

# TRANSCRIPT

## ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Inquiry into motorcycle safety

Melbourne — 7 March 2012

#### 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

#### Witnesses

Mr A. Woodroffe, senior manager, policy, service and review,

Mr M. Nieuwesteeg, research manager, road safety and marketing, and

Ms S. Cockfield, acting senior manager, road safety and marketing, Transport Accident Commission.

**The CHAIR** — Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the continuing public hearings of the Road Safety Committee's inquiry into motorcycle safety. We have received 74 written submissions since the release of the terms of reference and of having invited submissions. The purpose of these hearings is to obtain further evidence from selected witnesses covering the terms of reference. As you will have noted previously, Hansard will be recording today's proceedings and will provide a proof version of the transcript to witnesses so that any typos can be corrected. I ask observers to keep noise in the background to a minimum and to have mobile phones appropriately adjusted or switched off.

I thank you for attending here today. You are reminded that anything you say or publish before the committee is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the hearing, anything you say or publish outside the hearing room is not so protected. If you have any in camera comments you would like to make to us, we can also take them on board and clear the back of the room. In moving through the questions, I might start from the right-hand side and invite my colleague Bill Tilley to lead off with the first question.

**Mr TILLEY** — I am not addressing this to anyone. You can pick who would like to respond to it. I want to talk specifically about and start our conversation on data collection. We have heard evidence from quite a number of people about how data is captured and how it is used. In the spirit of that one thing we have picked up is that data might be collected by one agency but may not be used by another, and in that we may be missing certain elements that assist us in painting the full picture or demonstrating exactly what is happening on our roads.

The question is: how interoperable are the datasets of different road regulators? What I really want to get down to is how we optimise the data collection so that we can collect information that is useful to all the regulators involved in motorcycle safety. Can you suggest an alternative to the current approach of having multiple datasets where data cannot really be used across agencies because of the way that it has been collected, or because the first agency did not collect information that would have been of use to another agency? I cannot apologise for how broad ranging that is, but we will start the conversation around those terms and expand on that.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I will address that. There is a lot to cover here, so please interject if you want to explore anything.

**The CHAIR** — We are quite comfortable in interjecting.

**Mr ELSBURY** — We do that quite frequently; some more than others.

**The CHAIR** — We can extend the courtesy to you.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Thank you. Currently we are working with Deloitte on a little consultancy piece where we have asked them to help us map out the data collections around the state I suppose to identify barriers to data sharing and to consider any potential for a model that we can use to help us get around those barriers and work within the constraints and come up with a consolidated dataset. In our submission a couple of weeks ago in response to some questions by the committee we did refer to this and we provided an extract from a draft of this Deloitte report, so I can share that with you now.

I suppose it is a very high-level picture of the way road safety agencies operate and how data is shared among them at the moment. I must say that there are some good sharing arrangements at the moment. We can go a long way to improving things, but at TAC we are quite fortunate in that we have probably one of the most comprehensive road safety datasets you could hope to compile. There is room for improvement, but in terms of a crash we get everything we need from the police. We partly fund the police traffic incident system, so as part of that we have full access to that system and we can use that for analysis.

When we are accepting a claim from an injured person, we establish a link in the system, so the person is linked to a person record and a crash record in the police TIS. That gives us from a crash right through to an injury treatment, or the outcome of the crash. That is what I suppose is the real benefit of TAC having the scheme and arrangement it does with Victoria Police. That allows us to do quite in-depth analysis. I will cite a couple of recent examples that are quite important and that we would not be able to do without this particular linked data that we have currently.

There was a recent evaluation of electronic stability conducted by the Monash University Accident Research Centre. That looks at the vehicles that are involved in crashes, and then the occupants of those vehicles and the injury outcomes. You need to see crashes that have a less severe outcome along with crashes that have a more severe outcome. You look at the vehicles involved in both those sets and hopefully what you see, or what you do see in this situation, is that cars with electronic stability control have a better crash avoidance. Using the same data there is a similar study of side curtain airbags, where they are finding that there is a marked reduction in certain types of injury as a result of having a side curtain airbag.

I suppose historically we have not done a whole lot with that linked dataset. It is only in recent years that we are getting some depth out of it. The tool or the framework is there, but we are constrained in how we can use it. Within TAC we can use it well and we have a mandate to use that data, but, say, sharing it with other agencies is where it becomes a bit more tricky, I suppose.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — What is the rationale for not having the Department of Health in the top line of the box?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I suppose it is just to isolate the road safety partners. You could well argue that the Department of Health would be a good partner in the road safety strategy, but I suppose it is portraying the current state of things. Now that you have mentioned the Department of Health, I think that is the key to the data that we are not getting all the time. We get the Department of Health data where we have accepted a TAC claim. We are going to pay for the treatment, so we get the information about that treatment. In the cases where there is no TAC claim, we do not know. That is a limitation in our linked data. We can link only where there is a link, so if there is not a link you have a range of crashes about which you have no injury outcome information, or very limited information. Certainly the Department of Health would be one source of data we would love to see more comprehensively.

**Mr TILLEY** — With TIS, the traffic incident system, that is where you solely grab all your firsthand data?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — That is right. We rely on that for our crash information. That data is augmented, I suppose, or cleansed somewhat by VicRoads, which has a small team of people who go through and assess the injury crashes.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can you expand on that ‘cleansed’?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — They will look at some of the basic variables like ‘road user’. Was it a driver or a passenger? A police member who enters it may get it incorrect, and in reading the description of the crash the person at VicRoads might realise, ‘They meant to say this’, so they will update that.

**Mr TILLEY** — That is subjective, is it?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — It all comes down to what is recorded. So yes, I suppose you could say there is a subjective element in there. Whether someone is a rider or a driver is quite an objective thing really, but how you determine that might be subjective. Another area where the data is cleansed is in relation to location. That is quite a complex task in some situations, working out where a crash has occurred.

**Mr TILLEY** — How can it be if the police are responding to a crash situation? They go to the crash and they enter that data straight onto a disk. How can there be an argument about that?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Because they are not entering the latitude and longitude. They are entering the name of the road and that it is 1 kilometre from this intersection. But they are not getting a tape measure out.

**Mr TILLEY** — Some of the spatial mapping assists with some of that stuff?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Yes, they will try. If the description says it is on a curve and the curve shows it is 1.3 kilometres from that, that is what they will try to do.

**Mr TILLEY** — All right. I am just thinking through it. Yes, that will do for the time being.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can I just say in passing that, given the submissions put to us, the Department of Health data seems to be particularly good. I think you would concur with that. I can see your thinking in terms

of going back to your architecture, but I must say, with respect, that I am not convinced that it would not do you a lot of good, and indeed all of us, if you were to include the Department of Health there for your analysis. We were particularly impressed with what they had to say and the accuracy of their data. It is just a passing comment.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — If you are happy for me to make a response on that — —

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Please, yes.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — We have tried to work with the Department of Health to get the data, so we are getting it for claims, but when the VAGO put out its report it made all these references to Department of Health data. We put in a request to the Department of Health — I started talking to them in December 2010. After a bit of back and forth, I put in an official request on 5 April last year. I am still waiting for data. So there are challenges there. Having met with them face to face, they are willing to help, but they have got their issues as well. They feel very heavily constrained by the privacy rules that govern the way they use their data, which is reasonable, but I suppose — —

**Mr LANGUILLER** — But that could be sorted out.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I would hope so. What we are asking for is, I suppose, not a very standard request. It requires a bit of manual work to pull that data together and make sure it does not upset anyone's privacy rights. But it does take a very long time and we are working towards that.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — I appreciate your response.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — If I could just add something: the road safety agencies, or partners, have actually recognised the importance of the Department of Health. Recently there has been a position put on the management group and a Department of Health representative now attends. Part of that is for them to actually understand the challenges we are facing and, I suppose, to somewhat pave the way in terms of things like data requests and at least helping us understand the system and have somebody inside the system that can explain to us how it actually works. I think we have recognised to some degree exactly what you are saying.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Thanks for that. If one agency refines the raw data and others then use it, can assumptions be made on that data? Do you think it is possible that these assumptions may be questioned if the original data was incorrectly analysed or recorded in a way that did not take into account all of the factors?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Yes, we are limited by, or we are constrained by, what data is given to us. There are many difficulties in recording data — just practical difficulties. In roughly 70 per cent of crashes the police are at the scene of the crash, so you could make an assumption that the data is of a higher quality in relation to classifying that crash. But in 30 per cent of crashes that are reported and recorded on the police system they are reports that are made over the counter after the crash. So the police have to rely on a version of accounts of one person.

