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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In March 2008, Queensland Transport commenced a consultation process to identify strategies for improving the safety of motorcycle riders in Queensland. The consultation process was based on a document entitled: *Motorbike safety in Queensland – Consultation Paper* (Queensland Transport, 2008) and involved two phases:

- conducting three consultation workshops with key motorcycle rider safety stakeholder groups; and
- obtaining feedback from the community by making the consultation paper available on the web for the period 28 April – 30 May, 2008.

This report details the findings from the first phase of this consultation. More particularly, it provides an overview of the method used by the authors to facilitate the three stakeholder workshops and the findings that emerged from the discussions at the workshops. A report on the second phase of the consultation is currently being prepared by CARRS-Q and should be read in conjunction with this document.

Method

The selection and invitation of people to attend the three stakeholder workshops was undertaken by Queensland Transport and was based on existing committee structures. The three workshops were conducted with:

- 18 representatives of the Q-RIDE Registered Service Providers on 17 March, 2008;
- 10 members (or their representatives) of the Queensland Road Safety Committee on 27 March, 2008; and

All three workshops were facilitated by the authors utilising a standardised approach structured around the Consultation Paper. The majority of the discussions were undertaken in ‘break-out’ groups of approximately 4-5 people, with reporting back sessions being conducted with the whole group. Guidelines were provided to the attendees prior to the commencement of the discussion sessions stressing the need for an ‘open’, non-judgemental approach. Queensland Transport staff were available during the discussion sessions to clarify any relevant legislative or license processing queries that arose, but did not take part in the discussions.

Key findings

The body of the report provides a full overview of the wide range of views expressed at the three workshops. For summary purposes, however, the following section identifies: i) those proposals within the Consultation Paper for which there was strong support (although not

necessarily universal) across the workshops; ii) those for which there was general support; and iii) those for which there was little or no support.

**Proposals for which there were strong support**

Among the proposals that received strong support were that:

- Queensland Transport should introduce an enhanced licensing process for new motorbike riders catering for Pre-learner licence applicants, Learner licence holders, provisional/restricted licence holders, and Open licence holders;

- a zero alcohol limit should apply to all learner and provisional licence holders, regardless of their age;

- that people should not be allowed to ride a moped on an ‘ordinary’ car licence any longer in Queensland (although there were distinct differences of opinion as to how this change should be implemented);

- riders should be encouraged to wear appropriate protective clothing;

- an Australian standard and/or rating scheme should be implemented to enhance the quality of the protective clothing available on the market to riders;

- Queensland Transport should conduct specific motorcycle safety education campaigns targeting both motorcycle riders and other road users (particularly car drivers), utilising a variety of mediums such as print, radio, TV and the internet;

- the inclusion of more advanced safety features on motorcycles, such as anti-lock and linked breaking systems should be encouraged (although it was acknowledged that developments in this area were largely driven by technical and market considerations); and

- riding with the headlight on should be encouraged (although it was acknowledged that the majority of motorcycles on the market already had their headlight ‘hard-wired’ on).

Furthermore, a number of additional initiatives were identified across the workshops for which there appeared to be strong support including:

- providing more training facilities for motorcycle riders, particularly off-road;

- establishing some form of independent advisory committee to provide advice to the Government on motorcycle safety issues;

- improving the quality of the crash and exposure data relating to motorcycling;

- devoting more funds to improving the road environment to meet the needs of motorcycle riders; and

- ongoing research into motorcycle rider behaviour.
Proposals for which there was general support

Among the proposals for which there appeared to be a general level of support were:

- the introduction of a power-to-weight ratio, to replace the existing 250cc limit, to determine what motorcycles can be ridden by restricted licence holders (with the majority of the break-out groups either directly or indirectly not supporting the use of a higher engine capacity, such as 660cc, to augment this restriction);

- not allowing learner riders to carry pillion passengers (which was generally supported for provisional/restricted licence holders as well);

- that riders should be encouraged to wear highly visible clothing (although this was generally acknowledged as a matter of personal choice); and

- that the European standards for protective clothing should be adopted for use in Australia, in order to reduce unnecessary costs and time delays in implementation (although some concerns were raised about the unique climatic conditions in Australia and the related problem of hydration).

In addition, there were a number of suggestions made regarding the structure and content of an enhanced motorcycle licensing system which appeared to have general (but not universal) support among the workshop attendees including:

- a general preference for competency-based training and assessment (CBT&A) processes, as opposed to more traditional testing options such as Q-SAFE;

- the need to introduce some form of basic training at the Pre-learner stage for those people applying for a Learner’s licence, which would include both practical (off-road) and theoretical components;

- the need for Learner licence holders to undertake further training focusing on both practical (on-road) and theory components, particularly hazard perception;

- the need for a Provisional/Restricted licence phase characterised by particular restrictions, such as a zero alcohol limit and a power-to-weight based LAMS;

- the need for riders to undertake further training and assessment at the Provisional/Restricted stage to progress to riding an ‘unrestricted’ motorcycle; and

- the application of a zero alcohol limit to all motorcycle riders, regardless of licence class.

Proposals for which there was little or no support

Finally, there were a number of proposals within the Discussion Paper for which there appeared to be little or no support including:

- adopting a maximum period of three years for the Learner’s licence (with a 12 month maximum period being the most common alternative suggested);
- introducing a separate licence fee for motorcycle licences, which was seen as inequitable by many attendees (with a ‘bounty’ or refund for surrendered licences being the most common alternative suggested);

- introducing a levy on motorcycle riders to fund additional motorcycle safety initiatives, which was again seen as inequitable by many attendees;

- examining alternative methods for identifying speeding motorcycles, particularly front number plates, which were seen by many attendees as lacking a clear rationale and likely cost-effectiveness (although this proposal was strongly supported by some attendees).

**A note of warning**

It should be noted that the above views have been derived from a workshop process that involved the simultaneous consideration of a wide range of issues. As such, the ‘global’ nature of this feedback needs to be borne in mind when interpreting the results. In particular, care needs to be taken to not take any of the feedback out of context.

In addition, the outcomes of the three stakeholder workshops reported in this document represent only one part of the consultation process currently being undertaken by Queensland Transport. The second part involves the community feedback that is being sought in response to the consultation paper. As such, the findings outlined in this report should be read in conjunction with those emerging from the more general community-based consultation.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In March 2008, Queensland Transport commenced a consultation process to identify strategies for improving the safety of motorcycle riders in Queensland. The consultation process was based on a document entitled: Motorbike safety in Queensland – Consultation Paper (Queensland Transport, 2008) and involved two phases:

- conducting three consultation workshops with key motorcycle rider safety stakeholder groups; and
- obtaining feedback from the community by making the consultation paper available on the web for the period 28 April – 30 May, 2008.

CARRS-Q was commissioned by Queensland Transport to facilitate and report on the above consultations mechanisms. This involved two distinct tasks:

- facilitating the three consultation workshops and preparing a report identifying the views and issues that emerged; and
- analysing the results of the community feedback and preparing a report outlining the key quantitative and qualitative findings.

This report documents the first of the above two tasks. A separate report will be prepared by CARRS-Q documenting the outcomes of the second task, and should be read in conjunction with this document.

1.2 REPORT STRUCTURE

Chapter 2 of this report provides an overview of the processes used to facilitate the three consultation workshops and collate the content of the discussions. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the various views and issues that emerged from the workshops, structured around the key questions included in the Motorbike safety in Queensland – Consultation Paper (henceforth referred to as the consultation paper). A separate overview is provided for each of the workshops along with a summary that identifies the key areas of consensus (and non consensus). Chapter 4 attempts to synthesise the different perspectives emerging from the workshops by identifying: i) those proposals for which there was strong support across the workshops; ii) those for which there was general support; and iii) those for which there was little or no support.
2. METHOD

2.1 WORKSHOP ATTENDEES

The selection and invitation of people to attend the three stakeholder workshops was undertaken by Queensland Transport and was based on existing committee structures. The three workshops were conducted with:

- 18 representatives of the Q-RIDE Registered Service Providers on 17 March, 2008;
- 10 members (or their representatives) of the Queensland Road Safety Committee on 27 March, 2008; and

Appendix A contains a full list of the organisations represented at the workshops. Please note that a small number of people attended more than one workshop, due to their involvement on multiple committees. It should be noted that these individuals provided similar input at both workshops they attended.

