued evidence of the scale of offending is crucial to measuring the effectiveness of ACPO and DfT's declared aim to deny criminals the use of the roads.
- 3.2 This data obtained would also allow DfT, DVLA and ACPO to determine the operational levels of accuracy for the databases relating to vehicle registration, testing, insurance, and those relating to driver and vehicle licensing.
- 3.3 It was felt this Operation was fundamental to ACPO's declared intention to tackle criminal use of the roads. ACPO and ACPOS agreed to facilitate the gathering of this information by way of a road policing operation which randomly sampled the UK vehicle fleet throughout the 24 hours of Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008. The sample vehicles were motor cars, motorcycles, mopeds, minibuses and light commercial vehicles, but not any vehicle subject of a goods vehicle test or large passenger carrying vehicles (buses and coaches).
- 3.4 There was strong support for the Operation from all 52 UK police forces with road policing responsibilities, and all took part.
- 3.5 **How was the type of sample and its size determined?**
- 3.6 As with the original Operation, the DfT IHAC determined that information gained from a representative sample of approximately 6000 vehicles would allow analysts to extrapolate the level of compliance on a nationwide basis. As with V79-2004 and V79-2006, the level of offending or non-compliance would not be measured as a proportion of the vehicles in stock (i.e. those in use on our roads), but as a proportion of the total number of vehicle kilometres travelled. In the event, it was decided to attempt a sample in excess of this target in order that any shortfall caused by forces being unable to take part on the day, or from unusable data, would not adversely affect the sample. The target figure was set at 6720 vehicles.
- 3.7 The word 'random' is not one normally found in current operational policies or orders, particularly with ACPO's intent to comply with the National Intelligence Model. While the stop checks of the sample vehicles were to be as thorough as was possible, it was most important the sample was not skewed (for evaluation purposes) by only stopping those vehicles with a high likelihood of offences. Officers taking part were briefed that vehicles would be selected purely on a random basis, for example by stopping every 3<sup>rd</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> vehicle which was using the road when the officer was free to stop it. The only exceptions to this were to be:-

- if there would be significant risk to public safety if a vehicle which would not normally be selected was allowed to continue
- if the officer knew that to fail to stop a known offender would defeat the ends of justice.

Any vehicle stopped under these circumstances would have been identified to the data analysts. In the event only one such vehicle was stopped and this was removed from the analysed sample.

- 3.8 Once the 52 participating police forces were identified, IHAC determined on a target for a national sample size of 6720 vehicles. This meant that forces would be stopping either 112 (4 sites) or 140 (5 sites) vehicles. The vehicles would be stopped at identified sites in each force area with 28 vehicles being the required sample for each of those sites.
- 3.9 Participating forces were passed the details of the selected sites and asked to confirm their operational viability. This entailed full risk assessments of the proposed sites.
- 3.10 If operational viability could not be confirmed, force liaison officers and DfT IHAC worked together to determine alternatives to the original selection. The characteristics of the alternative sites had to match those they replaced.
- 3.11 **How was the roadside check sheet content determined?**
- 3.12 The use of the data gathered from the initial Operations showed the levels of non-compliance which could be anticipated if there was no change. It was anticipated from the outset the data from V79–2008 could be examined against the 2006 results which were themselves compared against the 2004 benchmark. The data would also examine the effectiveness of the MOT test certificate database which had been undergoing nationwide introduction during the 2006 Operation and was now fully complete and operational.
- 3.13 Consultation between ACPO and DfT determined the Operation should identify the level of compliancy in respect of:-
- vehicle registration
  - vehicle Licensing (including SORN declarations)
  - driver licensing
  - driver and vehicle insurance
  - vehicle testing.

In addition supplementary questions would determine the accuracy of information contained on the:-

- DVLA vehicle data base
- DVLA driver licensing data base
- vehicle testing data base
- motor Insurance database.

Once again, as in 2006, DfT required a question asking whether the vehicle registration marks were in the legal format. This related only to registration plate colour, font size and spacing.

Two further supplementary questions related to the tinting levels of vehicle windscreens and front (side) windows.

3.14 Working from post operational suggestions made by police officers involved in the 2006 Operation, a different style of roadside check sheet to that used in 2004 and 2006 was developed. The initial two versions of this were trialled by Essex Police to determine their effectiveness. Comprehensive guidance notes were also developed to assist officers in both understanding why particular questions were being asked, and also how the form should be completed.

3.15 Included in the IHAC report are copies of the roadside check sheet and the guidance notes and these documents are shown in annex A of the IHAC report.

### 3.16 **Single Points of Contact (SPOC)**

3.17 Each force was asked to identify a single point of contact to be responsible for:-

- liaising with ACPO and IHAC during the planning stage
- carrying out risk assessments for selected sites and agreeing their operational viability.
- identifying local resources, including where necessary control room staff
- producing their own force operational order
- attending the regional briefing
- disseminating the briefings, guidance and documentation
- collating the completed check sheets
- ensuring local enquiries were made to pursue HORT/1 productions
- locally resolving any queries raised by IHAC in respect of data contained on any particular form.
- ensuring payment to their force.

In itself this was recognised to be several days work and would, for many forces, be addressed by an Inspector or Sergeant.

### **3.18 Funding Mechanism**

3.19 The actual amount of funding is not mentioned in this report but it was sufficient to defray the expenses of those forces taking part and to ensure V79 enhanced policing activity on the day and did not detract from operational resilience.

3.20 It was determined by ACPO and DfT at an early stage that any attempt to raise 52 separate private hire contracts with each force would be a resource intensive and administratively expensive exercise in itself, and would inevitably use funding better put to the resourcing of the Operation on the day. In view of this, the funding provided by DfT had a portion set aside for administration by ACPO and the bulk was equally divided between all participating police forces. Thus forces knew the exact level of funding they would receive and were able to resource the Operation using officers who would either have been on rest days or who worked extended hours. Some forces hired in vehicles to ensure operational resources were not compromised.

3.21 The funding also took into account the supply and use of the police vehicles required for this Operation and the administrative work each force had to carry out to facilitate the roadside checks, the collation, copying and return of the check sheets, the resolving of any queries, and the enquiries to determine the result of any HORT/1's issued.

### **3.22 Human Rights**

3.23 An overarching operational order was issued by ACPO and from this, all forces developed their own orders which took account of local policies and procedures. The style of Operation had been reviewed and determined as HR compliant in 2006 and it was agreed by ACPO that this remained the case in 2008.

3.24 During planning, it was recognised that there was a likelihood of non-UK registered vehicles being stopped and also non-UK citizens being stopped driving either non-UK registered vehicles or UK registered vehicles. The question set included questions which would allow analysts to identify such drivers and vehicles but only on the basis that they were not the holders of UK driver's licences or other than temporarily in the UK. No minority groups could be identified from the data obtained.

### **3.25 Data Management and Protection**

3.26 Two areas of personal data would be identified and added to the data base created by entering the data from all of the roadside checks

sheets. The two areas where the vehicle registration number, and the identity number of the officer carrying out the check. Both of these were used to assist in identifying any potential duplicate forms, potential cloned vehicles, and, in respect of the force number to identify any officer where queries on any roadside check sheet needed to be resolved.

3.27 All actions in relation to the management and storage of any personal data were identified to the North Wales Police Data Protection Officer, and protocols were developed governing all persons involved in collating and analysing the data.

3.28 **Police National Computer (PNC)**

3.29 It was anticipated there would be significant extra use of PNC during this Operation. The National Policing Improvement Agency was contacted and confirmed no anticipated problems for the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008.

#### **4. Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

- 4.1 For the 2006 Operation, a sample of check sites had been drawn from a national roads database (maintained by the DfT). The sample was drawn using a stratified sampling technique to ensure a representative cross-section of road types in the UK. In some cases, the check sites were moved following discussion with the Police Forces involved, to safer, more practical locations. These sites were always selected to reflect the characteristics of the traffic at the original site.
- 4.2 Many of the check sites used in the 2006 Operation were used in 2008 Operation, together with a number of newly selected check sites. The new check sites were needed for the Police Forces not involved in the 2006 Operation and in order to meet the required larger sample in 2008. The additional check sites were selected on the basis of ensuring a representative cross-section of traffic on different road types in the UK.
- 4.3 In order to achieve results with the greatest level of accuracy, a sample size of 6720 vehicle checks was chosen. A total of 6690 forms were completed and returned for the drivers and vehicles checked. One of these forms had to be removed as the vehicle was not randomly stopped. This gave a valid response rate of 99.5% from the 6720 sought. A further 15 vehicles were non-UK registered and these were removed from the analysis leaving an overall sample of 6674 forms.
- 4.4 Where possible, the Police National Computer was used at the roadside to determine compliance when documentation was not physically presented at the roadside. When there was good reason to doubt the compliance of the driver or the vehicle keeper, a HORT/1 form was issued to the driver, requesting that documents be produced at a police station. It is known that one force carried out approximately 500 extra checks in relation to the 140 vehicles stopped. Extended nationally to all 52 forces, this suggests the Operation entailed some 250,000 database checks.
- 4.5 Survey forms, HORT/1 forms and DVLA V79 forms (to submit details of driver or vehicle record inaccuracies) were completed at the roadside where appropriate.
- 4.6 All drivers who were stopped were issued a form stating the reasons for the check and giving an e-mail address which they could contact for any enquiry, comment or grievance. Checks of this site over the next few weeks showed no contacts had been made.
- 4.7 Officers noted that some offenders were detected when they checked vehicles at random which would not normally have been stopped. One force seized two fairly recently registered vehicles when it was found that of the two drivers, both over sixty, one was unlicensed and the other had no insurance. Another force arrested a disqualified driver



whose age was given as in the 71 to 80 years old grouping. **Whilst these three cases are interesting it should be noted they are atypical of general level of compliance for the age groups involved.**

- 4.8 At least one force commented on the number of lease hire vehicles it had stopped which were, in fact, in the permanent custody and control of one person but were, obviously, registered to the leasing company. This type of arrangement makes it extremely hard to identify vehicle drivers quickly as the enquiring officer often has to approach the lease hire company and then, having identified the company hiring the vehicle, has to enquire with the company to ascertain the driver. This is not a new issue but it is disappointing that a problem which was under discussion between the police service and other agencies in the mid 1990s has still not been resolved.
- 4.9 Comment has been made in the results section of this report, and also in the IHAC report, in respect of the increased level of cases where the identity of the driver was not confirmed. It is believed this increase may be due to some officers only accepting photographic evidence as 100% confirmation of identity. Interestingly, for many of those where the identity was noted as 'not confirmed', old style paper driving licences had been produced at the roadside and the officers then carried out 5 or 6 database checks on the driver and car, all of which were supportive that the driver was compliant in all respects. A photo driver's licence was used to confirm identity in 44.3% of vehicles stopped.
- 4.10 **Resources used**
- 4.11 A single point of contact was appointed for each force. Generally, this was an officer of the rank of sergeant or inspector although some forces used constables and police staff. Thus 52 police personnel, both sworn and unsworn, were involved for a minimum of 7 working days in the administration of this Operation.
- 4.12 At least 607 officers\* carried out the roadside checks. Many of these worked as double crew but it was noticeable that many forces used single crewed cars. Since all checks were carried out in line with each force's operational policies and protocols, it was anticipated that there would be variation.  
(\*some force numbers were not discernible on a few of the check sheets)
- 4.13 Even if it was assumed the bulk of vehicles were double crewed, then at least 300 patrol vehicles would have been required to carry out the Operation. In the event this simplistic figure would have to be adjusted but would probably balance out since some vehicles would have been used by two or more crews during the 24 hour period whilst some vehicles would have only been single crews.