You can think of any example — a pedestrian crash is a good example. Frequently by the time the police member arrives the pedestrian is often in an ambulance. There is little information that the police can get from the pedestrian. They are relying on witnesses and drivers. With the tens of thousands of crashes that they are recording every year and probably 6000 or so members recording those crashes, it is natural that you are going to get different levels of quality. For a more minor crash you would expect a lower level of investigation than for a more severe crash.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Have you had discussions with MUARC in relation to a new linked data collection system? What are your thoughts on that and what benefits do think it would bring?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I work quite closely with Monash, working with the linked data that we have now. Monash are on the public record as saying that that is almost the best source of road safety data currently in Australia. There is a system that Western Australia have, which is a new system, where they are linking all the data together. I understand that linkage even includes property damage insurers. I think we should consider what benefits that might bring. There are obviously issues with ours — the main issue being that we are asking police who are pressed for time and who have other priorities to record quite a lot of information. That is not

always the best way of collecting the information. Building a link system from the start that could maintain privacy, that brought in the health outcomes, that brought in the crash circumstances and brought it into a link system that got around all those barriers of agency resourcing, funding and privacy and sometimes just incompatibility between systems would be a really good thing conceptually. There would be, I imagine, quite a lot of work in establishing the framework but yes, it is a good concept.

**Mr TILLEY** — That leads us to some of the stuff in the TAC advertising campaign. We see on our highways throughout the state, and we have heard evidence from a number of people, that motorcyclists were 37 or 38 or 34 — depending on the evidence — times more likely to be killed than other road users. I am particularly interested in how the TAC has arrived at this particular figure.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — We did not arrive at the figure; we have borrowed it from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. There is a report that comes out periodically, if not every year, but I have some numbers here to show you how we calculate that '37 times more likely'. Based on the hospital admission data that is collected from the hospitals around the country — —

**Mr TILLEY** — So you are relying on the data from that organisation?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — The institute of health and welfare, yes. They are getting hospital admission data; they are getting data from the ABS around the number of vehicles registered and an estimate of the number of kilometres travelled. Then they are estimating the number of crashes divided by the number of vehicle kilometres, and that is what we are using to come up with our 37 times.

**Mr TILLEY** — Do you have any knowledge of whether that has been peer reviewed?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I do not have knowledge on it specifically, but this publication has been around for quite a long time. It is quite a comprehensive one.

**Mr PERERA** — The Victorian Auditor-General's report *Motorcycle and Scooter Safety Programs* recommended that the inter-agency data committee of VicPol, the TAC and VicRoads could be strengthened and supplemented by the involvement of the Department of Health, Ambulance Victoria and the Department of Justice. What are your thoughts on these recommendations, and what steps, if any, have been taken upon these recommendations? I can see all of these ones apart from the ambos. Also you mentioned the Western Australian insurance department property damage insurance. What do you think of adding the ambos and the department of property damage insurance?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — The ambulance data could be really valuable. We have discussed it with them in the past. I have had several discussions with the data manager from Ambulance Victoria, and we are getting a report from them every month telling us the level of trauma that they are seeing. But what has been discussed in the past between the TAC and Ambulance Victoria is that whenever we accept a claim from someone who has been treated by Ambulance Victoria we get a whole lot of information from them. If that could be provided for every crash, if that could be linked with police data, that would be fantastic.

The real value there is that often the ambulance is there in advance of the police and they have got health data right from the earliest moments, so we get a very good understanding from the time of the crash until the time of first treatment of what the injuries look like initially. Then the TAC have got the Department of Health data to tell us what transpired months or years down the track with those injuries. So, yes, as a data analyst I would be excited by the possibility of getting that extra data.

In relation to insurance data the idea is good but I cannot see how we would be able to acquire that data. It would be heavily protected by the private companies that collect it themselves.

**Mr PERERA** — So you need a legislative framework to support that?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Yes, definitely.

**Mr PERERA** — What are the other impediments in getting Ambulance Victoria connected into this loop?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I cannot comment. I do not know why we did not get the data when we were talking about it originally. Maybe Alan knows, but it is still something that will be investigated further in the

future. It would be tied up with the whole contract between TAC and Ambulance Victoria that involves, I suppose, the payment of quite a lot of money for the services that Ambulance Victoria provides to TAC claimants.

**Mr PERERA** — It would be different from what you are getting from the hospital.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Yes. From the hospital we learn that this person had this injury. The ambulance would tell us an estimate of the impact speed; it is only a very crude estimate, but it is still something. They tell us whether that person had a seatbelt on, where the car was impacted and where the person was sitting in the car, and sometimes that information is not available from the police reports. It is actual crash information that they are collecting.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Now we will get onto a fun subject like funding. The committee has heard at a number of public hearings in regional areas that the TAC provides funding to Victoria Police for enforcement activities. Can you tell us how much money is expended on such activities, where that funding was brought from and what conditions you put on its use?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Samantha Cockfield. The TAC has funded Victoria Police in one form or another pretty much since its inception — so probably for at least 20 years. Initially a lot of that funding was around provision of, I suppose, technology. We actually developed the booze buses that you now see on the road for police and then handed them over to the police. It was the same with the mobile speed cameras, laser speed detection devices, radar speed detection devices and the evidentiary equipment used by police. This has pretty much all been developed and funded by the TAC.

More recently the model has moved to police self-funding or police acquiring funding for that sort of technology. Often in the past when we did fund those pieces of technology we also assisted in getting the equipment out there in what we called an enhanced enforcement program, and I suppose that is the legacy that continues now. If we look at the past financial year, which has been the sort of model that has been used over the last couple of years, we have allocated just over \$2 million to our enhanced enforcement program.

It is a three-phase program. One component is around providing funding to local police to address local road safety issues. The way that works is that we have two funding rounds a year and police are invited to put in submissions, or basically business cases, as to why they would like funding. The funding levels are generally somewhere between \$5000 and \$20 000 per project and we fund about 20 — —

**Mr TILLEY** — Sorry, how much?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Between \$5000 and \$20 000 per project. There are about 20 to 22 per round generally that are funded and they are from pretty much all across Victoria and all areas of Victoria Police. Another component of the program is the centralised operations program, which assists with the super operations that you see particularly at Christmas and Easter time when you hear about lockdowns, et cetera, and theoretically police run them throughout the year. We provide assistance with funding. The police already have some funding, but we are extending the work they are doing in that area. In fact this is where we work very closely with the police because not only are we providing some funding but we are also assisting in terms of public education role. So we will actually develop advertising campaigns advising the public that this is happening. It is, 'If you do the wrong thing, there will be no excuse because the police will be out there'. What we are aiming to do with these programs — and they are very well coordinated — is to increase drivers and riders' perceived risk of detection. We know in terms of road safety initiatives that this is a very effective formula.

The last program, which is a newer program in the way we do funding, is called our priority police service area, or priority PSA, program, and that looks at the top six of the riskiest police service areas primarily according to TAC data. Michael, who is sitting here with us, does that work, so feel free to ask him questions about how we actually decide on those priorities. That provides a high level of funding to the specific areas with the aim that they have a high level of trauma and if we put extra funding and allow them to plan out over a year where that funding can go, we are likely to have good effect in terms of the total road trauma picture in Victoria. What I need to emphasise is that it is a fairly well-planned program. There is actually a funding agreement between Victoria Police and the TAC which is quite specific about the fact that these funds are only to be used over and above anything police would normally be doing in their day-to-day operations. We see very often that police on overtime or on their days off are actually doing TAC work.

The other thing to note is that whilst the \$2 million sounds like a reasonable amount, this sort of funding program occurs certainly across Australia. Our equivalent, in what was the RTA in New South Wales, I think put about \$12 million to 13 million per annum into a similar program. The actual model is quite well understood because of the road safety outcomes. But in terms of the police budget \$2 million is obviously very minute, so we are quite specific about what we are achieving in that program.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Is the main metric you use for that the road toll, or how many people you have pulled over?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — In terms of how we allocate the funding?

**Mr ELSBURY** — How do you quantify the success of the program?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — With the smaller or localised programs where the funding is \$5000 to \$20 000 the reality is we rely a lot on infringement data and police reporting back to us, because they are very small programs and addressing relatively small issues in local areas. With the larger programs we are relying on an evidence base which has evaluated previous programs so that we understand the effectiveness of certain enforcement strategies and how they are likely to work. We do rely to some extent on that. We do get police reporting back to us quite extensively on the very large programs, what we call the Super Ardent and the centralised programs. Police actually provide for reporting back where the funding has been allocated so that it is easier to see the difference that enforcement can make.

**Mr PERERA** — Are you still doing black spot funding?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes, the program is now called the Safer Road Infrastructure program. The current program, which started in 2008, is a 10-year program, so it is going out to 2017. The investment was \$650 million, which is indexed, so in fact it will end up at around \$720 million over that 10-year period. It is primarily looking at intersection and run-off-road crashes, although there are components such as innovation in there to make sure we are continually improving the program. It is a very large program, potentially the largest program of its type in the world, and it is a very important part of what we do.

**Mr PERERA** — Who makes the calls? Is it based on VicRoads assessments?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Again we have a funding agreement as to how it will all work. But from early on we have had a steering committee between ourselves and VicRoads. Primarily the TAC funds the program, VicRoads delivers the program and the development of the program is between the two agencies. I suppose the key component in terms of guidelines and TAC outcomes is that we have a minimum benefit cost ratio of 3 to 1. I suppose that for every \$1 TAC invests, the Victorian community receives \$3 in benefits. Under that VicRoads does a lot of analysis work on individual sites to ensure we get treatments that will give that BCR.