2.2 WORKSHOP PROCESS

All three workshops were conducted at Transport House in Fortitude Valley and facilitated by Barry Watson and Darren Wishart from CARRS-Q.

Appendix B provides a copy of the Agenda used for the workshops. As will be noted, each workshop commenced with a series of short presentations by Queensland Transport staff and the facilitators. The purpose of these presentations was to provide participants with background information relating to:

- the scope of the consultation processes being used and the purpose of the workshops;
- motorcycle-related crash trends in Queensland;
- national and international developments in motorcycle safety; and
- the structure and contents of the *Motorbike safety in Queensland – Consultation Paper*.

The remainder of the workshops involved four discussion sessions structured around the contents of the discussion paper (see Appendix C). The specific questions addressed in each session are reported in Appendix D (in the format provided to the attendees). As can be seen, the attendees were requested to capture their discussions in the first two sessions in tabular form, to encourage a more systematic consideration of the various issues raised in the discussion paper. For example, among the issues that the attendees were requested to consider when discussing Question 1 (Should Queensland Transport introduce an enhanced licensing process for new motorbike riders?) were: i) the potential number of stages that would be in an enhanced system; ii) the training and assessment requirements at each stage; and iii) the processes for graduating to the next stage.
For sessions 1, 2 and 3, the discussions were conducted in ‘break-out’ groups of approximately 4 to 5 people. The reporting back for these discussions was conducted with the whole group. However, at all three workshops, the discussion and reporting back for Session 4 was conducted with the whole group (to reduce ‘discussion fatigue’). Prior to the commencement of Session 1, the facilitators outlined a number of ‘ground rules’ for the discussion sessions. Among the matters covered, the attendees were:

- requested to form into small break-out groups (of 4-5 participants) and proceed to rooms set aside for each group;
- encouraged within their small groups to engage in ‘open’, non-judgemental discussion regarding each of the questions posed within the discussion paper;
- instructed to present back to the larger group a summary (on butchers paper) of the group’s collaborative response to each question;
- instructed that if the group could not achieve consensus on particular issues they should note these discrepancies and highlight these when presenting back to the larger group;
- informed that each of the feedback sessions to the larger group would be recorded so that the facilitators could provide an accurate report of each group’s responses and subsequent explanation, but that only the facilitators would have access to the tapes and that they would be destroyed upon completion of the workshop report;
- assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their feedback; and
- informed that Queensland Transport staff would be on hand to clarify any relevant legislative or license processing queries that may arise, but would not take part in the discussions.

2.3 DATA REPORTING

As noted above, the structure of the discussion sessions were closely aligned to the key questions contained in the consultation paper. Accordingly, a similar structure is used in the next chapter to report the outcomes of the workshop discussions. For each of the key questions, an outline is provided of the range of comments that were provided in each workshop and whether a consensus position appeared to emerge or not. A summary section is then provided for each key question that identifies the areas of consensus (and non-consensus) across the three workshops.

As noted earlier, the ‘break-out’ groups were requested to identify areas of consensus and non-consensus in their reports back to the larger groups. As such, the results reported in the next chapter inevitably reflect the views of the feedback provided by the ‘break-out’ groups. Nonetheless, a number of steps have been undertaken to protect the anonymity of the participant responses. Firstly, the workshops are referred to in the results section by number, rather than by the relevant stakeholder group (i.e. Workshop No. 1, 2 and 3). Secondly, the discussions for each workshop are reported in an aggregate way, rather than for each of the individual ‘break-out’ groups.
3. RESULTS

3.1 SHOULD QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT INTRODUCE AN ENHANCED LICENSING PROCESS FOR NEW MOTORBIKE RIDERS?

3.1.1 Workshop 1

There was a general consensus in this workshop that an enhanced licensing process should be introduced for new motorcycle riders.

Structure of the licensing system

Although the number of formal licensing stages recommended by each of the breakout groups varied, there appeared to be a general consensus of the need to cater for four distinct groups of riders within the licensing system: Pre-learner licence applicants; Learner licence holders; Provisional licence holders; and Open licence holders.

However, a number of differences emerged between the breakout groups as to the particular structure of each stage. For example, one group suggested that the Provisional stage should be split into two, with fewer restrictions placed on riders in a P2 phase (see below for a discussion of relevant restrictions). Similarly, a second group suggested that riders within the Open licence phase should be required to undertake refresher training every five years.

In addition, there was a strong consensus across all groups at this workshop that the QSAFE option for obtaining and upgrading motorcycle licences be discontinued. Furthermore, concerns were raised about the recently introduced requirement for people to hold a car licence for a year before being eligible to apply for a motorcycle licence.

Components of the licensing system

Pre-learner licence stage

There was a strong consensus across all breakout groups that:

- more intensive training in motorcycle knowledge and skills is required at the pre-learner licence phase, as a pre-requisite for obtaining a learner’s licence;
- this training should be delivered in an off-road environment and ensure that the basic competencies for operating a motorcycle proficiently are demonstrated prior to a rider obtaining their learner licence;
- that the training should reflect current Q-RIDE competencies, without the on-road component;
- that consistent with the principles of competency-based training and assessment, riders would need to meet the competency requirements at this stage before becoming eligible to obtain a learner’s licence.

A further suggestion relating to this stage included that both a minimum and maximum time period should be specified for this stage. There were no major issues of non-consensus across the groups for the pre-learner licence stage.
Learner licence stage

There was a strong consensus across all breakout groups that:

- riders on their learner licence should be allowed to ride on the road without direct supervision, on the proviso that they had successfully completed the pre-learner licence requirements;
- learner riders should be required to undertake more training that reflects current Q-RIDE competencies with the on-road component;
- that consistent with the principles of competency-based training and assessment, riders would need to meet the competency requirements at this stage before becoming eligible to obtain a provisional licence.

A further suggestion relating to this stage was the need to include a Hazard Perception Test, although the manner of its delivery, timing and assessment standards were not specified.

One area of non-consensus concerned the optimal length of time for the learner licence stage. Three of the four groups suggested that riders should be required to hold their learner’s licence for a minimum of 12 months. However, the other group suggested that no minimum time period be required, rather that progression should be solely based on the demonstration of the relevant competencies.

Provisional licence stage

There was a strong consensus across all breakout groups that:

- there was a need for a provisional licence phase characterised by particular restrictions (although there were differences of opinion regarding the exact nature of these restrictions, as discussed in the relevant sections of 3.2 – 3.5);
- that riders who only met the competencies for riding ‘restricted’ motorcycles could remain on a provisional licence indefinitely, although certain other time-based restrictions may elapse; and
- that riders wanting to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles would need to demonstrate the relevant Q-RIDE competencies through a further competency-based training and assessment process.

Open licence stage

The majority of the groups did not propose any major changes to the Open licence stage. However, as noted above, all four groups appeared to support the view that the Open Licence should be preserved for those riders who had demonstrated the competencies required to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles. In addition, all four groups supported a zero BAC restriction on Open Licence holders (see below) and, as noted earlier, one group proposed that Open Licence holders be required to undertake refresher tests every five years.

3.1.2 Workshop 2

As with Workshop 1, there was a general consensus in this workshop that an enhanced licensing process should be introduced for new motorcycle riders.
Structure of the licensing system

There was a general consensus across the two break-out groups regarding the number of stages that should be incorporated into an enhanced licensing system, although the terminology used by each group varied in some cases (e.g. restricted vs. provisional stage). The stages suggested by the two groups were: Pre-learner licence; Learners licence; Restricted/Provisional licence; and Open licence.