4.14 Some check sites were on motorways and other high speed roads and in the main (from anecdotal evidence) it appears vehicles were randomly selected as they left these roads at junctions or rest areas. An alternative practice was to select the vehicle on the main carriageway and then stop it at the next junction or rest area.

## 5. The Results

- 5.1 As the survey was conducted through roadside checks, the measure of offence reflects this method of data collection and refers to **the proportion of kilometres travelled by non-compliant drivers/vehicles, rather than the proportion of drivers or vehicles which are non-compliant.**
- 5.2 In the analysis of the potential factors contributing to non-compliance, two measures of non-compliance were used: "at least one area of non-compliance", and "at least one area of serious non-compliance". Areas of serious non-compliance are:-
- lost or stolen vehicle
  - Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) [no VEL displayed, vehicle registered as SORN, fraudulent VEL displayed]
  - driving other than in accordance with a driving licence
  - uninsured driving
  - no MOT test certificate
  - false registration.
- 5.3 Further (less serious) areas of non-compliance are:-
- incorrect current keeper on register;
  - keeper details incorrect;
  - driver record not up to date;
  - failing to comply/misrepresentation of registration plate.
- 5.4 The areas of less serious non-compliance used in 2008 differ from those used in 2006. In 2006, two other areas of less serious non-compliance were considered in addition to the areas listed in 5.3, namely whether the driver's and vehicle's details were listed on the insurance database. In order to ensure a balanced comparison between overall compliance in 2006 and 2008, the overall compliance rate for 2006 has been recalculated taking into account the new 2008 definition. The areas of serious non-compliance in 2008 are the same as those used in 2006.
- 5.5 A further adjustment was made to 2006 levels of both overall and serious compliance in order to make them comparable to 2008. In 2008, where it was unknown whether a vehicle had committed an offence in a specific area of non-compliance (those listed in the IHAC report) but was compliant in all other 'known' areas, the vehicle's overall compliance was classified as 'unknown'. This criterion was applied to 2006 to recalculate a comparable rate of serious and overall compliance. Where there was a small amount of non response for some questions, then those non responses have been excluded from that particular section of analysis.

5.6 HORT/1 forms were issued in 189 cases (40 for driving licences, 113 for insurance certificate/policies and 36 for test certificates).

### 5.7 Overall compliance

Of the 6674 vehicles and drivers checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 11.1% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area. This includes 3.4% with at least one area of serious non-compliance. Overall, 88.9% of vehicles/drivers stopped were fully compliant.

2.6% of vehicles/drivers stopped were non-compliant in more than one area of compliance. 0.5% of vehicles/drivers stopped were non-compliant in more than one area of serious non-compliance.

Figure 1 compares compliance rates in 2008 with 2006 rates.<sup>5</sup> There has been a statistically significant decrease in both overall and serious non-compliance.

<b>Compliance rates</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008 %</b>	<b>2006 %</b>
Fully compliant	5830	3897	88.9%	79.0%
At least one area of non-compliance	726	1035	11.1%	21.0%
At least one area of <u>serious</u> non-compliance	224	403	3.4%	7.5%
Total	6556	5793		

**Figure 1 - Compliance rates 2008 and 2006**

Cont'd

---

<sup>5</sup> The compliance rates for 2006 have been recalculated using the 2008 compliance criteria in order to provide a fair yearly comparison. The criteria difference between 2006 and 2008 is explained further in the IHAC report

## 5.8 Vehicle registration

Checks on vehicle records using the Police National Computer or documents produced at the roadside revealed that 3.6% of vehicles were incorrectly registered. This included the DVLA vehicle register holding the incorrect keeper, having incorrect address or vehicle details, and the false registration of the vehicle. The breakdown of problems is given below:-

Registration problem	Frequency	% of vehicle registration problems	% of sample
Incorrect Current Keeper	35	14.5%	0.5%
Incorrect Keeper Details	115	47.5%	1.7%
Incorrect Current Keeper and Incorrect Keeper Details	92	38.0%	1.4%
False or Cloned Registration	0	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>

Figure 2 - Breakdown of registration non-compliance

A total of 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA vehicle register. This is significantly lower than the corresponding figure in 2006 (3.7%).

The proportion of vehicles falsely registered has also decreased significantly from 2006 to 2008 (0.3% to 0.0%).

Of the vehicles stopped with the correct current keeper on the vehicle register, 1.8% had incorrect keeper details. This is not significantly different from the proportion found in 2006 (2.2%).

## 5.9 Use of DVLA V79 forms

These were submitted to DVLA in 57.1% of checks which revealed an incorrectly registered vehicle. Most errors in respect of drivers occurred in the younger age groups and where driver/keeper induced errors caused by those people failing to advise DVLA of changes of address or, commonly with female drivers, changes of name following changes in marital status. Only those accuracies which would substantially affect the tracing of a vehicle keeper or a driver were considered. Minor spelling mistakes were excluded.

During the planning, it was found most forces held out of date stocks of V79 forms suggesting most officers hardly ever used these forms, but preferred to utilise PNC administration and interest reports.

5.10 Vehicle records were significantly less accurate for the following groups of vehicles/drivers:-

- vehicles aged over 5 years old
- vehicles driven by 17-21 and 25-35 year olds
- motorcycles.

5.11 Vehicle records were significantly more accurate for the following groups of vehicles/drivers:-

- vehicles aged 1-3 years old
- vehicles driven by those aged 60–80 years.

5.12 Vehicles which were incorrectly registered had, on average, 0.16 serious offences in addition to being incorrectly registered. As an example, 4.1% of incorrectly registered vehicles were also evading VED, 3.7% of the drivers were unlicensed or disqualified, 2.1% were committing a testing offence and 6.6% were uninsured.




Figure 3

**All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample and highlights the potential for cross criminality by offenders (also see 5.14 below).**

### 5.13 Vehicle Excise Duty

VED evasion was discovered during 1.0% of checks. This is a significant decrease from 2006 (2.0%).

VED evasion included vehicles which were not displaying a VEL, vehicles displaying out-of-date VEL, vehicles displaying a fraudulent VEL and vehicles which had been declared SORN. Figure 4 shows a breakdown of VED evasion.

VED Evasion	Frequency	% of VED evasion	% sample
False VEL displayed	1	1.5%	0.02%
No VEL displayed	17	26.2%	0.3%
No VEL displayed and SORN	1	1.5%	0.02%
Out-of-Date VEL	28	43.1%	0.4%
Out-of-Date VEL and SORN	4	6.2%	0.1%
SORN (valid VEL displayed)	14	21.5%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>

**Figure 4 - Breakdown of VED evasion**

If the 14 vehicles which had been declared as SORN but were displaying a current and valid VEL were considered to be compliant, thereby assuming the SORN had not yet been removed from the DVLA record (i.e. administrative delay), the VED evasion rate would fall to 0.8%.

The proportion of vehicles declared off-road has stayed approximately the same from 2006 to 2008 (0.3%).

A recent DfT study found a similar VED evasion rate to that found in Operation V79 (1.0%). However, the Transport Statistics Bulletin<sup>6</sup> estimated VED evasion to be 1.1% across all the VED tax bands in the UK vehicle fleet.

No vehicles were seized during the checks due to evading VED.

Vehicles were significantly more like to be evading VED if they were in the following groups:-

- vehicles aged over 10 years old
- vehicles driven by 25-35 year olds.

Vehicles were significantly less likely to be evading VED if they were in the following groups:-

- motorcars
- vehicles driven by 46-59 year olds.

---

<sup>6</sup> DfT Transport Statistics Bulletin: Vehicle Excise Duty Evasion 2007 - [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)

#### 5.14 VED Evasion and Other Offences

Vehicles which were evading VED had, on average, 0.43 serious offences in addition to evading VED. As an example, 15.4% of vehicles evading VED were also incorrectly registered, 6.2% of the drivers were unlicensed, 12.3% were uninsured and 15.4% of the vehicles were without a valid MOT test certificate, as shown in Figure 5. All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.




Figure 5

A roadside stop for no VED gives a strong possibility of detecting no insurance and/or no test certificate. **This possibility has been calculated as much as a factor of ten.** Whilst roadside and vehicle mounted ANPR devices can check high volumes of vehicles, general observation is still an efficient detection device for no VED and can be used by foot beat officers.

#### 5.15.1 Driver Licensing and Driver Records

0.8% of drivers checked were found to be driving other than in accordance with a driving licence. This is a significant decrease to that seen in 2006 (1.6%) and, when extrapolated to the UK driving population, **we are 95% confident it represents at least a 17% reduction in the number of kilometres driven by unlicensed drivers.**

5.15.2 Two drivers had been disqualified from driving (0.03%) and the remaining drivers who were found to be driving other than in accordance with a driving licence, had no valid licence (0.8%). The additional comments showed that no valid licence included provisional licence holders (or others) driving not in accordance with their licence e.g. unaccompanied, no L plates.



5.15.3 In 6.0% of the checks, the identity of the driver was not confirmed at the roadside. This is a significant increase from 2006, when 1.0% of checks could not confirm the certainty of the identity of the driver. These were cases where the identity of the driver could not be proved at the roadside by the driver producing a photo card driving licence, passport, other documentation (including paper driver's licence) or by other means such as PNC checks. The question on the survey form did not enquire if there was any suspicion about identity but simply asked whether the driver's identity was confirmed and no offences were noted for those occasions where certainty of identity could not be confirmed.

5.15.4 The significant increase in non-confirmed identity from 2006 to 2008 is likely to be due to:-


- a change in the wording of the question relating to this. V79-2006 required only a simple Y/N answer to the question "Identity confirmed". In 2008, a number of options for the method of confirmation were given, plus an option for 'not confirmed'. This may have led to an increase in the accuracy of reporting of unconfirmed identity cases,

or

- officers only accepting photographic ID as full confirmation. Interestingly, many drivers (44.3%) did use their photo card driver's licences as identification.

This question does not provide any information about identity fraud and there are no questions in the survey which cover that explicitly, since it was felt that if identity fraud was detected, it would most likely to be included by officers at the roadside checking and including the offence within the 'other offences' section. This did happen in one case where a driver gave false details and was later dealt with for the offence of perverting the course of justice.