Primarily, we work on the safe system approach, so we are looking for treatments that are going to be sustainable, and I suppose we work on the fact that people make mistakes — drivers and riders particularly make mistakes — and that the system will be forgiving. You will see a lot of roundabouts in terms of intersection treatments, and we are doing a lot of work to see how we can improve roundabouts to function even better. There are a lot of barrier treatments to stop people moving off the road or across the road in terms of going into oncoming traffic. I suppose we are really looking not only to reduce trauma but to make Victoria's roads sustainably safe.

**Mr TILLEY** — Before I move on to motorcycle safety, I want to ask specifically about some of the Victoria Police enforcement activities. During the inquiry we have heard a number of things in relation to off-road, and we appreciate now that the definition of a road also includes a lot of the unsealed sections of Victoria. No doubt you are the recipients of many claims in relation to them and they are probably under-investigated by police. We have heard evidence, particularly around rural areas, about some of the enforcement activities where they have cooperation no doubt as part of the \$2 million funding. Some areas have been able to identify funding to get off-road motorcycles and working with their local government and with manufacturers in some cases to be able to patrol and enhance the safety of motorcycle riding in off-road circumstances.

Specifically in relation to the question my colleague asked, can you go into some detail about how the funding actually works? You made mention of funding of between \$5000 and \$20 000. That is not going to get a lot

when it comes to the buying of essential equipment like protective clothing and motorcycles. Obviously Victoria Police has to do its own training, but it is about getting it to enhance the safety of our roads.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I suppose this is where the point I made about over and above their day-to-day operations comes in. As a rule we do not fund equipment. For example, the bikes that the officers use for off-road riding will primarily be provided by Victoria Police. What we will be doing is extending their use. Basically, my understanding — and please ask Victoria Police about this — is that there are limited numbers that can do that off-road work because of the very high level of training. You are right; we have actually assisted in that too, so I know there are some limitations. To ensure the bikes get the most use and that the officers who have the extensive training get to be used as much as possible in that work, we provide extended funding.

It is interesting that something between \$5000 and \$20 000 actually goes a fair way. If you are already doing 8-hour shifts and you want to add 2 or 4 hours to that shift, it can go quite a long way. You might get, say, four or five weekends of work where you have extended shifts over the motorcycling season. Similarly that was specifically for the local program. I think most of the funding of off-road would have come from that program. Each of the regions gets \$100 000 to \$120 000; so each of the priority service areas gets between \$100 000 and \$120 000. Some of those areas actually encompass riding areas, possibly not so much off-road, but they would also incorporate in their business plan to the TAC off-road riding and motorcycle enforcements, so there would probably be some more extended funding than that \$5000 to \$20 000 involved.

**Mr TILLEY** — The position or policy of the TAC would not be a closed shop in the future with some of these possibilities of enhancing that capacity.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No. I will go back a step in terms of how we plan our work with police. We actually have business planning sessions every year before we develop our business plan. We talk to police about how our funding, I suppose, will be rolled out. Police have a very large say in that program and its development. To develop it to where it is right now, we actually had a police officer on secondment for about six months a couple of years ago to make sure we were actually working with police and we were not enforcing something on them. The answer is that we are definitely open to different ways. Really it is reliant on police at the moment in terms of what they actually put forward in business cases.

**Mr TILLEY** — Just before I go on to motorcycles, would you care to comment on a statement that the TAC funding of Victoria Police for motorcycle-specific enforcement could be seen as creating a disincentive for additional police resources to be invested in enforcement against motorcycles? Do you see any negative aspects to your funding of police enforcement? Proportionally how much of your funding for motorcycle safety goes towards passive enforcement activities? We can break that down. It is long, but I had to get that specifically on the record.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Maybe we will start with the first part, which is the disincentive. I think the answer is a definite no. The fact is it is a very small amount of funding in comparison to the entire police budget. We have seen that area of police in general motorcycle terms starting to grow again. That has not anything to do with the TAC funding. I suppose it has been from within the police force that that has happened. More people are getting a licence — or a licence in Victoria Police terms — to be solo riders. More people are getting trained in terms of off-road riding. I also understand potentially more bikes are coming into the system as well, which makes it easier to enforce rider-related issues. From my perspective and from the TAC's perspective, no. I think if we thought that, we would not continue the funding. One of the other parts of the question — —

**Mr TILLEY** — It was in relation to your observation. Do you see any negative aspects to the funding of police enforcement? You can take the size into consideration.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not think there is any negative aspect we can see. As I said, we have been involved with Victoria Police in programs of one form or another for around 20 years. I think it is a positive. Particularly where we can coordinate public education and enforcement activity, it has been a success story for Victoria in terms of the number of people being killed and injured. It has been evaluated, so I think overall it has been a positive. I think at this stage we would be planning to continue the program.

**Mr TILLEY** — Of that \$2 million fund, having been the recipient of many of those overtime shifts over the years prior to this career, what is the proportion? In terms of proportion are you able to tell us how much of that \$2 million will actually be going into overtime shifts rather than the other parts of the program?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Primarily the funding would go to overtime and days off. That would be mainly what we are paying for. In fact we are never paying for the day-to-day operational work of police.

**Mr TILLEY** — They are all voluntary, I understand that.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. Certainly as far as I know, 90 per cent would be going into that. We do pay when police want to go to distant places also. For example if you want to go to Maffra, that is a centralised type of operation, so officers who are going from Dawson Street, Brunswick, to Maffra lose a lot of time in travelling. We pay for both their overtime while they are there and often accommodation while they are there, so that rather than coming back to Melbourne, they stay. There are some accommodation costs, but apart from that — and you would probably know better than I would — there would be some people costs in there too. I would say well into 90 per cent would be directly funding overtime and days off in terms of police work.

**Mr TILLEY** — I think we have pretty well covered that area. But getting onto the motorcycle safety levy, we understand that TAC collects the levy but VicRoads is responsible for the use of the funds generated. Can you expand on and explain to us how the transfer of funds is referenced in your annual general report?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — The motorcycle levy, as you know, is collected as part of the premium. It is about \$5 million per annum at the moment. It is separately accounted for and managed, but my understanding is that it remains in the fund and is extracted as needed for motorcycle safety programs. It is collected and remains part of the transport accident fund, but it is separately accounted for in terms of the expenditure and what it is used for. The expenditures are largely directed, as you said, by VicRoads.

**Mr TILLEY** — Is there anywhere that it is demonstrated publicly that motorcyclists can see how VicRoads is using that part of the funds?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Primarily it has been decided that VicRoads will communicate information about the levy and that there is specific funding within the levy program to communicate with riders and owners of registered motorcycles about how the money is used. So that has been the primary mechanism that we have to let people know. Certainly I sat on VMAC and information was provided to VMAC regularly and we do provide reporting to the Minister for Public Transport via VicRoads.

**Mr TILLEY** — The new VMAC has only sat once or twice now?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes, so I suppose it has not at this point become an issue, but certainly we report on the actual fund to VicRoads, to their minister. So there are some reporting arrangements, but it has primarily been part of a communication program or task that VicRoads has been managing.

**Mr TILLEY** — I want to expand on the process. What process does VicRoads have to go through to get the funding? Is it like a general grant application or a specific project?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — As you have already heard, TAC has a number of programs and funding arrangements with VicRoads, so I suppose we have fairly tight arrangements about the way we actually disperse funds to them. In some ways it is fairly simple. VicRoads sends us an assigned invoice to say they have undertaken a range of works associated with the motorcycle levy. They attach documentation as to what that work has been, and we pay an invoice.

**Mr TILLEY** — Do you believe them?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — And this is why I actually bring up the fact that we have a number of programs, because we have looked at this issue quite closely over time and in general government and to some degree ourselves as agencies are trying to keep administration around these issues to a minimum. We are really talking about funding between two government agencies which both have internal and external audit processes placed on them. When we ask the director of finance — and that is not his title but for all intents and purposes I will call him the director of finance — to sign off to say that VicRoads has expended the money, then yes, we believe him.

We do get information about what they have completed, and because I have personally sat on VMAC and we sit on a range of the actual project advisory committees, we are quite aware in general of what is happening. It is not as if they could pull the wool over our eyes. We are aware of the contracts they take out with universities

and how much they are for, so we are quite aware of the detail of the program. Yes, we do believe VicRoads and we keep a reasonable eye on the whole program in terms on what is happening.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — So you are confident that the totality of the revenue is used on motorcycle types of programs? Whatever they might be, they are strictly associated with riders and improvements that will benefit riders?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. The program is totally directed towards the safety of riders. Every project is directed towards that. The minister signs off on an approval document, which we get a copy of, to say that that is where the money is going. I suppose you could argue that as to the small amount of money that is used for the communications program — you may say that that is not directly for the safety of riders but I think it is a very important component — we let people know what is happening. But in general I would say that it is directed towards the program.

**Mr TILLEY** — We have heard a lot of evidence from motorcycle groups that are simply not understanding the communication about how the motorcycle safety levy they are paying is expended.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Perhaps I could just make a comment on that. I have not been involved in the VicRoads communication program around the levy for a little while, but I was quite involved at the start because of the TAC's communication experience. We would actually ask questions in focus groups more generally about the levy, how it was tracking and what people thought. These were your everyday motorcyclists that we might recruit to look at a Transport Accident Commission ad. It was really interesting that when they were asked they almost did not know about the levy. Then at the back of their minds they would start thinking, 'Oh yeah, I know what you're talking about', and then, 'Oh yeah, I got something with my registration notice but I didn't read it'.