While neither break-out group specifically recommended the discontinuation of the Q-SAFE testing option, there was strong support for competency-based training and assessment methods at the first three stages of the licensing system (see below for more details).

Components of the licensing system

Pre-learner licence stage

There was a consensus across the two breakout groups that:

- riders should be required to undertake basic skills and theory-related training prior to obtaining a learner’s licence;
- this training should be competency-based in nature, with the practical component delivered in an off-road training environment; and
- that progression to the learner licence stage should be based on a competency-based assessment of practical skills and a knowledge test, specific to the needs of motorcyclists (e.g. addressing matters such as road rules, value of helmets and protective clothing, hazard perception).

One of the break-out groups specifically mentioned that the competencies addressed at this stage should be similar to the current off-road component of Q-RIDE.

Neither break-out group specified either a minimum and maximum time period for this stage, reflecting the general competency-based orientation of their proposal.

Learner licence stage

While both break-out groups supported a competency-based training and assessment approach at this stage, there were distinct differences in how they believed this should be applied. One break-out group suggested that:

- training at this stage should involved at least 20 hours of on-road (competency-based training) from a professional instructor, plus and additional 20 hours of training that didn’t necessarily have to be undertaken with a professional trainer;
- assessment at this stage should be competency-based but only focus on practical on-road skills;
- progression to the next stage should be based on both the practical skills based assessment (above) and proof of having logged the required hours of training/practice; and
this stage should be for a minimum of 3 months and a maximum of 12 months (although support for this was qualified).

In contrast, the second break-out group suggested that:

- training at this stage should focus on both off-road and on-road competencies (although only the on-road competencies would be assessed); and
- assessment at this stage should comprise an on-road competency assessment, a theory test (assessing additional knowledge than that required at the pre-learner stage) and a hazard perception test.

The second group did not specify a minimum or maximum period of time for this stage.

**Restricted/Provisional licence stage**

There was a consensus across the two breakout groups that:

- there was a need for a restricted/provisional licence phase characterised by particular restrictions (although there were differences of opinion regarding the exact nature of these restrictions, as discussed in the relevant sections of 3.2 – 3.5);
- riders at this stage would not need to undertake any further training and/or assessment, unless they wanted to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles; and
- those riders wanting to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles would need to demonstrate the relevant competencies through a further competency-based training and assessment process.

**Open licence stage**

Neither break-out group recommended any changes to current Open licence requirements.

### 3.1.3 Workshop 3

As with the two other workshops, there was a general consensus in this workshop that an enhanced licensing process should be introduced for new motorcycle riders.

**Structure of the licensing system**

While there were some differences in the structure of the licensing systems proposed by the three break-out groups in this workshop, there was again four distinct groups of riders identified: Pre-learner licence applicants; Learner licence holders; Provisional/Restricted licence holders; and Open licence holders.

Two of the break-out groups proposed a four stage licensing system directly reflecting the four groups of riders identified above. However, while the third break-out group also proposed a four stage system, they combined the pre-learner licence applicants and learner licence holders into one group and the split the provisional licence holders into separate P1 and P2 stages.

For ease of presentation, the following summary of the workshop outcomes will be based on the licensing structure suggested by the first two groups. However, where relevant, special
mention will be made of the third group’s suggestions where they significantly vary from those made by the two other groups.

It should also be noted that all three groups were supportive of competency-based training and assessment methods being used either throughout the licensing system or at least for the majority of the stages. However, one group did suggest that the practical assessment undertaken at the end of the Learner licence phase, as well as that required to upgrade to an ‘unrestricted’ licence should be undertaken by Queensland Transport, to ensure the independence of the process.

Components of the licensing system

Pre-learner licence stage

As noted above, two of the three break-out groups proposed the inclusion of a separate pre-licence stage in the motorcycle licensing system. There were some strong similarities in the suggestions made by these two groups including that:

- riders at this stage should be exposed to basic practical training in an off-road training environment (similar in nature to aspects of the current Q-RIDE system);
- training should include a theory component (although one group proposed that this should be delivered by the training provider whole the other suggested the use of an on-line or DVD-based tool); and
- assessment requirements should focus on both practical skills and knowledge.

One of the above break-out groups also suggested that it should not be a requirement to have held a car licence for 12 months before commencing the pre-learner motorcycle licensing stage. Indeed, it was suggested that people should be able to commence this stage at 16 years of age. The third break-out group suggested that the Pre-Learner phase should be combined with the Learner licence stage and, as a result, is discussed below.

Learner licence stage

There were distinct differences in the suggestions made by each break-out group relating to this stage. One group suggested that:

- the learner licence phase should primarily serve a time-based function to enable novice riders to obtain experience while unsupervised, but when still subject to various restrictions;
- while it was acknowledged that the duration of this licence stage would be dependent on the extent of the assessment required, a 12 month period was nominated; and
- assessment at this stage should focus on roadcraft and hazard perception and be undertaken by Queensland Transport, to ensure its independence.

A second break-out group suggested that a competency based training and assessment approach process should form the basis of this licensing stage, somewhat similar to the current Q-RIDE course.
As noted above, the final group combined the Pre-learner and Learner licence stages into one and suggested that a competency-based training and assessment approach be utilised involving both off-road and on-road elements. It was also suggested that the training and assessment at this stage feature a strong focus on hazard perception and appreciation.

Provisional/Restricted licence stage

There was a consensus across the two breakout groups that:

- there was a need for a restricted/provisional licence phase of 12 months duration that is characterised by particular restrictions (but didn’t have a P1 and P2 phases within it); and
- riders at this stage would not need to undertake any further training and/or assessment, unless they wanted to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles; and
- riders would need to undertake further training and assessment to progress to the next stage where they could ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles (although one group did specifically suggest that this assessment should be undertaken by Queensland Transport, to ensure its independence).

The other break-out group suggested a two phase provisional stage involving the removal of certain restrictions (such as no pillions) in the second phase. Progression from the P1 to P2 phase would involve the completion of a competency-based training and assessment process. Similar to the other two break-out groups, this group suggested that riders wanting to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles would need to undertake a further competency-based training and assessment process to progress from the P2 to Open licence stage. In addition, people who had been licensed to ride either a restricted or ‘unrestricted’ automatic motorcycle would need to undertake a competency-based training assessment process to be able to ride manual motorcycles.

Open/unrestricted licence stage

None of the three break-out groups proposed specific changes to the Open/unrestricted licence stage, other than to the alcohol limit applied (see section 3.3.3). However, as noted above, all three groups appeared to support the view that the Open Licence should be preserved for those riders who had demonstrated the competencies required to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles.

3.1.4 Summary

One of the clearest areas of consensus to emerge across the three workshops was the strong support for an enhanced licensing process for new motorcycle riders. This proposal was supported by every break-out group at the three workshops.

Inevitably, there were differences in the various licensing systems models suggested at each workshop. Nonetheless, a number of commonalities emerged in the models presented, in terms of both the structure and content of the stages. The first common theme to emerge was the need to cater for four distinct groups of riders: Pre-learner licence applicants, Learner licence holders, Provisional licence holders and Open licence holders. A second theme was the general preference for competency-based training and assessment processes, as opposed to more traditional training and testing options. Indeed, one workshop (No.1) specifically
recommended the discontinuation of Q-SAFE, while only one break-out group across the three workshops recommended the ongoing involvement of Queensland Transport in motorcycle licence testing. Other key similarities and differences in the various licensing models suggested are identified below.

Pre-Learner applicants

There was a strong consensus across all three workshops that:

- some form of basic training be introduced at the Pre-learner stage for those people applying for a Learner’s licence;
- this training should include both practical and theoretical components;
- the practical component should reflect competency-based training and assessment principles and be conducted in an off-road training setting (similar to the off-road component of the current Q-RIDE system).