5.15.5 Figure 6 shows that 38.9% of offenders who were driving other than in accordance with the conditions of the driving licence were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped), 7.4% of these offenders were also driving vehicles without any VEL, 5.6% were driving a vehicle that did not have a valid MOT test certificate and 16.7% an incorrectly registered vehicle. These rates are considerably higher than the offence rates seen in the sample as a whole. On average, those offenders driving other than in accordance with the conditions of their driving licence had 0.5 additional serious offences.



**Figure 6**

Drivers were significantly less likely to have a valid driving licence if they were in the following groups:-

- on major urban roads
- in vehicles 10 years old or over
- male
- 25-35 years.

Drivers were significantly more likely to have a valid driving licence if they were in the following groups:-

- in vehicles 1 to 5 years old
- female
- 46-59 years
- driving a motorcar.

#### 5.16 DVLA Drivers' Records

The driver's record was found to be inaccurate in 3.3% of checks. This has stayed constant since 2006, when 3.4% of checks revealed inaccurate driver records. Drivers were less likely to have an up-to-date driver's record if they were in the following groups:-

- 22-35 years
- in vehicles over 10 years old.

Drivers were more likely to have an up-to-date record if they were 61-80 years old.

### 5.16.1 DVLA - Accuracy of the Record

Here are some statistics on the DVLA Accuracy of the Record Survey, 2005:-

- 66.9% of records were completely correct, i.e. 33.1% had at least one error. As discussed, this includes minor errors such as typos which were disregarded in V79 unless they affected the traceability of the subject.
- The Survey also found that, if all errors in address and postcode were eliminated, there would be a vast improvement in accuracy (up 22.5% to 89.4%).
- However, the more precise comparable figure, perhaps, is the amount of record holders who were directly traceable (i.e. that had at least a correct address on their record) - this was 74.5%. The proportion that were in any way traceable was 81.5%.

### 5.17 MOT test certificates

67.8% of the vehicles stopped required an annual test, either because they were over three years old, or for other reasons. Of these, 98.5% had a valid and current MOT test pass. This is a significant increase on 2006<sup>7</sup> (95.8%).

Of the vehicles which required testing and had a valid MOT test pass, 4.0% produced a pass certificate at the roadside, 95.3% were on the MOT Database and 0.3% were produced in order after a HORT/1 was issued and the remaining 0.4% of vehicles were recorded as being 'not tested' although the use was deemed lawful.

36 HORT/1s were issued for MOT documents. Of these, 61.1% produced documents in order within the seven days, while the remaining 38.9% failed to do so and an offence was committed.


Vehicles requiring an annual test were significantly less likely to hold a current MOT test pass if they were being driven on major rural roads.

- 5.18 Vehicles without a current MOT test pass had, on average, 0.28 serious offences in addition to being without a MOT. For example, 7.2% of vehicles without a current MOT test pass were also incorrectly registered, 4.3% of the drivers were driving other than in accordance with a driving licence, 14.5% of the vehicles were untaxed, and 10.1% were uninsured, as shown in Figure 7. **All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample and**

---

<sup>7</sup> The computerisation of MOT test results was not fully complete in 2006, which meant that many vehicles and drivers were legitimately not on the MOT database during the 2006 Operation. Therefore in 2006 many HORT/1 were issued requesting insurance documentation to be produced in order to confirm whether a vehicle had a valid and current MOT test pass in 2006.

**highlights value of ANPR databases and partnership working where other agencies supply police patrols with current databases.**



**Figure 7**

### 5.19 Insurance

1.2% of drivers checked were not insured for the vehicle they were driving. This is a significant decrease from the proportion of uninsured kilometres driven in 2006 (1.9%) but, lest we feel complacent, it still means:-

**1.2% of the kilometres (i.e. 5,700,000,000 or 5.7 billion) travelled in the UK is by uninsured vehicles.**

113 HORT/1 forms were issued requesting production of insurance documents. Of these, 102 (90.3%) resulted in insurance documents being produced in order.

### 5.20 Insurance database

93.6% of drivers checked were found on the drivers' insurance database. Of those drivers on the insurance database, 99.8% were insured. Of those not on the database, 84.9% were insured.

The insurance database held the correct details for the majority of the drivers registered (99.6%). For the small number of drivers where the insurance database record was incorrect, the most common reason was the details had changed recently, and the database had not been updated (61.9% of incorrect records), probably due to administrative delay.

### 5.21 **Seized Vehicles**

Some 56 vehicles were seized at the roadside<sup>8</sup> utilising powers conferred under Section 165 Road Traffic Act 1988 – no insurance. This equates to 0.8% of the whole sample. 1.2% of the sample was uninsured.

Two drivers, who were uninsured at the time of being checked, were able to reinsure, by mobile phone from the roadside and thus continue using their vehicles. This is an increase in the level of seized vehicles from the 2006 Operation and gives an indication of the logistical, funding and administrative issues which arise for the police service when implicating such measures. Experience has shown that vehicles which have a reasonable or high value will be reclaimed, with the charges being borne by the offender. Where a vehicle is not reclaimed, then it is the police service (and the tax paying community) which pays the costs of removal and storage. Although the value of scrap metal has risen the relevant de-pollution costs prior to the permanent dismantling of a vehicle, and the fluctuating value of scrap metal on a weekly basis may cause contracted recovery agents to recover their whole costs against the police service.

### 5.22 Vehicles and drivers were significantly less likely to be insured if they were in the following groups:-

- in vehicles over 10 years old
- male
- 25-35 years.

Vehicles and drivers were significantly more likely to be insured if they were in the following groups:-

- cars
- in vehicles 1-5 years old
- female
- 60-70 years old.

### 5.23 **No Insurance and other offences**

Uninsured drivers had, on average, 0.43 serious offences in addition to driving without insurance. For example, 20.0% of uninsured drivers were also incorrectly registered, 26.3% of the drivers were driving other than in accordance with a valid driving licence, 10.0% of the vehicles

---

<sup>8</sup> There may have been more vehicles seized due to insurance since some uninsured drivers were also unlicensed and the categories only allowed for one option to be chosen (see road side check sheet for categories). This is the statistic calculated from the data collected.

were not displaying a valid VEL, and 8.8% of vehicles did not have a current MOT test certificate, as shown in Figure 8. All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.




Figure 8

As with the MOT non-compliance, the use of ANPR and up-to-date databases is a most effective road policing tool in relation to this area of non-compliance.

#### 5.24 Vehicle Registration Marks [VRM] (Registration or Number Plates)

2.2% of the vehicles checked had illegal VRMs. This could have been due to incorrect spacing or character size. This is a significant decrease on 2006 (5.4%).

A significantly proportion of checks that were carried out at minor urban road check sites discovered illegal VRMs. Drivers aged 71-80 were significantly less likely to have illegal VRMs fitted to their vehicle. 31.0% of vehicles with illegal VRMs were under three years old; this equates to 0.7% of the valid sample.

2.8% of the vehicles with illegal registration plates also committed an insurance offence, whilst 2.1% also had a VED offence and 0.7% had a MOT testing offence.

5.25 None of the vehicles stopped and checked were discovered to be lost or stolen.

#### 5.26 Other offences

Other offences were detected in 61 of the checks (0.9%). A list of other offences is shown in Figure 9. As some checks revealed more than one other offence, 63 offences were detected in total.

Offence	Frequency	Driver Arrested?
Defective tyre	22	No
Tyre pressures	1	No
Defective windscreen	7	No
Use of mobile phone	2	No
Defective lights	4	No
Contravening red light	1	No
Illegal immigrant	1	Yes
Defective windscreen washer	1	No
No seat belt	16	No
Perverting the course of justice	1	Yes
Defective exhaust	2	No
Excess speed	1	No
Diesel cap not secure	1	No
No learner plates	1	No
Dangerous condition overall	2	No
Total	63	

**Figure 9 – Other offences detected as a result of the roadside checks**

In addition to the two arrests shown in Figure 9, arrests were also made as a result of two other checks. These arrests were for offences of disqualified driving and no insurance.

## 5.27 Other findings

5.28 81 vehicles were seized at the roadside (1.2% of the valid sample). Of those, 56 (69.1%) were seized due to no insurance and the remaining 25 (30.9%) were seized for a reason other than no insurance or VEL. There were no seizures for VEL evasion.

5.29 99.8% of vehicles had a level of windscreen and front window tinting (if any) that was in order. All 10 vehicles (0.2%) whose tinting level appeared excessive were subject to a visual safety examination only. All evidential standard examinations (0.4% of examinations) found the level of tinting in order. The additional comments suggest that a number of the tinting evidential standard examinations were conducted using the Tintman<sup>9</sup> device.

5.30 Additional comments show that at least 0.1% of vehicles stopped were being driven on trade plates<sup>10</sup>, at least 0.1% were company vehicles or covered by company insurance and at least 0.1% were either hire, rental, lease or courtesy vehicles.

<sup>9</sup> A commercially available meter which measures the LUX factor of glass and gives an evidential reading.

<sup>10</sup> Trade plates are displayed on vehicles used under a trade licence. Trade licences are issued to motor traders and vehicle testers. There is no automatic exemption for MOT testing for vehicles used under a trade licence. The vehicle may be driven by the trade licensee, or anyone else driving with their consent, provided it is for a use authorised by the licence.

### 5.31 Non-UK drivers

88 vehicles<sup>11</sup> checked were driven by a drivers who held a non UK drivers licence(1.3% of the valid sample). Of these, 19.5% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area. This includes 14.9% with at least one area of serious non-compliance. 80.5% were fully compliant.

Checks on non-UK drivers driving UK registered vehicles were significantly more likely to find incidences of non-compliance than checks on UK drivers.

### 5.32 Non-UK registered vehicles

Of the 6689 vehicles randomly stopped, 15 were non-UK registered vehicles. These non-UK registered vehicles were stopped under the same conditions as UK registered vehicles.

None of drivers of non-UK registered vehicles were found to be unlicensed and 6 (40.0%) of the drivers held a UK licence.

One driver was not insured for the vehicle they were driving. Two HORT/1 forms were issued requesting production of insurance documents and both resulted in insurance documents being produced.

**None of these 15 vehicles, or their drivers, were included in the analysed sample when determining compliance rates.**

### 5.33 Location of check sites

The location of the all the roadside checks used in the Operation (except the Northern Ireland checks) are shown in Figure 13 of the IHAC report. They cannot be reproduced here due to software considerations.