So even though they acknowledge that they got information about the levy, their interest level was such that they were not really that interested. I think we potentially overestimate how much interest the general motorcycle community has in the levy. Some groups are looking for more information — and I understand that — and sometimes the amount of information available on individual projects can be quite limited, but motorcyclists as a whole are probably quite content with the range of information that is available.

**Mr TILLEY** — I certainly appreciate that this is across a whole range of issues, and not necessarily road safety or the levy. We are getting people to discuss or share information in relation to fire, and unless there is smoke on the doorstep they are not interested. It is similar with flooding: unless there is water in their homes, in general, getting across that information presents some difficulties; I appreciate that. But on the levy specifically and the position of it, how much is in the levy that remains unspent at the moment?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — To date as of 31 December, I think we had collected approximately \$44 million via premium.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — That is for five years?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No, it commenced in October 2002. And at TAC we have provided VicRoads with about \$38 million. It would be around \$6 million that remains unspent but allocated. So by the strategic guide on how the levy fund is expended, that has actually been allocated.

**Mr TILLEY** — The difficulty is also that TAC's annual report does not demonstrate it, and neither does VicRoads in their annual report demonstrate how they use that funding, so it is going back to that issue of accountability.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. I think that is a reasonable point you raise, and I am sure VicRoads and ourselves can work on making that information more transparent to the community.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — I think the general view has been, and certainly the view of the committee has been, that the TAC does a great job and is a great agency. But I hope you appreciate that sometimes, for the benefit of making sure that we can assist in the improvement of the way in which we run our agencies, we ask questions which have been brought to our attention by way of submissions.

I want to talk about advertising. Submissions that our committee has received to date from riding groups, the public, road safety committees and other witnesses appear to conflict with your judgement or views in terms of your ads on television. I understand you do them on the basis of your focus groups. Can I first say that I do not recollect groups indicating to us that they actually related to your ads. Common sense tells us that if the groups that you are targeting cannot actually relate to them, at least in terms of the submissions we have received, where is the effectiveness? How do you do that? How do you do these focus groups and how do you constitute them? Would you accept that these focus groups have limitations and can perhaps provide views that are not necessarily reflective of the broader community's views? How do you account for this limitation?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — The way we undertake the development of an advertising campaign is best practice, as far as we know it, in terms of social marketing and in terms of the very early development of what the issue is right through to the showing of an ad on air. There are limitations. With everybody who develops advertising campaigns, whether they be social marketing or advertising widgets, there are going to be limitations. The positive for people who advertise around widgets is that it is usually a sales relationship, so if you have a good ad, you sell more widgets. If you do not have a good ad, you know it is no good, because there are no widgets being sold. In our terms, the relationships are a lot longer term.

One of the key objectives of public education from the perspective of the TAC is putting issues on the community agenda and making the community aware that there is a certain issue. Earlier on we did it with drink driving. More recently we have been tackling speed in quite a large way. But I suppose of all the key issues, there is drugs and driving. We have done that fairly much in a head-on form since the start of our education program.

Going back to market research and the way we actually form market research groups, we have a target market for all of our advertising. We will generally use that target market at a script stage when we have a script. We will have a number of scripts that will be tested with the target market. For riders, generally the target market will be middle-aged males because they are the people who are the most overrepresented. But the work our research groups do and other evidence bases will be very much informed that. We assume it is going to be something like 25 to 39-year-old males as our target group. We will use that group right throughout the campaign.

We primarily use one market research company, Sweeney Research, that looks after our advertising research, but occasionally we use others. It is not an exclusive arrangement. It has a lot of experience in this type of research. We put a range of scripts in. Some of them will be quite provocative. We are trying to get different reactions. We try to understand what is going to work in terms of putting an issue on the agenda. What is going to work? Usually one or two scripts will come through. We might use some of the ideas from each of those scripts from that focus group to move into the development of an actual ad. We will then usually evaluate with focus groups at a very early stage, which is at pre-postproduction, or basically what they call first edit. As soon as we have shot it and put it together in a loose form we will again market research the same demographic, but it would be a different group, and again when we have the finished product.

The key for all of this is not whether people like or do not like our ads. The key is about the key message they are getting out of it, whether they are likely to change their behaviour or they are at least likely to reconsider their behaviour in relation to this particular issue.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Is it not about discouraging people from riding altogether?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No, certainly not.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — I must tell you that that is what it does to me and that is the sense I get from the submissions — that is, that it is about this alleged culture of anti-riders rather than encouraging safe riding and so on and so forth. It is about saying to the public, 'Riding a motorbike is so dangerous, so do not ride it'. Is that one of the objectives?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No. Raising the perceived risk of having a crash is an objective of nearly all of our campaigns, so it is actually having people understand the level of risk they face. This is for drivers as well as for riders. It has been part of what we are attempting to achieve since day one. We are certainly trying to increase the perceived risk of having a crash. As I said, we have done that with a range of ads. I have been to nearly

every focus group we have done with motorcyclists and I have never had the perception when they have been watching our ads that it will stop them from riding.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Do you exclude any particular groups and what do you do to consult outside those groups and outside the riding groups?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — To some degree when we do focus groups we exclude people who are outside the target group. For example, we are just undertaking some market research tonight on our latest ad for riders. In fact I think I have it here; I did bring some information about that. We will be testing with two groups — 21-to-30-year-old males and 31-to-45-year-old males. What we have asked from them is that they are frequent commuters. That means they need to commute a minimum of twice a week. This is set in an urban scenario. They need to be fully licensed. We will take probationary licence-holders but only a maximum of two per group, so you may well be excluded if we have that quota. We reflect the inner city and outer suburban residents, blue and white-collar professionals.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Do you include car drivers or bus drivers or truck drivers, because you would know better than us that a lot of the incidents that take place on the roads actually relate to a collision with car drivers; do you do that?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — They would not be the target market for specific motorcycle ads.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — You do not think car drivers perhaps need to get a message or two — and I am a car driver? For example, we might have to share the road with riders. If you do not have a message for the car drivers or the truck drivers, are you not doing only half the job?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — We do have some very specific messages for other road users around motorcyclists.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — In relation to motorcyclists?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. We developed a specific campaign called Vice Versa, although it would probably be more commonly known as ‘Put yourself in their shoes’. I think we produced that in 2006 or 2007. It had quite a long run and in fact we are considering re-running it right now. We have worked with VMAC through levy funding. We reproduced an English ad called Look Again, which was very much about right-turn crashes when it can sometimes be difficult to see motorcyclists. That now sits on the TAC’s reel in terms of the ads we will play.

We have also used ads that are not specifically about motorcyclists, but have motorcycling issues as an issue. For example, we talked about distraction. One of the scenarios we used was potentially not being aware of a motorcyclist behind you. We do specifically talk to drivers about those issues. I do not know whether we want to get into this now, but I suppose in and of itself raising awareness of that issue and putting that on the agenda is probably not the only thing we could do for drivers and riders, because the issue is a little bit more than raising awareness. When drivers do not see motorcyclists it is not usually because they are not looking or are not aware that they might be there. I am sure you have heard said many times in this committee, ‘I looked but did not see’, which is very much an automated cognitive issue that we are finding hard to address, although we are trying.

**The CHAIR** — Just on that point, we have had some submissions that have told us that the only campaign that focused on drivers rather than riders was safety levy funded, and it was the only one you had commissioned in the last five years.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Potentially Vice Versa would be about five years old, and that is probably true. We would normally get somewhere between three and five years, so two ads in that period would be about right for any one issue. I suppose I am saying that Vice Versa or the Put yourself in their shoes campaign possibly could be more than five years old.

**The CHAIR** — That was safety levy funded as well?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No. That was a TAC campaign.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — The committee has seen local road safety advertising that has been produced cheaply and tailored to local road safety issues being knocked back for funding by the TAC. Why have you taken such an approach to not funding local content? I particularly refer to one that my colleagues and I saw in Traralgon by Victoria Police, which was particularly good.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — We have the community grants program, and I believe what you are talking about may have been a submission to our community grants program. Was it a direct request for funding? I do not think it would have been to the TAC. I think it would have been part of a community grants program. The way that works is you can make submissions of up to around \$20 000 for local road safety projects. The decisions around who gets funded are based on committee structure. So there is an initial committee structure that actually assesses all the applications, and then an overseeing committee actually makes the final approval decision. Both of them have a range of community representatives, including representatives from local government, police, VicRoads et cetera. RACV sits on that as well. So it would have been a committee decision not to fund that, not just a pure TAC decision.

I have seen what I think was an incredibly well-done piece of work out of the Gippsland area, so I think we are probably talking about the same piece. I do not actually recall exactly why the one you are talking about would not have been funded, but, as I said, it is a grants program. A number of submissions come in and the best ones get chosen. For some reason that may not have been the best program.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Okay.