Issues on which no clear consensus was reached included:

- whether the theory component should be delivered by professional trainers or via an online/DVD tool;
- the nature of the assessment for the theory component; and
- whether a minimum and/or maximum time period should apply for this stage (probably reflecting a preference for a performance-based approach to this stage).

Learner licence stage

General areas of consensus regarding the Learner licence stage were that learners should:

- be allowed to ride on-road unsupervised (on the proviso that they had completed the Pre-learner stage);
- undertake further practical training focussing on the competencies required for safe on-road riding; and
- undertake further training in relevant theory issues, particularly hazard perception.

Issues on which no clear consensus was reached included:

- the assessment methods to be used at this stage, although the most common suggestions were for a competency-based assessment process for the practical skills and a hazard perception test;
- the optimal length of time for this stage, although the most common preference was for a maximum of 12 months (see 3.2.4);
- whether learners should be required to achieve a set amount of other training or practice before being eligible to progress to the next stage of licensing.
Provisional/Restricted licence

Although the terminology used to describe this stage varied across the break-out groups (i.e. provisional vs. restricted) there was a general consensus regarding many of the features of this stage including that:

- there is a need for a provisional/restricted licence phase characterised by particular restrictions (although there were differences of opinion regarding the exact nature of these restrictions);
- riders at this stage would not need to undertake any further training and/or assessment, unless they wanted to ride ‘unrestricted’ motorcycles (however defined – see 3.3.4); and
- riders would need to undertake further training and assessment to progress to the next stage where they could ride ‘unrestricted’.

Issues on which no clear consensus was reached included:

- whether this stage should consist of a P1 and P2 phase as suggested in the consultation paper, although the most common position was for a single-phase stage;
- the optimal length of time for this stage;
- the assessment methods to be used for those riders wanting to upgrade to an ‘unrestricted’ licence, although the most common suggestion was for a competency-based assessment process.

Open/unrestricted licence stage

The general consensus across the workshops was that this stage should remain largely unchanged. However, a number of break-out groups proposed that a zero alcohol limit be applied to riders at this stage (see section 3.3.3).

3.2 SHOULD AN ENHANCED GRADUATED LICENSING SYSTEM LIMIT THE LENGTH OF TIME A LEARNER LICENCE IS HELD TO A MINIMUM OF THREE MONTHS AND A MAXIMUM OF THREE YEARS (BEFORE BEING RENEWED)?

3.2.1 Workshop 1

Although there was some support for requiring the Learner’s licence to be held for a minimum of three months, there was no clear consensus on this issue. In addition, there was no clear consensus regarding the maximum period for the Learner’s licence, with at least one group suggesting that it should be valid for no more than 12 months.

3.2.2 Workshop 2

One of the break-out groups indicated their support for the proposal that Learner licences be held for a minimum of three months and a maximum of three years. However, as already noted (see section 3.1.2), the other group suggested that a 12 months maximum period may be more appropriate.
3.2.3 Workshop 3

There was no clear consensus on this proposal across the three break-out groups. While one group appeared to support a minimum of three months for the Learners licence, they questioned the suitability of a three year maximum (and nominated 12 months instead). A second group specifically did not specify a time limit on this stage, while the third group suggested a minimum of 12 months for completing the overall licensing requirements from Pre-learner through to Open licence. This last group in particular indicated their belief that a fully competency-based training and assessment system should not specify minimum time periods for particular stages, since progression should be solely based on performance.

3.2.4 Summary

There was no clear consensus across the three workshops concerning this proposal. While there was some support for specifying a minimum period of three months for the Learner’s licence, there appeared to be little support for a maximum period of three years. Rather, there appeared to be more support for a 12 month maximum period. Over and above this, some attendees believe that progression to a higher stage of licensing should be based on the demonstration of competency, rather than be limited by a time period.

3.3 SHOULD AN ENHANCED GRADUATED LICENSING SYSTEM INCLUDE A POWER-TO-WEIGHT RATIO TO DETERMINE WHAT BIKE A RESTRICTED LICENCE HOLDER COULD RIDE, REPLACING THE EXISTING 250CC RESTRICTION?

3.3.1 Workshop 1

All four break-out groups supported the introduction of a power-to-weight ratio to replace the existing 250cc capacity restriction. This approach was commonly referred to as a Learner Approved Motorcycle Scheme (LAMS), based on interstate practice. Of note, however, two of the groups specifically mentioned that the LAMS should not also include a capacity restriction (such as the 660cc limit applied in some other states).

3.3.2 Workshop 2

Within one break-out group, there was strong support for a power-to-weight restriction to replace the current 250cc capacity restriction. In addition, this group did not suggest that the power-to-weight restriction should be accompanied by a higher level capacity restriction (such as 660cc limit).

In the other break-out group there was a lack of consensus regarding this proposal. Some attendees supported the retention of the current 250cc limit, possibly with some particular high powered models of motorcycle being also banned. This position appeared to be linked to concerns about the perceived difficulty of enforcing power-to-weight restrictions. In contrast, other attendees within this group supported the adoption of a LAMS system consistent with that operating in other states. These attendees noted the value of maintaining consistency in regulations across Australia.

3.3.3 Workshop 3

All three break-out groups supported the introduction of a power-to-weight ratio to replace the existing 250cc capacity restriction. In addition, one of the groups suggested that this...
restriction also incorporate a capacity restriction of 660cc, as is the case with the LAMS in some other states. Another group also suggested that the power-to-weight formula may vary between automatic and manual motorcycles.

3.3.4 Summary

Although not universal, there was general support across the three workshops for the introduction of a power-to-weight ratio restriction to replace the existing 250cc capacity restriction. Furthermore, the majority of the break-out groups either directly or indirectly did not support the use of a higher engine capacity restriction (such as the 660cc limit operating in some other states) to augment the power-to-weight restriction. Among those attendees who did support the 660cc limit to augment the power to weight ratio, the primary consideration appeared to be related to national uniformity.

3.4 SHOULD AN ENHANCED GRADUATED LICENSING SYSTEM REQUIRE THAT ALL LEARNER AND PROVISIONAL LICENCE HOLDERS (REGARDLESS OF AGE) HAVE A ZERO BLOOD/BREATH ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LIMIT?

3.4.1 Workshop 1

There was strong support across all four break-out groups that all learner and provisional licence holders (regardless of age) should have a zero alcohol limit. In addition, two of the four groups indicated support for applying a zero alcohol limit to all riders, irrespective of licence class. Furthermore, this suggestion appeared to be generally supported by all attendees at the relevant reporting back session.

3.4.2 Workshop 2

There was strong support across both break-out groups that all learner and provisional licence holders (regardless of age) should have a zero alcohol limit. However, one particular group did raise concerns about the need to maintain consistency across the licensing systems for motorcycle riders and car drivers.

3.4.3 Workshop 3

There was strong support across all three break-out groups that all learner and provisional licence holders (regardless of age) should have a zero alcohol limit. In addition, two of the groups suggested that Open licence holders should also be subject to a zero alcohol limit.

3.4.4 Summary

There was strong support across all three workshops for this proposal. Furthermore, a number of the break-out groups suggested that a zero alcohol limit should apply to all riders, including open licence holders. The only qualification raised at one of the workshops was the need to maintain consistency in practices across drivers and motorcyclists.
3.5 SHOULD AN ENHANCED GRADUATED LICENSING SYSTEM REQUIRE THAT LEARNER RIDERS CANNOT CARRY PILLION PASSENGERS, INCLUDING A SUPERVISOR?

3.5.1 Workshop 1

Two of the four break-out groups indicated support for not allowing learner riders to carry pillions, while the other two did not specifically address the matter in their feedback. In addition, one group suggested that only those riders who had successfully completed a relevant competency-based training and assessment process should be allowed to carry pillions (including provisional and open licence holders).

3.5.2 Workshop 2

There was support within one of the break-out groups for not allowing learner riders to carry pillions, including supervisors. Indeed, this group suggested that this restriction should also apply at the Restricted licence stage. The other break-out group did not make any specific suggestions regarding this restriction.