### 5.34 Likelihood of non compliance

Vehicles/drivers were significantly more or less likely to be non-compliant in at least one area if they were in the following groups:

<b>Significantly More Likely</b>	<b>Significantly Less Likely</b>
Driven on a major urban road	Vehicle aged between 1-3yrs old
Older vehicles (aged over 10yrs)	Car
Motorcycle	Driver aged between 46-80yrs old
Driver aged between 22-45yrs old	Driver of UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle
Driver of non-UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle	

**Figure 9**

---

<sup>11</sup> UK registered vehicles



In respect of drivers of non UK nationality the authors of this report could find little to indicate whether the level of non compliance is from ignorance of UK legislation or deliberate intent to avoid compliance. This is exactly the same case as with UK licence holders since the holder of a UK drivers licence need not necessarily be a UK citizen and, even if they are, either may have a limited knowledge of the legislation relating to motor vehicle use, or have a deliberate intent not to comply with legislation.

Vehicles/drivers were significantly more or less likely to be non-compliant in at least one area if they were in the following groups:

<b>Significantly More Likely</b>	<b>Significantly Less Likely</b>
Motorcycle	Car
Light Commercial Vehicle	Younger vehicle (0 - 3yrs)
Older Vehicle (10yrs+)	Female
Male	Driver aged between 60-70yrs
Driver aged between 22-35yrs	
Driven on major urban roads	

**Figure 10**

## 6. Conclusions

6.1 Of the 6674 vehicles and drivers checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008:-

- 88.9% were fully compliant;
- 11.1% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area;
- 3.4% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area of serious non-compliance.

6.2 There has been a drop in the level of offending with the survey revealing a significant increase in both serious and overall compliance from 2006.

6.3 Figure 11 shows a summary of the results for different vehicle and driver serious offences:-

Offence	Rate in 2008 sample	Rate in 2006 sample
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	1.6%
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	1.9%
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	4.2%
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	1.0%	2.0%
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.2%
False Registration	0.0%	0.3%

Figure 11 – Offence rates in 2008 and 2006

6.4 Figure 12 shows the billion kilometres<sup>12</sup> travelled with offences being committed.

Offence	Rate in Sample	Billion Kms travelled
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	3.9
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	5.7
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	7.2
Vehicle tax evasion	1.0%	4.7
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.0
False Registration	0.0%	0.0
Incorrectly Registered	3.6%	17.4
Overall non compliance	11.1%	53.0
Serious non-compliance	3.4%	16.2

Figure 12 – Billion kilometres travelled with offences being committed

The total of non compliant driven kilometres is: 53,000,000,000 Kilometres

<sup>12</sup> DfT Traffic Statistics 2007, 471.9 billion kms were travelled in 2007, by cars, LGVs, and motorcycles.

6.5 Driving licence offences had the highest number of additional serious offences. On average, unlicensed drivers committed 0.50 additional serious offences, as shown in Figure 13.

	<b>Additional Serious Offences</b>
Unlicensed Driver	0.50
Uninsured Driver	0.43
Vehicles without current MOT	0.28
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	0.43
Incorrectly Registered	0.16

**Figure 13 – Additional serious offences**

**If a police officer stops two unlicensed drivers then, on average, one of those is likely to be committing another serious offence.**

6.6 38.9% of unlicensed drivers were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped).

6.7 Drivers / vehicles were more likely to be non-compliant (overall) if they were in the following groups:-

- Motorcycle;
- Driver aged between 22-45 years old;
- Driven on a major urban road;
- Older vehicle (over 10yrs old);
- Driver of non-UK nationality driving a UK vehicle

6.8 Drivers / vehicles were less likely to be non-compliant (overall) if they were in the following groups:-

- Car;
- Driver aged between 46-80 years old;
- Vehicle aged between 1-3 years old;
- Driver of UK nationality driving a UK vehicle

6.9 Drivers / vehicles were more likely to have a serious non-compliance if they were in the following groups:-

- Motorcycle or Light Commercial Vehicle;
- Driver aged between 22-35 years old;
- Male;
- Driven on major urban roads;
- Older vehicle (10yrs and above).

6.10 Drivers / vehicles were less likely to have a serious non-compliance if they were in the following groups:-

- Car;
- Driver aged between 60-70yrs old;
- Female;
- Younger vehicle (0-3yrs).

6.11 Additional analysis showed that:-

- the identity of the driver was not confirmed in 6.0% of the checks; this is a significant increase on the 2006 check (1.0%) but may be due to officers only accepting photographic identity as 100% certainty. (see paragraph 5.15.3 ante)
- 3.3% of driver records were found to be inaccurate; this has stayed approximately constant since the 2006 check (3.4%);
- 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA register; this is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (3.7%);
- 0.3% of vehicles stopped had been declared as off-road SORN; which is consistent with the 2006 check (0.3%).
- 93.6% of drivers were on the drivers' insurance database, the majority of which (99.6%) held the correct details;
- 2.2% of vehicles had illegal registration plates, a significant improvement on the 2006 check (5.4%);
- Older vehicles (over 10 years old) were significantly less likely to have accurate vehicle records or be correctly registered, less likely to be insured, more likely to be untaxed and less likely for the driver to be licensed and driver record to be correct;
- Male drivers were significantly less likely to be licensed or insured.
- Drivers aged 25-35 years old were significantly less likely to be insured or licensed or have an up-to-date driver's record, and significantly less likely to have the vehicle taxed or correctly registered.

6.12 The use of the DVLA, Motor Insurance and MOT databases are an invaluable asset to roads policing officers. This type of operation measures their accuracy both in a pragmatic and empirical format. The levels of accuracy were found to be high and this standard must be maintained to sustain public trust and police service confidence.

6.13 PNC resilience was also checked in an unintended fashion with at least 260,000 database checks being carried out on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March in order to fulfil the road checks required for this Operation. We understand there were no extra (PNC) resources and all of these

checks were in addition to the usual daily level of checks carried out by officers involved in 'business as usual'. **It is a positive reflection on the robustness of the system.**

- 6.14 The DVLA form V79 is still an under publicised form within the police service. Whilst use of PNC administration and interest reports may satisfy policing requirements in the short term failure to use form V79 prevents DVLA from updating its databases in line with data protection principles.

## 7.0 Recommendations

- 7.1 Government agencies and the police service consider their ongoing enforcement strategies and activity relating to:-
- the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition devices which can utilise the accuracy of the databases available and maximise the benefits in road safety to be achieved by intelligence led roads policing.
  - enforcement of the compliance offences covered in this operation which can only be detected, in the main, by physical stopping of offenders on our roads. Increased pro active patrols will increase chances of offenders being detected (and the perception of likelihood of being detected) and add to the satisfaction of law abiding motorists who do pay the high insurance premiums and increasing levels of vehicle excise licensing
- 7.2 The detection of compliance offences do not need to be carried out only by specialist roads policing officers. The ability to accurately check drivers' and vehicles' documentation is a required basic policing skill. Only the police service has been entrusted with this duty in its entirety. If the police service is seen, or perceived, to abrogate this duty then there is no other agency empowered within the roads policing partnership to adequately enforce for road safety on a national basis.
- 7.3 A further exercise of this nature should be considered for 18 to 24 months hence in order to further compare the levels of compliance.
- 7.4 The question set of the roadside check form used in V79-2008, other than the two supplementary questions, should remain the same for subsequent checks.
- 7.5 DVLA and ACPO should consider how the use of DVLA form V79 can be better publicised to all, and increase the accuracy levels of DVLA data.

## **Appendix 1**<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> This is the whole report from DfT IHAC which has been transferred into this report. Any errors in pagination or page references are the unintended result of that transfer. References are, therefore, best followed by paragraph numbers

**National Vehicle and Driver compliance March 2008  
(Operation V79)  
Roadside check results: Final report**

**Prepared by the In House Analytical Consultancy  
in the Department for Transport on behalf of the  
Association of Chief Police Officers**



*Department for*  
**Transport**



GOVERNMENT OPERATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE



## Contents<sup>14</sup>

Contents.....	
1. Executive summary.....	
2. Introduction .....	
3. Methodology .....	
4. Results.....	
4.1. Overall compliance .....	
4.2. Vehicle registration .....	
4.3. Vehicle excise duty.....	
4.4. Driver licensing and driver records .....	
4.5. Vehicle testing .....	
4.6. Insurance .....	
4.7. Other offences .....	
4.8. Other findings .....	
4.9. Non-UK drivers .....	
4.10. Non-UK registered vehicles .....	
4.11. Description of sample.....	
4.12. Overall effect of contributory factors .....	
5. Conclusions .....	
6. Recommendations .....	
Annex A - Roadside data sheet and guidance notes .....	

---

<sup>14</sup> See footnote 13 on previous page.

## 1. Executive summary

- 1.1 On 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 6689 vehicles<sup>15</sup> were randomly stopped as part of the national Police Operation V79. This was the third such roadside check carried out in the United Kingdom, and was set up to measure the baseline level of compliance with documentation and licensing regulations of drivers and vehicles on the road. The first check was carried out in March 2004, and the second in March 2006. Valid information was gathered from all 6689 of the vehicle checks.<sup>16</sup>
- 1.2 As the survey was conducted through roadside checks, the measure of offence reflects this method of data collection and refers to **the proportion of miles travelled by non-compliant drivers/vehicles, rather than the proportion of drivers or vehicles which are non-compliant.**
- 1.3 From the sample of vehicles stopped and checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 11.1% of vehicles/drivers were committing at least one offence. 2.6% of vehicles were committing more than one offence. 3.4% of vehicles/drivers had at least one area of serious<sup>17</sup> non-compliance, and 0.5% of checks found more than one area of serious non-compliance.
- 1.4 For drivers/vehicles which were non-compliant in at least one area, the 95% confidence interval on accuracy was 11.1% +/- 1.0%. This means that it is expected that in 95% of samples of the UK drivers/vehicles between 10.1% and 12.1% of miles driven would be non-compliant in at least one aspect. The 95% confidence interval on accuracy for serious non-compliance was 3.4% +/- 0.5% shows the 95% confidence interval on accuracy for non-compliant miles driven.

Confidence intervals	Non compliance	Lower limit	Upper limit	Range
Serious Compliance Offences	3.4%	2.9%	3.9%	+/- 0.5%
All Compliance Offences	11.1%	10.1%	12.1%	+/- 1%

Figure 1

- 1.5 Figure 2 shows a summary of the results for different vehicle and driver licensing, testing and insurance offences for 2008 and 2006. All offence categories show a significant decrease from 2006 to 2008.

---

<sup>15</sup> Cars, light goods vehicles, minibuses, motorcycles, mopeds, and 'other' vehicles were included. Heavy good vehicles and passenger carrying vehicles were not included.

<sup>16</sup> 15 of these checks were on non-UK registered vehicles and were removed for the main part of the analysis, leaving an overall valid sample of 6674 vehicles.

<sup>17</sup> Serious non-compliance areas are vehicle excise duty evasion, being uninsured, unlicensed or without a valid MoT test certificate, a stolen vehicle or vehicle using false registration plates.