**The CHAIR** — I believe I heard you on the radio this morning — —

**Ms COCKFIELD** — You did.

**The CHAIR** — It was in relation to the TAC providing file footage of advertising material that is being replayed overseas with translations. One example is Bosnia, where a Victorian commercial has been used over there. In reverse, do you ever adopt advertisements made overseas? The committee has seen an excellent advertising campaign from the UK, which does not have the blood and guts displayed so much, but has a good musical background to it and is effective. It is the one where there are motorcyclists with their names in flashing lights above them.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I know the campaign.

**The CHAIR** — It is quite striking in its impact. Has the TAC thought about saving costs at one level and importing schemes from overseas?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — You are aware, because we have just discussed it, that one of the campaigns that is now on our play list, Look Again, was actually a UK campaign. It was developed by THINK!, which is the road safety marketing arm of the Department for Transport in the UK. We have a very good relationship with the Department for Transport because I suppose there are really only two or three agencies in the world that are producing a lot of public education in this space. They are one of them and they do a very good job. We were aware of that campaign in development and certainly pretty much as soon as it came out. We were incredibly interested in how it did evaluate because, as you have pointed out, on the face of it, it looked like an interesting idea. It did not address any particular issues that were coming up for us right then, which was a few years ago now in terms of our own research and our own evidence base, but we still thought it was a good campaign, and we are keeping an eye on what has actually happened.

The exact point you talked about — is it effective? — is something that we do not know, because unfortunately with the global financial crisis, funding for that THINK! unit was cut severely, and they could not evaluate that campaign. What we are not sure about is its effectiveness in terms of how it actually played out. We know about all the research that led up to it, and in fact that is on their website. We do not know how effective it was, and we really would have liked to have seen that, given, as you have pointed out, it was very much about awareness raising — if you knew who we really were, you might think a bit differently. I would have to say that at the end of the day the take-out message probably would not be too dissimilar from our Put yourself in their shoes campaign, which is the one we are considering replaying again in the not-too-distant future.

**The CHAIR** — There are suggestions that you would give it a go anyway on the basis that there is a view that it is a well-received advertisement.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — That we should because it is a well-received campaign? From the TAC's perspective, we want to make sure that our campaigns are effective in terms of key messages. What I would say is that what we would be prepared to do is put it into research to see how effective it was with target groups in Australia, and how well it did impart the message to Australian audiences. When we did that with the THINK! campaign Look Again, it did work very well. Certainly we often put other material from other jurisdictions into our market research to understand how well concepts and ideas work and if potentially we could use them in the Australian context.

**Mr ELSBURY** — One of the common criticisms of the TAC's advertising campaigns has been a perceived emphasis on speed as the main factor in accidents. What would you say is the level of importance you place on speed as a proportion of the advertising in which you have focused on protective clothing, fatigue et cetera?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Were you speaking specifically around motorcycling issues?

**Mr ELSBURY** — From my recollection, you have got the reduce your risks campaign, which talks about some placement, putting on a helmet and that sort of thing, but it concludes with imagery of the motorcyclist gunning it for a change of signal and then concludes with the motorcyclist being collected because he oversteers into an oncoming four-wheel drive. That is the imagery that you are left with at the very end of the ad, so certainly I can understand why motorcyclists would be quite sensitive to this perception that they are just out there, gung-ho and almost trying to emulate Star Wars speeder bikes going along through forests and that sort of thing in comparison to messages about the safety equipment you should have, about how you should not ride when you are feeling tired or about how you have got to adapt your riding method in wet weather. Some of it is a bit of a motherhood statement, but something we continue to do for car drivers is to say, 'Do not drive when fatigued', 'Adapt to the conditions', 'Be aware of spacing between vehicles' and that sort of thing. The message seems to be constant for drivers but not so much for our motorcycling companions.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — There are a couple of issues in there. In terms of our general road safety campaigns, with the messaging we put into general campaigns, although they often are targeting drivers, we believe the message imparts somewhat to other road users. Even if they do not drive a car, most people understand key messages around stopping to take a power nap, for example, so because a campaign is aimed at one target market does not mean you cannot expect some of the information to be imparted to others and in terms of issues like fatigue, et cetera, I would say that is definitely the case.

The reason we develop any campaign is that we believe the evidence is that is a key issue for that target group. In relation specifically to fatigue, for example, I am not aware that that is a key issue for riders. I can understand why, because not all but most riding is done on a much more discretionary basis. There are a lot of people who drive for a living who are usually in trucks, courier vans et cetera and there are a lot of people when they are undertaking a large trip with the family or whatever will do it in a car. That does not mean they are not riders. It just means that often with those types of journeys that are not so discretionary, if it is a really wet day and a rider is going out either as a commuter to work but has a public transport or a car option, they may well choose to take another option. If it is a long ride, for example, if they are going down the Great Ocean Road from the outer suburbs of Melbourne, they will probably not start off until mid-morning — and I call 8 o'clock mid-morning — say, between 8.00 a.m. and 10.00 a.m. I often see them waiting at the end of the West Gate Bridge — I live around that area — or convening at somewhere between 8 o'clock and 9 o'clock in the morning. So in terms of issues like fatigue I am not sure and I am not aware of it. I might just ask my colleague to comment on that.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I would just say that if you are looking at the profile of motorcycle trauma across the clock in the week, it does not coincide with what you would expect to be times of high fatigue.

**Mr ELSBURY** — You do have a high proportion of accidents on weekends at around about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. A group has gone off in the morning. They have gone and had some fun with the bikes and then they start thinking about turning around and coming home. It is when you have relaxed a bit and you are on your way home. It is almost a commute back home after having had a good ride out with the mates, or even after lunch. I know I will feel sleepy in a little while when I have had a few sambos, but when it comes down to it, it

is that time of the day when it seems that people have more difficulty staying upright on two wheels. Certainly in the evidence we have received through the committee we have also heard that if you go out with a club, rider groups have designated rest points. They work out that you are not going to ride as far as you would normally drive simply because the concentration required on a bike is much greater than that for driving. For someone who is not a member of a club, who rides a bike daily into work — yes, that is normal — to decide, ‘I might just go down to Bendigo, it is only 2 hours down the road’, the suggestion that Kyneton is not a bad place for a bit of a stopover and having a quick snack before continuing on, that sort of education process does not seem to have occurred within the advertising program that the TAC has put forward, which means that you have still got an area that is being left open. You are concentrating on your balance and on your placement on the road a lot more as a motorcyclist. The committee has heard that the physical act of riding causes greater fatigue. What are your comments on that particular issue?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — As I said, we are trying to use an evidence-based approach, and certainly with that weekend ride — the issue you were just talking about — it is what is next on the agenda. So you are right, we have not addressed it, but it is literally next off the mark. I would still say that in terms of what I know from pure evidence, I have not seen it identified as a major issue. That does not mean it is not an issue at all, but in terms of us trying to tackle the major issues, speed is certainly up there. It is up there for drivers and it is up there for riders. I think we need to tackle the major issues if we are really going to make a difference.

We know that speed is involved in literally every accident. With speeding, whether it is going well above the speed limit or going at the wrong speed for the conditions you face, if we cannot stop and we cannot stay in control of our vehicle, we are going to have an accident. This issue about speed is incredibly important in terms of the general road trauma picture in Victoria. You are right; TAC has a general concentration on that issue. It includes riders because there are some specific issues for riders, but I think our concentration is just as heavy for drivers.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — On that very subject, I fully concur with you generally on the issue of speed. It probably means, as you have just said, that there is the legal speed as distinct from the appropriate speed. You hear from some riders, ‘It is 60 kilometres and up, so I am doing 60’, but 60 kilometres per hour on a rainy day in certain areas may not necessarily be appropriate. Are you confident that that message is getting through? You could well be doing 100 kilometres per hour legally but totally inappropriately. On that message — and I know it is a subtle, complex and very challenging one — are we getting there?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I think the general answer is yes. The TAC and all the agencies in Victoria have been addressing the issues around speed for some years now, and I think what we have done is to gradually start to move the community to understanding what the speeding issue is really about. It is a slow process because when we started, people considered 15 to 20 kilometres per hour over the speed limit to be speeding — that was when you started speeding. We have now got the community to understand that going 5 kilometres per hour over the speed limit is speeding, so in terms of the debate we have come a long way. When drink-driving first became an issue and we started testing people for drink-driving, they could not see a problem. They could drive their car; they were actually a better driver when they had had a few to drink. Nobody would say that these days, so I think we are making gains. The thing about road safety campaigns and road safety in general is that it is long term. It is small gains. We are always making small gains towards the ultimate end, but we still have work to do in that area.

**Mr ELSBURY** — I am not wanting to get a preview of the advertising that you have said is coming, but an issue like fatigue is hard to quantify. You have speed — easy, radar gun; you can pick up that someone is speeding. You can pick up if someone has been drinking. You know if there is an issue with the roadworthiness of a vehicle just by looking at it. How do you develop an advertising road safety campaign that does not really have a strong enforcement tool? It is not something where you can say ‘Yes, this person is definitely fatigued or this person is — —

**Ms COCKFIELD** — It is very difficult. It is not difficult to develop the advertising campaign; it is difficult to get behavioural change without that enforcement tool. If we look across the world in terms of the most successful programs, they have certainly had that combination of public education — making sure that the community is aware of what the issue is and what they can do as an individual to assist. In our case that has very much been about taking a 15-minute power nap, and we know that message in Victoria’s scenario is very well

understood; they understand the key messages. It is actually getting people to change their behaviour; that is the issue for us.