3.5.3 Workshop 3

Two of the three break-out groups supported restrictions preventing both learner and provisional licence holders from carrying pillions. The third group did not specifically address this issue in their feedback.

3.5.4 Summary

The issue of pillions did not appear to be a high priority among some of the attendees, since a number of the break-out groups did not specifically address the matter in their feedback. However, among those groups who did address the issue, there appeared to be general support for not allowing learner riders to carry pillions. Furthermore, this proposal was generally supported for provisional/restricted licence holders within these groups.

3.6 SHOULD A PERSON WHO RIDES A MOPED BE REQUIRED TO HOLD A SPECIFIC MOPED OR MOTORBIKE LICENCE?

3.6.1 Workshop 1

There was strong agreement across all four break-out groups that people should not be allowed to ride a moped on a car licence any longer in Queensland. Moreover, there was a general consensus that the licensing of moped riders should not be a separate process, but be integrated into the general motorcycle licensing system by treating mopeds as automatic motorcycles. This would ensure that the various training and assessment requirements applying to all other riders, as well as relevant restrictions, would also apply to moped riders.

3.6.2 Workshop 2

There were mixed views regarding this proposal across the break-out groups. Within one, there was general agreement that people should not be allowed to ride mopeds on a car licence. However, there was no clear consensus as to whether a separate licence should be established for mopeds or whether they should be integrated into the general motorcycle licensing system.

licensing system. Much of the discussion within this group centred on the perceived similarities and differences in the skills required to ride a moped, automatic scooters and other motorcycles.

Among the attendees in the second break-out group there was a clear difference of opinion regarding this proposal. Some attendees agreed that people should not be allowed to ride mopeds on a car licence, although they were not sure as to whether they should be required to hold a separate moped licence or an automatic motorcycle licence. However, others in the group remained unconvinced that the current situation needed to be changed, in the absence of clear evidence relating to the crash risk of moped riders.

3.6.3 Workshop 3

There was strong agreement across all three break-out groups that people should not be allowed to ride a moped on an ordinary car licence any longer in Queensland. However, there were distinct differences of opinion as to how this change should be implemented. One group suggested that moped riders should be required to complete a short course, which would enable a ‘moped condition’ to be placed on their car licence. A second group suggested that a moped specific licence should be introduced, which featured competency-based training and assessment requirements and a moped-specific provisional period (12 months in duration). The remaining group suggested that mopeds should be fully integrated into the motorcycle licensing system by treating them as automatic motorcycles.

3.6.4 Summary

With the exception of one break-out group, there was strong agreement across the workshops that people should not be allowed to ride a moped on an ‘ordinary’ car licence any longer in Queensland. However, there were distinct differences of opinion as to how this change should be implemented. The most common suggestion was for mopeds to be treated as automatic motorcycles and for the licensing of moped riders to be integrated into the mainstream motorcycle licensing scheme. However, two other variants were suggested that entailed specially designed training and assessment for moped riders, which would be managed via: i) a condition on a car driver’s licence; or ii) by establishing a separate moped licence.

Within the one particular break-out group where there was opposition to this change, concerns were raised about the lack of evidence confirming the crash risk of moped riders.

3.7 SHOULD RIDERS WEAR PROTECTIVE CLOTHING AND/OR CLOTHING THAT IMPROVES THEIR VISIBILITY TO OTHER ROAD USERS?

3.7.1 Workshop 1

All four break-out groups supported the need for riders to wear protective clothing, with two groups suggesting that this should be made compulsory. When further discussed in the reporting back session, the support for making protective clothing compulsory appeared to grow. In contrast, there appeared to be little support for requiring riders to wear more visible clothing. While the importance of the visibility issue was generally acknowledged, it was considered that this was more a matter of individual rider choice. In addition, one group suggested that the primary focus should be on encouraging drivers to be more aware of motorcycles.
3.7.2 Workshop 2

While both break-out groups supported the need for riders to wear protective clothing, there were differences of opinion regarding the best strategy to achieve this goal. One of the groups remained undecided about whether protective clothing should be made compulsory, citing cost and climatic concerns. Within the second group, there was more support for making some clothing compulsory, such as the wearing of enclosed shoes, long pants and some form of reflective clothing. However, this group did note that any attempt to mandate protective clothing would need to be undertaken in an incremental way.

3.7.3 Workshop 3

All three break-out groups supported the need for riders to wear protective clothing, with two groups suggesting that certain minimum requirements should be made mandatory (e.g. as per Q-RIDE requirements). While the advantages of high visibility clothing was acknowledged by some attendees, it was suggested that this was a matter for education rather than legislation.

3.7.4 Summary

There was a strong consensus across all three workshops that riders should wear protective clothing. While some break-out groups argued that the wearing of protective clothing should be made compulsory, other groups cited concerns about the cost implications for riders, the hot climatic conditions in Queensland, and the need to adopt an incremental approach commencing with intensive education prior to legislation and enforcement.

While many attendees acknowledged the problem of rider visibility, there was little support for requiring riders to wear highly visible or reflective clothing. The general consensus was that this should be a matter of rider choice. Moreover, some attendees suggested that the best way to address rider visibility was to educate drivers to be more aware of motorcycles.

3.8 SHOULD THERE BE A SPECIFIC AUSTRALIAN STANDARD OR RATING SYSTEM FOR PROTECTIVE CLOTHING SIMILAR TO THE SYSTEM IN EUROPE?

3.8.1 Workshop 1

There was general agreement across the four break-out groups that Australia should adopt a standard or rating system for protective clothing. In addition, there appeared to be a general consensus that this system should utilise the European standards, rather than be based on a separate review and assessment process in Australia (which would unnecessarily add to the time and costs involved in implementing the system).

3.8.2 Workshop 2

There was general agreement within both break-out groups that Australia should adopt the existing European standards for protective clothing. One group also proposed the implementation of a star rating scheme incorporating the above standards.
3.8.3 Workshop 3

Two of the break-out groups supported the adoption of minimum standards for protective clothing in Australia. One of these groups suggested the direct adoption of the European standards, while the other noted the need for heat/hydration issues to be considered closely in the Australian context. The remaining break-out group suggest that a star rating scheme should be considered, since this was considered easier to implement than a standards-based approach.

3.8.4 Summary

There was a strong consensus across the three workshops that either an Australian standard and/or rating scheme should be implemented to enhance the quality of the protective clothing available on the market to riders. The most common view was that the European standards should be adopted for use in Australia, in order to reduce unnecessary costs and time delays in implementation. However, one group of attendees questioned whether the European standards would be directly applicable due to the different climatic conditions in Australia (and the related problem of hydration).

A number of break-out groups also suggested the introduction of a star rating scheme for protective clothing to provide better information to consumers regarding the quality of different clothing. It was acknowledged that such a system could work in conjunction with an Australian standard, with the standard becoming the minimum requirement for obtaining a star rating. However, one group did suggest that it may be more feasible in the short-term to implement the star rating scheme without linking it to an Australian standard.

3.9 SHOULD THERE BE A SEPARATE LICENCE FEE FOR A MOTORBIKE LICENCE TO ENCOURAGE DORMANT LICENCE HOLDERS TO SURRENDER THEIR LICENCE?

3.9.1 Workshop 1

While all four break-out groups appeared concerned with the issue of dormant licences, there was little support for a separate licence fee to be applied to motorcyclists. Indeed, it was suggested in the reporting back session that such a separate licence fee would be discriminatory for riders, given the lack of such a fee for other specific licence classes (e.g. truck and bus drivers).