Offence	Rate in 2008 sample	Rate in 2006 sample
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	1.6%
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	1.9%
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	4.2%
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	1.0%	2.0%
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.2%
False Registration	0.0%	0.3%

**Figure 2**

1.6 Figure 3 shows the billion kilometres<sup>18</sup> travelled with offences being committed.

Offence	Rate in Sample	Billion Kms travelled
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	3.9
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	5.7
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	7.2
Vehicle tax evasion	1.0%	4.7
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.0
False Registration	0.0%	0.0
Incorrectly Registered	3.6%	17.4
Overall non compliance	11.1%	53.0
Serious non-compliance	3.4%	16.2

**Figure 3**

1.7 The level of full compliance increased from 79.0% in 2006 to 88.9% in 2008.<sup>19</sup> This increase is statistically significant.

1.8 The level of compliance on serious offences has increased from 92.5% in 2006 to 96.6% in 2008. This increase is statistically significant.

1.9 In addition to these baseline results, the main findings from the analysis were:-

- The identity of the driver was unconfirmed at the roadside in 6.0% of the checks; this is a significant increase on the 2006 check (1.0%);
- 3.3% of driver records were found to be inaccurate; this is similar to the level found in 2006 (3.4%);
- 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA register; this is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (3.7%);

<sup>18</sup> DfT Traffic Statistics 2007, 477.9 billion kms were travelled in 2007, by cars, LGVs, and motorcycles.

<sup>19</sup> The 2006 overall compliance rate quoted in this report has been calculated using the 2008 criteria for overall compliance. Therefore the 2006 overall compliance rate quoted in this report and quoted in the 2006 Operation V79 Report will differ. The criteria difference between 2006 and 2008 is explained further post.

- 2.2% of vehicles had illegal registration plates. This is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (5.4%);
- Older vehicles were less likely to have a current MoT, less likely to have accurate vehicle records or be correctly registered, less likely to be insured or licensed and more likely to be untaxed;
- Vehicles aged 1-3 years old were more likely to be compliant overall, and vehicles aged 0-3 years old were also less likely to have a serious non-compliance;
- Driving licence and insurance offences have the highest number of additional serious offences (1.50 and 1.43 serious offences, respectively, on average);
- 38.9% of unlicensed drivers were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped);
- Checks on motorcycles were more likely to find incidences of non-compliance than checks on cars; checks on motorcycles and light commercial vehicles were more likely to find incidences of serious non-compliance than checks on cars;
- Checks on major urban roads found a higher rate of non-compliance;
- Drivers aged 22-45yrs old were more likely to be non-compliant overall, while drivers aged 46-80yrs were more likely to be compliant. Drivers aged 22-35yrs were more likely to have a serious non-compliance whereas drivers aged 60-70yrs were less likely to have a serious non-compliance;
- Males were more likely to have a serious non-compliance than females. For example, male drivers were less likely to be licensed or insured;
- Checks on non-UK drivers, (driving UK registered vehicles) were significantly more likely to reveal an incidence of non-compliance than checks on UK drivers (driving UK registered vehicles).

## 2. Introduction

- 2.1 This report contains the results of the analysis of the data collected during the Police Operation V79 carried out on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008. The Operation aimed to randomly stop 6,720 vehicles at 240 different roadside check sites, and to check the documentation for the vehicle and the driver concerned.
- 2.2 During the roadside checks, the police checked the following:-
- Whether the vehicle was registered as stolen, and/or whether the vehicle was being used on a false registration mark, or with a illegal format number plate;
  - Whether the DVLA record had the current keeper of the vehicle correct, and whether the details (address, etc.) of the keeper were correct;
  - Whether the vehicle had a current and valid tax disc displayed, or whether the vehicle was registered as "off road" (SORN);
  - The identity of the driver, whether the driver licence was valid, and whether the driver had been disqualified;
  - Whether the driver's record was up to date on the DVLA register;
  - Whether the vehicle was of an age/type requiring annual testing, and whether a test certificate could be produced, or the annual test was held on the MoT Testing Database;
  - Whether the driver and vehicle were insured, and whether the driver's details were available and correct on the insurance database.
- 2.3 In addition, data were collected on the age and type of vehicle, the type of road and time that the check was carried out on, the age range and gender of the driver, whether a HORT/1 was issued asking the driver to produce documents at a police station, and whether any additional offences were detected, arrests made, or the vehicle seized.
- 2.4 The checks focused on cars, motorcycles, light goods vehicles, minibuses and mopeds. Heavy goods vehicles and passenger carrying vehicles were not included in the checks (national baseline compliance checks for these vehicle types are carried out by the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency on an annual or biennial basis).
- 2.5 The roadside checks were carried out on the same day, at sites selected using a stratified sampling technique to ensure a representative cross-section of road types across the United

Kingdom. All Police Forces took part in the checks, and a similar number of checks were conducted by each force.

- 2.6 Data from the roadside checks was provided to the In House Analytical Consultancy (formerly Operational Research Unit) in the Department for Transport in order to undertake an analysis of the data on behalf of the Association of Chief Police Officers. The data were checked for consistency, duplicate entries were removed, and some anomalies in the data were resolved by 9<sup>th</sup> June 2008, resulting in a valid sample of 6689 vehicle and drivers. The valid response rate was 99.5%.

### 3. Methodology

- 3.1 For the 2006 Operation a sample of check sites was drawn from a national roads database (maintained by the Department for Transport). The sample was drawn using a stratified sampling technique to ensure a representative cross-section of road types in the UK. In some cases, the check sites were moved following discussion with the Police Forces involved, to safer, more practical locations. These sites were always selected to reflect the characteristics of the traffic at the original site.
- 3.2 Many of the check sites used in the 2006 Operation were used in 2008 Operation, together with a number of newly selected check sites. The new check sites were needed for the Police Forces not involved in the 2006 Operation and in order to meet the required larger sample in 2008. The additional check sites were selected on the basis of ensuring a representative cross-section of traffic on different road types in the UK.
- 3.3 In order to achieve results with an accuracy of +/- 1.8% at the 95% confidence level, a sample size of 6,720 vehicle checks was chosen. This figure assumed a response rate of 80%<sup>20</sup>, that no more than 28 vehicles would be stopped at any one location (a "cluster size" of 28), and used an estimate that approximately 13.5% of vehicle/driver combinations would be non-compliant in at least one aspect of the check.
- 3.4 A total of 6690 forms were completed and returned for the drivers and vehicles checked. One of these forms had to be removed as the vehicle was not randomly stopped. This gave a valid response rate of 99.5% from the 6720 sought. A further 15 vehicles were non-UK registered and these were removed from the analysis leaving an overall sample of 6674 forms.
- 3.5 The accuracy of the results from a survey is determined by the sampling methodology (discussed further in Annex A). For this roadside survey the accuracy of the headline results was as follows:-
- For drivers/vehicles which were non-compliant in at least one area, the 95% confidence interval on accuracy was 11.1% +/- 1.0%. This means that it is expected that in 95% of samples of the UK drivers/vehicles between 10.1% and 12.1% of miles driven would be non-compliant in at least one aspect. The 95% confidence interval on accuracy for serious non-compliance was 3.4% +/- 0.5%.

---

<sup>20</sup> Where non-responses are survey forms which have been lost or spoiled, checks which had to be abandoned on the day due to operational reasons, or where inadequate or inconsistent data was supplied on the form.

- For drivers/vehicles which were non-compliant in at least one area, the 95% confidence interval on accuracy was 3.4% +/- 0.5%. This means that it is expected that in 95% of samples of the UK drivers/vehicles between 2.9% and 3.9% of miles driven would be non-compliant in at least one aspect
- 3.6 Where possible the Police National Computer was used to trace documentation which was not physically presented at the roadside. When there was good reason to doubt the compliance of the driver or the vehicle keeper, a HORT/1 form was issued to the driver, requesting that documents be produced at a police station.
- 3.7 Survey forms, HORT/1 forms and DVLA V79 forms (to submit details of vehicle record inaccuracies) were completed at the roadside where appropriate. The data collected in the survey forms were then entered into a database, and checked for consistency. The results of some checks needed to be followed up with the officers who conducted the checks, to determine where possible whether or not the driver and vehicle keeper were compliant. A copy of the roadside survey form is attached at Annex A.
- 3.8 Analysis was carried out on the data in the main areas of driver and vehicle compliance which were covered by the Operation and also on demographic information about the location of the roadside check site, the age and type of vehicle stopped, and the age and gender of the driver. These factors were linked to compliance to see if there were any groups which were more or less compliant.
- 3.9 As the survey was conducted through roadside checks, the measure of offence reflects this method of data collection and refers to **the proportion of miles travelled by non-compliant drivers/vehicles, rather than the proportion of drivers or vehicles which are non-compliant.**
- 3.10 In the analysis of the potential factors contributing to non-compliance (section 4.12), two measures of non-compliance were used: "at least one area of non-compliance", and "at least one area of serious non-compliance". Areas of serious non-compliance are:-
- Lost or stolen vehicle;
  - VED<sup>21</sup> tax evasion (no VEL<sup>22</sup> displayed, vehicle registered as SORN, false VEL displayed);
  - Unlicensed driver;
  - Driver uninsured for vehicle;
  - Vehicle without current MoT test certificate;
  - False registration.

---

<sup>21</sup> Vehicle Excise Duty (VED)

<sup>22</sup> Vehicle Excise Licence (VEL)



- 3.11 Further (less serious) areas of non-compliance are:-
- Incorrect current keeper on register;
  - Keeper details incorrect;
  - Driver record not up to date;
  - Illegal registration plate.
- 3.12 The areas of less serious non-compliance used in 2008 differ from those used in 2006. In 2006, two other areas of less serious non-compliance were considered in addition to the areas listed in 0, namely whether the driver's and vehicle's details were listed on the insurance database. In order to ensure a fair comparison between overall compliance in 2006 and 2008, the overall compliance rate for 2006 has been recalculated taking into account the new 2008 definition. The areas of serious non-compliance in 2008 are the same as those used in 2006.
- 3.13 A further adjustment was made to 2006 levels of both overall and serious compliance in order to make them comparable to 2008. In 2008, where it was unknown whether a vehicle had committed an offence in a specific area of non-compliance but was compliant in all other 'known' areas, the vehicle's overall compliance was classified as 'unknown'. This criterion was applied to 2006 to recalculate a comparable rate of serious and overall compliance.
- 3.14 It should be noted that there was a small amount of non response for some questions. These non responses have been excluded from that particular section of analysis.
- 3.15 HORT/1 forms were issued in 189 cases (40 for driving licences, 113 for insurance policies and 36 for test certificates).
- 3.16 In the following section of the report, where a significant difference between results has been stated, the difference is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level. This means that differences in compliance rates (for example), show a difference which cannot be explained by natural variation, and show that it is expected that 95% of samples of vehicle/drivers in the UK would show this difference. In some cases, a difference can appear to be substantial, but small sample sizes (or groupings of the sample) can cause results to be inconclusive.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Overall compliance

- 4.1.1 Of the 6674 vehicles and drivers checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008, 11.1% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area. This includes 3.4% with at least one area of serious non-compliance. Overall, 88.9% of vehicles/drivers stopped were fully compliant.
- 4.1.2 2.6% of vehicles/drivers stopped were non-compliant in more than one area of compliance. 0.5% of vehicles/drivers stopped were non-compliant in more than one area of serious non-compliance.
- 4.1.3 Figure compares compliance rates in 2008 with 2006 rates.<sup>23</sup> There has been a statistically significant decrease in both overall and serious non-compliance.

Compliance rates	2008	2006	2008 %	2006 %
Fully compliant	5830	3897	88.9%	79.0%
At least one area of non-compliance	726	1035	11.1%	21.0%
At least one area of <u>serious</u> non-compliance	224	403	3.4%	7.5%
Total	6556	5793		

Figure 4 - Compliance rates 2008 and 2006

### 4.2 Vehicle registration

- 4.2.1 Checks on vehicle records using the Police National Computer or documents produced at the roadside revealed that 3.6% of vehicles were incorrectly registered. This included the DVLA vehicle register holding the incorrect keeper, having incorrect address or vehicle details, and the false registration of the vehicle. The breakdown of problems is given below.

---

<sup>23</sup> The compliance rates for 2006 have been recalculated using the 2008 compliance criteria in order to provide a fair yearly comparison. The criteria difference between 2006 and 2008 is explained further in 3.12 and 3.13 .

Registration problem	Frequency	% of vehicle registration problems	% of sample
Incorrect Current Keeper	35	14.5%	0.5%
Incorrect Keeper Details	115	47.5%	1.7%
Incorrect Current Keeper and Incorrect Keeper Details	92	38.0%	1.4%
False or Cloned Registration	0	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>

**Figure 5 - Breakdown of registration non-compliance**

- 4.2.2 A total of 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA vehicle register. This is significantly lower than the corresponding figure in 2006 (3.7%).
- 4.2.3 The proportion of vehicles falsely registered has also decreased significantly from 2006 to 2008 (0.3% to 0.0%).
- 4.2.4 Of the vehicles stopped with the correct current keeper on the vehicle register, 1.8% had incorrect keeper details. This is not significantly different from the proportion found in 2006 (2.2%).
- 4.2.5 A V79 form was submitted to DVLA in 57.1% of checks which revealed an incorrectly registered vehicle.
- 4.2.6 If the vehicles that had an incorrect current keeper or keeper details on the register but where no V79 was submitted were considered to be compliant, thereby assuming the correct details had not yet been updated on the DVLA record i.e. administrative delay, the proportion of vehicles that were incorrectly registered would fall to 2.1%.
- 4.2.7 Vehicle records were significantly less accurate for the following groups of vehicles/drivers:-
- Vehicles aged over 5 years old;
  - Vehicles driven by 17-21 and 25-35 year olds;
  - Motorcycles.
- 4.2.8 Vehicle records were significantly more accurate for the following groups of vehicles/drivers:-
- Vehicles aged 1-3 years old;
  - Vehicles driven by those aged 60–80 years.

4.2.9 Vehicles which were incorrectly registered had, on average, 0.16 serious offences in addition to being incorrectly registered. For example, 4.1% of incorrectly registered vehicles were also evading VED, 3.7% of the drivers were unlicensed or disqualified, 2.1% were committing a testing offence and 6.6% were uninsured, as shown in Figure . All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.




Figure 6

### 4.3 Vehicle excise duty

4.3.1 Vehicle excise duty evasion was discovered during 1.0% of checks. This is a significant decrease from 2006 (2.0%).

4.3.2 Vehicle excise duty evasion included vehicles which were not displaying a vehicle excise licence, vehicles displaying out-of-date vehicle excise license, vehicles displaying a false licence and vehicles which had been declared off-road. Figure 4 shows a breakdown of vehicle excise duty evasion.


VED Evasion	Frequency	% of VED evasion	% sample
False VEL displayed	1	1.5%	0.02%
No VEL displayed	17	26.2%	0.3%
No VEL displayed and SORN	1	1.5%	0.02%
Out-of-Date VEL	28	43.1%	0.4%
Out-of-Date VEL and SORN	4	6.2%	0.1%
SORN (valid VEL displayed)	14	21.5%	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>

Figure 7 - Breakdown of VED evasion

- 4.3.3 If the 14 vehicles declared off-road that were displaying a current and valid vehicle excise license were considered to be compliant, thereby assuming the SORN had not yet been removed from the DVLA record i.e. administrative delay, the vehicle excise duty evasion rate would fall to 0.8%.
- 4.3.4 The proportion of vehicles declared off-road has stayed approximately the same from 2006 to 2008 (0.3%).
- 4.3.5 A recent Department for Transport study found a similar VED evasion rate to that found in Operation V79 (1.0%), the Transport Statistics Bulletin<sup>24</sup> estimated vehicle excise duty evasion to be 1.1% across all tax classes in Great Britain traffic.
- 4.3.6 No vehicles were seized during the checks due to evading Vehicle Excise Duty.
- 4.3.7 Vehicles were significantly more like to be evading Vehicle Excise Duty if they were in the following groups:-
- Vehicles aged over 10 years old;
  - Vehicles driven by 25-35 year olds.
- 4.3.8 Vehicles were significantly less likely to be evading Vehicle Excise Duty if they were in the following groups:-
- Motorcars;
  - Vehicles driven by 46-59 year olds.
- 4.3.9 Vehicles which were evading Vehicle Excise Duty had, on average, 0.43 serious offences in addition to evading Vehicle Excise Duty. For example, 15.4% of vehicles evading Vehicle Excise Duty were also incorrectly registered, 6.2% of the drivers were unlicensed, 12.3% were uninsured and 15.4% of the vehicles were without a valid MoT, as shown in Figure 5 . All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.

---


<sup>24</sup> DfT Transport Statistics Bulletin: Vehicle Excise Duty Evasion 2007. Available on [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)



**Figure 8**

#### **4.4 Driver licensing and driver records**

- 4.4.1 0.8% of drivers checked were found to be unlicensed. This is a significant decrease to that seen in 2006 (1.6%)
- 4.4.2 Two drivers had been disqualified from driving (0.03%) and the remaining unlicensed drivers had no valid licence (0.8%). The additional comments showed that no valid licence included provisional licence holders (or others) driving not in accordance with their licence e.g. unaccompanied, no L plates.
- 4.4.3 In 6.0% of the checks, the identity of the driver was not confirmed at the roadside. This is a significant increase from 2006, when 1.0% of checks could not confirm the identity of the driver. (see paragraph 5.15.4 of the main report page 23)
- 4.4.4 40 HORT/1 forms were issued requesting production of driving licence. Of these, 33 (82.5%) resulted in the driving licence being produced.
- 4.4.5 Figure shows that 38.9% of unlicensed drivers were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped), 7.4% of unlicensed drivers were driving an untaxed vehicle, 5.6% were driving a vehicle that did not have a valid MoT and 16.7% an incorrectly registered vehicle. These rates are considerably higher than the offence rates seen in the sample as a whole. On average, unlicensed drivers had 0.5 additional serious offences.



**Figure 9**

4.4.6 Drivers were significantly less likely to have a valid driving licence if they were in the following groups:-

- Driving on major urban roads;
- Driving vehicles aged over 10 years old;
- Male;
- Aged 25-35 years old.

4.4.7 Drivers were significantly more likely to have a valid driving licence if they were in the following groups:-

- Driving vehicles aged 1 to 5 years old;
- Female;
- Aged 46-59 years old;
- Driving a motorcar.

4.4.8 The driver's record was found to be inaccurate in 3.3% of the checks. This has stayed approximately constant since 2006, when 3.4% of checks revealed inaccurate driver records.

4.4.9 Drivers were less likely to have an up-to-date driver's record if they were in the following groups:-

- Drivers aged 22-35 years old;
- Vehicles aged over 10 years old.

4.4.10 Drivers were more likely to have an up-to-date record if they were in the following group:-

- Aged 61-80 years old.


## 4.5 Vehicle testing

- 4.5.1 67.8% of the vehicles stopped required an annual test, either because they were over three years old, or for other reasons. Of these, 98.5% had a valid and current MoT test pass. This is a significant increase on 2006<sup>25</sup> (95.8%).
- 4.5.2 Of the vehicles which required testing and had a valid MOT test pass, 4.0% produced a pass certificate at the roadside, 95.3% were on the MOT Database and 0.3% were produced in order after a HORT/1 was issued and the remaining 0.4% of vehicles were recorded as being 'not tested' although the use was deemed lawful.
- 4.5.3 36 HORT/1s were issued for MOT documents. Of these 61.1% produced documents in order within the seven days, while the remaining 38.9% failed to do so and an offence was committed.
- 4.5.4 Vehicles requiring an annual test were significantly less likely to hold a current MoT test pass if they were in the following group:-
- Driven on major rural roads.
- 4.5.5 Vehicles without a current MoT test pass had, on average, 0.28 serious offences in addition to being without a MoT. For example, 7.2% of vehicles without a current MOT test pass were also incorrectly registered, 4.3% of the drivers were unlicensed, 14.5% of the vehicles were untaxed, and 10.1% were uninsured, as shown in Figure . All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.

---

<sup>25</sup> The computerisation of MOT test results was not fully complete in 2006, which meant that many vehicles and drivers were legitimately not on the MOT database during the 2006 Operation. Therefore in 2006 many HORT/1 were issued requesting insurance documentation to be produced in order to confirm whether a vehicle had a valid and current MOT test pass in 2006.





**Figure 10**

## **4.6 Insurance**

- 4.6.1 1.2% of drivers checked were not insured for the vehicle they were driving. This is a significant decrease from the proportion of uninsured drivers found in 2006 (1.9%).
- 4.6.2 113 HORT/1 forms were issued requesting production of insurance documents. Of these, 102 (90.3%) resulted in insurance documents being produced.
- 4.6.3 93.6% of drivers checked were found on the drivers' insurance database. Of those drivers on the insurance database, 99.8% were insured. Of those not on the database, 84.9% were insured.
- 4.6.4 The insurance database held the correct details for the majority of the drivers registered (99.6%). For the small number of drivers where the insurance database record was incorrect, the most common reason was that the keeper details had changed recently, and the database had not been updated (61.9% of incorrect records).
- 4.6.5 56 vehicles were seized due to being uninsured<sup>26</sup>. This equates to 0.8% of the whole sample.
- 4.6.6 Vehicles and drivers were significantly less likely to be insured if they were in the following groups:-
- Vehicles aged over 10 years old;
  - Male;

<sup>26</sup> There may have been more vehicles seized due to insurance. This is the statistic calculated from the data collected.

- Drivers aged 25-35 years old.

4.6.7 Vehicles and drivers were significantly more likely to be insured if they were in the following groups:-

- Cars;
- Vehicles aged 1-5 years old;
- Female;
- Drivers aged 60-70 years old.