To be honest, in terms of something like fatigue, obviously we are working very hard with our partners, Victoria Police and VicRoads, in trying to develop either an enforcement mechanism or a tool that will help people recognise fatigue. But where we think the biggest long-term value is going to be is in technology — vehicles that will be able to detect when drivers are fatigued. In fact we have a project right now which is not related to motorcycling but it is doing that exactly. It is called our safe car project, and it is looking at technologies of the future and how we might be able to assist people in terms of issues such as fatigue and drowsy driving.

**Mr TILLEY** — On that and going back to data, we were talking about capturing data specifically in relation to fatigue. How would all this be referenced by Victoria Police in the TIS system?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — With great difficulty. I think yesterday there were some changes to the TIS system to give police members greater flexibility about recording the perceived cause of accident.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can we go into a little bit of detail there so we have a very good understanding.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — They tell us about members' opinion of cause of accident. Previously it was not collected well, but now there is a range of options they can choose. I do not have the list; I have not seen the list in a couple of months, but I think fatigue was in there.

**Mr TILLEY** — It was a number of months ago. Is it limited by the options that a member of the police force has on the road when he is collecting the information?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — On the road it is done in the notebook, but it is when they go back to the terminal at the station. For members' opinion of cause there will now be a drop-down box, whereas previously it was a text box that they would type in. Now it will be a drop-down box and they can select as many opinions of cause as they like; I think there are around 20 or so. I would put that question to the police.

**Mr TILLEY** — I suppose now with the powers of police and considering what police can and cannot ask drivers when they are investigating a crash, is there going to be a requirement for legislative change? Here we are probably asking questions for drink-driving offences where you try to determine place of last drink, who with, and number of drinks consumed. Are we now going down that path? If they are not only summary offences, but if they are leading to more serious indictable offences, is there going to be a requirement for legislative change? We are trying to establish fatigue and those other matters.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — It is challenging to identify fatigue as the cause of a crash, and we suspect it is a contributor to many crashes. With the TIS dataset, the one police have got, I think you are asking too much of a police member to make that call, especially when they are not even at 30 per cent of the crashes that they are reporting. We look to other tools, such as an in-depth crash study that Monash runs, where they will send engineers to the crash scene, interview an injured person in a hospital, look at the crashed cars and try to piece together what happened. They have done some preliminary work — it is not at a report stage — that suggests that fatigue is a substantial contributing factor. There is the falling asleep type of fatigue, but then there is the, 'I am tired; I am not giving it my all'.

**Mr TILLEY** — Distractions.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — It is a very tricky and expensive area to research thoroughly. Pretty much the only other tool that you can rely on with some precision is the naturalistic study, where you put cameras in cars and you can watch people's eye movements. Basically you have a journal of their log of driving. We are planning to do a bit of dipping our toe in the water by doing some basic exploratory research with our clients over the next few months, asking them a few questions that might give us a sense of how important fatigue was in their crash. The obvious one is, 'Did you fall asleep?'. More holistically you try to create a picture of what they were doing — 'How much sleep did you have the night before?', 'How long had you been driving?', 'Are you a shiftworker?' — and those sorts of things to try and explore it more fully. But you are right; it is an area that is really hard to get hard data on.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Previous committee reports related to motorcycle safety in 1993 and 1998 have recommended that public education campaigns which encourage car drivers to be aware of motorcycles be developed. This issue was raised on a number of separate occasions with the committee this time around as well. Can you explain how this recommendation was addressed in the past?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — My history is not quite as far back as those inquiries. As I have said, we have had two specific public education campaigns talking to drivers specifically about motorcycle issues, particularly about being aware of motorcycles. One of those was completely TAC developed and funded. The other one was the use of an English campaign which initially had some funding from the levy program. We paid for the airing of it and we have continued to pay for the airing of that campaign in recent years.

**Mr ELSBURY** — What are the research findings and evaluations for your advertising? Can you provide us with that sort of information for motorcycling advertisements over the last 10 years, as in what is its cut through? How have you been able to quantify its cut through?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — The answer is yes, our records go back 10 years in terms of our tracking. We have changed methodology a little bit over that time, but we should be able to do that in relation to ongoing tracking. I suppose this does relate a little bit. We specifically evaluate campaign by campaign, but, as I have mentioned earlier, we do see all of public education on a continuum and that we are slowly moving people through that continuum, so it is creating awareness and expecting to see slow change. We do use ongoing monitoring — tracking — with the community.

On changing methodology, in terms of motorcyclists the numbers that were coming through in our early tracking were fairly similar to their population numbers. It was fairly low; I suppose that is what I am saying. We did change the methodology to do more specific work with motorcyclists in recent years. So if we go back 10 years it might be a little bit light on in terms of numbers, but we certainly can supply what we have to you and in relation to specific campaigns as well.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Would you agree that enforcement is just one tool for policy makers in getting people to change behaviour?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. Being the primary front of public education campaigns, we would certainly say we have a range of tools, and some of them are not even directly related to behaviour. A good example might be infrastructure and pedestrians. We know we can build infrastructure — what we call gateway treatments — to narrow roads and create a perception for the driver that they are coming into a high-pedestrian and high-bicycle area. We can do a lot of work, even in the areas of infrastructure, which helps change behaviour. People slow down because they know they are coming to an area that is likely to be conducive to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. You get the feeling, 'I should not be going quite so fast in this area'. We can have perceptual countermeasures too in terms of infrastructure. Highlighting curves on the road, et cetera, can assist in the way we drive. Enforcement is an important tool, and historically it has been one of the most successful, but as time moves on we are looking at infrastructure and the vehicle itself to assist in behaviour or to some degree helping with behavioural issues, not necessarily changing behaviour.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can I just complement my previous question in relation to advertising, the one I referred to in Traralgon? Victoria Police made a comment in relation to a very localised ad, which they thought related to particular people in Gippsland because they had the benefit of having done their own work and consultation. They put the following on the record, and I seek your comment on this. One of the officers said:

Certainly the TAC does the most advertising for motorcycling across the state. In regard to the advertisements that you saw earlier and the one from the previous year, the ER group had actually applied to the TAC to do local campaigning as a pilot to see if it was more effective. It was knocked back on the basis that it was already being covered at a state level.

In other words, the way I understand it is that state level advertising appears to prevail over and above any potential local advertising that they think is far more relevant to them than it would be to riders in the middle of the CBD or the Nepean Highway.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Do you know what the actual issue was that they were aiming to address? Was it protective clothing?

**Mr ALIFERIS** — It was with reference to accidents in the Gippsland area and particular run-off-type accidents they were having. So they crunched the statistics and they found — —

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Okay. The only thing I will go back to is that it will be part of the community grants program because that is the funding stream where you could apply for that, so it would have been a committee decision. But we are happy to provide the feedback that we provided to them. I imagine it would have been Gippsland MotorSafe that applied for that funding.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — So your policy is not to fund local projects of the kind such as local ads?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — So you do fund local ads?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not think we have had too many applications. There is almost no limit to it. The criteria is much around being a not-for-profit group, identifying a local issue and you have identified that they have done that. The criteria is not about the actual initiative, although we normally ask for some evidence base that the type of initiative would work.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Is there any particular ad that you have funded that is localised?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I cannot think of an actual ad. I can think of media products. I can think of a DVD which was also made in the Gippsland area around farm equipment, like the ATVs and tractors and the sorts of specific trucks that they move between farms, et cetera. I cannot recall an ad, but we do actually fund quite a lot of projects out of that. It is a funding arrangement, a grant arrangement, so we are not involved in the program. We will basically allow them to go ahead. We ask them for reports on where they have got to, just to make sure that the projects go ahead in a timely fashion. We require a report that it has been completed, but we are not involved at all in the day-to-day development of those programs.

**The CHAIR** — We will now be moving on to the topic of protective clothing, and we have a couple of other back issues that we will return to in a moment.

**Mr PERERA** — When talking about advertisements we were talking about fatigue versus speed. How about protective gear? All the witnesses highlighted that most of the time — 90 per cent of the time — protective gear plays an important role in most motorcyclists' lives, especially when they meet with accidents. Why are you not focusing advertising on protective gear? The second part of my question concerns motorcyclists' attitudes to other road users, and other road users' attitudes towards motorcyclists. They are not reflected in the advertisements.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Just in relation to protective gear, I would argue that the TAC probably does more advertising on protective gear than anybody else in the world. I think we have got extensive campaigns. Since we have identified that this is an issue we have had an evidence-based campaign, which has meant specific advertisements for both motorcyclists and scooter riders talking about it in the context of a range of risk which we have already talked about, such as that reduce your risks campaign. We do a range of work in the Victorian context in terms of providing motorcycle retailers who actually stock protective gear with promotional material to promote that protective gear and actually help them sell it.

We have stands at both the motorcycle expo when it is on in Melbourne, but also the motorcycle GP which we know is incredibly well attended by motorcyclists in Victoria and also by those from interstate. Our program around protective gear is quite extensive and we have moved that program now into a pilot testing phase to be able to help motorcyclists choose the best quality gear that they can. So I think it would be very unfair to say that we are not doing work in this area.