A number of alternative options were raised within the break-out groups to address the issue of dormant licences. The two most common were:

- introduce a bounty for people who relinquish their motorcycle licence, for example, in the form of a reduction in their licence renewal fee; and

- make it a requirement for riders to undertake periodic refresher courses (e.g. every five years), which would serve to discourage some people from unnecessarily holding onto their motorcycle licence.
3.9.2 Workshop 2

Once again, while both break-out groups appeared concerned with the issue of dormant licences, there was little support for a separate licence fee to be applied to motorcyclists. Indeed, one group raised the fact that dormant licences are not necessarily unique to motorcycling, since other drivers can retain the right to drive different types of vehicles without paying an additional licence fee.

As an alternative, however, both groups did suggest that a bounty or refund could be provided to people who surrender their unwanted motorcycle licences. In addition, one of the groups noted that certain motorcycle clubs, such as the Ulysses Club, offer discounts to returning riders who undertake training. In the report back session it was also suggested that certain riders should be required to undertake refresher training, such as those who hadn’t had a motorcycle registered in their name for a period of time. However, concerns were raised about this proposal, particularly among those people who rode a motorcycle registered in their business’s name.

3.9.3 Workshop 3

As with the two previous workshops, attendees at workshop 3 were opposed to the introduction of a separate licence fee for motorcycle riders. One group specifically noted that this would be inequitable since it doesn’t apply to other licence types, while a second group suggested that such an approach would be too complex.

As an alternative, two of the three groups suggested that a reward/refund be provided to people who surrendered unwanted motorcycle licences. In addition, the remaining group suggested that a retraining requirement be placed on riders who attempt to renew their motorcycle licence, but haven’t had a motorcycle registered in their name for more than 10 years. This would require a ‘trigger’ to be inserted into the Queensland Transport licensing system, linked to the vehicle registration system. This retraining requirement placed on these riders would be aligned with that offered for new riders in the mainstream motorcycle licensing system.

3.9.4 Summary

While there was a concern about dormant licences across all three workshops, there was strong opposition to the introduction of a separate licence fee for motorcycle licences. The recurrent concern across all workshops was that this approach would be inequitable, since it doesn’t currently apply to other situations where people hold multiple motor vehicle licences. The most common alternative suggested was for a ‘bounty’ or refund to be introduced for people who surrender unwanted motorcycle licences. In addition, a number of groups suggested that certain (or possibly all) riders should be required to undertake periodic refresher training courses (e.g. every five years). This was seen as serving two potential functions: i) ensuring that people with dormant licences would periodically need to undertake training to retain their licence; and ii) encouraging those people with little intention of riding in the future to surrender their licence. While one break-out group suggested that the linking of licensing and registration records could be used as a means of identifying those with dormant licences, attendees at another workshop raised concerns about this approach for those people who ride motorcycles registered in the name of another person or business.
3.10 SHOULD QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT HAVE SPECIFIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS TO ADDRESS MOTORBIKE SAFETY?

3.10.1 Workshop 1

There was general support among all break-out groups for Queensland Transport to conduct motorcycle safety education campaigns targeting both motorcycle riders and other road users (particularly car drivers). In addition, there was considerable discussion about the need to use different types of media to reach different groups of road users. In addition to the more traditional mediums of print, radio and TV, there was strong support for the use of other strategies such as providing information in motorcycle sales shops and via the internet.

Another common theme to emerge was the need for relevant stakeholders to be involved in the development of motorcycle safety campaigns.

3.10.2 Workshop 2

There was general support among both break-out groups for Queensland Transport to conduct motorcycle safety education campaigns. Within one break-out group, it was proposed that these campaigns should be rider-specific in nature focussing on issues such as the wearing of protective clothing (especially among commuters in general and females) and the implementation of any revisions to the motorcycle licensing system. The second group suggested that the campaigns should target both motorcycle riders and other road users (particularly car drivers). In addition, it was suggested by this group that the endorsement of these campaigns by motorcycle dealerships and motorcycle rider groups would add to their credibility among riders.

3.10.3 Workshop 3

All three break-out groups agreed with the need for Queensland Transport to conduct specific motorcycle safety education campaigns. Two of the groups suggested that these campaigns should target both motorcycle riders and other road users. Among the types of mediums suggested by the groups were: television advertising (similar to campaigns recently run in the United Kingdom), roadside billboards, and inserts in registration renewal notifications.

3.10.4 Summary

There was a strong consensus across all three workshops that Queensland Transport should conduct specific motorcycle safety education campaigns. The most common view was that these campaigns should target both motorcycle riders and other road users (particularly car drivers). In addition, attendees suggested there was a need to use both traditional mediums such as print, radio and TV, as well as more innovative approaches including the internet.

Another common theme to emerge was the need for relevant stakeholders to be involved in the development of motorcycle safety campaigns.
3.11 SHOULD MOTORBIKES BE FITTED WITH ADVANCED SAFETY FEATURES SUCH AS ANTI-LOCK AND LINKED BRAKING SYSTEMS?

3.11.1 Workshop 1

While there was general support among the attendees for the inclusion of advanced safety features on motorcycles, it was suggested that this should be an optional rather than compulsory requirement. Among the concerns expressed about making such systems compulsory on all motorcycles were the cost implications and technical feasibility.

3.11.2 Workshop 2

The attendees acknowledged that anti-lock braking systems were being progressively fitted to more motorcycles. While there was general support for this move, it was argued that it could only occur in cases where it was technically feasible and that manufacturers were in the best position to assess this matter. Similar views were also expressed in relation to link braking systems. It was also noted that some riders who could most benefit from these technological improvements, such as young riders and those riding sports bikes, may be the least likely to seek out motorcycles with these features.

3.11.3 Workshop 3

While there was general support among the attendees for increasing inclusion of advanced safety features on motorcycles, it was acknowledged that developments in this area are largely driven by market forces. Moreover, while motorcycle sales have been increasing rapidly over recent years, the Australian market was still relatively small by world standards.

3.11.4 Summary

There was a strong support across the workshops for the inclusion of more advanced safety features on motorcycles. However, the discussion of this issue suggested that there was little that could be done to directly influence developments in this area since:

- manufacturers were already making anti-lock and linked braking systems more widespread in models where it was technically feasible;
- technological developments in this area are largely driven by market forces and the Australian market was relatively small by world standards; and
- some more high-risk riders may be reluctant to select motorcycles with these features.

3.12 SHOULD MOTORBIKES RUN WITH THEIR FRONT HEADLIGHT ON TO IMPROVE VISIBILITY?

3.12.1 Workshop 1

While there was general support among the group for motorcyclists to ride with their headlight on, there was little support for this to be made compulsory. This position appeared to be based on:
- the fact that the majority of motorcycles available on the market already had a ‘hard-wired’ lights on feature; and
- in cases where motorcyclists were riding motorcycles without ‘hard-wired’ lights on, that they would be in the best position to decide when to ride with their headlight on.

### 3.12.2 Workshop 2

There was general agreement among the group as to the benefits of motorcyclists riding with their headlight on. It was acknowledged that the vast majority of motorcycles on the market had the headlight ‘hard-wired’ on and, as such, there was little need to lobby for a vehicle design rule change in this area. However, there was some support within the group for introducing state-based legislation requiring riders to run with their headlights on (in cases where they are not hard-wired).

### 3.12.3 Workshop 3

While there was general support for the use of headlights on motorcycles, the attendees did not consider this matter a high priority since the vast majority of motorcycles on the market already had the headlight ‘hard-wired’ on.

### 3.12.4 Summary

There was strong agreement across the workshops of the advantages associated with motorcyclists riding with their headlight on. However, for the majority of the attendees this did not appear to be a priority issue, due the fact that the vast majority of motorcycles on the market already had the headlight ‘hard-wired’ on. Nonetheless, there was some support within one of the workshops for introducing state-based legislation requiring riders to run with their headlights on (in cases where they are not hard-wired).

### 3.13 SHOULD A MOTORBIKE SAFETY LEVY BE INTRODUCED TO FUND ADDITIONAL MOTORBIKE SAFETY PROJECTS, OVER AND ABOVE QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT-FUNDED MOTORBIKE SAFETY INITIATIVES?

