**Customer’s perspective**

Our customer was Traffic Head from Traffic Police, Satdobato. On the basis of existing systems mentioned above, the customer had an overall positive perspective towards the system. He highlighted following points:

1. There is no any prevailing system and has been none attempts to computerize the traffic rule violation.
2. When a misunderstanding takes place in between driver (referred to both motorists and motorcyclists), the current system of showing CCTV footage proof is both tedious and time consuming.
3. He mentioned how the traffic violence was increasing at an exponential pace and was going out of control with only manual existing system.
4. He highlighted the need for a computerized system in traffic violence control as manual detection and fine to individual breaches are close to impossible.
5. He pointed out the lack of enough manpower in the field of traffic control as a whole, most of the manpower is centralized towards traffic control than traffic violation monitoring.

**Observation of existing or similar systems**

1. Table of Comparison

Following table lists the table of comparisons of different existing system:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.N.** | **Place of Application** | **Name (If any)** | **Features** |
| 1. | Nepal | - | Red Light Camera: ❌ | Speed Camera: ❌ |  Speed Camera: ❌ | Photo Speed Vans: ❌ |
| 2. | Colorado, USA | - | Red Light Camera: ✔️ | Speed Camera: ✔️ |  Speed Camera: ✔️ | Photo Speed Vans: ✔️ |
| 3. | NSW, Australia | NSW Speed  Camera  Strategy | Red Light Camera: ✔️ | Speed Camera: ✔️ |  Speed Camera: ✔️ | Photo Speed Vans: ✔️ |  + Point-Point Detection Camera (Average  Speed Camera) + Mobile Phone Detection  Camera |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Common system features/functions

Following table lists the table of common system features/functions of different system: