

# TRANSCRIPT

## ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Inquiry into motorcycle safety

Geelong — 15 November 2011

#### Members

Mr A. Elsbury

Mr T. Languiller

Mr J. Perera

Mr M. Thompson

Mr B. Tilley

Chair: Mr M. Thompson  
Deputy Chair: Mr T. Languiller

#### Staff

Executive Officer: Ms K. Jenkins

Research Officer: Mr J. Aliferis

#### Witness

Mr R. Newland.

**The CHAIR** — Welcome to the Victorian Parliament's road safety inquiry. We are looking specifically at improving motorcycle safety outcomes. The terms of reference have been distributed. I welcome Mr Ray Newland. By way of background, Mr Newland, I will make a couple of comments. The evidence that you present has the benefit of parliamentary privilege. You will get a transcript of your comments, which you are invited to correct and then send back to us, following which it will be published on the internet. If there is any evidence that you would like to give in camera — that is, in closed session — we can take that on board as well. We thank you for the time that you have contributed to the preparation of your submission, and we look forward to your further commentary. For the purpose of the transcript it would be helpful if you could start by giving your name, your qualification or expertise in the field and then speak generally to your submission, perhaps highlighting your key points. Following that, we will be pleased to ask you a number of questions.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Thank you, Chair. My name is Ray Newland. I have been involved in matters of motorcycle safety for a long time — since 1976 — and I was employed by VicRoads in its former name of the RTA. In 1984 I joined the RTA as chief motorcycle instructor and was instrumental in the early development of the rider training and testing program in Victoria. I worked for VicRoads when it became VicRoads until 1995, when I took early retirement. Since then I have been consulting in some overseas instances, and I have also worked for the motorcycle industry as a manager of motorcycles from 1997 until 2008 when I unfortunately suffered a stroke and found that I could not continue with full-time work. I was then 68, and now I am an old guy of 71, and counting!

I am pleased to be here today to speak to you about some of my knowledge and experience and to also flag for the committee that I have recently had a trip overseas in which time I took in discussion with Dr Alex Stedman at the University of Nottingham concerning the motorcycle simulator and some particular outcomes there. I think that is enough about me.

**Mr PERERA** — You mention in your submission that the New South Wales RTA curriculum for testing is the best in Australia. What are the New South Wales system's strengths, and how does the Victorian approach compare to the New South Wales approach?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Let me take first of all the RTA situation and say why it is the preferred one in my opinion. In New South Wales there is still a hold on the rider training curriculum, and the licensing as a result of that, by the Roads and Traffic Authority in New South Wales. They do have private providers delivering the program, but they have control, with a certain body of people, over the curriculum and its delivery techniques so that when people are trained as instructors they have to be qualified by the RTA, not by just the individual providers. I think that gives a certain amount of confidence in the fact that the government has strong input and control over curriculum and delivery.

Secondly, the RTA program can not only boast to be a true competency-based training program, but also it has an on-road assessment. In my opinion over the last 30-something years that I have been involved I have come to the firm conclusion that unless you test and assess somebody on the road in the traffic mix, you cannot justifiably say how they will perform in those circumstances. That is pretty much the answer to your question. How does it compare to Victoria? Victoria has given out the curriculum and the competencies. They set out competencies to be achieved, but they let the providers go about achieving them in the manner that they decide is best. I think that is a bit loose, because colloquially we know of many instances where the delivery people do not deliver the program in its ultimate form. Secondly, there is no riding on the road either in a training portion or in an assessment way in Victoria that would justify what I said before about being assessed in traffic.

**Mr PERERA** — So in New South Wales the testing regime is controlled by the RTA?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Yes.

**Mr PERERA** — How about the liability issues if something happens while they assess on the road?

**Mr NEWLAND** — If you check with RTA, they have been doing this on-road segment of their training in the level 2 — that is, when you come back from being on your learners for a period of time to do the second part of the training. That is where the road riding is developed within that section, and they are assessed in that road ride as well, and they also then come to do the skills testing on the range. But the liability factor does not appear to have been a problem; they have had that since 1995 when I first reviewed their program. That is some

years ago. How many problems has the RTA had? I do not know; perhaps it could be asked of them. There are none that I am aware of.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Thank you for your submission. On the same subject, why do we not do the road assessments in Victoria? What is at the back of that, from your knowledge and experience?

**Mr NEWLAND** — The on-road segment?

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Yes.

**Mr NEWLAND** — A fear of the liability I believe has been the main driver.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Is there any research, data or evidence in relation to all of those, if I may say, allegations?

**Mr NEWLAND** — You mean that — —

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Has VicRoads done any assessment, any modelling?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Not to my knowledge.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — So you believe it is just because of liability, and the fact that they have dropped a problem, because there used to be, as I understand it?

**Mr NEWLAND** — When VicRoads first put the program out to private providers in the early 1990s and then it came to fruition by about the mid-1990s, it was totally in the hands of private providers. It seems now they do not have any expertise to look at the control and examine it and say what would be better now. About all I could add to that would be that there is currently a graduated licensing scheme being promoted. Victoria has done some good work on that, and it is about to be embarked on by the National Road Safety Council. This will be hopefully a national graduated licensing scheme. When they do have a national GLS, I would like to urge most strongly that there is an on-road riding component and assessment before a person is issued ultimately with a licence.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Burrowing down into your submission a bit more based on the training side of things, you have expressed some concerns over the training and auditing of instructors. Would you care to expand upon that statement?

**Mr NEWLAND** — I mentioned that in the New South Wales RTA they have a handle on the curriculum and all of the descriptive parts of that, and when an instructor is trained the RTA attend to make sure that that instructor has the knowledge and can deliver the program according to the RTA curriculum. There is no such thing in Victoria. There is no quality control over the instructors. If you were a private provider and I was a licensed motorcyclist and you thought, 'Ray would make a good instructor', you would take me on board and it would be your say-so. The only thing you would have to do is qualify for a particular version of something under the TAFE system that a person has to do to be qualified for an instructor role either for motor cars or for certificate IV in something — it is in my submission. That particular thing is the only requisite for the VicRoads people. A police check needs to be done to make sure the person is quite acceptable, but beyond that the skill and expertise of that instructor is of no concern to VicRoads.

**Mr ELSBURY** — In New South Wales do they do spot checks of instructors?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Yes.

**Mr ELSBURY** — You will have a mystery person who just turns up.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I do not know if there is a mystery. The person would turn up and they would have a copy of the curriculum with them. They would look at the program being delivered and watch it for 10 or 15 minutes to make sure it is right on track and being delivered correctly.

**The CHAIR** — In relation to clothing, could you expand upon your statement that the effectiveness of newer clothing is yet to be established in real-world tests?

**Mr NEWLAND** — I can do that, because that is part of the research package that Liz de Rome and her colleagues had done recently. I think I cite that at the bottom of my study. You people should know de Rome, Ivers, Fitzharris and other names that I cannot read, including Narelle Haworth. They mention in Gear study 1, *Motorcycle Protective Clothing — Protection from Injury or Just the Weather?*, which is a fairly reasonable document I would say, that in terms of protective clothing there is yet no real evaluation of the European standards in real-world situations. So they err on the side of not going forward with a strong recommendation for mandating until that situation is resolved.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — You talked in your submission about returning riders. You have provided a definition of returning riders as those who have been away from riding, let us say, for about 10 to 20 years. What is the basis of your definition? What are the criteria? How did you reach that definition?

**Mr NEWLAND** — It is from personal observations from the over 35 years that I have been involved and when seeing many colleagues grow old, as I have, in motorcycling. Simple observations from my years of experience lead me to give that little bit of a judgement about what I think a returning rider is. That is just something I have heard others speak of and that I have spoken of, but there is no basis for that other than to say that that fairly much fits the returning rider.

**Mr TILLEY** — I just want to go back to the training. Earlier in your contribution you mentioned on-road testing in New South Wales with the RTA and testing in terms of the traffic mix and New South Wales RTA having oversight over structures. Can you think of any circumstances where a test-only option would be appropriate?

**Mr NEWLAND** — No.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can you elaborate on that?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Can I think of any? No. If you want me to elaborate slightly on that, I can say the test-only option as it functions in Victoria gives an easy out to people. It is similar to the test-only option that operates in Queensland. We could believe in imposing training, but training, incidentally, has never been proven in the research; I am the first to admit that. I am not arguing there is something hidden that we have not found yet. That could be so, but the evidence so far says that it does not work. Why then do we have it compulsory in a number of states, voluntary in Victoria and Queensland and supported by government — it is introduced by government, in the first instance — before it is given out to private providers? Yet in both Queensland and Victoria we allow them to do a test-only option. If we really believed there is something in this training business, why do we not ask them all to go through the motions of the value in being trained?

**Mr TILLEY** — Just expanding a little bit more about training, what do you think would be the most appropriate? Is it a matter of hours?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Compulsory training.

**Mr TILLEY** — Is it a matter of achieving a certain standard before you embark off on the next stage?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Most definitely. When you have a competency-based training program, you specify all of the objectives and outcomes. You must see those outcomes demonstrated. You must be able to see the repeatability of those particular skills whenever it is asked. You do not just happen to luckily display that and demonstrate that skill once; you should be able to demonstrate it at any given time if you are competent. If we do that, you then have a standard. So the assessment can take part in the knowledge that that standard had been reached and would be able to be reproduced by that particular person.

**Mr PERERA** — Recently you have been to the University of Nottingham and you had some exposure to motorcycle simulators. Can you provide the committee with your thoughts on the use of motorcycle simulators in training or research?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Safety research?

**Mr PERERA** — Yes.

**Mr NEWLAND** — The one thing that stood out to me in the University of Nottingham study — there is a small paper that is circulating, and some of you might have seen this — is when it speaks about the little general approaches to it, but then it goes into talking about and focusing on the riding of curves. In this country, as well as internationally, for many years the riding of curves has been a problem. Single vehicle accidents tend to happen when a rider is out in the country riding on curved roads. Sometimes they can come to grief on straights, but mostly it is on curved roads. Sometimes there will be an errant vehicle coming in the opposite direction that will be across the rider's side of the road and conflict can happen there, but very often it is the rider themselves getting into trouble. For many years — and I am talking about 30 years — this has been running at around 33 to 35 per cent. In the last six to eight years it has escalated to be, what is quoted now in VicRoads documentation, at 40 per cent of fatalities. This is where I believe we can make a real step forward in helping to reduce this. If there is a 40 per cent fatality rate in single vehicle accidents where the major cause is running wide on a curve, why would we not focus on this? This would be an enormous target. If we could do something by half in that area, we would achieve something really good.

What I saw in the simulator at Nottingham was a strong focus on this ability or non-ability to adequately ride curves. They tested it with the Institute of Advanced Motorists trained riders — that is, those who had done the IAM course; they tested it with experienced riders; they tested it with novice riders. And guess what? The further-trained person came out on top in every instance. Not just some, but in every instance. You might say all this is self-selection, where the person is concerned with their safety, but nevertheless here is a simulator study that can ask people to do precisely the same tasks every time they put it up on the screen and get the results from that person. I found that to be really interesting. I would urge that this could be something the committee take a further look at and that it really give consideration to recommending the insertion of curve riding in the training program, because it does not really exist at the moment.

**Mr TILLEY** — Are you saying nor has it existed in the past?

**Mr NEWLAND** — When I was still with VicRoads we toyed with the idea of riding curves, and we inserted it into some of the training programs in the last couple of years that I was there, but when it was handed out to the private providers the riding of curves disappeared from the competency list. Ultimately it does not prevail now in the Victorian program.

**Mr TILLEY** — If the committee were to make recommendations on this, should it be a graduated thing for new licensed riders, or should it be bringing back every licensed rider in the state of Victoria and have them get that competency?

**Mr NEWLAND** — If you are game; that would not be on my head, you see! There is something to be said for that. If we see that this program says that experienced riders still do not ride as well as the trained riders, we could look at putting up a proposal that would identify riding curves, braking and swerving around an object as three critical skills that we would assess returning riders on. It would be able to be administered as an assessment in a matter of 12 to 15 minutes, and then if they did not do any good on it, you would send them to a training program to do that.

**Mr TILLEY** — The opposing side is that during the course of these public hearings we have heard expressions from other witnesses calling for better education for drivers. Do you have any thoughts on that at all?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Yes, that has been long overdue. I think there is a need to look at having, in the training and testing for drivers, some segments on recognition of vulnerable road users, sharing the road with those vulnerable road users and trying to elevate the situation of motorcycle riding into the minds of newly licensed drivers of cars.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And truck drivers? Just recently on the Geelong road I had a truck about 10 metres behind me.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I might tell you that — as you know, I am not now a rider — up until the time I had the stroke I would prefer to ride behind a professional truck driver and know that he knew I was there and could see me in the mirror than I would behind a private, licensed driver of a motor car. You could put it into the truck driving program, but remember that a truck driver also must hold a car driving licence before he graduates to

the truck. If your program for cars has the element in it of sharing the road and recognising vulnerable road users, you have already captured the truck driver, I would think.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Just on that sort of line of progression from car to truck, over in WA they have mopeds; you can ride a moped around the city. In fact one of the submissions we have received for this inquiry suggests mopeds as a means of making drivers much more aware of two-wheeled vehicles around the place simply because if you have more of them around, people see them more often. They become more aware because their daughters, their sons, their wives, their boyfriends are out there on the road every day, so you do not want to knock them over — although we might be a bit more careful if the in-laws are involved! Do you see any advantage in people being given this moped experience, especially before they take on a full motorcycle licence, and do you see any advantage in drivers getting used to having more two-wheeled vehicles out there on the roads?

**Mr NEWLAND** — The number of licensed riders in the country is not huge by any stretch of the imagination. The number of riders of mopeds is certainly a lot less. You would almost need to dictate that everybody rode a moped to do what you are saying about a wife, a daughter or a son. Not everybody is going to have that experience. It could have some benefits, but I cannot say. There is nothing on which to judge your foundation of this; it is only an opinion. If you said, ‘Should they be on mopeds before they are on a motorcycle?’, then no, I do not think that has any foundation either. There is no research that says you make a better motorcyclist if you are on a moped first. They are quite different styles of riding, and people choose to do that rather than being funnelled into it. If that was your mechanism to getting a motorcycle licence, it would not be a very good one, in my opinion.

I do not necessarily subscribe to the fact that if we had everybody riding, we would all be aware of it. Yes, that is true in Italy, for example, where in the past people have been able to ride mopeds at age 14, so they grow up riding with two wheels before they get onto four, but that is a different kettle of fish. I would not think the committee would be supportive of having 14-year-olds on mopeds — not that I am saying it is not a good idea, but do we want to take that quantum leap? I do not know. Besides, because it is not in my submission I do not feel very qualified to speak on that.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can I take you back to your submission? You made a recommendation in relation to data analysis — research and evaluation. What comment can you make in relation to the data of VicRoads, the Department of Health or Victoria Police? Is there any general observation that you might make in relation that?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Most of that jurisdictional data gathering that you have talked about is different. They gather them for different purposes, so they are never the same. What we need is to have accurate, reliable data that all matches, so if there is going to be any collection of it, it is done in a particular format that brings the same information in from everywhere and it is married together accurately. At the moment the police will say, ‘Oh, there are a lot of people evading fines, because they do not have a front numberplate’, and we have VicRoads claiming, ‘You are 38 times more likely to be killed or seriously injured on a motorcycle than if you are in another vehicle’. What is that based on? What the hell does ‘38 times’ means? I do not know. Do you?

I think there is a need to have accurate data, and, without prolonging it, this is a point that I put as no. 1, because I believe it is a very strong one. Correcting the lack of reliable data is essential — critical — to road safety in this country, and so is the quality of the research and evaluation that is done. I am all for supporting evidence-based research, but firstly show me the evidence. Often the research that is done is commissioned — for example, the commission from VicRoads to the Monash University Accident Research Centre. In my time serving on the former Victorian Motorcycle Advisory Council there were a number of incidences when the results of MUARC’s research were not available to that council to determine whether they should support or not support the findings. There is no such thing as secret research. It must be available for peer review. It must be available to any interested institution or private person for examination, and when it does that it can withstand scrutiny and you can uphold it as quality research. But much of it is not and very often it is poor information or data on which the thing is based.

**The CHAIR** — Do you have any examples of that?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Yes. Early last year, in 2010, I was commissioned by VicRoads to do a small study of the state of the industry concerning technology and protective clothing. My report was submitted and I was paid

for the research. VicRoads said, 'Thanks very much, we hope to publish it sometime'. A year later it still has not seen the light of day. At the same time, because I was a little bit critical of the ABS research that was around at the time, VicRoads also commissioned MUARC to do research and produce a report for them on ABS and perhaps other technologies. I never saw the report. I was told they would share it with me at the end after I had submitted my document to them, but that has not been forthcoming.

**Mr TILLEY** — You mentioned you were on VMAC. Have you been successful in being made a committee member of the new Motorcycle Advisory Group?

**Mr NEWLAND** — No. I had been on VMAC since its inception under Geoff Craige and served on it until I retired from my job with the industry. I served from 1998 until 2008, so it was 11 years if you include 2008. No, I have not been invited back to the new committee. I was requested to submit a CV, which I did, but they may have thought because of my current health situation it might be best to put me out to pasture.

**Mr TILLEY** — As an external observer is there anything that you picked up in that time in relation to the newly formed group?

**Mr NEWLAND** — No. Some of my friends are on the new group, but we do not discuss it because under the charter of that particular group everything must be confidential. So I do not ask them.

**Mr TILLEY** — We have got parliamentary privilege in here.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I was hopeful that I might have given some experience to the new group but it was not to be. I am comfortable with where I am.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can I just ask by way of a supplementary question if I may? In the past you were able to report to the minister directly?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Yes.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — As I understand it, the new group may not be able to do that. They will have to go through the filter of VicRoads. How do you feel about that?

**Mr NEWLAND** — They are your words not mine. I like it.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Yes, they are my words; absolutely.

**Mr ELSBURY** — That is a fairly leading question, Telmo.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I like it by the way, and I think it says that the new group is a toothless tiger.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — I have said it in the past, and I will repeat it so that I am clear in my position, that I think the minister will realise he is doing himself a disservice. That is a personal opinion, not the committee's opinion.

**Mr ELSBURY** — This is a fairly leading question as well.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Okay. Lead away.

**Mr ELSBURY** — This is going to open the scope quite a fair bit for you. Are you able to give us information as to what outcomes you would like to see from this inquiry?

**Mr NEWLAND** — I would like to see a tightening up of what is claimed to be evidence from research and that all of the research and so-claimed evidence is available to anyone for review; an improvement in data collection; and an urgent review of the rider training program, specifically outside of the learner course, to ensure that it includes an on-road training and assessment component. I would not advocate taking learners out on the road — that would be horrendous — but in the second level, leading up to the granting of the P-licence, there ought to be, and there must be in my opinion, a training and assessment program.

Finally, at this stage I would like there to be no mandating of technology, a la ABS for motorcycles, and no mandating of protective equipment as is stated clearly in the Liz de Rome report, which is yet to be qualified

regarding its serviceability in the real world. I believe at this stage that the industry is doing its part regarding ABS and you will see that once ABS becomes mandatory in Europe in 2017 and comes to UNECE, it will naturally flow to Australia, and we will be on the same page. I do not see any use in having that particular mandating in Victoria. If you are going to do it, it would have to be across Australia. You cannot have it mandated in this state when across the bridge at Albury it is not. To then suddenly say, 'Now I don't have to have this' is ludicrous. We need a national approach to these things.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Just taking you up on your position about protective equipment not being mandated, is it partially because of the difficulty posed by the fact that we do not have an Australian standard for the quality of any of the equipment?

**Mr NEWLAND** — No. If we look at helmets, we have a standard for helmets in this country. We do not even manufacture helmets in this country, but we have a standard, and anyone who wants to import helmets has to submit a batch to comply with that standard and it has to be tested. There are standards in the world that are upheld as highly acclaimed standards. These include the FMVSS in the USA, the British standard on which ours was originally based, the Euro standard, which is called a regulation. It is a standard accepted in 22 countries and in England, and yet those standards and the Japanese one cannot come into this country until they pass our standard. What are we talking about here? I do not think it is the business of having an Australian standard. I think it is perhaps a little bit eager to mandate clothing before we know its true value. We could say it had potential and, if that is the case, let us pursue this star rating and give advice to the consumer about the level of quality in the clothing. That would be a preferred way that I would see.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Just recently the committee went to Perth to the road safety conference, and we heard a submission, interestingly, from the motorcycle riders in Europe.

**Mr NEWLAND** — From FEMA?

**Mr LANGUILLER** — FEMA, yes. As I understood their submission, they oppose the compulsory nature of ABS. But one interesting argument that they put to us — and we did not have hearings, just informal discussions — was that by doing that it would discourage many riders who would rather use that investment or that amount of money, which is quite costly of course, on protective gear. So they put it in the context that in some cases, in some particular places in Europe, it would be better to encourage riders to have those resources invested in protective gear and not necessarily in ABS. They questioned the effectiveness in all circumstances, if we were to make it in absolute terms, of the use of ABS. What do you think?

**Mr NEWLAND** — That is a fairly sensible approach, but I want you to know here that I am not against ABS. I think ABS is terrific. I think there has been such great improvement in the ABS over the last decade; it is just mind blowing. But at this stage I see that it is well in hand with manufacturers overseas building these into their products getting towards 2017 when it will be mandatory for all motorcycles except the small ones. That will naturally flow on here because we do not build motorcycles here either; they are all imported. I think I have quoted in there a little table that lets you see how many of the current ones at May last year were equipped with ABS. If you looked at it now, you would find that this would have been improved again with the availability of more models coming out. We buy all this quantity of motorcycles from overseas, and so ABS comes here. I do advocate ABS as a valuable tool, a valuable technology for motorcycles and motorcyclists, but I think to mandate it would be just a little bit rough. Your comment about being able to invest that money in protective clothing is a good one. In the same way that you cannot be a truck driver without doing some lifting, I suggest you cannot be a motorcyclist without equipping yourself with the right sort of gear. So I would say that this is the thing when you enter motorcycling: you make a choice that you are going to buy this gear or you do not ride.

**Mr TILLEY** — I just want to go briefly back to training and some of the comments that you made earlier, particularly when we were talking about mopeds. You made mention that it was a different type of riding. The inquiry has been talking about off-road riding. Victoria has many thousands of kilometres of unsealed road covered by existing legislation, but it is still a road.

**Mr NEWLAND** — And 50 per cent of sales, not only in Victoria but nationally, over the last few years have been related to off-road riding for bikes.

**Mr TILLEY** — That is where I want to go, in particular to training, in that we all understand when we operate motorcycles that it gets down to the balance, the manoeuvring and the roadcraft, where it applies. Do you have any views that you might be able to extend to the committee at this stage in relation to the value of training in off-road riding that might be able to add to roadcraft on-road?

**Mr NEWLAND** — No. The biggest difficulty when I was chief motorcycle instructor in training people who had come to do the training program and were formerly dirt bike riders — unlicensed, maybe — was that the technique used for riding in the dirt and the loose stuff meant you have a great propensity to use the rear brake. We all know that there are two braking systems on a motorcycle: a front wheel brake operated by a lever on the handle bar and a rear wheel brake operated by the right foot.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can I disagree with that because my training and experience is substantially on off-road and on-road. I certainly did not apply the rear brake all the time when I was riding off-road; it was 70 per cent on the front end.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Okay. I am talking — —

**Mr TILLEY** — As long as you know where the front end is going, it does not really matter where the back end is.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I am talking about my experience a while back. In this state and in this country off-road riding is on dirt primarily, but nearly everywhere is a road or a road-regulated area. You know about the Australian road rules. You cannot ride legally unless you have a registered vehicle and a licence to cover that category. So let us forget about the training differences and we will agree to disagree about the — —

**Mr TILLEY** — The training is where I want to go because a major employer, Victoria Police, for example, has off-road — —

**Mr NEWLAND** — Victoria Police, do you say?

**Mr TILLEY** — Absolutely.

**Mr NEWLAND** — They have off-road training.

**Mr TILLEY** — Having attended the course myself — —

**Mr NEWLAND** — They have off-road training; I know they do.

**Mr TILLEY** — A major employer.

**Mr NEWLAND** — But what are you saying about that?

**Mr TILLEY** — When you are operating a motorcycle in the performance of your employment, training does have off-road as well as its on-road component.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Where does a normal person have employment in an off-road situation?

**Mr TILLEY** — Certainly defence, Victoria Police — —

**Mr NEWLAND** — And those places have their own internal training programs, don't they?

**Mr TILLEY** — Some of it applies. They have some input from the private sector as well.

**Mr NEWLAND** — I am not aware that they do, but you may be right. What are we concerned about with the training of off-road? Do you want to train them in how to miss trees or do you want to train them in the dynamics — —

**Mr TILLEY** — I am talking to you about balance. We are talking about some of the comments you made about being able to conduct adequately a left and right turn, say, for example. We are talking about good practice and applying it to all conditions.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Left and right turns on hard-top bitumen are entirely different to left and right turns on the dirt.

**Mr TILLEY** — Why?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Because you get slide factor.

**Mr TILLEY** — It depends upon acceleration, would it not be fair to say?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Somewhat, but you have no delineation on the dirt. There is no centre line and there is no edge line. The coefficient of friction is entirely different. I think we are talking about two different kettles of fish here, and my submission is tailored around training people for riding on the road in the dynamic traffic mix. I am sorry, but I do not want to get drawn on the off-road debate.

**Mr TILLEY** — Why is that? It is still a road under legislation?

**Mr NEWLAND** — Because from what I hear you have a view, and no matter what I say, your view is set.

**Mr TILLEY** — No, I disagree. We are canvassing other existing — —

**Mr NEWLAND** — If you want my opinion — —

**Mr TILLEY** — Please. That is why I am asking.

**Mr NEWLAND** — If you want my opinion, I do not see any value in the off-road training for riders in this state or in any part of the country.

**Mr TILLEY** — Thank you; that is all I am chasing.

**The CHAIR** — I might thank both of you for your commentary there. People moved to the edge of their seats as they were following the dynamics of the exchange. We are happy to take it on board, so feel free to feed some information through to my colleague in a break in a minute or two.

**Mr NEWLAND** — Could I just beg the indulgence of the committee to look at these couple of slides. It will take one to two minutes.

#### **Overheads shown.**

**Mr NEWLAND** — This is from University of Nottingham. It is a left-hand bend. This is the rider coming into the scenario, not seeing the vehicle parked on the left until he reaches a certain point and he or she may be travelling, as you see there, at 40 miles per hour. At this point you have to decide what you are going to do about that vehicle. How are you going to get by it?

The next slide is a view of what happens to the novice, represented by the black dotted line here closest to the inside curve; the experienced rider is represented by the darker dots in the middle; and the IAM-trained rider is the one closest to the centre line. You notice that the two inside lines have to suddenly take a swing out and around the obstacle. The outside one, the IAM rider, hardly has to vary his position to clear that particular vehicle. Then the better trained rider comes back in very close to the left edge in preparation for the next turn to the right, because there were a series of left and right bends.

I will not bore you with the next slide because we just talked about that. This slide shows the bike coming into the right-hander. Now the speed is at 60, and here is a vehicle fairly close to the centre line that suddenly appears in view. In this particular instance we have a need for each of the three grades of riders to do something about it. You will see that the IAM rider is now positioned closer to the outside of the curve and maintains that position all the way through right around to no. 7 category in the curve and is now inside, preparing then to be at the centre line to take up the best position for the following left curve, where the others have the same situation being in too close too early and ballooning out when the hazard appears. I found this to be refreshing and I just wanted to share that with you. I really think there is something here that is showing the value of particularly trained people to perform and re-perform in any given circumstance better than the non-trained or novice rider.

**The CHAIR** — Good. Just one final quick comment on technology. Recently in Perth there was a device being marketed that was able to locate movement over distance against the GPS speed limit coordinates of a particular area. Are you familiar with that sort of technology that trucking companies are now using to trace the movement of their fleets? Is there any potential application to motorcycles and the recidivist behaviour of speeding riders where there would be a black box device on a motorbike that might record the speeds of a cycle?

**Mr NEWLAND** — In the trucks there is a data-logging device that does talk about the gear changes, the braking and all of this, and the speeds of the vehicle on the whole journey. I am not familiar enough with it. I think it would be a very great imposition to anybody, and would it really achieve a lot? Could we rely on them not tampering with the things, for example? If we are really concerned with over-speeding people, oughtn't we fit them to every vehicle?

**The CHAIR** — On behalf of the committee, thank you for your time.

**Witness withdrew.**