#### 3.13.1 Workshop 1

There was strong opposition to the introduction of separate levy for motorcycle riders, even if it was devoted to funding motorcycle safety projects. The main concern raised related to the perceived discriminatory nature of imposing a special levy on one particular road user group, rather than all road users.

#### 3.13.2 Workshop 2

While it was acknowledged that a motorcycle levy would be unpopular among riders, there was qualified support for this initiative among the group. In particular, it was acknowledged as a means of increasing the overall level of funds allocated to motorcycle safety. Among the qualifications that were raised were:

- processes would need to be put in place to ensure that all the proceeds from the levy were directed into motorcycle safety initiatives;
• an independent advisory committee, similar to Victoria’s Motorcycle Advisory Council (VMAC), would need to be established to overview the operation of the levy; and

• information regarding the use of the levy funds would need to provided to the public to demonstrate the integrity and benefits associated with the scheme.

3.13.3 Workshop 3

This proposal was not supported by the attendees. The predominant view to emerge was that the Government was already collecting enough funds from motorcyclists (in terms of licence and registration fees) and that it was a matter of these funds being used more effectively to benefit motorcyclists.

3.13.4 Summary

Among the attendees at two of the workshops, there was strong opposition to this proposal. This opposition appeared to be grounded on the perceived inequity of a levy being imposed on motorcycle riders alone. Within the other workshop, however, there was an acknowledgement of the potential value of the levy in increasing funding for motorcycle safety initiatives. However, the attendees at that workshop raised a number of qualifications regarding the way such a levy would need to operate, including the need: for all the funds to be dedicated to motorcycle safety activities; the levy to be administered by an independent advisory committee; and public education regarding the levy to be undertaken.

3.14  SHOULD QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT CONSIDER THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS TO IDENTIFY SPEEDING MOTORBIKES FOR ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES?

3.14.1 Workshop 1

There was general opposition to this proposal among the attendees. Among the concerns raised were the perceived lack of a clear rationale for the proposal and a belief that it was only targeting a small group of riders, who would find other methods to circumvent speed detection.

3.14.2 Workshop 2

There were mixed views in the group regarding the need for and likely benefits of initiatives in this area. Some group members strongly supported the need for better motorcycle identification methods to reduce instances of punishment avoidance among riders (generally in cases where speed cameras were operated in a forward-facing direction). However, other group members questioned the extent of the punishment avoidance that was currently occurring and whether the proposed changes would prove cost-effective. In addition, a number of specific concerns were raised regarding certain solutions that had been proposed in the past, particularly front number plates.

3.14.3 Workshop 3

While there were mixed views relating to this proposal, there was little support for the introduction of front number plates among attendees. Some attendees raised the possibility of utilising other types of technology to identify motorcycles, such as radio transmitters.
However, other attendees expressed a range of concerns relating to these options on the grounds of privacy and cost. Many of the attendees appeared to be unconvinced of the need for additional measures in this area and their likely cost-effectiveness.

3.14.4 Summary

There was a lack of consensus regarding this proposal across the three workshops. The strongest opposition emerged for the introduction of front number plates for motorcycles, which was viewed by many attendees as either unwarranted and/or potentially unsafe for riders and pedestrians. Nonetheless, the attendees at two of the workshops appeared to support attempts to explore other technological solutions, such as radio identification of motorcycles, primarily on the grounds that it was found to be a cost-effective option.

3.15 WHAT OTHER INITIATIVES CAN YOU THINK OF?

3.15.1 Workshop 1

A range of other potential safety initiatives were raised by the group including:

- the need to integrate motorcycle safety issues into existing school-based road safety education;
- the provision of subsidies by the Government for people to undertake rider training;
- more Government assistance for trainers to access off-road training facilities;
- more support for regionally-based motorcycle trainers.

When prompted, a number of areas for further research were identified including:

- better understanding the behavioural patterns of different riders;
- evaluating the impact of school-based road safety education; and
- ongoing research into the impact of drug driving and riding on safety.

3.15.2 Workshop 2

Three particular initiatives were raised by this group:

- the need to encourage relevant stakeholders to hold ‘track days’ where riders could practice their riding in a controlled and supervised environment;
- the need for an independent, high-level advisory group to be established to provide advice to the Government on motorcycle safety matters (particularly, but not limited to, if a levy was to be introduced – see above);
- the need to improve the quality and timeliness of relevant data including the types of motorcycles involved in crashes, the injuries sustained by riders in crashes, and the amount and type of riding (i.e. exposure) undertaken by different types of riders.

In terms of future research, the main issue that was raised was the need to obtain better data about the extent and nature of dormant motorcycle licences.
3.15.3 Workshop 3

A range of other potential initiatives were raised by the attendees at this group including:

- implementing more extensive school-based road safety education, particularly at the secondary level;
- providing more off-road training centres that reflected normal road conditions, to facilitate more realistic training in a controlled environment;
- establishing a Queensland Motorcycle Advisory Committee, with an independent Chair, to provide advice to the Government on motorcycle safety issues;
- providing more dedicated funding to improve motorcycle crash blackspots;
- improving crash data collection methods to improve our understanding of motorcycle crashes;
- changing existing road rules to allow motorcycles to travel in bus lanes and to filter between other vehicles;
- examining the creation of separate stop lines for motorcycles (in advance of other vehicles) as has been implemented in some parts of the United Kingdom.

3.1.4 Summary

A wide range of additional initiatives were raised by the attendees across the three workshops. In summary, they tended to focus on:

- enhancing school-based road safety education, particularly as it relates to motorcycle safety;
- providing more training facilities for motorcycle riders, particular off-road;
- establishing some form of independent advisory committee to provide advice to the Government on motorcycle safety issues;
- improving the quality of the crash and exposure data relating to motorcycling;
- devoting more funds to improving the road environment to meet the needs of motorcycle riders, focusing on motorcycle crash blackspots and the trialling of innovative practices (such as advanced stop lines for riders); and
- ongoing research into motorcycle rider behaviour.
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This section attempts to synthesise the different perspectives emerging from the workshops by identifying: i) those proposals for which there was strong support (although not necessarily universal) across the workshops; ii) those for which there was general support; and iii) those for which there was little or no support.

4.1 PROPOSALS FOR WHICH THERE WERE STRONG SUPPORT

A number of proposals within the Motorbike safety in Queensland – Consultation Paper (Queensland Transport, 2008) received strong support at the three workshops including that:

- Queensland Transport should introduce an enhanced licensing process for new motorbike riders and that this system should cater for Pre-learner licence applicants, Learner licence holders, provisional/restricted licence holders, and Open licence holders;
- a zero alcohol limit should apply to all learner and provisional licence holders, regardless of their age;
- that people should not be allowed to ride a moped on an ‘ordinary’ car licence any longer in Queensland (although there were distinct differences of opinion as to how this change should be implemented covering options such as i) treating mopeds as automatic motorcycles, ii) establishing a separate licence for mopeds, and iii) making a special condition on a car driver’s licence;
- riders should be encouraged to wear appropriate protective clothing;
- an Australian standard and/or rating scheme should be implemented to enhance the quality of the protective clothing available on the market to riders;
- Queensland Transport should conduct specific motorcycle safety education campaigns targeting both motorcycle riders and other road users (particularly car drivers), utilising a variety of mediums such as print, radio, TV and the internet;
- the inclusion of more advanced safety features on motorcycles, such as anti-lock and linked breaking systems should be encouraged (although it was acknowledged that developments in this area were largely driven by technical and market considerations); and
- riding with the headlight on should be encouraged (although it was acknowledged that the majority of motorcycles on the market already had their headlight ‘hard-wired’ on).

Furthermore, a number of additional initiatives were identified across the workshops for which there appeared to be strong support including:

- providing more training facilities for motorcycle riders, particular off-road;
- establishing some form of independent advisory committee to provide advice to the Government on motorcycle safety issues;
improving the quality of the crash and exposure data relating to motorcycling;

devoting more funds to improving the road environment to meet the needs of motorcycle riders; and

ongoing research into motorcycle rider behaviour.