4.6.8 Uninsured drivers had, on average, 0.43 serious offences in addition to driving without insurance. For example, 20.0% of uninsured vehicles/drivers were also incorrectly registered, 26.3% of the drivers were unlicensed, 10.0% of the vehicles were untaxed, and 8.8% were vehicles without a valid MOT, as shown in Figure 11. All of these additional offence rates are higher than for the general sample.

4.6.9




Figure 11

## 4.7 Other offences

4.7.1 2.2% of the vehicles checked had registration plates which were illegal. This could have been due to incorrect spacing or character size. This is a significant decrease on 2006 (5.4%).

4.7.2 A significantly greater proportion of checks that were carried out at minor urban road check sites discovered illegal plates. Drivers aged 71-80 years old were significantly less likely to have illegal plates fitted to their vehicle. 31.0% of vehicles with illegal plates were under three years old; this equates to 0.7% of the valid sample.

- 4.7.3 2.8% of the vehicles with illegal registration plates also committed an insurance offence, whilst 2.1% also had a tax offence and 0.7% had a testing offence.
- 4.7.4 None of the vehicles stopped and checked were discovered to be lost and/or stolen.
- 4.7.5 Other offences were detected in 61 of the checks (0.9%). A list of other offences is provided in Figure . As some checks revealed more than one other offence, 63 other offences were detected in total.

Offence	Frequency	Driver Arrested?
Defective tyre	22	No
Tyre pressures	1	No
Defective windscreen	7	No
Use of mobile phone	2	No
Defective lights	4	No
Contravening red light	1	No
Illegal immigrant	1	Yes
Defective windscreen washer	1	No
No seat belt	16	No
Perverting the course of justice	1	Yes
Defective exhaust	2	No
Excess speed	1	No
Diesel cap not secure	1	No
No learner plates	1	No
Dangerous condition overall	2	No
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	

**Figure 12 – Other offences detected as a result of the roadside checks**

- 4.7.6 In addition to the two arrests shown in Figure , arrests were also made as a result of two other checks. These arrests were of a disqualified driver and an uninsured driver.

## **4.8 Other findings**

- 4.8.1 81 vehicles were seized at the roadside (1.2% of valid sample). Of those, 69.1% were seized due to no insurance and the remaining 30.9% were seized for a reason other than no insurance or tax. There were no seizures for invalid vehicle excise licence.
- 4.8.2 99.8% of vehicles had a level of tinting (if any) that was in order. All 10 vehicles (0.2%) whose tinting level appeared excessive were subject to a visual safety examination only. All evidential standard examinations (0.4% of examinations) found the level of tinting in order. The additional comments suggest that a number of the tinting evidential standard examinations were conducted using the Tintman device.

4.8.3 Additional comments show that at least 0.1% of vehicles stopped were being driven on trade plates<sup>27</sup>, at least 0.1% were company vehicles or covered by company insurance and at least 0.1% were either hire, rental, lease or courtesy vehicles.

#### **4.9 Non-UK drivers**

4.9.1 88 vehicles<sup>28</sup> checked were driven by a non-UK driver (1.3% of valid sample). Of these, 19.5% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area. This includes 14.9% with at least one area of serious non-compliance. 80.5% were fully compliant.

4.9.2 Checks on non-UK drivers were significantly more likely to find incidences of non-compliance than checks on UK drivers.

#### **4.10 Non-UK registered vehicles**

4.10.1 Of the 6689 vehicles randomly stopped, 15 were non-UK registered vehicles. These non-UK registered vehicles were stopped under the same conditions as UK registered vehicles.

4.10.2 None of drivers of non-UK registered vehicles were found to be unlicensed and 6 (40.0%) of the drivers held a UK licence.

4.10.3 One driver was not insured for the vehicle they were driving. Two HORT/1 forms were issued requesting production of insurance documents and both resulted in insurance documents being produced.

#### **4.11 Description of sample**

4.11.1 The location of the all the roadside checks used in the Operation (except the Northern Ireland checks) are shown in Figure 13.

---

<sup>27</sup> Trade plates are displayed on vehicles used under a trade licence. Trade licences are issued to motor traders and vehicle testers. There is no automatic exemption for MOT testing for vehicles used under a trade licence. The vehicle may be driven by the trade licensee, or anyone else driving with their consent, provided it is for a use authorised by the licence.


<sup>28</sup> UK registered vehicles

Operation V79 2008 Check Sites (excluding NI)




**Figure 13**

4.11.2 The roadside check locations were selected to provide a representative sample of vehicles on different road types. Figure 14 compares the sample distribution across road types with the national distribution of billion kilometres travelled across road types. There was no significant difference between the national profile and the sample profile.




**Figure 14**

4.11.3 The majority of vehicles checked were cars (87.5%). The second largest group of vehicles checked was light commercial vehicles (8.9%). Figure 15 shows the proportion of different vehicles checked.



**Figure 15**

4.11.4 Figure 16 shows the vehicle type profile of the vehicles checked against the national vehicle type profile.



**Figure 16**

4.11.5 There are significant differences between the sample and national vehicle type profiles, namely that light commercial vehicles were under sampled whilst motorcycles/mopeds and cars were over sampled. As the results have shown vehicle type effects compliance, therefore an unrepresentative sample could introduce bias to the overall compliance rate. Analysis involving weighting the proportions of vehicle type in the sample by the actual proportions in the population will determine whether the over and under sampling has had an effect on the overall result.

4.11.6 Figure 17 compares the confidence intervals seen in the sample (10.3% - 11.8%) and those when weighting the proportions of vehicle type in the sample by the actual proportions in the population (10.1%- 11.6%). The majority of the sampling confidence interval falls within the confidence interval for the weighted population, however it is possible that Operation V79 has slightly over reported overall non-compliance. The same can be said for the serious non-compliance, as shown in Figure 18.

Confidence interval for non-compliance	lower limit	non-compliance	upper limit	range
Sample	10.3%	11.1%	11.8%	+/-0.8%
Weighted for population	10.1%	10.9%	11.6%	+/-0.8%

**Figure 17**


Confidence interval for serious non-compliance	lower limit	non-compliance	upper limit	range
Sample	3.0%	3.4%	3.9%	+/-0.4%
Weighted for population	2.9%	3.3%	3.8%	+/-0.4%

**Figure 18**

4.11.7 The likelihood of a vehicle being checked reflects the method of data collection (roadside checks), therefore the proportion of miles

travelled by a vehicle determines its chances of being stopped more so than the drivers or vehicles characteristics e.g. driver age, vehicle age. However these characteristics could still be influential, for example as newer vehicles are likely to have a greater annual mileage than older vehicles, and therefore newer cars may have had a greater exposure to the checks.

4.11.8 Figure 19 shows that the age profile of the drivers stopped is broadly similar to the national age profile of driving licence holders, although there are some significant differences. These differences are likely to be due to the higher annual mileage undertaken by drivers of particular age groups, and therefore their greater exposure to the roadside checks.



**Figure 19**

4.11.9 Approximately two-thirds (66.1%) of drivers stopped were male and one-third female (33.9%). The sample contained a significantly greater proportion of male drivers than the proportion of male drivers in the general population with driving licences. This is likely to be due to the higher annual mileage undertaken by male drivers, and therefore their greater exposure to the roadside checks.

4.11.10 The hours of the day when the highest number of checks were carried out was between 9am and 11am, with a declining number of checks carried out from 11am onwards. Figure 20 shows the distribution of checks at different times of the day.






Figure 20

#### 4.12 Overall effect of contributory factors

4.12.1 The compliance rates referred to in this section are those described in 0 and 0, namely, "at least one non-compliance", and "at least one serious non-compliance".

4.12.2 Vehicles/drivers were significantly more or less likely to be non-compliant in at least one area if they were in the following groups:-

Significantly More Likely	Significantly Less Likely
Driven on a major urban road	Vehicle aged between 1-3yrs old
Older vehicles (aged over 10yrs)	Car
Motorcycle	Driver aged between 46-80yrs old
Driver aged between 22-45yrs old	Driver of UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle
Driver of non-UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle	

Figure 21

4.12.3 Vehicles/drivers were significantly more or less likely to have at least one serious non-compliance if they were in the following groups:-

Significantly More Likely	Significantly Less Likely
Motorcycle	Car
Light Commercial Vehicle	Younger vehicle (0 - 3yrs)
Older Vehicle (10yrs+)	Female
Male	Driver aged between 60-70yrs
Driver aged between 22-35yrs	
Driven on major urban roads	

Figure 22

## 5. Conclusions

5.1 Of the 6674 vehicles and drivers checked on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2008:-

- 88.9% were fully compliant;
- 11.1% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area;
- 3.4% were found to be non-compliant in at least one area of serious non-compliance.

5.2 There has been a significant decrease in both serious and overall compliance from 2006.

5.3 Figure 11 shows a summary of the results for different vehicle and driver serious offences:-

Offence	Rate in 2008 sample	Rate in 2006 sample
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	1.6%
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	1.9%
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	4.2%
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	1.0%	2.0%
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.2%
False Registration	0.0%	0.3%

**Figure 23 – Offence rates in 2008 and 2006**

5.4 Figure shows the billion kilometres<sup>29</sup> travelled with offences being committed.

Offence	Rate in Sample	Billion Kms travelled
Unlicensed Driver	0.8%	3.9
Uninsured Driver	1.2%	5.7
Vehicles without current MOT	1.5%	7.2
Vehicle tax evasion	1.0%	4.7
Lost / Stolen vehicle	0.0%	0.0
False Registration	0.0%	0.0
Incorrectly Registered	3.6%	17.4
Overall non compliance	11.1%	53.0
Serious non-compliance	3.4%	16.2

**Figure 24 – Billion kilometres travelled with offences being committed**

5.5 Driving licence offences had the highest number of additional serious offences. On average, unlicensed drivers committed 0.50 additional serious offences, as shown in Figure 25.

<sup>29</sup> DfT Traffic Statistics 2007, 477.9 billion kms were travelled in 2007, by cars, LGVs, and motorcycles.

	<b>Additional Serious Offences</b>
Unlicensed Driver	0.50
Uninsured Driver	0.43
Vehicles without current MOT	0.28
Vehicle Excise Duty evasion	0.43
Incorrectly Registered	0.16

**Figure 25 – Additional serious offences**

- 5.6 38.9% of unlicensed drivers were also uninsured for the vehicle they were driving (0.3% of all drivers stopped).
- 5.7 Drivers / vehicles were more likely to be non-compliant (overall) if they were in the following groups:-
- Motorcycle;
  - Driver aged between 22-45 years old;
  - Driven on a major urban road;
  - Older vehicle (over 10yrs old);
  - Driver of non-UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle.
- 5.8 Drivers / vehicles were less likely to be non-compliant (overall) if they were in the following groups:-
- Car;
  - Driver aged between 46-80 years old;
  - Vehicle aged between 1-3 years old;
  - Driver of UK nationality, driving a UK registered vehicle.
- 5.8.1 Drivers / vehicles were more likely to have a serious non-compliance if they were in the following groups:-
- Motorcycle or Light Commercial Vehicle;
  - Driver aged between 22-35 years old;
  - Male;
  - Driven on major urban roads;
  - Older vehicle (10yrs and above).
- 5.8.2 Drivers / vehicles were less likely to have a serious non-compliance if they were in the following groups:-
- Car;
  - Driver aged between 60-70yrs old;

- Female;
- Younger vehicle (0-3yrs).

#### 5.9 Additional analysis showed that:-

- the identity of the driver was not confirmed in 6.0% of the checks; this is a significant increase on the 2006 check (1.0%);
- 3.3% of driver records were found to be inaccurate; this has stayed approximately constant since the 2006 check (3.4%);
- 1.9% of vehicles stopped had the wrong vehicle keeper recorded on the DVLA register; this is a significant improvement on the 2006 check (3.7%);
- 0.3% of vehicles stopped had been declared as off-road; this has stayed approximately constant since the 2006 check (0.3%).
- 93.6% of drivers were on the drivers' insurance database, the majority of which (99.6%) held the correct details;
- 2.2% of vehicles had illegal registration plates, a significant improvement on the 2006 check (5.4%);
- Older vehicles (over 10 years old) were significantly less likely to have accurate vehicle records or be correctly registered, less likely to be insured, more likely to be untaxed and less likely for the driver to be licensed and driver record to be correct;
- Male drivers were significantly less likely to be licensed or insured.
- Drivers aged 25-35 years old were significantly less likely to be insured or licensed or have an up-to-date driver's record, and significantly less likely to have the vehicle taxed or correctly registered.
- Four arrests were made as a result of the checks.

## 6. Recommendations

6.1 Results and feedback from Operation V79 in 2008 have led to the following recommendations, should this type of Operation be repeated in the future:-

- To identify the required analysis and tailor the roadside survey to suit, for example:-
  - Whether the non-compliance is due to administrative delay;
  - Change of ownership date;
  - If the vehicle is on the insurance database;
  - Single question to identify if the driver is a UK or Non-UK driver ;
  - If the vehicle is a company or hire/rental vehicle;
  - If the vehicle being driven on trade plates.
  
- To aid the analysis:-
  - final question in each section of the survey identifying whether or not an offence had been committed and whether the vehicle had been seized for committing that offence;
  - review age of vehicle categories.

## Annex A - Roadside data sheet and guidance notes

Operation V79-2008		Roadside Data Sheet V5		RESTRICTED WHEN COMPLETE	
Dft Site Number	Time Veh. Stopped	Officer Number	Vehicle Registration		
1.1 Type of vehicle stopped: Motorcar / Motorcycle / Moped / Light commercial / Minibus / Other					
1.2 Age of vehicle: less than 1yr / 1 yr up to 3 yrs / 3 yrs up to 5 yrs / 5 yrs up to 10yrs / 10 yrs and over					
1.3 UK registered vehicle: Yes / No					
1.3a If not UK give International registration letter(s) .....					
<b>PNC and VEL Check:</b> _____					
2.1 VEL displayed: Yes / No / NA					
2.1a If answer to 2.1a is 'Yes', is the VEL: Current and Valid / False or Fraudulent / Out of date but correct for the vehicle					
2.2 PNC available: Yes / No					
2.3 Veh. lost or stolen: Yes / No					
2.4 Current keeper shown: Yes / No / Non UK vehicle					
2.5 Keeper details: Correct / Incorrect (If 'Correct' go to question 2.6)					
2.5a If not correct, was this because: (a) keeper details have recently changed Yes / No					
(b) the DVLA record is wrong Yes / No					
2.6 False or cloned registration detected: Yes / No / Non UK vehicle					
2.7 Is there a SQRN for the vehicle: Yes / No / Non UK vehicle					
2.8 Number plates legal: Yes / No / Non UK vehicle					
2.9 V79 submitted: Yes / No					
<b>Driver Record:</b> _____					
3.1 Driver record available: Yes / No / Non UK driver					
3.2 Driver identity confirmed by: Passport / Photo drivers licence / Other documentation / Other means / Not confirmed					
3.3 Driver licensed: Yes UK licence / Yes E.U. licence / Yes other domestic licence / No valid licence / Disqualified					
3.4 Driver record up to date: Yes / No / NA (Non UK)					
3.5 Driver's sex: Male / Female					
3.6 Age at last birthday: Under 16 / 16 / 17-21 / 22-24 / 25-35 / 36-45 / 46-59 / 60-70 / 71-80 / 81-90 / 90+					
3.7 HORT/1 for drivers licence: No / Yes, and document produced later in order / Yes, but valid licence not produced within seven days and offence committed					
<b>Vehicle Testing:</b> _____					
4.1 Testing database available: Yes / No / Non UK vehicle					
4.2 Does the vehicle require testing: Yes, over 3 years / Yes, other reason / No, UK vehicle / No, Non UK vehicle					
4.3 Proof of valid test: On database / Pass certificate produced at roadside / Vehicle not tested / NA					
4.4 If the vehicle should have a valid test pass but does not, is the use lawful: Yes / No / NA					
4.5 HORT/1 issued for test certificate: No / Yes and valid document produced later in order / Yes, but valid document not produced within seven days and offence committed					
<b>Insurance:</b> _____					
5.1 Insurance database available: Yes / No / NA vehicle / NA insurance company (If the answer here is NOT 'Yes' go to 5.5)					
5.2 Driver on insurance database: Yes / No / NA Non UK					
5.3 Database details: Correct / Incorrect / NA (Non UK) (If the answer here is 'Correct' or 'NA (Non UK)' go to 5.5)					
5.4 If details not correct was this because: (a) The vehicle keeper details had changed recently Yes / No					
(b) The database is wrong Yes / No					
5.5 Driver insured for vehicle: Yes / No					
5.6 HORT/1 issued for insurance: No / Yes and document produced later in order / Yes, but valid insurance not produced within seven days and offence committed					
<b>Seizure of Vehicle:</b> _____					
6.1 No offences, vehicle not seized / Offence, but vehicle not seized / Vehicle seized - no VEL / Vehicle seized - no insurance / Vehicle seized - other					
<b>Excessive Windscreen and Front Window Tinting: (Answer either 7.1 or 7.2)</b> _____					
7.1 Visual safety examination only: Level of tinting (if any) appeared in order / level appeared excessive driver advised					
OR					
7.2 Evidential standard examination: Level of tinting in order / Level allegedly excessive					
<b>8 Any other offences detected as a result of this check and NOT SHOWN ABOVE</b>					<b>Arrested Yes / No</b>

Question Number	Explanatory note
General	'Non UK veh.' means any vehicle not registered in the UK which is lawfully being used temporarily in the UK.
1.1	The target sample only includes those classes of vehicles which are or will be tested under Part II Sec 45 RTA 1988. <b>It DOES NOT include Goods Vehicles subject to a Goods Vehicle test.</b> As it is a random sample a foreign registered vehicle may be stopped.
1.2	The answer assists in validating other answers relating to vehicle testing.
1.3	This assists in determining why some responses of 'Not applicable' will be valid for some questions.
1.3a	Shortest way of giving country of registration.
2.1	The NA allows for any non UK vehicles and any exempt UK vehicle.
2.1a	<b>Misprint. This question should read 'If the answer to 2.1 is Yes', not 2.1a as is printed.</b> Do not put any answer at all for non UK vehicles
2.2	Sometimes PNC is down.
2.3	No Note
2.4	Non UK registered vehicles are not normally on the keeper database but can on the lost/stolen
2.5	Only count those errors which have a significant impact on the accuracy or validity of the record. DO NOT count small spelling errors as incorrect. If the answer is 'Correct' then do not answer 2.5.
2.5a	Only use this if the DVLA record is incorrect. You must answer both (a) and (b).
2.6	Please answer this even where vehicle is 'in order'
2.7	Please answer this even where there is a current VEL and No SORN. Sometimes a SORN will still be on file for a recently licensed vehicle
2.7	Use Yes or No for all UK vehicles. NA should only be used for non UK vehicles.
2.8	Was the plate colour and the font, character size and spacing correct for UK vehicles.
2.9	Answers on this question relate to both the vehicle record and the driver record (q. 3.4). If both records are Correct then mark this as 'No'. If either the vehicle or driver record is incorrect then complete a form V79 and mark this as 'Yes'.
3.1	The answer to this indicates why an HORT/1 may have to be issued.
3.2	Use of 'other' here is identity confirmed by local knowledge or other checks.
3.3	No note.
3.4	If the answer is 'No' please complete a V79 and indicate this has been done at question 2.9.
3.5	No note.
3.6	No note
3.7	It is anticipated the most common answer will be 'No'. This is one of the few questions which you may not be able to complete at the roadside. Even seven days later you may be unable to say whether the offence is No licence or failing to produce.
4.1	No note.
4.2	'Yes, other reason' caters for vehicles such as 'Q' plate vehicles. 'Non UK vehicle' only caters for those temporarily used in the UK.
4.3	NA should be used where a vehicle does not require testing (e.g. because of age) or is a Non UK vehicle. Only use 'Not tested' if the vehicle does require testing but has not been tested. Use NA if vehicle does not require testing, is exempt, or is Non UK.
4.4	If the answer to 4.3 was other than 'not tested' the answer here is 'NA'. If the answer to 4.3 was, 'Not tested' then the use may still have been lawful. (e.g. on way to or from a pre arranged test). If none of the exemptions apply then the answer should be 'No'.
4.5	It is anticipated the most common answer will be 'No'. This is one of the few questions which you may not be able to complete at the roadside. Even seven days later you may be unable to say whether the offence is No Test Certificate or failing to produce.
5.1	Use 'No' when the database is physically unavailable. Use 'NA vehicle' for Non UK Vehicles or UK vehicles not yet on the database. Use NA Insurance Company for UK vehicles where you know the Insurance company does supply data to the database.
5.2	No note.
5.3	Only count those errors which have a significant impact on the accuracy or validity of the record. DO NOT count small spelling errors as incorrect. If the answer is 'Correct' then do not answer 5.4
5.4	Only use this if the record is incorrect. You must answer both (a) and (b).
5.5	There will either be a Yes or No answer to this question. If you have to require production and issue a form HORT/1 then you will complete this at a later date.
5.6	It is anticipated the most common answer will be 'No'. This is one of the few questions which you may not be able to complete at the roadside. Even seven days later you may be unable to say whether the offence is No Insurance or failing to produce.
6.1	No Note.
7.1	If you are not qualified or equipped to lawfully test the level of tinting then please carry out a brief visual inspection of the windscreen and front windows.
7.2	If an evidential standard examination was done, then please complete this section.
8	Only details of offences not indicated in any of Sections 1 to 7