**Mr PERERA** — But in terms of advertising, do your advertisements reflect that protective gear should be worn?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. We have a number of campaigns going back for four or five years that specifically address that, and primarily a TVC will lead those campaigns, there will be outdoor advertising and I can think of an example of the Tullamarine Freeway where, in the last three or four months, there have been

billboards on this issue. So it is not just the television; it will be radio, outdoor advertising and online advertising as well.

**Mr PERERA** — What proportion compared to the speeding issue?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I could not tell you. I will take it on notice, but I would say that at this point it is probably a higher proportion.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Can you explain to the committee what specific actions the TAC has taken in relation to protective clothing and the development of a standard or a star system?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — There have been a number of reports which the TAC has been involved in, in terms of sitting on project advisory committees, et cetera, undertaken by the Monash University Accident Research Centre, talking about the issues that might relate to development of a protective clothing ratings system. Most recently the Motor Accidents Authority in New South Wales has done another extensive piece of work which we have been involved in. The MAA in New South Wales is, I suppose, our sister body. They are the overseer of third-party insurance in New South Wales, which is also quite extensive. So all of these reports are, I suppose, pointing to the fact that we do need some sort of rating system and some of the difficulties that exist within that.

I suppose that almost three years ago to some degree you could see the writing on the wall, and until you start dipping your toe into the water it will be hard to realise what some of these issues are. We actually have a pilot program that is looking at testing the pieces of clothing. We have set up an advisory committee which involves stakeholders from VicRoads and the industry, so it includes both the manufacturers, which are quite limited in the Victorian and Australian context, and the importers of clothing and retailers. The adviser for this project is Paul Varnsverry, who is acknowledged as an international expert in textile and protective clothing, not just related to motor cycles.

It is an interesting project. I suppose, in terms of our business planning, it has been on our full business plan for two years and we have actively been working on this project that whole time. As late as this week we have had a teleconference with the United Kingdom, which is where the clothing is right now, for testing, and we have come up with a number of issues about that testing process. I might give you the latest report from that because it is indicative of the amount of work involved — and we are only talking about a pilot — and how much work goes into getting something like this off the ground.

What we are trying to achieve with this pilot is just understanding what the processes are to get clothing tested. How many pieces do we need? Do we need five pieces to do one test? It is that sort of thing. We are finding that we have got some pieces of clothing, such as a very popular piece of protective clothing on the market at the moment in Victoria, where we actually might not be able to harvest the sample. They use harvested samples to do this testing, and we initially wanted to do testing for this pilot to the full European standard, which I think is EN 1395 or something. For the pilot we wanted the full testing, because we felt that indicative testing may not be seen as being rigorous enough. That full testing is probably only going to be undertaken with the aid of manufacturers, and, as I said, most of the manufacturers are not in Victoria or Australia. Most of the major manufacturers are actually overseas.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Where?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Some of the better-known brands are coming out of Europe and the US. I suspect that the manufacturing of those brands is not actually being done in those countries, but possibly in some Asian countries. We also have a number of products which we would probably like to test, which are coming out of, say, Pakistan, and some other Asian countries, where we do not even know how you would get to the manufacturer. We know who the people are with some of the very well-known brands and certainly the importers have very good relationships with them, but for some of the lesser-known brands, which as I said are possibly the ones that you are really interested in, we would not know where to start. They actually want samples of the seam stitches, not in the garment, but a larger sample, so that they can do their testing on that. I am probably getting into too much detail, but it is quite extensive. To be honest, we will continue and we are really trying to move this along, because we know there is a lot of interest and a lot of need, but I suspect it will take a while to actually get to some sort of formal rating program, and it may not be a star-rating program.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Would it be ‘by a while’? Are we talking about months, years or decades?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — We are two years in. We have got very active and eager people involved in the project, and we are at the starting point. I am thinking that it is probably at least six months until we finish this pilot and then the information out of that can be distributed. It really is hard to know how long that will then take to move into something more formal, because the whole idea of the pilot is to say what is the best way forward in terms of this issue? It is fair to say that the TAC has been fairly involved in a number of consumer rating programs, so we are quite aware of the general issues — in both the Australasian new car assessment program and the used car safety ratings program. We have looked at a range of other programs, such as around water ratings and all those sorts of things, to understand the consumer side of it. So in some ways we are quite well developed. It is really understanding with the particular gear what is the best way forward, given that it is not a large motor car that is going to stay on the market for three to five years. It is a jacket that might stay on the market for three to five months.

**Mr ELSBURY** — In 2008 VMAC received information that the CSIRO lab in Geelong would be used for testing. Why did that not eventuate?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not think that was part of the TAC project. We had always felt that in the long term we would be happy to work with local providers of this testing, but the testing laboratories and the expert that we knew were based in the UK. I say that we knew him, but we probably did not know him and we only found him through this work. That laboratory has got 20 years of experience, and that experience is now starting to come out because they are able to provide us with very good advice. They are doing testing for some of the major manufacturers and in fact for one of our local manufacturers, Draggin Jeans. They are able to provide excellent advice because they have been doing it for 20 years. I know how much you learn through experience from sitting on the council of ANCAP. It is very hard to understand how you end up somewhere after 20 years, but I know all the debates we have had, all the testing we have done and the changes we have made to get that program to where it is today. SATRA, which is doing this pilot testing for us, has got that experience. I think in the long term it would not make sense to be sending garments overseas, and in fact you would hope you would be able to bring some of that experience from other testing laboratories to Australia and to have the same test facilities, just as we did with car testing. We do pretty much all of that testing in Australia now.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Were you sitting on VMAC in 2008?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. I was.

**Mr ELSBURY** — But you were not aware of this in relation to CSIRO?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I remember that somebody went to visit CSIRO to see what facilities they had. When you say that they were being used, it was definitely not related to the TAC project. I have been involved in the TAC project from the start. At least from my perspective there has been no intention that we would be using laboratories that did not have extensive experience in doing this testing and in the full range of testing. The other issue is actually being able to do the full range of testing. CSIRO has certainly been mentioned, and I suspect in the longer term they are going to be a very good option.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Having received your submission on this issue of protective gear — and I am very cognisance of the issues raised — do you have a view in relation to making any part of protective gear mandatory? It would be remiss of us not to ask you the question. Can I just give you some examples — half helmets, full helmets, gloves and boots? We can put them all together in one bag, or we can split them up and think about gloves only, or boots only. Do you have any views in relation to making mandatory any or all of it?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Can I first say that the pilot program that the TAC is developing or running right now has got nothing to do with mandating. It is entirely about providing consumers, and in this case primarily riders and pillion passengers, with information that is going to assist them to buy better clothing. However, one of the reasons I feel that in the past mandating has not been on the agenda at all is that apart from the area of helmets we have not had good information in terms of telling riders what they can buy. It is very difficult to say, ‘We know this is going to protect you, but we do not know how well’. I think that is a difficult decision to make in the absence of that evidence base. What is emerging now is very good evidence, some of it from our own organisation and Michael spoke before about the linked database. We are able to understand a lot more about injuries relating to wearing of protective clothing. Some work that Liz de Rome has done out of Canberra and

New South Wales is definitely indicating that protective clothing actually does what it says — it protects people. I think we are starting to see that the evidence is really growing in the area of boots, in particular, and that you might want to consider mandating. That is also potentially true in the area of gloves. I think we really have to look at the evidence base, because we are trying to protect people from being injured.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — What about the helmets? We have received two submissions, yesterday and today, from two experts — one an orthopaedic surgeon and the other a plastic surgeon. From the point of view of soft tissues and the type of orthopaedic work potentially required, the very graphic pictures they showed us point very clearly to the fact that making a full helmet mandatory may be the way to go — that is, if we desire to avoid serious injuries to the face and to the skull, and so on.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I think our own evidence base would certainly support the view of the surgeons on that, and I suspect that some of these people are our clients and probably most of them are.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Yes, there is a significant difference between full-faced and open-faced helmets, in terms of injury outcome.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — The committee also received submissions from injured riders. My recollection is that all of their evidence was very complimentary of the support they received from the TAC, bureaucracy aside. But it was very complimentary, and I think it is worth putting that to you.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Thank you. I will give that praise to Mr Woodroffe, who certainly has more to do with the claims side of the business than Michael or me.

**Mr PERERA** — Is the TAC part of the protective clothing project currently being managed by the Motor Accidents Authority in New South Wales? If so, how is the work being undertaken by the MAA different to that being done by the TAC?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — The Motor Accidents Authority is, I suppose, our sister organisation in New South Wales. We are part of the project advisory committee on that group. We are not part of the technical group, but we are part of the general advisory committee. We have reviewed the report, which is in its final draft stage now.

The work that the TAC is doing right now is practical. We have protective clothing out there being tested. This is very much about the technical detail of how you might manage a consumer rating program and what the group does primarily is talk to a range of manufacturers, the industry and other consumer rating programs about the best way to develop the program. In fact we are working together. We are eagerly awaiting the outcomes of this pilot so we can marry the technical information and the process information about the public education side of the program with the actuality of testing and the technical side of testing. We are certainly aware of it and, as I said, we are very much working together. I think the draft report is almost finalised and they will be waiting to see what comes of the TAC work.