4.2 PROPOSALS FOR WHICH THERE WAS GENERAL SUPPORT

In addition, there were a number of proposals within the consultation paper for which there appeared to be a general (although not universal) level of support including:

- the introduction of a power-to-weight ratio, to replace the existing 250cc limit, to determine what motorcycles can be ridden by restricted licence holders (with the majority of the break-out groups either directly or indirectly not supporting the use of a higher engine capacity, such as 660cc to augment this restriction);

- not allowing learner riders to carry pillions (which was generally supported for provisional/restricted licence holders as well);

- that riders should be encouraged to wear highly visible clothing (although this was generally acknowledged as a matter of personal choice); and

- that the European standards for protective clothing should be adopted for use in Australia, in order to reduce unnecessary costs and time delays in implementation (although some concerns were raised about the unique climatic conditions in Australia and the related problem of hydration).

In addition, there were a number of suggestions made regarding the structure and content of an enhanced motorcycle licensing system which appeared to have general (but not universal) support among the workshop attendees including:

- a general preference for competency-based training and assessment processes, as opposed to more traditional testing options such as Q-SAFE;

- the need to introduce some form of basic training at the Pre-learner stage for those people applying for a Learner’s licence, which would include both practical (off-road) and theoretical components;

- the need for Learner licence holders to undertake further training focussing on both practical (on-road) and theory components, particularly hazard perception;

- the need for a Provisional/Restricted licence phase characterised by particular restrictions, such as a zero alcohol limit and a power-to-weight based LAMS;

- the need for riders to undertake further training and assessment at the Provisional/Restricted stage to progress to riding an ‘unrestricted’ motorcycle; and

- the application of a zero alcohol limit to all motorcycle riders, regardless of licence class.
4.3 PROPOSALS FOR WHICH THERE WAS LITTLE OR NO SUPPORT

Finally, there were a number of proposals within the Discussion Paper for which there appeared to be little or no support including:

- adopting a maximum period of three years for the Learner’s licence (with a 12 month maximum period being the most common alternative suggested);
- introducing a separate licence fee for motorcycle licences, which was seen as inequitable by many attendees (with a ‘bounty’ or refund for surrendered licences being the most common alternative suggested);
- introducing a levy on motorcycle riders to fund additional motorcycle safety initiatives, which was again seen as inequitable by many attendees;
- examining alternative methods for identifying speeding motorcycles, particularly front number plates, which were seen by many attendees as lacking a clear rationale and likely cost-effectiveness (although this proposal was strongly supported by some attendees).

4.4 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In closing, it should be noted that the above views have been derived from a workshop process that involved the simultaneous consideration of a wide range of issues. As such, the ‘global’ nature of this feedback needs to be borne in mind when interpreting the results. In particular, care needs to be taken to not take any of the feedback out of context. For example, while there was a general opposition to the proposal of having a separate licence fee for motorcycle riders, this does not mean that the attendees were not concerned about the issue of dormant motorcycle licences. Indeed, this appeared to be a major issue of concern to attendees that prompted the suggestion of a number of alternative solutions.

In addition, the outcomes of the three workshops reported in this document represent only one part of the consultation process currently being undertaken by Queensland Transport. The second part involves the community feedback that is being sought in response to the consultation paper. As such, the findings outlined in this report should be read in conjunction with those emerging from the more general community consultation.
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APPENDIX A: ORGANISATIONS REPRESENTED AT THE MOTORCYCLE SAFETY CONSULTATION WORKSHOPS

Aegis Training Services
Australasian College of Road Safety
Australian Motorcycle Academy
Bike Craft
Centre for Accident Research & Road Safety – Queensland (CARRS-Q)
Department of Emergency Services
Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries
Gold Coast Motorcycle Safety Working Group
Honda - Brisbane
Ian Watson’s Driver Training Centre
IMW Rider Training
Kickstart Motorcycle Training
Maclean Pines Driving School
Main Roads
Morgan & Wacker Motorcycle Training Centre
Motor Accident Insurance Commission
Motor Traders Association Queensland
Motorcycle Riders Association Queensland
Noyes Motorcycle Rider Training
Older People Speak Out
Pro Honda Rider Training Pty Ltd
Queensland Country Women’s Association
Queensland Motorcycle School
Queensland Police Service
RACQ
Ridabike
Rising Sun Honda Rider Training
Stay Upright Motorcycle Techniques
Team Moto Motorcycle Riding School
TK’s Driving School
Ulysses Club
### APPENDIX B: GENERIC WORKSHOP AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 1</th>
<th>Welcome (Barry Watson and Darren Wishart, CARRS-Q)</th>
<th>(5 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 2</td>
<td>Purpose of workshop (Queensland Transport Representative)</td>
<td>(10 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 3</td>
<td>Queensland motorbike safety overview and current trends (Mike Gollschewski, Queensland Transport)</td>
<td>(10 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 4</td>
<td>Australian and international motorcycle safety issues and challenges (Barry Watson and Darren Wishart)</td>
<td>(5 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 5</td>
<td>Summary of Consultation Paper and Key Policy Areas (Mike Gollschewski)</td>
<td>(10 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 6</td>
<td>Breakout Group Discussions and Reporting (Barry Watson and Darren Wishart) Session 1 Session 2 Session 3 Session 4 (Incorporating morning/afternoon tea)</td>
<td>(3 hours, 30 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item 7</td>
<td>Conclusion and where to from now (Barry Watson and Darren Wishart)</td>
<td>(20 mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: STRUCTURE OF WORKSHOP DISCUSSION SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session No.</th>
<th>Topics covered</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Proposed structure of Motorcycle GLS and related training and testing requirements</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion time (45 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Restrictions associated with GLS</td>
<td>60 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion time (30 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reporting time for sessions 1 &amp; 2 (30 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Other rider safety strategies</td>
<td>60 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion time (30 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reporting time (30 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Vehicles and roads strategies</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion time (20 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reporting time (20 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN EACH DISCUSSION SESSIONS

Session 1: Structure of Motorcycle GLS

Should Queensland Transport introduce an enhanced licensing process for new motorbike riders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence stages</th>
<th>Training requirements</th>
<th>Assessment requirements</th>
<th>Process for graduating to next stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 2: Licensing restrictions (1)

Should an enhanced graduated licensing system limit the length of time a learner licence is held to a minimum of three months and a maximum of three years (before being renewed)?

Should an enhanced graduated licensing system include a power-to-weight ratio to determine what bike a restricted licence holder could ride, replacing the existing 250 cc restriction?

Should an enhanced graduated licensing system require that all learner and provisional licence holders (regardless of age) have a zero blood/breath alcohol concentration limit?

Session 2: Licensing restrictions (2)

Should an enhanced graduated licensing system require that learner riders cannot carry pillion passengers, including a supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence stages</th>
<th>Training requirements</th>
<th>Assessment requirements</th>
<th>Process for graduating to next stage</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 3: Other rider issues

Should a person who rides a moped be required to hold a specific moped or motorbike licence?

Should riders wear protective clothing and/or clothing that improves their visibility to other road users?

Should there be a specific Australian Standard or rating system for protective clothing similar to the system in Europe?

Should there be a separate licence fee for a motorcycle licence to encourage dormant licence holders to surrender their licence?

Should Queensland Transport have specific education campaigns to address motorbike safety?

Session 4: Safer vehicles, roads & speeds

Should motorbikes be fitted with advanced safety features such as anti-lock and linked braking systems?

Should motorbikes run with their front headlight on to improve visibility?

Should a motorcycle safety levy be introduced to fund additional motorbike safety projects, over and above Queensland Government-funded motorbike safety initiatives?

Should Queensland Transport consider the use of alternative methods to identify speeding motorbikes for enforcement purposes?

What other initiatives can you think of?