**Mr PERERA** — Are there any other international organisations that you work with overseas?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Not so much in the protective clothing space, probably because the consultant working on that project with us is from the UK. He has a lot of contacts, so we are quite aware of what else is happening, but we do not have direct contact with them.

It might be worth saying that there is another project slated in this same space, which I think will also be complimentary. I think the Monash University Accident Research Centre is joining with the George Institute to also do some testing of protective gear products that have been involved in crashes and that potentially will link back to our database. It is not a very well-developed project yet, but it has quite a lot of potential to further inform consumers about the protective nature of the clothing that is on sale.

**Mr PERERA** — According to the RACV, post-licence training has not been shown to be beneficial and should not be supported as an effective road safety countermeasure. That view has been consistently challenged by witnesses to this committee and to an extent seems counterintuitive. What are your views on post-licence training and do you think they have the potential to reduce motorcycle trauma?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — You are right. Some things that happen in road safety are counterintuitive; they are not as we might expect. Training has been one of the issues where, particularly when we have evaluation of driver training, it has not been an effective initiative in terms of safety outcomes. Specifically in relation to motorcycles I would agree with you, given the nature of riding and the technical skills and somewhat the cognitive skills, that intuitively you would say that there is something in training.

If we are starting to ask where the training should start, I think it is probably back at the mandatory stage, and that is our licensing system. I know that on behalf of the government VicRoads has had a discussion paper and undertaken consultation around a graduated licensing system, and I understand they now have a proposal in terms of that. I think a staged approach to what is a form of training and getting your licence is probably going to come a long way in terms of the issues.

One of the issues we face in terms of post-licensing is that unless we mandate something, people are unlikely to do it. We have a lot of experience of that. We currently have a number of trials going on — one in the motorcycle area — that show people are unlikely to do it. It makes it very difficult in terms of evaluating something. It then also makes it very difficult for agencies if they do not have an evidence base — if we cannot evaluate something — to say that people should do it. It is a round circle, and I can understand. Intuitively we think we should do it, but all the evidence we have says that it is not effective as a road safety measure. We do not have any measures to say that it is effective; I suppose that is a better way of putting it.

We should think about how we can do some sort of training that we can actually evaluate. As I said, there is one very large trial going on right now, which is a very expensive trial, across Australia. We are having trouble getting recruits. It is in the young driver space. It almost has to be that you would have to mandate something to actually test its effectiveness and then make the decision whether it should be something you would mandate and impose the cost of on a community forever.

Right now in terms of where we stand, because we do not have any evidence to say that there are safety outcomes from undertaking post-licence training, we are fairly neutral. If people say to us, 'I want to do this', we would never say, 'No, that is not a good idea'. We would normally say, 'It is totally up to you'. As I said, intuitively I think we would feel there could be something in it. We just do not have an evidence base to back that up.

**Mr PERERA** — The TAC recently funded Ulysses Club members to undertake this type of training. What are your comments on that?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I am not sure. Is this a community grants program? It was not first aid training, was it?

**Mr PERERA** — I am not sure.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I might take that on notice, because I recall funding a program that was around a first response-type issue, but I do not — —

**Mr KOSTICK** — I believe it was advanced training.

**The CHAIR** — We have a comment from the audience. I will get you to give your name to Hansard just for the record.

**Mr KOSTICK** — Adam Kostick, Maurice Blackburn Lawyers.

**The CHAIR** — Could you repeat your comment?

**Mr KOSTICK** — I believe it was advanced rider training.

**The CHAIR** — Perhaps you might be able to get some further information and pass it through to the secretariat.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I will. It would be part of our community grants program, as I said, so it would be one of the programs that committees that make decisions about that had decided on.

**The CHAIR** — We would be interested in any review on it as well as part of that process.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Normally if we fund something there is not a huge evidence base about — —

That is one of the stipulations of that funding. Certainly we will find out and get the details to you.

**The CHAIR** — We are running out of time a little bit. We have time for a few more questions.

**Mr TILLEY** — I will make it quick. I want to go back to money, which is something we skipped earlier. During the course of the inquiry we have heard various references to motorcycles being cross-subsidised in terms of the TAC coverage. Can you give us some detail how this works, given that most motorcyclists — and they may or may not — also own another motor vehicle and are therefore in effect paying twice? Is that actually the case?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — It may well be the case. Multiple vehicle ownership is not an issue we consider when we work out cross-subsidies, because essentially cross-subsidisation in the TAC premium is only based on a couple of factors. The only bases for the charging of premiums are vehicle type and location — garaged address, effectively — for registration. So there are all kinds of other confounding factors which might contribute to what is a cross-subsidy.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can you just expand? Can you provide some demonstrations or examples for this inquiry?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — Age, sex, the safety of your vehicle — there are all kinds of other issues. One of them might be that, with multiple vehicle ownership, a person who has five vehicles is paying five premiums, and obviously you can only drive one vehicle at a time, so there are four idle vehicles, all of which you have paid a premium for. There is a cross-subsidisation effect there, but we do not note that, and it is not a component part of the premium collection process. When you are talking about cross-subsidies it is quite dangerous to say how much or how little the cross-subsidy is, because the premium itself only uses a couple of factors; but on those couple of factors the actual cost to pay for motorcycle injuries is much higher than the amount of premium collected. On the raw, simple facts you would say that there is a cross-subsidy to motorcycle riders.

**The CHAIR** — Can you give a guesstimate of what those figures might be?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — It is quite large. If you look at your payments, the TAC collects about \$53 million from motorcycle riders and pays out \$152 million worth of compensation from motorcycle injuries per annum. They are 3.5 per cent, or thereabouts, of the vehicle fleet and 20 per cent of the costs in terms of injury.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — What is the cost of a severe and profound injury to the person on average?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — The average would be around \$150 000; that is an average. Some people make a very good recovery and do not have anywhere near those costs. For other people it would be \$25 million in terms of future care costs. It really depends on how severe the injury is, so there are a lot of outliers that dominate the cost. The largest cost to the TAC — 60 per cent of its liability — is long-term care. There are about 3500 people managed in a major injury or in dependent supervision, and that is 60 per cent of our liability. We have about 44 000 active clients. It is actually a very small proportion of people who eat up much of the liability, and motorcycle injuries tend to be more serious than car injuries. That would be a factor in those costs.

In terms of cross-subsidisation, if you are looking at pure cost recovery for a large motorcycle, the premium would probably have to more than double; but, as I said, that is looking at it in a very narrow framework of focus. There are also affordability issues. If the TAC covers people whether they pay or do not pay, which it essentially does, most of its benefits are payable even if they are unregistered.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And off-road?

**Mr WOODROFFE** — Yes, and off-road. If you want to talk about cross-subsidisation, I suppose the largest cross-subsidisation is for cyclists and pedestrians, because they do not pay at all to have access to the scheme. It is very difficult to look at cross-subsidisation in a narrow framework. We have not done that. The focus of the scheme has essentially been, 'Do we collect enough to pay for everybody who has access to the scheme?', and we do; but if the premium goes to a point where people do not pay it but we are still covering them, it becomes an affordability issue. I understand, but I get a lot of calls from people about premiums. They say, 'I have three cars and a motorbike. Why am I paying this motorcycle safety levy and three car premiums? I only ride the bike

on the weekend'. There is no way to capture data that says you only ride on the weekend or that all of those three cars are not in use by some other member of the household. There is not a way for us to capture that. The only logical way, and I think the way it is done almost everywhere in Australia, is on a per vehicle basis. That is the way premiums are collected.

**Mr TILLEY** — That is great.

**The CHAIR** — I have one final question. Is there scope for TAC-style information to be presented to prospective licence gainers at the point of going through the licence-testing process? I am mindful of the evidence that we have taken onboard in the last couple of days from a plastic, maxillofacial surgeon at the trauma centre at the Alfred hospital. He does detailed plastic surgery and rehabilitation. We also saw today the orthopaedic surgeon. Their exposition of the trauma that results is reasonably salutary and how the presentation of trauma at the end of the process is evaluated by the TAC's campaigns and how you strike that constructive balance in the presentation of the information — that is, that people are mindful, both motorists and motorcyclists, of the risks of the interface between the two forms of transport on the road.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I suppose the short answer is that yes, there is certainly the potential to show that style of information. We would probably develop the material very specifically, potentially using some that already exists, including cutting, et cetera. We are quite mindful of contextual issues in relation to presenting what can be more graphic information. Potentially you can relate it to specific behavioural issues and you make sure that the target market is the correct target market for a particular advertisement. Once we have made an ad that we are really trying to get cut-through on, we will make sure it is shown at times that are appropriate, et cetera.

With all of those caveats, I would say most definitely. In fact we already provide material for a range of educational programs across Australia. Some of the programs I was talking about that we do not have a good evidence base around, which are the driver training-type programs, are already in use. We provide them with information and video products that will assist them in terms of getting particular messages across. The short answer is yes, we would certainly work with providers to do that.

**The CHAIR** — On behalf of my colleagues I thank you for your attendance here today and for the preparation you have done and the information you have given to us. We appreciate it very much.

**Witnesses withdrew.**